

STUDYING THE STRESS LEVEL OF STUDENTS OF THE FACULTY OF SPORTS SCIENCES

Turkcapar Unal^{1,2}, K.Ch. Dzhanuzakov¹

¹Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

²Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to describe the stress state of students of the Department of Physical Education and Coaching Education of the Faculty of Sports Sciences on different variables. A descriptive screening model was used in the study. The study used a descriptive scanning model. The study group consists of 160 students, 20 students from each class, studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences, Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University in the academic year 2021-2022. The research data was collected using the Personal Information Form prepared by the researcher and the Rosenbaum Learned Resourcefulness Scale (RÖGÖ), adapted into Turkish by Dağ and Siva. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation, t-criterion, and one-way variance ($p < 0,05$) were analyzed on the obtained data. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the stress level of the participants studying in the Departments of Physical Education and Coaching Education was moderate and adequate. In addition, it was concluded that the faculties, gender, grade level, and socio-economic level of students did not affect the stress level.

Keywords: stress, socio-economic level, sport.

ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ УРОВНЯ СТРЕССА СТУДЕНТОВ ФАКУЛЬТЕТА СПОРТИВНЫХ НАУК

Туркчапар Унал^{1,2}, e-mail: unal.turkcapar@manas.edu.kg, ORCID: 0000-0002-4205-6446

К.Ч. Джанузакوف¹, e-mail: kanat.dzhanuzakov@manas.edu.kg, ORCID: 0000-0001-9138-4799

¹Кыргызско-Турецкий Университет «Манас», Бишкек, Кыргызстан

²Университет Кахраманмараш Сютчу Имам, Кахраманмараш, Турция

Аннотация

Целью данного исследования является описание стрессовых ситуаций студентов факультета спортивных наук на кафедрах «Преподаватель физической культуры и спорта» и «Подготовка тренеров по различным переменным». В исследовании использовалась описательная модель сканирования. Исследование проводилось в 2021-2022 учебном году на факультете спортивных наук университета Кахраманмараш Сютчу Имам. В опросе приняли участие 160 студентов, по 20 человек из каждой группы. Данные исследования были собраны с использованием «Формы личной информации», подготовленной исследователем, и «Описи RÖGÖ», разработанной Розенбаумом и адаптированной на турецкий язык Дагом и Шивой, на собранных данных были выполнены расчеты: среднеарифметическое, стандартное отклонение, t-критерий и однофакторный анализ дисперсии ($p < 0,05$). В результате анализа выявлено, что уровень стресса у участников, обучающихся на кафедрах преподавателей физической культуры и спорта и подготовки тренеров, был умеренным и адекватным. Кроме того, был сделан вывод о том, что кафедры, пол, группы и социально-экономический уровень студентов не влияют на уровень стресса.

Ключевые слова: стресс, социально-экономический уровень, спорт.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of «stress» is derived from the Latin term «estrica» and the French «estrece». In the past, the word «stress» in Europe had the meaning of calamity, destruction, trouble and misfortune. In Turkish, as in other languages, the word «stress» is used as a synonym for the word «tension» [12]. Stress, in its meaning, is a situation that occurs when the physical and mental boundaries of

the body are challenged and threatened in the face of everything that affects the body [26]. Anxiety and depression are the leading negative emotional states resulting from these stressful situations [15]. As a result of prolonged exposure to a stressful life, stress has psychological and physiological effects on people. This impact causes disorders such as cardiovascular diseases, respiratory diseases, digestive diseases, depression, obesity, substance

abuse, and sleep disorders, which are particularly common in modern societies [13].

There are different opinions on how to identify stress in advance and take preventive measures. Because stress symptoms are subjective, they can vary from person to person. Each person may experience unique symptoms of stress. Identifying stress symptoms in advance is important to prevent stress symptoms from growing and progressing to a chronic phase [18, 19].

Types of stress fall into two categories. The first is constructive stress, that is, «good» stress is a type of stress that has a positive effect on the body. The second is destructive stress, which causes unfavorable effects on the body [23]. Constructive stress is a type of stress that provides motivation and helps people cope with the challenges they face. Unlike destructive stress, constructive stress benefits people and communities. Low levels of stress increase energy in an organization, stimulate employees, increase creativity and contribute positively to hard work and mindfulness. In addition, constructive stress promotes people to act in harmony with others. It is a type of stress that is so extreme and intense that people cannot resist the life challenges they face and as a result overcomes human resistance. Destructive types of stress have a negative impact on an individual's life. Destructive stress causes negative consequences such as reduced performance of people and organizations, and deterioration of mental and physical health [23].

