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ABSTRACT
Sports allow young people to develop in many ways. It is one of the effective ways for them to acquire a social identity. Sports environments are areas where social integration takes place very easily. The aim of this research is to examine the social integration levels and attitudes towards sports of Batman University Physical Education and Sports School students according to various demographic variables. The research group consisted of a total of 303 students, 175 male-128 female, from Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports. The data were collected with the “Personal Demographic Information Form” applied to the students, the “Social Integration Scale in Sports” developed by Yılmaz et al. (2007) and the “Attitude Scale towards Sports” developed by Koçak (2014). In the analysis of the data, normality tests, T-tests, and Pearson correlation analysis were used as well as descriptive statistics. According to the study results, a significant difference was found between the Social Integration Scale in Sports and the Attitude towards Sports Scale and the variable of “doing sports with license” in favor of those who do licensed sports. A positive and significant relationship was found between the Social Integration Scale in Sports and the Attitude towards Sports Scale. It can be said that as the students' social integration level in sports increases, their attitude toward sports will also increase. As a result, sport is a very important factor in the development of individuals' social integration and attitudes towards sports.
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INTRODUCTION
In addition to providing health to the individual through bodily movements, sports also benefit social integration in terms of giving the person a social identity and belonging to a group (Küçük and Koç, 2004). Sports provide support to individuals’ physical, mental, and social personalities (Armstrong et al. 1998). Sport, which has a universal value because it brings societies together under the same roof, plays an important role in bringing people's behavior in society to the right point (Beutler, 2008; Sunay and Balci, 2003,Karaca and ilkım 2021). In the sports environment, people present themselves more easily and are in the socialization environment (Lenger and Schumacher, 2015). Socialization through sports involves individuals interacting with each other and reinforcing this, establishing friendships without marginalizing the other, and providing one's mental peace.
When individuals are in a sports environment, their physical, mental, and emotional development tends to increase regardless of which sports branch they are in. However, individuals can develop positive and correct friendships with different people (Baciu and Baciu, 2015). The person becomes a part of some groups in the sports environment and starts to gain status by interacting socially within the group. Physical and sports activities bring people together in the same environment and provide health gains as well as the emergence of social groups formed by these people (Rusu and Rusu, 2017; Duyan et al., 2022).

Social Integration: Social integration, or the level of mental adjustment to one's group with others, is a broad phenomenon. Social integration is a term with multiple meanings. It can cover concepts such as togetherness, cooperation, community, social groups, trust, and interaction. In Western countries, sports play an important role in eliminating the problems of citizens such as health, socialization, and social cohesion. Many politicians see sports as a neutral space where social cohesion can be strengthened (Ulseth, 2004). While social integration enables people to take control of life with various interactions and look at life more meaningfully, it also helps individuals to discover themselves by increasing their sense of self-confidence. The person adopts social norms more easily with social integrations (Brisette et al., 2000). Today, sports emerge as one of the most important ways of social integration. It helps the individual to enter social groups and mingle with people (Özdinç, 2005).

Attitude: According to Hogg and Vaughan (2006), attitude is a concept that directs our behavior even if it is not directly visible. Positive attitudes developed through sports contribute to the psychological state and self-confidence levels of young people while reducing or completely eliminating psychological disorders such as stress and depression in the individual (Jianzhong, 2004). Attitude is a psychological orientation expressed as being satisfied or dissatisfied by evaluating a certain situation at a certain point (Eagly and Chaiken, 2007). It is an important element for perceiving an individual's behavior. It is explained as a complex mental state that includes beliefs and emotions (Latchanna and Dagnew, 2009). It has been determined that more than one reason affects the determination of students' attitudes toward sports. However, demographic, sociological, and economic factors can cause differences in attitudes toward sports (Çağlayan et al., 2010).

The university environment is a dynamic period in which young people generally live separately from their families, take a new step towards their independence, experience rapid physical and mental changes, and increase social relations (Pullman et al., 2009). For this, it is of great importance to protect young people from bad habits and to provide them with a strong infrastructure in social, physical, and mental aspects of their daily lives, and a positive attitude and properly planned social integration, which is developed by organizing sports from childhood (Chung and Phillips, 2002; Koca and Demirhan, 2004; Stelzer et al., 2004; Dean et al., 2005; Mohammed and Mohammed, 2012).

From this point of view, our study, it is aimed to examine the social integration levels and attitudes of physical education and sports school students through sports.

**METHOD**

**Research Group**

The research group consisted of a total of 303 volunteers, 175 male-128 female, from Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports.

