



Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi

Yıl: 2026 Sayı: (20) ss: 1-10

Academic Review of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Year: Issue: (20) pp: 1-10

<http://dergipark.org.tr/pub/ohuiibf/>

ISSN: 2564-6931

DOI: 10.25287/ohuiibf.1795482

Geliş Tarihi/Received: 02/10/2025

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 27/06/2026

Yayınlanma Tarihi/Published: 27/06/2026

Araştırma Makalesi

Research Article

## EXAMINING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL POLICY

Ali AĞAR<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

The study was conducted as a cross-sectional descriptive study to examine the school engagement of university students in the context of social policy. The population of the study consisted of associate and undergraduate students at a state university in the Eastern Black Sea region in the spring semester of 2023-2024. G power power analysis was performed to determine the sample size and it was determined that 327 students would be sufficient for the study. The data were collected using the Demographic Information Form, Questions Measuring the Situation of Students Regarding Their Lives in the Context of Social Policy, and the University Students' School Engagement Scale (UOSES). It was found that the school engagement status of associate degree students was higher than that of undergraduate students. In addition, students who received scholarships had higher levels of school engagement than students who did not receive loans or any support. As a result, it is among the responsibilities of both decision-makers and social policy makers working in this field to improve the conditions of university students, whom social policy examines from a modern perspective, during their school life and to prepare them for the future in a more hopeful way.

**Keywords** : Social Policy; University Students; School Commitment; Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution.

**Jel Classification** : I23; I28; J24.

<sup>1</sup> Asst. Prof. Dr., Artvin Çoruh University, aliagar828@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-2771-9587

### Citation:

Ağar, A. (2026). Examining University Students' School Engagement in the Context of Social Policy, Academic Review of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Issue 20, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.25287/ohuiibf.1795482>.

# ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN SOSYAL POLİTİKA BAĞLAMINDA OKUL BAĞLILIK DURUMLARININ İNCELENMESİ

## Öz

*Araştırma üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal politika bağlamında okul bağlılık durumlarının incelenmesi amacıyla kesitsel tanımlayıcı olarak yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini 2023-2024 bahar yarıyılında Doğu Karadeniz bölgesinde yer alan bir devlet üniversitesinde ön lisans ve lisans öğrencileri oluşturmuştur. Örneklem büyüklüğünü belirlemek için G power güç analizi yapılmış ve 327 öğrencinin çalışma için yeterli olacağı belirlenmiştir. Veriler Demografik Bilgi Formu, Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Politika Bağlamında Yaşamlarına İlişkin Durumunu Ölçen Sorular ve Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Okul Bağlılığı Ölçeği (ÜÖOBÖ) kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Ön lisans öğrencilerinin okul bağlılık durumlarının lisans öğrencilerine göre yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Ayrıca burs alan öğrencilerin okul bağlılık durumları kredi ya da hiçbir destek almayan öğrencilere göre yüksek çıkmıştır. Sonuç olarak sosyal politikanın modern bakış açısı içerisinde incelediği üniversite öğrencilerinin, okul hayatları boyunca şartlarının iyileştirilmesi ve onları geleceğe daha umutlu bir şekilde hazırlaması hem karar vericilerin hem de bu alanda çalışan sosyal politikacıların sorumlulukları arasındadır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler** : Sosyal Politika; Üniversite Öğrencileri; Okul Bağlılık; Yükseköğrenim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu.

**Jel Sınıflandırılması** : 123; 128; J24.

## INTRODUCTION

Social policy is defined as the set of public policies and practices aimed at securing the welfare of disadvantaged groups in society who are coping with economic difficulties (Dal, 2017: 5). Pensioners, women, children, working classes and individuals requiring special protection are of special interest to social policy science. However, it is observed that many university students in our country face material and moral difficulties. Since university students do not have professional chambers, associations or trade unions, they have difficulty in making their voices heard and defending their rights. This situation has led the field of social policy to examine groups such as university students and to develop solutions. From this modern perspective, university students are one of the disadvantaged groups that social policy should pay special attention to.