University period, which is one of the most important turning points in people's lives, is a social environment that allows young people to discover different lifestyles and approaches to life Ceyhan, Ceyhan & Kurtyilmaz (2009); Serlachius, Hamer & Wardley, (2007). However, it also brings with it a host of problems that threaten the emotional well-

being of young people (Erkan, 2009). During their student years, young people encounter different and new social roles in various social environments and try to strike a balance between their expectations and those of the environment [4, 20, 11].

In addition, they may face many stressful situations such as separation from their family, getting used to the conditions offered by the university, adjusting to dormitory life, worrying about their future professional life along with social, economic, and cultural changes [4, 20].

For this purpose, the stress level of the students studying in the Faculty of Sports Science was analyzed.

METHOD

Study sample

The study has a descriptive character, the stress conditions of students studying at the Departments of Physical Education and Coaching Education of the Faculty of Sports Sciences were studied. The study is based on a survey model. Survey models are research approaches that are conducted on a sample selected from the general population, including large groups, and are aimed at studying a situation that has existed in the past or continues to exist as it exists. The event, individual, or subject of the research tries to be defined in its own terms and in the way in which it exists [14].

Working group

The working group of this research consists of 160 students, 20 students from each class, studying at Kahramanmaraş Sütçü Imam University in the departments of Physical Education Teaching and Coaching Education in the academic year 2021-2022. The distribution of students by faculties, classes, gender, and socio-economic level is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – Working Group
Таблица 1 – Рабочая группа

Grade/ level/ Группа/ Уровень	Coaching Education Department Кафедра «Подготовка тренеров»					Physical Education Teaching Department Кафедра «Преподаватель физической культуры»				
	gender / пол		socio-economic level / социально-экономический уровень			gender/ пол		socio-economic levels / социально-экономический уровень		
	female жен.	male муж.	low нижний	medium средний	high верхний	female жен.	male муж.	low нижний	medium средний	high верхний
1	9	11	6	14	0	9	11	7	13	0
2	16	4	9	11	0	8	12	10	10	0
3	15	5	10	9	1	14	6	6	14	0
4	17	3	12	8	0	7	13	6	14	0
Total / Итого	57	23	37	42	1	38	42	29	51	0

Data collection tools

In order to find answers to the sub-problems of the study, the domestic and foreign literature [7, 17] was firstly studied by means of the literature review method.

Then, the «Personal Information Form» developed by the researcher was used to determine the demographic characteristics of the students. This form consists of questions regarding the students' gender, age, department, class, and socio-economic level. The socio-economic level (SLE) of students was calculated based on indicators such as place of residence before entering university, monthly family income, parents' education level, and parents' occupation. For each indicator, the following scale was used when calculating socio-economic level scores:

- The environment in which you lived before coming to university: (1) rural, (2) urban, (3) suburban, (4) city center.
- Your family's monthly income is (1) 0-500 Turkish Lira, (2) 501-1000 Turkish Lira, (3) 1001-1500 Turkish Lira, (4) more than 1500.
- Education level of mother and father (assessed separately): (1) primary school, (2) secondary school, (3) high school, (4) university.
- Occupation of your mother: (1) Housewife, (2) Retired, (3) Civil Servant, (4) Labourer.
- Your Father's Occupation: (1) Retired, (2) Civil Servant, (3) Labourer, (4) Self-employed.

