Systematic Action in Academics for Improving Student Success

İlker Etikan*, Sulaiman Abubakar

Department of Biostatistics, Near East University, Cyprus.

www.ijsrm.humanjournals.com

ABSTRACT

The research study covers only student from Near East University Cyprus with the aim of revealing the usefulness of student engagement to academics performance. This tells the extent which student is determine to perform or engage himself in school predicts his academic achievement. The sample questions were collected on two hundred and twenty seven student (227) by means of closed ended design questionnaire. However, analysis and transformation of variables were conducted using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0. Based on the analysis newly student performance showed no significant difference with old student performance. Performance of student base on gender and performance of student among years of study showed there was no significant difference, also the result for Cumulative Grade Points Average (CGPA) among student performance after Kruskal Wallis test showed at least one the performances is different, as a result, Mann Whitney was performing to see the differences. Weak student versus very good student and weak student versus good student showed there was significant difference while very good student versus good student indicated there was no significant difference. However, student performance based on source of sponsorship Kruskal Wallis result reveals that there was no significant difference since p-value is greater than alpha value and the result of spearman rank correlation indicated a positive week relationship between ages on student performance.

INTRODUCTION

Stovall (2003) acknowledge engagement of student by saying apart from the study time student devoted concentrating in school, it also needs to combine with commitment in taking part in educational activities. Student engagement is seen by Bomia and colleagues (1997) as compliance struggling of student, giving attention by having motivation desire towards the achievement in the learning manner. (Harper and Quaye, 2009) Educational psychology field reveals student engagement as entails not merely surviving effective but most have the feelings and sense of succeeding. Hu and Kuh (2001) and Kuh (2009a) view educational activities of student as the allocation of time by student to his activities of education in the direction of the contribution to his anticipated results, based on the quality of his joined struggles.

Gunuc and Kuzu (2014) explain educational engagement as any demonstration with developmental of results either mentally or by reasoning through process of learning as well as class and outside classroom, academically and collective behaviors to achieve successful learning outcomes based on excellence and level of the students.

Data collection methods

Questionnaire design was used to accomplished research study by channels of using closed ended question which makes it easy and less time for the respondent to answer. Student was asked question that has to do with general life and background.

Purpose

What ascertains the research is about the systematic engagement in academics for improving student performance in Near East University Cyprus.

Data analysis

Different type's statistical analysis was used to ascertain the goal, such as Independent Sample t-Test of Mann Whitney U test, one way ANOVA of Kruskal Wallis Test, Cross tabulation of Chi-Square Test and Correlation. These statistical analysis was performed with the help of statistical software titled SPSS version 18. The software also assisted in transforming some variables especially recording into different variables. All the variables were tested for normality to see whether the assumption was held or not, all the same, some

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

151

that violated the parametric assumption an alternative approach to the parametric solution was achieved for the correct analysis

Sampling methods

Sample size of 227 students participated in the survey in the month of April 2017 across Near East University Cyprus, The method of sampling covers postgraduate and undergraduate student, student gender, scholarship student and non-scholarship student, International and National student and those students residing off campus and on campus.

Table 1: Survey Response Percentage

Survey Response Percentage				
Age category	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Middle age	150	66.1	66.1	66.1
Old age	4	1.8	1.8	67.9
Young age	65	28.6	28.6	96.5
Missing data	8	3.5	3.5	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Years of stay				
Fresh student	106	46.7	46.7	46.7
Old student	121	53.3	53.3	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Student status				
Very good student	35	15.4	15.4	15.4
Good student	96	42.3	42.3	57.7
Week student	94	41.4	41.4	99.1
Missing data	2	0.9	0.9	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Student residence				
In campus	36	15.9	15.9	15.9
Near campus	93	41.0	41.0	56.9
Distance campus	98	43.2	43.2	100.1

