STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH EDUCATION: DIAGNOSTIC TECHNIQUES AND INTERRELATED FACTORS

Mamadjanova Madina Aleksandrovna
Uzbekistan World State Language University
T: +998 97 403-50-11
Email: m.a.solitude08@gmail.com

ABSTARCT

Theoretical analysis of the problem.
In international contexts, student satisfaction stands as a crucial indicator of higher education quality. Evaluations primarily focus on specific aspects of the educational process rather than the subjective state of students. It is imperative to diagnose satisfaction as a key manifestation of the inner world and experiences of the individual in the field of psychology. From a practical perspective, the study of student satisfaction with education serves as a vital tool to assess and improve the quality of education and to enhance psychological support at both the individual and group levels. Furthermore, it serves as a direct indicator of the efficacy of interventions aimed at unleashing the personal potential of students. It's important to note that the development of techniques for measuring subjective indicators of higher education quality primarily relies on the iden-subject approach and studies of personal potential.

INTRODUCTION

Recent psychological research has been focusing on interdisciplinary concepts such as quality of life and quality of education. It is logical to assume that they have significant interrelations because education plays a crucial role in modern life, affecting not only individuals but also society as a whole. While studies on quality of life give importance to subjective indicators like satisfaction and well-being, assessments of education quality in domestic and psychological works tend to focus on "objective" diagnostics of students' educational achievements. One reason for the lack of attention to subjective indicators in education quality assessments is the insufficient development of methodological tools for their study.

Sample, Methodologies, and Research Methods

We employed the following methodological approaches to evaluate students' satisfaction with the education they received.

1. We conducted a qualitative integral assessment of satisfaction by asking the question: "If you could give advice to yourself at the time when you were making a decision about choosing a university and a specialty for study, you would most likely advise..." and provided six alternatives. This question is based on the assumption that the answer requires the student to express their generalized, overall attitude towards whether they are satisfied with the education received. In the event of dissatisfaction, the question prompts them to specify the reasons for it.

2. We have developed a questionnaire to assess satisfaction with the procedural aspects of education. In previous publications, we referred to this as "satisfaction with educational needs in the process of learning," but we now believe this name is less accurate. The questionnaire

aims to gauge the overall emotional experience of learning. The version we are currently using includes 17 questions spread across six scales. These scales were selected based on data factorization in a sample of 440 subjects. Respondents evaluate the initial statements using a six-point agreement/disagreement scale. When consolidating responses across scales, values are averaged, resulting in scores ranging from -3 to +3.

3. Differential evaluation of images of real and desirable education. The methodology is based on the assumption that satisfaction can be understood as correspondence of reality to some desirable, ideal state. While in describing emotional attitudes the preferred state, as a rule, can be defined quite unambiguously (for example, the evaluation of an object as interesting is almost always more positive, preferred than as uninteresting), there is no unanimity with regard to what a "correct", "good", desirable education should be. The use of dual assessment allows us not only to determine satisfaction as a degree of closeness of real and desired assessments, but also to study the content of individual and group perceptions of the educational environment.

In the methodology we used, subjects are asked to evaluate the educational process in the university twice on 25 bipolar scales, using 7 gradations from 3 to +3, including 0. Three values can be analyzed for each scale: real and desirable evaluations and the difference between them. To obtain a generalized indicator of satisfaction we used the "city metric" the sum of absolute values of differences between real and desirable scores on all scales (the lower the indicator, the more satisfied the subject is with the education received).

As part of evaluating satisfaction with the education received, we asked questions aimed at self-assessment of learning success (as a generalization of the received grades and direct assessment of knowledge and skills in the specialty being mastered). Additionally, we administered two personality questionnaires: "The test of resilience" (D. A. Leontiev, E. I. Rasskazova) and the method "Style self-regulation of behavior" (V. I. Morosanova, E. M. Konoz). These assessment tools were integrated into a diagnostic program in the format of an MS-Excel spreadsheet. The research sample (No. 266) comprised students from Volgograd State Social and Pedagogical University (No. 179) as well as students from other universities in the city and the country, who were engaged via computer communication. We used the SPSS 20.0 package to process the obtained results.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION

When asked about their overall satisfaction with the education they received, the majority of respondents (191 people, 72%) stated that they would make the same choice again. 17 people (6%) indicated that they would choose the same university but a different major, while 24 respondents (9%) expressed a desire to choose the same major at a different university. 12% of the students (33 people) would prefer to opt for a different university and major altogether. None of the respondents wished to forgo higher education in favor of secondary education, and only one female student expressed a desire to delay higher education (this case was excluded from further analysis).

The overall satisfaction was not found to be influenced by whether the choice of higher education institution and major was made independently and deliberately, accidentally, or under the influence of relatives (8.67%: p-0.19). Regarding the scale of overall assessment of

satisfaction with the student years, only one statement was used: "I think that my student years will be one of the best in my life." It was observed that students satisfied with their choice of university rated it significantly higher (M 1.80; SD 1.34) compared to those who wished to study at a different university (M -1.58; SD 1.33; p-0.028).

On the developmental impact of learning scale, which includes statements related to ability development, maturation, and worldview formation, it was found that students who were completely dissatisfied with their choice of university and major gave significantly lower scores (M-1.08; SD 1.28) compared to those who were partially or completely satisfied (M-1.89; SD 0.93; p=0.000). The level of interest in the learning material reflects students' engagement with the subjects they are studying, as well as their understanding of the material and its significance.