According to the above scoring scale, the lowest socio-economic level score that can be calculated is 6 and the highest is 24. Accordingly, 6-12 points mean low, 13-18 points mean medium, and 19-24 points mean high socio-economic level. Finally, in order to determine the stress levels of the students of the Faculty of Sport Sciences, the RÖGÖ Inventory (Rosenbaum Learned Resourcefulness Scale) developed by Rosenbaum (1980) and adapted into Turkish by Dağ (1991) and its reliability was tested. It is a scale that the individual can answer on his/her own, easy to apply, and suitable for group application. The answers to the items are given by selecting and marking one of the options «Does not define at all», «Defines a little», «Defines quite well», «Defines well» and «Defines very well». A score of 1 is obtained for «does not define at all», 2 for «defines a little», 3 for «defines quite well», 4 for «defines well» and 5 for «defines very well». Thus, a total score ranging from 36 to 180 can be obtained. The 7-digit (-3, -2, -1, 0,

1, 2, 3) plus and minus scale scoring system was replaced by the above system due to its complexity. Rising scores indicate high self-control skills, in other words, the coping strategies represented in the scale are frequently applied. The internal consistency coefficient of Cronbach's alpha was .82 on the American sample and .79 on the Turkish sample (Siva, 1991). It was noted that the factor structure of the scale was generally consistent with the conceptual dimensions highlighted in its construction and that the factors obtained had an internal consistency of at least .51 [17, 7].

Data Analysis

Based on the data obtained through data collection tools, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, t-test, and one-way analysis of variance were conducted. A level of 0.05 was taken as the level of significance in the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As seen in Table 2, the average stress level of the students studying in the Physical Education Teaching Department is ($\bar{X}=123,8$), while the average stress level of the students studying in the Coaching Education Department is ($\bar{X}=123,6$). An increase in the scores obtained from the RÖGÖ scale indicates a high level of self-control skills, in other words, the coping strategies represented in the scale are frequently applied (Siva, 1991). Accordingly, it can be said that the stress levels of the students studying in both the Physical Education Teaching Department and the Coaching Education Department are moderate and adequate. This finding is also consistent with the literature data. As a matter of fact, Çardak (2002) [5] examined the relationship between job satisfaction and coping with stress among primary school teachers. It was found that there was no significant difference between job satisfaction and such variables as age, gender, experience, and field of occupation of teachers working in primary schools.

In Table 3. it can be seen that there are no significant differences between students' stress levels depending on the type of faculty they study at [$t(158-2) = 0.07, p > 0.05$]. This result can be interpreted that the schools the students attend do not differentiate their stress levels. Thus, Aysan and Bozkurt (2004) [1] found no significant differences between mean scores on the problem-solving, seeking social support, and avoidance subscales, which are coping strategies for stress,

Table 2 – Findings Related to Stress Levels of Participants
Таблица 2 – Уровень стресса участников

Type of Department / Вид обучения	N	Min.	Max.	\bar{X}	ss.
Physical Education Teaching Преподаватель физической культуры	80	72,00	164,00	123,8	16,32
Coaching Education / Подготовка тренеров	80	76,00	152,00	123,6	16,78

Table 3 – Findings Related to Differences in Students' Stress Levels According to Department Type
Таблица 3 – Данные о различиях в уровне стресса студентов по отделениям

Variables/ Переменные		N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Stress Levels Уровни стресса	Physical Education Teaching Преподаватель физической культуры	80	123,80	16,32	0,07	158	0,943
	Coaching Education / Подготовка тренеров		123,61	16,78			

Table 4 – Stress Levels of Students According to Gender Variable
Таблица 4 – Уровни стресса студентов по половому признаку

Variables/ Переменные		N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Stress Levels Уровни стресса	Female / Женщины	65	122,28	16,98	1,321	158	0,188
	Male / Мужчины	95	125,78	15,67			

across school type, gender, and age of school counselors. Similarly, Ellez (1999) [10] investigated stress and achievement motivation among teachers. The evaluation of data obtained from 150 teachers and 1,440 students studying at the Buca Faculty of Education concluded that teachers' perceptions of the sources of stress at work had significant differences according to gender, position, and seniority, but did not differ across faculties. Şanlı (2017) [22] studied teachers' level of perceived stress in terms of different variables and found no significant difference between the level of perceived stress and the type of school they work in.