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

152

Total	227	100	100	100
Transportation service				
Like	133	58.6	58.6	58.6
Dislike	94	41.4	41.4	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Source of sponsor				
By self	30	13.2	13.2	13.2
By parent	133	58.6	58.6	71.8
By scholarship	60	26.4	26.4	98.2
Missing data	4	1.8	1.8	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Marital status				
Single	183	80.6	80.6	80.6
Into relationship	12	5.3	5.3	85.9
Married	27	11.9	11.9	97.8
Divorced	5	2.2	2.2	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Religion				
Islam	94	41.4	41.4	41.4
Christianity	131	57.7	57.7	99.1
Buddish	1	0.4	0.4	99.5
Others	1	0.4	0.4	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Various sport				
Individual event	87	38.3	38.3	38.3
Team event	134	59.0	59.0	97.3
Missing data	6	2.6	2.6	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Hobby				
Reading	99	43.6	43.6	43.6
Sport	50	22.0	22.0	65.6
Music/watching	27	11.9	11.9	77.5

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

153

Others	51	22.5	22.5	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Tradition				
Mosque time	63	27.8	27.8	27.8
Church time	87	38.3	38.3	66.1
Bedtime	26	11.5	11.5	77.6
Others	46	20.3	20.3	97.9
Missing data	5	2.2	2.2	100
Total	227	100	100	100
Monthly expenditure				
Low in spending	184	81.1	81.1	81.1
Medium in spending	28	12.3	12.3	93.4
High	14	6.2	6.2	99.6
Missing	1	0.4	0.4	100
Total	227	100	100	100

This result explain the above table using descriptive statistics were age of student participated were presented based on age categories such that middle age was found to be (66.1%), old age (1.8%) and young age (28.6%) in that order. Student component base on their period of stay in the university showed new student were (46.7%) and old student were (53.3%). Student performance for those doing well showed (15.4%), those doing very well indicated by (42.3%) and those that were weak in performance gave 41.4%. Student residential setting for those leaving on-campus accounted for (15.9%), near campus (41.0%) and distance campus gave (43.2%). More so student staying off-campus and therefore enjoyed the school transport system were having (58.6%) and (41.4) % for those that did not enjoy the transportation system, must of them were found leaving on-campus. The survey indicated that majority of students were taking care by their parent which resulted to (58.6%) followed by student on scholarship with (26.4%) and those that sponsor themselves showed (13.2%) respectively. Student marital status was also considered were single student in the University accounted for (80.6%) then (11.9%) were married, student that were into relationship showed 5.3% and divorced student shows (2.2%) respectively. Representation of student based on religion showed that Islam have 41.4% ,Christianity have 57.7%, Buddish have 0.4% and

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

154

other religion have 0.4% respectively. Student engagement in recreational activities were considered, that is student that have interest for various sport activities such as individual event which gave account for 38.3% and those playing team event were 59.0% . Assessment of student based on hobby was seen, were student with reading hobby accounted by 43.6%, sport were 22.0% , Music and watching recorded 11.9% and others showed 22.5% respectively. Tradition of student was not left behind, we have those with tradition for Mosque time which gave 27.8%, Church time gave 38.3%, time for Bed accounted 11.5% while others gave 20.3% respectively and lastly monthly expenditure of student with less spending were 81.1% , in between low and high spending were 6.2% and also those that spend high were 6.2% correspondingly.