Youth, which constitutes a significant portion of countries in terms of quantity, is an important value for all societies and is considered as a transition period between childhood and adulthood (Arici, Özgür, & Efendioğlu, 2019: 80). Young people are often seen and represented through a deficit-based framework that assumes they lack the knowledge and skills to make informed choices about their sexuality, health and well-being (Fields et al., 2014: 310). However, young people are seen as the leading actors of social change, economic development and technological innovation in their countries. Social, political, cultural and economic dynamism in a country cannot be considered independent of its youth. Universities are among the institutions that host a significant part of the youth program (Arici et al., 2019: 80).

Universities are educational institutions where ideas are freely expressed and discussed and scientific thinking skills are tried to be acquired. The university period is a period in which students experience changes in their personal, academic, socio-cultural and economic lives, as well as efforts to change their future. In this period, students' developmental years at university not only allow them to develop their knowledge and skills but also lead them to gain an independent identity (Donat, Bilgiç, Eskiocak, & Koşar, 2019: 452).

Maslow stated that in order for individuals to have a healthy state of mind, it is important that basic characteristics or other needs closely related to these needs are met or that these characteristics are not threatened. He explained the fulfillment of these needs in an ascending hierarchical order of development, with biological needs at the bottom and personal and social needs at the top. In this hierarchical order in which ranking is important, the basic level characteristics must be satisfied to a certain extent in order for the higher level needs to be met. Individuals who are able to fulfill their higher-level needs are socially successful and democratic, able to make decisions independently and

mentally healthy individuals who can accept their own and others' free characteristics (Bilgiz & Peker, 2018: 1980).

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is explained in detail in most university courses. However, due to various political shortcomings for students at the point of implementation, no student can reach the top step of Maslow's triangle. This is a clear indication that university students are no different from other disadvantaged groups.

Social policy offers a framework for engaging with and learning from young people about their understanding of the contemporary social and political climate in relation to their rights, but little research has examined the ways in which young people participate in or respond to the social policies that shape their lives (Fields et al., 2014: 310).

In the light of this information, this study aims to contribute to making education and training processes in universities more effective, increasing the quality of life, strengthening their commitment to school, and making various opportunities more accessible by presenting the problems experienced by university students in detail from their own perspectives as a result of the interviews and determining the solution suggestions in detail, providing ideas to the stakeholders who will play a role in eliminating these problems. In the development and progress of countries, addressing the problems of university students, who are seen as the living force of the society and accepted as the future of the country, is of great importance both individually and socially.

Research questions:

Is enough importance given to the lives of university students in the context of social policy?

Do some socio-demographic characteristics of university students affect their lives in the context of social policy?

Is there a relationship between undergraduate and associate degree students' social policy awareness?

## **I. METHOD**

### **I.I. Type of Research**

The study was conducted as a cross-sectional descriptive study to examine the school engagement of university students in the context of social policy.

### **I.II. Place and Time of the Study**

This study was conducted in a state university located in the eastern Black Sea region. The data were collected in the spring semester of 2023-2024.

### **I.III. Population and Sample of the Study**

The population of the study consists of associate and undergraduate students studying at a state university in the Eastern Black Sea region. While all students studying in 2023-2024 constitute the population of the study, the sampling was carried out using the convenience sampling method. In this study, a priori power analysis was performed with the G power package program to determine the sample size. Two-tailed test, small effect size (0.2), alpha value of 5%, theoretical power of 95 (Cohen, 2013: 17) 327 students were determined to be sufficient for the study. Convenience sampling method was used as the sampling method in the study. Convenience sampling method provides more economical data collection in terms of material and moral aspects (Creswell & Creswell, 2017: 105). In this context, the data of the study were collected by Google form method and the students who filled the data collection form properly and completely were evaluated within the scope of the study and the study was completed with a total of 338 people.

### **I.IV. Limitations of the Study**

This study covers students studying at a state university in the Eastern Black Sea region. Therefore, the results obtained from the study can only be generalized to the research group.

#### **I.V. Data Collection Tools**

Within the scope of the research, an online questionnaire form (Google form) was used as data collection tools. The questionnaire consists of a total of 3 sections: Socio-Demographic Information Form, Questions Measuring Students' Situation Regarding Their Lives in the Context of Social Policy, and University Students' School Engagement Scale (USSES).