In Table 4, there is no significant difference between the stress levels of the students according to their gender [$t_{(158-2)}=0,07$, $p>0,05$]. This finding can be interpreted as that the gender of the students does not differentiate their stress levels. Thus, the study conducted by Binboğa (2002) [3] was aimed at determining the ability to overcome stress and the general state of health of students of health schools, and in this regard, it was noted that there were no significant differences between the gender of students and the scores on the sub-

scales of the ways they used to cope with stress. Similarly, Bayram et al. (2016) [2] found that there was no difference between the indicators of male and female students when the scores on the perceived stress scale were examined according to gender in their study. In a study conducted by Yıldız (2018) [27], no significant differences were found in students' perceived stress according to the gender variable. Dağtekin et al. (2019) [8] stated that in their study, there were no differences between genders in terms of medians of the total score of the perceived stress scale. Şanlı (2017) [22] found that there were no differences in the total scores of the stress scale and the subscales of the sense of insufficient self-efficiency and perceived stress/discomfort. Tekin (2022) [24] in his study on physical education teachers, found no significant differences in stress perception by physical education teachers depending on the gender variable. In contrast to our study, Turksoy (2022) [25] found that in his study there is a differentiation depending on gender. In a study conducted by G. Dayan et al. (2020) [9] in a private educational institution, similar results to this study were obtained.

Table 5 – Findings Related to Students' Stress Levels According to Grade Levels
Таблица 5 – Уровень стресса студентов по группам

Grades / Группы	N	\bar{X}	S
1 st Grade / 1-я Группа	40	123,93	12,73
2 nd Grade / 2-я Группа	40	121,08	19,85
3 rd Grade / 3-я Группа	40	125,70	18,53
4 th Grade / 4-я Группа	40	124,13	14,10
General Average / Итого	160	123,71	16,50

Table 6 – The Impact of Grade Levels on Stress Levels
Таблица 6 – Влияние уровня обучения на уровень стресса

	Source of Variance Источник дисперсии	Total Squares Сумма квадратов	Stress Levels Уровни стресса	Mean of Squares Средне-квадратичное	F	p	Significant Difference / Достоверное различие
Stress Levels Уровни стресса	Inter-Group / Между группами	444,869	3	148,290	0,540	0,655	No / Нет
	Intra-Group / Внутри групп	42826,325	156	274,528			
	Total / Всего	43271,194	159				

Table 7 – Stress Levels of Students According to Socio-Economic Level
Таблица 7 – Уровень стресса студентов по социально-экономическому уровню

Variables / Переменные		N	\bar{X}	ss	t	sd	p
Stress level Уровень стресса	Low socio-economic level Низкий социально-экономический уровень	66	126,11	15,56	1,548	157	0,124
	Medium socio-economic level Средний социально-экономический уровень	93	122,00	17,10			

As seen in Table 5, the mean scores of the students regarding their stress levels in the 1st Grade As shown in Table 5, the mean scores of students' stress levels are $\bar{X}=123.93$ in Grade 1, $\bar{X}=121.08$ in Grade 2, $\bar{X}=125.70$ in Grade 3, and $\bar{X}=124.13$ in Grade 4. Grade 3 has the highest stress level and Grade 2 has the lowest stress level. The results of the analysis of variance conducted to determine whether this difference between stress levels by grade is significant are shown in Table 6. When examining Table 6, it can be seen that grade levels do not differentiate students' stress levels [$F_{(3-159)} = 0.540, p>0.05$]. This finding can be interpreted to mean that students' grade levels do not discern stress levels; in other words, in higher education, grade levels do not influence students' stress levels sufficiently. This finding is also consistent with the literature data. Thus, in the study conducted by Sürücü and Bacanlı (2006) and İ. Yildirim (1991) [21; 26] to determine the psycho-

logical resilience and adaptation level of university students, it was found that there is a significant relationship between students' adaptation to the university environment and their psychological resilience. They found that the indicators of adaptation to the university environment are increasing as the grade level increases.

Table 7 shows that although the mean stress level of students with lower socioeconomic level ($\bar{X}=126.11$) is higher than the mean stress level of students with higher socioeconomic level ($\bar{X}=122.00$), there is no significant difference between the stress levels of students depending on their socioeconomic level [$t_{(158-2)}=0.07, p>0.05$]. This finding can be interpreted that students of lower and middle socioeconomic level do not differ in stress level. This finding is inconsistent with the results of a study conducted by Çiftçi (Çiftçi, 2002) [6]. Çiftçi (2002) [6] noted that students with higher socioeconomic level are able to cope

with stress more effectively and have high scores on problem-solving and social support-seeking subscales, while students with low socioeconomic level have low scores on problem-solving and social support-seeking subscales. Malkoç (2021) [16] in his study on the relationship between the level of rational-emotional self-determination, perceived stress, and job satisfaction among teachers, noted that the level of monthly income showed a significant difference in the subscale of insufficient self-efficiency and that teachers with an income of less than 5,000 TL had higher stress indicators than teachers with income more than 5001 TL. However, he found no significant differences in the stress/discomfort subscales.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the analyses conducted and the results obtained, the following conclusions were drawn on the sub-problems of the study:

1. The level of stress in students studying at the Departments of Physical Education and Coaching Education is moderate and sufficient.

2. The departments where students study do not differ in their stress levels.
3. The gender of students does not have an impact on stress levels.
4. Students' grade levels do not differentiate stress levels; in other words, grade levels in higher education do not impact sufficiently students' stress levels.
5. The socioeconomic level of students did not differ in stress levels.

In order for university students to be able to deal with stressful factors that they may encounter in their future life and professional activities, psychological counseling and career guidance departments should pay special attention to psychological counseling, providing students with information about what stress and stressful situations are. Due to the era we live in, stress manifests itself as a health problem in all people. In order to remove our society from stress and to have a healthy generation, it is important to focus more on this issue, to direct teachers, students, and even the whole society to physical activity as well as to inform them about this issue.

REFERENCES

1. Aisan F., Bozkurt N. Okul psikolojik danyshmanlarynyn yasham doymu, stresle basha chykma stratejileri ile olumsuz otomatik dushunjeleri: Izmir ili eurneklemi / F. Aysan, N. Bozkurt //XIII. Ulusal Eitim Bilimleri Kurultai. – 2004. – T. 6. – №. 9.
2. Bairam L., Keskin Ö.D.Y., Derebashi D.G. Universite eurenjilerinin algylanan stres duzelelerinin cheshitli deyshkenler achysyndan injelenmesi / L. Bairam, Ö.D.Y. Keskin, D.G. Derebashi //Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. – 2016. – T. 8. – №. 14. – C. 291-302.
3. Binboa D. Osmangazi Universitesi Saalyk Yuksek Okulu eurenjilerinin stresle basha chykma ve genel saalyk durumlarynyn incelenmesi: дис./ Binboa D. – Saalyk Bilimleri Enstitüsü, – 2002.
4. Jeihan A.A., Jeihan E., Kurtyilmaz Y. Problemler ve problemler olma internet kullanymyna sahip universite eurenjilerinin euzellikleri / A.A. Jeihan, E. Jeihan, Y. Kurtyilmaz //Uluslararası. – 2009. – T. 5. – C. 470-474.
5. Chardak M. Ilkeuretim okullarynda chalyshan eurenmenlerin ish doymu ile stresle bashachykma iollary: дис. / M. Chardak //– Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, – 2002.
6. Chiftdzhi M.P. Bir grup lise eurenjisinin stresle basha chykma yollary ile strese karshy dayanyklylyklary arasyndaki ilishkinin injelenmesi / M.P. 6. Chiftdzhi // Iaynlanmamysch Yuksek Lisans Tezi). Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Eitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. – 2002.
7. Dağ İ. Rosenbaum'un Eurenilmish Guchluluk Eulcheii'nin universite eurenjileri ichin guvenirli ve gecherli / İ. Dağ //Turk Psikiyatri Dergisi. – 1991. – T. 2. – №. 4. – C. 269-274.
8. Dağtekin G. et al. Typ fakultesi eurenjilerinde jinsiyete geure sigara tuketimi, algylanan stres ve yasham kalitesi / Dağtekin G., A. Emrah, A. Kylynch, M. Eyuboğlu, D. Eyuboğlu, A. Unsal, D. Arslantash //Osmangazi Typ Dergisi. – 2020. – T. 42. – №. 4. – C. 350-356.
9. Dayan G. B. D. Euzel Eitim Okullarynda Chalyshan Eurenmenlerin Algylanan Stres Ve Ish Tatminleri Arasındaki Ilishkinin Injelenmesi / G. Dayan, V. Geucher, S. Bayat, K. Dayan //Anadolu Turk Eitim Dergisi: – 2020. 2(2); 33-51.
10. Ellez A. M. Euretım elemany stresı ve bashary gudusu, Iaynlanmamysch yuksek lisans tezi / A.M. Ellez //Dokuz Eylul Universitesi, Izmir. – 1999.
11. Erkan S. et al. Universite genchliinin problem alanlary ve yarym arama davranıshlary: Universite duzeyinde psikolojik danyshma ve rehberlik hizmetlerine ieunelik eurgut ve hizmet modelinin gelishtirilmesi / S. Erkan, Y. Euzbay, Ş. Terzi, Z. Dzhhangir Chankaia //Tubitak projesi. – 2009. – №. 106K340.
12. Geukler R. et al. Modern chagin hastalygy; stres ve etkileri/The Disease of Modern Era; Stress and its Effects / R. Geukler, I. Yshytan //Journal of history culture and art research. – 2012. – T. 1. – №. 3. – C. 154-168.
13. Gundoodu R., Adiguzel Eu. Stres ve yaratyly drama: Universite eurenjileri ile iapylan bir chalyshma / R. Gundoodu, Eu.Adyguzel //Iaratyly Drama Dergisi. – 2016. – T. 11. – №. 1. – C. 45-70.
14. Karasar N. Bilimsel Arashtyrma Ieuntemi (6. Basky). Ankara: 3A Arashtyrma Eitim Danyshmanlyk Ltd. aidogdu, YV, & Aksoi, S. (2015). A Study on Quantitative Benefits