Students who are completely satisfied with their choice of university express the most positive attitude toward the content being studied (M 1.66; S 0.85), followed by those who are satisfied only with their university choice (M- 1.60; S 0.67). Students who would prefer to study at a different university but in the same field show somewhat less positive attitudes toward the content (M-1.18; S-0.88), and those who are dissatisfied with their choice of university display the lowest scores (M-0.81; S= 1.07). The differences between these groups are significant (H-15.756; p 0.001).

The overall positivity of students in their state, including low stress levels, was significantly lower among students who were dissatisfied with their choice (M 0.65; S 1.40) compared to those who were partially or fully satisfied (M 1.19; S 1.21; U=2913; p = 0.025).

Students who are satisfied with their choice of university show higher acceptance of their ways of learning (M 1.38; S 0.90) compared to those who would prefer to study in another university (M- 0.77; S-0.99; U-3737.5; p=0.000).

Those students who are fully satisfied with their choice evaluated relationships with classmates and professors more favorably (M- 1.20; S 0.97), compared to those who are fully or partially dissatisfied with it (M 0.50; S 1.24; U-9531.5; p=0.000). The overall level of satisfaction is highest among students who are fully satisfied with the choice they made (M 1.52; S 0.63). It is somewhat lower among those who would like to study at the same university in another specialty (M 1.44; S 0.53).

Students who would like to study at another university in the same specialty are even less satisfied with the learning process (M 1.15; S 0.61). Those who would prefer to change both specialty and university showed the lowest level of satisfaction (M 0.77; S 0.80). Intergroup differences are significant at the p=0.001 level (H=15.756).

On the final indicator of the methodology of differential assessment of images of real desirable education, the most significant differences were between the groups of students satisfied (M 38.2; S 17.1) and dissatisfied (M 44.9; S 18.6) with their choice of university (document_number_1.5; p = 0.015).

It is important to note that there are significant differences among the groups being considered when it comes to assessing the actual image of education versus the desired image. Although we won't provide detailed descriptions of these differences, we observe trends that correspond to the most significant differences. Students who are more satisfied tend to evaluate their education as higher quality and more diverse in terms of development. They also find that it

requires less additional study in the workplace and involves more frequent (not just final) assessments, as well as being more focused on achievable goals for students. One notable difference in the desired image of education is that students who would advise themselves to make a different choice upon entering university expect the university to provide more opportunities for socializing outside of studies and to organize leisure time (M 2.24; S 1.41), compared to those who are content with their choice (M 1.65; S 1.91; U-8121; p=0.014).

In analyzing the groups based on personality questionnaires, it was discovered that students who are more satisfied have notably higher scores in all resilience test scales. However, no differences were found in terms of self-regulation of behavior style or in self-assessment of learning performance.

Satisfaction with procedural aspects of education questionnaire scales, except for the acceptance of learning methods scale, are significantly linked to resilience test indicators. The strongest connection is between all manifestations of resilience and the general positivity of the state during higher education studies (0.434 for the general indicator, p- 0.000; 0.479 for involvement, p 0.000).

Correlations between satisfaction with procedural aspects of education and self-regulation indicators are generally less pronounced. Overall self-regulation is most closely related to positive attitudes toward the content of education (r 0.288, p 0.000). Additionally, strong correlations were found between overall positivity during learning and the flexibility (r 0.349, p 0.000) and modeling (r 0.332, p- 0.000) scales.

It's worth noting the negative relationships between the scale of independence and satisfaction with procedural aspects of education. The strongest is the relationship with general satisfaction (r-0.157, p- 0.010), and weaker but significant relationships were found with the scales of the influence of learning on development (r-0.140, p- 0.023), positive attitude to the studied content (r=-0.138, p-0.025), and favorable relations with classmates and teachers (r-0.121, p-0.048).

CONCLUSION

The indicators of students' satisfaction with education, obtained using different methodological techniques, are related to each other, indicating their validity. At the same time, they each have specific content. These indicators can be used to assess the quality of education and to provide psychological support within higher education institutions.

In terms of content, complete dissatisfaction with both the university and the chosen field of study is linked to low ratings of the impact of training on personal development, overall positivity, and attitude towards the content of training. Positive relationships with classmates and teachers are particularly important for satisfaction with both the university and the chosen field of study.

The results support the possibility of increasing student satisfaction through changes in the educational process and the development of personal qualities such as resilience, flexibility, and the ability to model self-regulation.

REFERENCES

1. Kane D., Williams J., Cappuccini-Ansfield G. Student satisfaction surveys: The value in taking a historical perspective. Quality in Higher Education, 2008, vol. 14, Iss. 2, pp. 135-155 (in English).

2. Merkulova O. P. Sub "ektivnye indicators of quality of higher professional education (Subjective indicators of quality of higher education). Educational psychology in XXI century: theory and practice. (Educational psychology in XXI century: theory and practice). Volgograd, 2011, pp. 446-450 (in Russian).

3. Leont'ev D. A., Rasskazova E. 1. Testzhiznestoykosti (Test of hardiness). Moscow, 2006. 63 p. (in Russian).

4. Morosanova V. I., Konoz E. M. Style self-regulation of human behavior (Style self-regulation of human behavior). Voprosy psychologii (Questions of Psychology), 2000. 2, pp. 118-127 (in Russian).