Table 2: Performances of student determine by qualified lectures

Performances of student determine by qualified lectures (independent sample t test)							
Descriptive statistics							
CGPA	N	Median	Min.	Max.	Normality	p-value	Test statistics
Agreed	172	3.80	1.50s	3.700			
Disagreed	50	3.65	1.50	3.700	Not normal	0.301	Mann Whitney 3889.00
Performance of student determine by structures/ facilities (independent sample t test)							
Agreed	175	3.8000	1.50	3.700			
Disagreed	47	3.8000	1.50	4.400	Not normal	0.739	Mann Whitney 3983.000
Performance of student among gender (independent sample t test)							
Male	135	3.8000	1.50	3.700			
Female	87	3.8000	1.50	3.700	Not normal	0.540	Mann Whitney 5588.000
Performance of student based on their years of study (One way ANOVA)							
1st year	104	3.8000	1.60	3.700			
2nd	67	3.8000	1.50	3.700	Not normal	0.249	Kruskal Wallis
3rd +	50	3.5000	1.50	4.300			
Performance of student based on years of entrance (independent sample test)							
Fresh student	105	3.8000	1.60	3.700			
Old student	117	3.7000	1.50	3.700	Not normal	(0.203)	Mann Whitney 5631.000
Student Number supporting the importance of transport system (independent sample t test)							
Enjoy	133	108.0000	1.00	227.00			

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

155

Not enjoy	94	115.5000	3.00	220.00	Not normal	0.203	Mann-Whitney 5631.000
Monthly expenditure among student performances (independent sample t test)							
Good	95	340.000	100.00	1500.00			
Very good	35	300.000	100.00	1300.00		0.691	Kruskal Wallis
Weak	94	345.000	100.00	1500.00			
CGPA among student category of performance (One way ANOVA to Kruskal Wallis)							
Performance 1	93	3.5000	1.50	3.700			
Performance 2	34	3.9000	1.80	4.50	Normal	0.032	Kruskal Wallis
Performance 3	93	3.8000	1.50	3.700			
P1 versus P2						0.032	Mann Whitney 11.89.00
P1 versus P3						0.030	Mann Whitney 3531.500
P2 versus P3						0.573	Mann Whitney 1478.500
P1 vs P2 and P1 vs P3 is significant P2 vs P3 not significant							
Performance among source of sponsorship (one way ANOVA to Kruskal Wallis)							
Sponsorship 1	58	3.9000	1.80	3.700			
Sponsorship 2	130	3.8000	1.50	4.50	Normal	0.143	Kruskal Wallis
Sponsorship 3	30	3.9000	1.90	4.50			
Sponsorship 4	4	3.9000	2.50	4.00			

The above table result Statistics test was tested for normality before the real analysis, some that violated the parametric assumption an alternative to the parametric solution performed the correct analysis. The result characteristics of participants showed that student performance due to qualified lectures indicate no significant difference considering $(p = 0.301)$, median for those that agreed with qualified lecturers would increase student performance is higher than those that did not disagree also increase in performance due to structures and facilities shows no significant difference $(p = 0.739)$ both the median were the same. In respect of gender, performance $(p = 0.540)$ shows there was no significant

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

156

difference between performances of male student with performance of female student equality of median testify that. Performance of student using one way ANOVA also showed that there was no significant difference among years of study $(p = 0.249)$. Fresh student performance also showed no significant difference with old student performance $(p = 0.203)$. Again there was no significant difference between participants that agreed with the importance of transport system with those that did not $(p = 0.203)$. Monthly expenditure of student with student performances shows no significant difference $(p = 0.691)$. The result for CGPA among student performance after Kruskal Wallis test, $(p = 0.032 < \alpha = 0.05)$ showing at least one the performances are different, so therefore further analysis using Mann Whitney was performing to see the differences. Weak student versus very good student and weak student versus good student showed there was significant difference while very good student versus good student indicated there was no significant difference. However, student performance based on source of sponsorship Kruskal Wallis result reveals that there was no significant difference since p-value is greater than alpha value $(p = 0.143 > \alpha = 0.05)$.