- of Port Community Systems / N. Karasar //Maritime Policy & Management. – 1994. – T. 42. – №. 1. – C. 1-10.
15. Kojabasoglu C., Suresh N. C. Strategic sourcing: an empirical investigation of the concept and its practices in US manufacturing firms / C. Kojabasoglu, N.C. Suresh // Journal of Supply Chain Management. – 2006. – T. 42. – №. 2. – C. 4-16.
 16. Malkoch, E. Eüğretmenlerde Rasyonel Duygu Euz Kararlılyk Duzeyi, Algılanan Stres ve İş Doyumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. / E. Malkoch //Lüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara İlydyrym Baiazıt Üniversitesi, Saalyk Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara. – 2021
 17. Rosenbaum M.A. schedule for assessing self-control behaviors: Preliminary findings / M.A. Rosenbaum //Behavior therapy. – 1980. – T. 11. – №. 1. – C. 109-121.
 18. Rowshan A. Stres İeunetimi: Haiatynyzyn sorumluluunu almak için stresi nasyl İeunetebilirsiniz / A. Rowshan – Sistem İaiynjlylyk, – 2000.
 19. Sarp N. Hekim ve Stres İeunetimi / N. Sarp //Ankara Üniversitesi Typ Fakültesi Mejmuası, – 2000. 53(2), 133-137.
 20. Serlachius A., Hamer M., Wardle J. Stress and weight change in university students in the United Kingdom / A. Serlachius, M. Hamer, J. Wardle // Physiology & behavior. – 2007. – T. 92. – №. 4. – C. 548-553.
 21. Suruju M., Bajanly F. Uyum ve Psikolojik Daianyklylyk: Gazi Üniversitesinde Bir Chalyshma / M. Suruju, F. Bajanly //Muula: Muula Üniversitesi. – 2006. – T. 15.
 22. Shanli Eu. Euretmenlerin algılanan stres duzeylerinin cheshitli deiishkenler achisindan İncelenmesi / Eu. Shanli // Elektronik sosyal bilimler dergisi. – 2017. – T. 16. – №. 61. – C. 385-396.
 23. Taktak, N. (2019). Stres. Erishim adresi: <http://www.nedimtaktakkimdir.com>.
 24. Tekin, E. Beden Eitimi Euretmenlerinin Stres Algyları İle İletishim Bejerilerinin Arashtyrylmasy (Hakkari İli Eurnei) / E. Tekin //Lüksek Lisans Tezi, Eitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Van İuzunju İyl Üniversitesi. Van. – 2022.
 25. Turksoy K.K. (2022). Beden Eitimi Euretmenlerinin Algılanan Stres ve Fiziksel Aktivite Duzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, Lüksek Lisans Tezi, Amasia Üniversitesi, Saalyk Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Amasia.
 26. İlydyrym İ. Stres ve stresle bashachykmada gevscheme teknikleri / İ. İyildirim //Hajettepe Üniversitesi Eitim Fakültesi Dergisi. – 1991. – T. 6. – №. 6.
 27. İyildiz K. Eitim fakültesi eurenjilerinin zaman İeunetimi ve stres algylarynyn İncelenmesi / K. İyildiz //Sakaria University Journal of Education. – 2018. – T. 8. – №. 3. – C. 80-99.