**Data Collection Tools**

The “Personal Demographic Information Form” developed by the researcher, as well as the “Social Integration Scale in Sports” and “Attitude Scale towards Sports” were used as data collection tools.

**Social Integration Scale in Sports (SISS)**

Social Integration Scale in Sports (SISS) was used as a data collection tool in the study. While the first part of the questionnaire distributed in the research consisted of statements questioning the personal characteristics of the participants,
the second part consisted of the social integration scale in sports consisting of 34 items and 7 sub-dimensions (integration, physical benefit, moral development, socialization, emotional development, personal growth, psychological development) developed by Yılmaz et al., (2006), in which the personal, social, psychological and physical gains of the participants as a result of their participation in sports were evaluated. A five-point Likert-type scale was used to evaluate the items (1= strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree).

**Attitude Scale Towards Sports (ASTS)**

As a second data collection tool, the "Attitude Scale Towards Sports" developed by Koçak (2014) consisting of 22 items and 3 sub-dimensions was used to determine the attitudes of university students studying in fields other than sports. There are 12 items in the Psychosocial Development sub-dimension, 6 items in the Physical Development sub-dimension, and 4 items in the Mental Development sub-dimension of the scale. The scale is scored as I completely agree “5 points”, agree “4 points”, moderately agree “3 points”, slightly agree “2 points”, and strongly disagree “1 point”. The highest score that can be obtained from the scale with this scoring method is 110; the lowest score is 22.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

Statistical analyzes of the data obtained from the scales were made with Microsoft Excel and SPSS 22.0 programs. In the research, first of all, empty data were evaluated for the convenience of the analyses and the control of the hypotheses. As a result of these processes, the data of 5 participants who filled incompletely and incorrectly were excluded from the analysis. After this stage, the extreme value analyses were evaluated by considering the Mahalanobis distance. As a result of the extreme value analysis, the data of 12 people were excluded from the analysis, and analyses were made on the data of the remaining 303 people. Then, the internal consistency coefficient of the scales was examined and it was determined as .91 for the Attitude Scale and .97 for the Social Integration Scale.

**RESULTS**

**TABLE 1:** Mean, Standard Deviation, and Skewness Kurtosis Values of the Scales Used in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>107.1287</td>
<td>11.64059</td>
<td>-1.138</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>146.0924</td>
<td>15.30003</td>
<td>-.946</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 1, it was determined that the skewness values were between -1.138 and -.946, and the kurtosis values were between 1.392 and,125. Considering the -1.5+1.5 skewness kurtosis values suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell, (2013), the distribution was found to be normal. After this stage, the normality assumptions were first checked with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and it was determined that the data did not meet the normality assumptions. However, there is an increasing number of opinions in the related literature that normality tests are not sufficient in Likert-type scales (Hair et al., 2013). For this reason, the prominent skewness and kurtosis values for the normality assumptions were examined. In this context, the -1.5+1.5 skewness kurtosis values suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) were taken into consideration and the distribution was found to be normal (Table 1). In this direction, T-Test was used to determine the differences between individuals' attitudes toward sports and their social integration levels in sports according to the variables of gender and licensed sports. In addition, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationships between the variables within the scope of the research.
TABLE 2: T-Test Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Gender Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>145,4286</td>
<td>15,19998</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>147,0000</td>
<td>15,44918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports according to the gender variable in Table 2 were examined, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the total score of social integration $t(301) = .883, p > .05$.

TABLE 3: T-Test Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Licensed Sports Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>License Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>148,6348</td>
<td>13,70126</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>142,4720</td>
<td>16,72335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports are examined according to the licensed sporting variable in Table 3, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the total score of social integration $t(301) = 3,516, p < .05$). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the social integration levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not.

TABLE 4: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Age Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (n=(303))</th>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the social integration levels in sports according to the age variable of the participants are examined in Table 4, although there is a statistically significant low-level positive relationship between age and the total score of social integration in sports ($r = .039; p > .05$), this relationship is not statistically significant found to be insignificant.

TABLE 5: T-Test Results on Attitudes Towards Sports According to Gender Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>107,1943</td>
<td>11,57420</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>107,0391</td>
<td>11,77573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the attitude levels of the participants towards sports according to the gender variable in Table 5 were examined, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the total attitude score $t(301) = .114, p > .05$.
**TABLE 6**: T-Test Results on Attitudes Towards Sports According to the Variable of Licensed Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>License Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>109,4663</td>
<td>9.53563</td>
<td>4.290</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>103,8000</td>
<td>13.46141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports according to the licensed sports variable in Table 6 are examined, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the total attitude score of \( t(301)=4.290 \ p<.05 \). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the attitude levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not.