##### **a. Socio-Demographic Information Form**

It consists of a total of 9 questions about the demographic characteristics of the students (gender, education level, monthly personal income, etc.) prepared by the researcher.

##### **b. Questions Measuring Students' Situation Regarding Their Lives in the Context of Social Policy**

Prepared by reviewing the literature (Taşlıyan, Paksoy, & Hırlak, 2013: 964; Özkan & Güvendir, 2015: 175; Çepni, Aydın, & Kılınç, 2018: 437; Mahmut & Demir, 2018: 338; Deniz, 2022: 120; Öçal, 2022: 125). The questionnaire consists of a total of 14 questions that include propositions aiming to evaluate the situation of students regarding their lives in the context of social policy (such as access to social assistance, receiving in-kind-cash aid or scholarships, and whether the scholarships received meet their needs). Students were asked to evaluate these propositions as “yes” and “no”.

##### **c. University Students' School Engagement Scale (USSES)**

The University Students' School Engagement Scale was developed in 2016 by Marco et al., (Maroco, Maroco, Campos, & Fredricks, 2016: 2) and its Turkish validity and reliability study was conducted by Gün et al. in 2019. (Gün, Turabik, Arastaman, & Akbaşlı, 2019: 509). The scale is structured as a 5-point Likert-type instrument, with response options ranging from “1 = Never”, “2 = Sometimes”, “3 = Most of the time”, “4 = Often”, to “5 = Always”.

The 15-item scale consists of three sub-factors: behavioral (items 1-5), affective (items 6-10) and cognitive commitment (items 11-15). The 6th item is reverse coded. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient values for each factor were calculated as .74, .88, and .82 for behavioral, affective, and cognitive commitment dimensions, respectively. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the whole scale is .88. In our study, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was .82. The scores that can be obtained from the University School Engagement Scale are divided between 15 and 75. Students with low scores on the scale have low school engagement, while high scores indicate high school engagement.

#### **I.VI. Ethical aspects of the research**

Ethical permission was obtained from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of a state university for the conduct of the study (Date: 16.04.2024/ Number: E-18457941). In addition, institutional permission was obtained from the university where the study was conducted (Date: 26.04.2024/ Number: E-12475423). Permission was obtained from the researchers who conducted the Turkish validity and reliability of the scale. In addition, a voluntary consent form was obtained from the students participating in the study.

#### **I.VII. Statistical Analysis**

SPSS 22.0 package program was used to evaluate the data. In the evaluation of the data, percentage, frequency, mean and standard deviation were used for questions measuring sociodemographic characteristics and their status regarding their lives in the context of social policy. In addition, the Chi-Square Test was used for the questions measuring the situation regarding their lives in the context of social policy. In the analysis of variables with a row column number of 2x2, the results of Pearson chi-square test are reported if the expected value number is greater than 25, Yates chi-square test if it is between 25 and 5, and Fisher Exact test if it is less than 5 (Güngör & Bulut, 2008: 86). In the evaluation of statistical significance,  $p=0.05$  was accepted. The conformity of the research data to normal distribution was evaluated by Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test. Since it was observed that the data were not suitable for normal distribution, nonparametric tests were preferred in data analysis. Post-hoc Bonferroni correction was performed to determine the accuracy of the difference between the groups

with significant differences in the duration of Kruskal-Wallis tests. Since there were 3 groups in the variables, the significance level recorded with Bonferroni modification was calculated as  $0.05/3 = 0.016$ .

## II. FINDINGS

Descriptive characteristics of the students are presented in Table 1. It was found that most of the students who participated in the study were male (77.5%), most of them had bachelor's degree (53.6%), most of them chose the department to study at university (82.8%) and the average age of the students was  $20.91 \pm 2.88$  years. It was also found that 49.4% of the students lived in a detached house with their families, 76% owned their own houses, 34.6% could barely make ends meet during their university education, 86.4% did not work part-time and 44.1% received scholarships.

**Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of Students**

| Descriptive characteristics             |                                    | n   | %    |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Gender                                  | Female                             | 76  | 22.5 |
|                                         | Male                               | 262 | 77.5 |
| Education degree                        | License                            | 181 | 53.6 |
|                                         | Associate's degree                 | 157 | 46.4 |
| Self-preference of the school           | Yes                                | 280 | 82.8 |
|                                         | No                                 | 58  | 17.2 |
| Type of dwelling where the family lives | Detached                           | 167 | 49.4 |
|                                         | Apartment                          | 157 | 46.4 |
|                                         | Slum                               | 14  | 4.1  |
| Ownership of the house                  | Our own home                       | 257 | 76   |
|                                         | Rent                               | 81  | 24   |
| Part-time employment status             | Yes                                | 46  | 13.6 |
|                                         | No                                 | 292 | 86.4 |
| Economic status of the student          | I am considered wealthy            | 25  | 7.4  |
|                                         | Middling                           | 100 | 29.6 |
|                                         | I can barely get by                | 117 | 34.6 |
|                                         | I need support                     | 96  | 28.4 |
| Loan or scholarship status              | I get a scholarship                | 149 | 44.1 |
|                                         | I'm getting a repayment loan       | 107 | 31.7 |
|                                         | I get neither scholarship nor loan | 82  | 24.3 |
| Age                                     | 20.91 $\pm$ 2.88                   |     |      |

Table 2 shows the opinions of undergraduate and associate degree university students regarding their awareness in the context of social policy. It is seen that the level of social opportunities offered to university students is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) according to the level of education. While 87.9% of associate degree students stated that social opportunities were insufficient, 78.5% of undergraduate students stated that social opportunities were insufficient.

It is seen that the level of knowledge about the rights provided to university students is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) according to the level of education. It was determined that 70.2% of undergraduate students did not have enough information about the rights provided, while 54.1% of associate degree students did not have enough information.

It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between the level of whether the library facilities meet the need for studying and the degree of education. It was determined that 67.5% of associate degree students did not meet the need for library facilities, while 55.2% of undergraduate students did not meet the need for library facilities to study.

It is seen that there is a statistically significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) between providing free transportation on the days of spring festivals and the degree of education. It was determined that 90.6% of undergraduate students agreed that free transportation should be provided on the days of spring festivals, while 82.8% of associate degree students agreed with undergraduate students.

**Table 2: The Relationship between Undergraduate and Associate Degree Students' Awareness in The Context of Social Policy**

|                                                                                                          |     | Associate's degree | License     |              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|-------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                          |     | n (%)              | n (%)       | p            |
| Social opportunities offered to university students are adequate                                         | Yes | 19 (%12.1)         | 39 (%21.5)  | 0.022        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 138 (%87.9)        | 142 (%78.5) |              |
| Our school has all kinds of social activities                                                            | Yes | 18 (%11.5)         | 49 (%27.1)  | <b>0.000</b> |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 139 (%88.5)        | 132 (%72.9) |              |
| Social opportunities are at the same level wherever there are universities                               | Yes | 13 (%8.3)          | 22 (%12.2)  | 0.324        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 144 (%91.7)        | 159 (%87.8) |              |
| Everything I dreamed of before I came to university and everything I dreamed of after I came is the same | Yes | 14 (%8.9)          | 24 (%13.3)  | 0.277        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 143 (%91.1)        | 157 (%86.7) |              |
| The rights given to university students are sufficient                                                   | Yes | 35 (%22.3)         | 35 (%19.3)  | 0.504        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 122 (%77.7)        | 146 (%80.7) |              |
| I have enough information about the rights provided to university students                               | Yes | 72 (%45.9)         | 54 (%29.8)  | <b>0.002</b> |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 85 (%54.1)         | 127 (%70.2) |              |
| I have housing problems in my university life                                                            | Yes | 25 (%15.9)         | 20 (%11.0)  | 0.248        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 132 (%84.1)        | 161 (%89.0) |              |
| Distribute books/photocopies free of charge                                                              | Yes | 123 (%78.3)        | 151 (%83.4) | 0.234        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 34 (%21.7)         | 30 (%16.6)  |              |
| I think that KYK scholarships are treated equally                                                        | Yes | 51 (%32.5)         | 58 (%32.0)  | 0.931        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 106 (%67.5)        | 123 (%68.0) |              |
| I think they are treated equally when leaving the KYK dormitory                                          | Yes | 76 (%48.4)         | 74 (%40.9)  | 0.165        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 81 (%51.6)         | 107 (%59.1) |              |
| The amount of KYK scholarship/loan given is sufficient                                                   | Yes | 12 (%7.6)          | 7 (%3.9)    | 0.205        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 145 (%92.4)        | 174 (%96.1) |              |
| Services provided for students with disabilities are sufficient                                          | Yes | 43 (%27.4)         | 57 (%31.5)  | 0.410        |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 114 (%72.6)        | 124 (%68.5) |              |
| Library facilities are sufficient to meet my study needs.                                                | Yes | 51 (%32.5)         | 81 (%44.8)  | <b>0.021</b> |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 106 (%67.5)        | 100 (%55.2) |              |
| Free transportation should be provided on the days of spring festivals.                                  | Yes | 130 (%82.8)        | 164 (%90.6) | <b>0.049</b> |
|                                                                                                          | No  | 27 (%17.2)         | 17 (%9.4)   |              |