REFERENCES

1. Aisan F., Bozkurt N. Okul psikolojik danışmanlarının yaşam doyumu, stresle başa çıkma stratejileri ile olumsuz otomatik düşünceleri: İzmir ili örnekleme / F. Aysan, N. Bozkurt //XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı. – 2004. – T. 6. – №. 9.
2. Bayram L., Keskin Ö., Derebaşı D.G. Üniversite öğrencilerinin algılanan stres düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi / L. Bayram, Ö. Keskin, D.G. Derebaşı //Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. – 2016. – T. 8. – №. 14. – C. 291-302.
3. Binboğa D. Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Yüksek Okulu öğrencilerinin stresle başa çıkma ve genel sağlık durumlarının incelenmesi: дис. / Binboğa D. – Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, – 2002.
4. Ceyhan A.A., Ceyhan E., Kurtyılmaz Y. Problemler ve problemler olmayan internet kullanımına sahip üniversite öğrencilerinin özellikleri / A.A. Ceyhan, E. Ceyhan, Y. Kurtyılmaz //Uluslararası. – 2009. – T. 5. – C. 470-474.
5. Çardak M. İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ile stresle başa çıkma yolları: дис. / M. Çardak //– Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. – 2002.
6. Çiftçi M.P. Bir grup lise öğrencisinin stresle başa çıkma yolları ile strese karşı dayanıklılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi / M.P. Çiftçi //Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. – 2002.
7. Dağ İ. Rosenbaum'un Öğrenilmiş Güçlülük Ölçeği'nin üniversite öğrencileri için güvenilirliği ve geçerliliği / İ. Dağ //Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi. – 1991. – T. 2. – №. 4. – C. 269-274.
8. Dağtekin G. et al. Tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinde cinsiyete göre sigara tüketimi, algılanan stres ve yaşam kalitesi / Dağtekin G., A. Emrah, A. Kılınc, M. Eyüboğlu, D. Eyüboğlu, A. Ünsal, D. Arslantaş //Osmangazi Tıp Dergisi. – 2020. – T. 42. – №. 4. – C. 350-356.
9. Dayan G. B. D. Özel Eğitim Okullarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerin Algılanan Stres Ve İş Tatminleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi / G. Dayan, V. Göçer, S. Bayat, K. Dayan //Anadolu Türk Eğitim Dergisi: – 2020. 2(2); 33-51.
10. Ellez A. M. Öğretim elemanı stresi ve başarı güdüsü, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi / A.M. Ellez //Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir. – 1999.
11. Erkan S. et al. Üniversite gençliğinin problem alanları ve yardım arama davranışları: Üniversite düzeyinde psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik hizmetlerine yönelik örgüt ve hizmet modelinin geliştirilmesi / S. Erkan, Y. Özbay, Ş. Terzi, Z. Cihangir Çankaya // Tubitak projesi. – 2009. – №. 106K340.
12. Gökler R. et al. Modern çağın hastalığı; stres ve etkileri/The Disease of Modern Era; Stress and its Effects / R. Gökler, İ. İşitan //Journal of history culture and art research. – 2012. – T. 1. – №. 3. – C. 154-168.
13. Gündoğdu R., Adıgüzel Ö. Stres ve yaratıcı drama: Üniversite öğrencileri ile yapılan bir çalışma / R. Gündoğdu, Ö. Adıgüzel //Yaratıcı Drama Dergisi. – 2016. – T. 11. – №. 1. – C. 45-70.
14. Karasar N. Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi (6. Baskı). Ankara: 3A Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık Ltd. aydogdu, YV, & Aksoy, S. (2015). A Study on Quantitative Benefits of Port Community Systems / N. Karasar //Maritime Policy & Management. – 1994. – T. 42. – №. 1. – C. 1-10.
15. Kocabasoglu C., Suresh N. C. Strategic sourcing: an empirical investigation of the concept and its practices in US manufacturing firms / C. Kocabasoglu, N.C. Suresh // Journal of Supply Chain Management. – 2006. – T. 42. – №. 2. – C. 4-16.
16. Malkoç, E. Öğretmenlerde Rasyonel Duygu Öz Kararlılık Düzeyi, Algılanan Stres ve İş Doyumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. / E. Malkoç //Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Yıldırım Bayazıt Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara. – 2021