Table 3: Cross tabulation of period of stay versus student performance

Cross tabulation of period of stay versus student performance $\chi^2 - value$ (0.801) $p - value$ (0.849)					
Period of stay has effect on student performance		Student performance			
		Good student	Very good	Weak student	Total
Period of stay	New student				
	Count	48	16	41	105
	% within period of stay	45.3%	15.1%	38.7.%	100.0%
	% within performance	50.0%	45.7%	43.6%	46.7%
	Old student				
	Count	48	19	53	120
	% within period of stay	39.7%	15.7%	43.8%	100%
	% within performance	50.0%	54.3%	56.4%	53.3%
	Total				
	Count	96	35	94	226
	% within period of stay	42.3%	15.4%	41.44%	100%
	% within performance	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

157

Cross tabulation of place of residence versus student performance $\chi^2 - value$ (12.783) $p - value$ (0.47)					
		Good student	Very good	Weak student	Total
Place of residence	Near campus				
	Count	38	11	43	92
	% within place of residence	40.9%	11.8%	46.2.%	100.0%
	% within performance	39.6%	31.4%	45.7%	41.0%
	Distance campus				
	Count	50	17	30	97
	% within place of residence	51.0%	17.3%	30.6%	100%
	% within performance	52.1%	48.6%	31.9%	43.2%
	On–campus				
	Count	8	7	21	36
	% within place of residence	22.2%	19.4%	58.3%	100%
	% within performance	8.3%	20.0%	22.3%	15.9%
	Total				
	Count	96	35	94	225
	% within place of residence	42.3%	15.4%	41.44%	100%
	% within performance	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

Cross tabulation result above for student years of study with student performance gave $\chi^2 = 0.801$ and $p = 0.849$. The $p - value$ for the Chi-Square is greater than the $\alpha - value$. Therefore, failing to reject the null hypothesis was applied and we conclude that years of study has no effect on student performance. For residence among student performance, the computed $\chi^2 = 12.783$ and 0.047. The $p - value$ is less than the $\alpha - value$. The null hypothesis was rejected, we there for conclude that place of residence has effect on student performance.

Research Question and hypothesis: Is there any significant indication showing that there is linear correlation between age with CGPA

$H_0 : (H_0 : \rho = 0)$

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

158

$H_1 : (H_1 : \rho \neq 0)$

TEST STATISTICS: - Bivariate Correlation between age with CGPA

The assumption for using Pearson correlation did not hold because the scatter plot data is not linear, that means there is no linear relationship. Alternative for using the correlation was spearman rank correlation. Therefore the result for the spearman rank correlation was found to be 0.166 indicating a very positive week correlation between age on CGPA. Then $(p = 0.015)$ which is $(p < \alpha)$. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there was correlation between student age on their performance, this imply that there is significant relationship between student age on CGPA performance.

Research Question and hypothesis: Is there any significant indication showing that there is linear correlation between student performances with their hobby.

$H_0 : (H_0 : \rho = 0)$

$H_1 : (H_1 : \rho \neq 0)$

TEST STATISTICS: - Phi analysis for cross tabulation

The Phi correlation between student performances with their hobby is 0.252 indicating a positive week relationship between performance and hobby. Therefore $(p = 0.108)$ which $(p > \alpha)$. Acceptance of the null hypothesis was done, in conclusion, there was no correlation between student performance and hobby

Research Question and hypothesis: Is there any significant indication or suggestion revealing a linear relationship between marital status with student performance.

$H_0 : (H_0 : \rho = 0)$

$H_1 : (H_0 : \rho = 0)$

TEST STATISTICS: - Phi analysis for cross tabulation

The Phi correlation between marital status with student performance is 0.163 indicating a positive week relationship. The $p\ (0.980) > \alpha\ (0.05)$. We, therefore, accept the null

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

159

hypothesis and conclude that there was no significant relationship between marital status with student performance.

Result of correlation between student performance with student place of residence violate the assumption for using Pearson correlation from the scatter plot graph showing no linear relationship between student performance with student place of residence based on that we perform Spearman Correlation and the result was 0.047 while the $p = 0.486$. This shows that there was very positive week correlation seen between student performances with their place of residence that is no correlation with regards to student performance in terms of place of residence.