When Table 3 is analyzed, no statistically significant difference was observed between university students' gender, self-selection status, ownership of the house, part-time employment status, type of residence and economic status of the family, and the PPLSS ( $Z = -0.902$ ,  $p = 0.367$ ;  $Z = -1.334$ ,  $p = 0.182$ ;  $Z = -0.840$ ,  $p = 0.401$ ;  $Z = -1.291$ ,  $p = 0.197$ ;  $X^2 = 0.888$ ,  $p = 0.642$ ;  $X^2 = 1.554$ ,  $p = 0.670$ ). A statistically significant difference was observed between the degree of education and the USSSES ( $Z = -3.131$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). It was determined that associate degree students had higher levels of school engagement than undergraduate students. When Table 3 is examined, a statistically significant difference was observed between the status of receiving loans and scholarships of university students and the level of USSSES ( $X^2$ : 12.490,  $p < 0.05$ ). Bonferroni test results were examined to determine the source of the difference and significant results were found in favor of students receiving scholarships ( $p < 0.016$ ).

**Table 3: Comparison of Descriptive Characteristics and School Addiction Status of University Students**

| Variables                               |                                                 | N   | University Students' School Engagement Scale (USSES) |                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
|                                         |                                                 |     | Rank mean                                            | z/x <sup>2</sup> /p                             |
| Gender                                  | Female                                          | 262 | 172.08                                               | Z=-0.902                                        |
|                                         | Male                                            | 76  | 160.61                                               | P=0.367                                         |
| Education degree                        | License                                         | 181 | 154.01                                               | Z=-3.131                                        |
|                                         | Associate's degree                              | 157 | 187.36                                               | P=0.002                                         |
| Self-preference of the school           | Yes                                             | 280 | 172.23                                               | Z=-1.334                                        |
|                                         | No                                              | 58  | 153.93                                               | P=0.182                                         |
| Ownership of the house                  | Our own home                                    | 257 | 172.00                                               | Z=-0.840                                        |
|                                         | Rent                                            | 81  | 161.56                                               | P=0.401                                         |
| Part-time employment status             | Yes                                             | 46  | 186.77                                               | Z=-1.291                                        |
|                                         | No                                              | 292 | 166.78                                               | P=0.197                                         |
| Type of dwelling where the family lives | Detached                                        | 167 | 165.02                                               | X <sup>2</sup> =0.888<br>P=0.642                |
|                                         | Apartment                                       | 157 | 174.85                                               |                                                 |
|                                         | Slum                                            | 14  | 162.86                                               |                                                 |
| Economic status of the student          | I am considered wealthy                         | 25  | 162.38                                               | X <sup>2</sup> =1.554<br>P=0.670                |
|                                         | Middling                                        | 100 | 168.92                                               |                                                 |
|                                         | I can barely get by                             | 117 | 177.75                                               |                                                 |
|                                         | I need support                                  | 96  | 161.90                                               |                                                 |
| Loan or scholarship status              | I get a scholarship <sup>a</sup>                | 149 | 148.84                                               | X <sup>2</sup> =12.409<br>P=0.002<br>a>b<br>a>c |
|                                         | I'm getting a repayment loan <sup>b</sup>       | 107 | 181.47                                               |                                                 |
|                                         | I get neither scholarship nor loan <sup>c</sup> | 82  | 191.42                                               |                                                 |

Table 4 shows the mean scale scores of school engagement levels of university students according to their education level. While the school engagement levels of associate degree students were 53.15±9.75, the school engagement levels of undergraduate students were 51.58±8.54. The total school engagement level of university students was 51.77±9.20.