17. Rosenbaum M.A. schedule for assessing self-control behaviors: Preliminary findings / M.A. Rosenbaum // Behavior therapy. – 1980. – T. 11. – №. 1. – C. 109-121.
18. Rowshan A. Stres Yönetimi: Hayatınızın sorumluluğunu almak için stresi nasıl yönetebilirsiniz / A. Rowshan – Sistem Yayıncılık. – 2000.
19. Sarp N. Hekim ve Stres Yönetimi / N. Sarp // Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Mecmuası. – 2000. 53(2), 133-137.
20. Serlachius A., Hamer M., Wardle J. Stress and weight change in university students in the United Kingdom / A. Serlachius, M. Hamer, J. Wardle // Physiology & behavior. – 2007. – T. 92. – №. 4. – C. 548-553.
21. Sürücü M., Bacanlı F. Uyum ve Psikolojik Dayanıklılık: Gazi Üniversitesinde Bir Çalışma / M. Sürücü, F. Bacanlı // Muğla: Muğla Üniversitesi. – 2006. – T. 15.
22. Şanlı Ö. Öğretmenlerin algılanan stres düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi / Ö. Şanlı // Elektronik sosyal bilimler dergisi. – 2017. – T. 16. – №. 61. – C. 385-396.
23. Taktak, N. (2019). Stres. Erişim adresi: <http://www.nedimtaktakkimdir.com>.
24. Tekin, E. Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Stres Algıları ile İletişim Becerilerinin Araştırılması (Hakkari ili Örneği)., / E. Tekin //Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi. Van. – 2022.
25. Türksöy K.K. (2022). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Algılanan Stres ve Fiziksel Aktivite Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Amasya Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Amasya.
26. Yıldırım İ. Stres ve stresle başa çıkma da gevşeme teknikleri / İ. Yıldırım // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. – 1991. – T. 6. – №. 6.
27. Yıldız K. Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin zaman yönetimi ve stres algılarının incelenmesi / K. Yıldız // Sakarya University Journal of Education. – 2018. – T. 8. – №. 3. – C. 80-99.

СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ:

Унал Туркчапар (Unal Turkcapar) – доктор PhD, профессор; факультет спортивных наук, Кыргызско-Турецкий Университет «Манас» – факультет спортивных наук, Университет Кахраманмараш Сутчу Имам; 720001, Кыргызстан, г. Бишкек, пр. Мира, 56; e-mail: unal.turkcapar@manas.edu.kg; ORCID: 0000-0002-4205-6446.

Джанузакан Канат Чыныбаевич (Dzhanuzakov Kanat Chynubaevich) – кандидат педагогических наук, профессор; факультет спортивных наук, Кыргызско-Турецкий Университет «Манас»; 720001, Кыргызстан, г. Бишкек, пр. Мира, 56; e-mail: kanat.dzhanuzakov@manas.edu.kg; ORCID: 0000-0001-9138-4799.

Поступила в редакцию 14 июля 2023 г.

Принята к публикации 31 августа 2023 г.

ОБРАЗЕЦ ЦИТИРОВАНИЯ

Унал Туркчапар. Исследование уровня стресса студентов факультета спортивных наук / Туркчапар Унал, К.Ч. Джанузакан // Наука и спорт: современные тенденции. – 2023. – Т. 11, № 3. – С. 120-127. DOI: 10.36028/2308-8826-2023-11-3-120-127

FOR CITATION

Unal Turkcapar, Dzhanuzakov K.Ch. Studying the stress level of students of the faculty of sports sciences. Science and sport: current trends, 2023, vol. 11, no. 3. – pp. 120-127. DOI: 10.36028/2308-8826-2023-11-3-120-127