CONCLUSION

The effective engagement in academics for improving student performance revealed that student of Near East University Cyprus have seen the usefulness of student engagement to academics performance. Their performance determination and engagement predicts their academic success, all this was achieved by the good help of the qualified lectures with structure and facilities the school have on ground. Performance in terms of gender shows no dissimilarity between them. It was seen that newly student performance exhibited no difference with old student performance also performance of student indicated no significant disparity among years of study. Monthly expenditure with student performance has shown no significant difference. Among the CGPA result with the level of good, better and weak performance presented at least one level performances were different. Student outcome concerning their sources of sponsorship shows there was no significant change among the sponsors. Spearman rank correlation showed a positive low relationship between age on student accomplishment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Assist. Prof. Dr. Salim. (October 2014 Volume : 5 Issue: Article 19 ISSN 1309-6249). The Relationship Between Student Engagement and their Academic Achievement. GUNUC International Journal on trend in Education and their Implication.

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

160

2. Astin, A., & w. (1984). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. Journal of colledge Student Development, 25, 297-308.

3. Bratti, M., & Staffolami, S. (2002). Student Time Allocation And Educational Production Function University of Ancona.

4. Considine, G., & and Zappala, G. (2002). Influence of Social and Economics disadvantage in the Academic Performance of Socail Students in Austrialia. Journal of Sociology, 38, 129-148.

5. Cummins, R., & A. (1998). International Society for Quality Life Studies. Quality of life defination and terminology : a discussion document from the International Society for Quality of Life Studies. Blacksburg Virginia: International Society for quality of life studies.

6. David, K. a., Reuben, a. M., & Sillah. (2003). The Effect of Academic Environment and Background Characteristics on Student Satisfaction and Performance. Colledge Studen Journal, 37, 298-308.

7. George, D., Kuh, J. K., Brian, K., Bridges, J. C., & Hayek. (2006). What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature Commissioned Report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success.

8. Kuh, G. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. Journal of Higher Education, 66(2), 121–155.

9. Laura, H. C. (n.d.). THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. Problem Solution Exploration Papers LITERATURE REVIEW OF STUDENT SUCCESS.

10. Molner, D., Busseri, M., Perrier, C., & and Sadava, S. (2009). A longitudinal examination of alcohol use and subjective well-being in an undergraduate sample. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 70(5), 704–713.

11. Muhammad, H. M. (31 October 2 November 2012). Environment Satisfaction of Campus and Off-Campus Settings: A conceptual overview Behaviour Studies. AicE-Bs2012 Cairo ASIA Pacific International Conference on.

12. Shoukat, A. Z. (2013 Vol, 1, No. 8,283-289). Factors Contributing to Students Academic Performance A case study of Islamia University Sun Campus. American Journal of Education Research.

13. Vicki, T. D. (November 2010). The Higher Education Academy Student engagement literature review. The Higher Education Academy Student engagement literature review.

14. Julian, R., & Betts, a. D. (1999). The determination of Undergraduate Grade Point Average: The Relative Importance of Family Background, High School Resources and Peer Group Effects. Journal of Human Resources, 34: 268-293.

15. Korrel, W., & Kanoy, a. J. (1996). Effect of first year Leaving and learning residence Hall on Retention and Academic Performance. Journal of the Freshman Year Experience and Student in Transition, 8:7-23.

16. Mechael, D. (1993). Academic Performance in College Town Education.

17. Miller, W., P, and Birch, R., & E. (Retrieved on December 3, 2008). The Influence of type of light School Attended on University Performance. interscince,wiley.com /journal/118538313.

18. Reddy, P., & and Telcott, J. (Retrieved o July 4, 2008). Predicting University Success in Pychology . from:http:/www.aston.ac.uk/downlosds/ihs/peelea/huw2006p.pdfpdf.

Citation: İlker Etikan et al. Ijsrm.Human, 2017; Vol. 7 (3): 150-161.

161