**Table 4: Mean Scores of the School Engagement Scale (USSES) According to the Educational Status of University Students**

|                  | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean±SS    |
|------------------|-----|---------|---------|------------|
| Associate degree | 157 | 15      | 75      | 53.15±9.75 |
| License          | 181 | 28      | 75      | 50.58±8.54 |
| Total            | 338 | 15      | 75      | 51.77±9.20 |

### III. DISCUSSION

Social policies are programs implemented by the state to ensure equal access to basic services such as health, education, security, housing and employment. The main objective of social policy is to ensure social justice between individuals (Uslu, 2018: 1). In this study, the school engagement status of university students in the context of social policy was examined. It was found that the school engagement status of associate degree students was higher than that of undergraduate students. In addition, it was determined that the total school engagement of university students was at a medium level.

When we look at the literature, there are almost no studies examining university students in the context of social policy (Kovankaya, 2021: 49; Öçal, 2022: 10; Uslu, 2018: 30). Therefore, our study is one of the limited number of studies that examine university students in terms of social policy.

When we look at the findings evaluating our research in the context of social policies; it is seen that the level of social opportunities offered to university students, the level of information about the rights provided to students, the level of whether library facilities meet the needs for studying and the level of free transportation on the days of spring festivals are statistically significant with the degree of education. The statistical difference between associate's and bachelor's degree students in terms of social policies can be interpreted as the difference in campuses, differences in the profile and expectations of students, the duration of education and the use of social facilities, and the lack of budget and resources.

In our study, it was found that there were significant differences in the school engagement levels of university students according to the variables of education degree and receiving loans or scholarships, while no significant differences were found between the variables of gender, self-preference to school, ownership of the house, part-time working status, type of residence of the family and economic status.

In a study conducted with students, it was found that female students had higher levels of school engagement than male students (İlgar & Parlak, 2014: 230). In another study, it was observed that male students had higher levels of school engagement than female students (Erdoğan, 2018: 210). In our study, although there was no significant relationship between gender and school engagement, the school engagement of female students was higher than that of male students. This may be due to the fact that female students are more active in motivation, discipline, social relations and communication.

One of the most important findings of our study is that school engagement levels of associate degree students are higher than undergraduate students. A review of the literature reveals that students with low levels of school engagement tend to come to school late, have attendance problems, have low academic achievement and exhibit problematic behaviors at school (Özdemir, 2012: 229). The low level of school engagement of undergraduate students can be interpreted as an indication that some political decisions are wrong in our country. For example, the lack of teacher appointments in recent years may have interrupted the school engagement of undergraduate students due to reasons such as the lack of teacher appointments and the fact that people with associate's degree level are more likely to be appointed.

One of the other important findings of our research is that there are significant differences in students' school engagement levels according to their education and the status of receiving loans or scholarships. Students who received scholarships had higher levels of school engagement than students who did not receive loans or any support. The reason for this can be interpreted as that students receiving scholarships may have increased their level of school engagement due to the concern that their scholarships will be cut.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, it was determined that the services provided by university students in the context of social policy are not sufficient, the majority of them are not treated fairly when determining the KYK scholarship and dormitory and the amount of loans/scholarships is insufficient, and the rights given to disabled students and the library conditions at the university are not sufficient. In terms of school engagement status, it was determined that the school engagement status of associate degree students was higher than that of undergraduate students.