**TABLE 7**: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results Regarding Attitudes Towards Sports According to Age Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n=(303)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the attitudes towards sports according to the age variable of the participants in Table 7 are examined, it has been determined that although there is a statistically significant relationship between age and attitude total score \( r=-.039; \ p>.05 \), in the negative direction, at a low level, this relationship is not statistically significant.

**TABLE 8**: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results between Levels of Social Integration in Sports and Attitudes towards Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n=(301)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.642**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the correlation analysis results between the social integration levels of the participants in sports and their attitudes towards sports are examined in Table 8, there is a statistically significant and moderately positive relationship between the total integration score and the total attitude total score \( r=.642; \ p<.05 \). This relationship was found to be statistically significant. This result can be interpreted as the level of attitudes towards sports will increase as the social integration levels of the participants increase in sports.

**CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

Sports is an environment that brings people together, socializes, and integrates them. Sports not only strengthen people physically but also makes them stronger individuals mentally, psychologically, and socially. While there are numerous benefits of sports that affect human life, one of the most important of these benefits is the development of a positive attitude towards sports in the individual by integrating people for the same purpose. The following results were obtained within the scope of our research, which examined the social integration levels and attitudes of physical education and sports school students in sports.

When the social integration levels of the participants were examined according to the gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Similar to our research,
Duman (2020), Evli (2018), and Filiz (2010) did not find a significant difference in terms of gender. However, Polat et al. (2019) found a significant difference according to the gender variable in their research.

A significant difference was found when the social integration levels of the participants in sports were examined according to the licensed sports variable. Considering the average scores, it is seen that the social integration levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not. In his study, Karadag (2019) found a significant difference according to the variable of doing licensed sports in parallel with our research.

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports were examined according to the gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Similarly, Duman (2020) did not find a significant difference in his study in parallel with our study.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports were examined according to the gender variable, no significant difference was found. In parallel with our research, Gökşel and Jazz (2016), Koçak et al. (2015), Yanık and Çamlıyev (2015), Yavuz and Yücel (2019), Gökşel et al. (2017), Gürbüz and Özkan (2012) did not find a significant difference between the attitude towards sports and the gender variable in their studies. However, Kargın and Şentürk (2019), Varol et al. (2017), Gökşel et al. (2017), Birsin et al. (2017), Gülülü (2007), Şişko and Demirhan (2002), Taşgın and Tekin (2009) Efe et al. (2018), Yıldırım et al. (2018), Koça and Demirhan (2004), Aksoy et al. (2020), in favor of male students in their studies; Tükel (2018) and Kalfa (2019) found a significant difference in favor of female students.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports according to the licensed sports variable were examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference. When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the level of attitude towards sports is higher for the participants who do licensed sports than those who do not. Again, in direct proportion to our study, Aksoy et al. (2020), Singh and Devi (2013), and Kangalgil et al. (2006) found a significant difference in favor of those who do licensed sports in terms of attitudes towards sports.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports were examined according to the age variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Gökşel et al. (2017), Koçak (2014), Turkmen et al. (2016), Varol et al. (2017), Journeyman (2019), Atlay et al. (2015), Sarı and Taylan (2020) could not find a significant difference in their studies parallel to our research. Kangalgil et al. (2006) found a significant difference according to the age variable.

When the correlation analysis results between the social integration levels of the participants in sports and their attitudes towards sports were examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant relationship.

As a result, no significant difference was found in the Social Integration and Attitude toward Sports scales of the participants according to gender and age variables. In Social Integration in Sports and Attitude towards Sports scales, a significant difference was found in favor of those who do sports under license, according to the variable of doing sports as licensed. This can be interpreted as those who do sports under license are more open to social integration through sports and develop more positive attitudes towards sports. In our research, there is a positive and significant relationship between the levels of social integration in sports and the level of attitude towards sports. This situation can be interpreted as the level of positive attitude towards sports will increase as the level of social integration in sports increases.

Sports have a great place in the socialization of people. In this research, which determines the social integration and attitudes towards sports in sports, it would be beneficial to conduct research in different fields by considering different socialization tools and fields. First of all, with the research to be applied in secondary education institutions, the problems of the youth in the socialization lane should be determined and precautions should be taken. It can be stated that it would be socially beneficial for universities,
especially sociology departments, to focus on sports-related studies, apart from physical education and sports colleges. Considering the great effect of sports on socialization, the spring sports festivals and organizations held by universities every year should be presented to university youth throughout the year within the framework of sports organizations, not in a one-week period.
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