It is known that many university students in our country face financial and moral difficulties. In particular, it is important in terms of fairness and conscientious responsibility that KYK scholarship and loan applications should be meticulously examined and KYK dormitory applications should be meticulously examined. In this context, it is the responsibility of both decision-makers and social politicians working in this field to improve the conditions of university students, which social policy examines from a modern perspective, throughout their school life and to prepare them for the future in a more hopeful way.

---

### **Ethics Statement**

*The author explicitly declares that they have adhered to ethical guidelines throughout the entire preparation process of this study. In the event of any violation, the Journal of Artvin Çoruh University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences bears no responsibility whatsoever, and all responsibility rests solely with the author.*

*For this study, the necessary permissions were obtained from the Artvin Çoruh University Ethics Committee on April 26, 2024, under number: E-12475423.*

### **Conflict of Interest**

*The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding this study. Furthermore, they confirm that the study is original and is not currently under review in another journal.*

---

## REFERENCES

- Arici, F., Özgür, E., & Efendioğlu, A. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin üniversite eğitimi ve yaşamına ilişkin problemleri: Bir durum çalışması. *Journal of Advanced Education Studies*, 1(2), 79–95.
- Bilgiz, Ş., & Peker, A. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin duygu düzenleme becerileri ile psikolojik yardım ihtiyaçları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(4), 1978–1990.
- Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Çepni, O., Aydın, F., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2018). Erasmus programına katılan öğrencilerin yaşadıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri: Fenomenolojik bir araştırma. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 8(3), 436–450.
- Dal, S. (2017). Sosyal politikanın dönüşümünü küreselleşme üzerinden anlamak. *Uluslararası Beşeri ve Sosyal Bilimler İnceleme Dergisi*, 1(1), 4–18.
- Deniz, Ü. (2022). Öğrencilere sunulan imkanlar ve fırsatlar açısından Türk yükseköğretiminin değerlendirilmesi. *Üniversite Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 119–129.
- Donat, A., Bilgiç, B., Eskiocak, A., & Koşar, D. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sorunları ve çözüm önerileri. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 9(3), 451–459.
- Erdoğan, M. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin okula bağlılık ile genel öz-yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 32(1), 205–227.
- Fields, A., Snapp, S., Russell, S. T., Licona, A. C., Tilley, E. H., & Crossroads Collaborative. (2014). Youth voices and knowledges: Slam poetry speaks to social policies. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 11(4), 310–321.
- Gün, F., Turabik, T., Arastaman, G., & Akbaşlı, S. (2019). Adaptation of university student engagement inventory to Turkish culture: Validity and reliability study. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 20(2), 507-520.
- Güngör, M., & Bulut, Y. (2008). Ki-kare testi üzerine. *Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1), 84–89.
- İlgar, M. Z., & Parlak, K. (2014). Üniversite sınavına hazırlanan öğrencilerin okula bağlılık, öz bilinç ve girişimcilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. *İZÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(4), 211-242.
- Kovankaya, Ş. (2021). Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi döneminde gençlere yönelik sosyal politikalar (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). *Kırklareli Üniversitesi, Kırklareli*.
- Mahmut, İ., & Demir, M. (2018). Eğitimde fırsat eşitliği ve kamu politikaları: Türkiye üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 337–359.
- Maroco, J., Maroco, A. L., Campos, J. A. D. B., & Fredricks, J. A. (2016). University student's engagement: Development of the University Student Engagement Inventory (USEI). *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 29, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-016-0042-8>
- Öçal, M. (2022). Üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik sosyal politika uygulamaları ve öğrencilerin yaşam koşullarına etkisi (Doktora Tezi). *Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli*.
- Özdemir, M. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okul yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin algılarının cinsiyet ve fakülte değişkenlerine göre incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2(2), 225–242.
- Özkan, G., & Güvendir, M. A. (2015). Uluslararası öğrencilerin yaşam durumları: Kırklareli ve Trakya Üniversiteleri örneği. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 174–190.

Taşlıyan, M., Paksoy, H. M., & Hırlak, B. (2013). Kurumsal imaj ile örgütsel bağlılık, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(4), 963–979.

Uslu, R. (2018). Sosyal politika çerçevesinde barınmada Yüksek Öğrenim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu'nun (KYK) rolü: Ankara ili örneği (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Ankara.