

Examination of Psychological Counselor Candidates' University Satisfaction: The Case of Uludag University

Nagihan Oğuz Duran¹ & Feyyat Gökçe¹

¹ Faculty of Education, Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey

Correspondence: Nagihan Oğuz Duran, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey. E-mail: noguzduran@hotmail.com

Received: December 8, 2016

Accepted: January 3, 2017

Online Published: January 5, 2017

doi:10.5539/jel.v6n2p85

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n2p85>

Abstract

In the present study, Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, Guidance and Psychological Counseling (GPC) undergraduate program students' expectations and satisfaction levels regarding the services and facilities provided by the university were investigated in a sample of 354 students (227 females and 127 males). The data collected by the "Student Expectation and Satisfaction Survey of Hacettepe University" were analyzed based on the program type (Daytime and Nighttime Education) and year of study. Findings revealed that the expectation levels of students in all groups were high and satisfaction levels were medium or lower. There was no significant effect on the satisfaction level of the program type and the year of study.

Keywords: satisfaction, psychological counselor candidates, undergraduate students

1. Introduction

The fulfillment of one's needs can be regarded as the basic condition for the survival of an individual (Metle, 2003). Needs can be affected by many variables such as severity of needs, individual characteristics, culture, and the severity of some needs may be greater than other needs (Hellriegel, Slochum, & Woodman, 2001). People are satisfied when their needs are met (satisfaction) and suffer and feel sad when they are not satisfied (Günbayı, 2000). It is possible to say that people are pleased and happy to the extent that their needs are met (Yetim, 2001); that is, when there is satisfaction with the experience or perception of one's life, meeting or exceeding his/her expectations.

The definition of satisfaction, how it is obtained and its association with happiness is a subject that has occupied the mind of mankind for thousands of years (Schmuck & Sheldon, 2001). In today's world, one of the main problems of organizations that offer a product (goods or services) is to what extent the products their produce satisfies their users (Eroğlu, 2005), because the satisfaction of the users of a product will determine whether that product will be reproduced (Kavrakoğlu, 1998). Therefore, satisfaction of users in the process of enjoying, choosing and consuming a product makes it necessary to continuously improve the quality of that product.

The idea of continuous improvement of quality to satisfy the users of a product is in fact a recent concept (Aksu, 2002), and has been associated particularly with the concept of total quality as "customer satisfaction". Customer satisfaction is now an issue that all organizations that produce goods or services must take into consideration (Ceylan, 1997). Considered from this aspect, quality or customer satisfaction mean that that all stakeholders and suppliers present within the organization are involved in all processes from production to consumption. In the context of education, although a large part of it is offered by the state under the name of compulsory education or other practices, it is possible to say that, recently, those who benefit from educational services are taking on an increasing role in the production of these services (Sallis, 1996). Moreover, because education provides economic, socio-cultural and academic gains to individuals as well as the society at large, it has been observed that the expectations of individuals and society from the education system continue to grow (Langford & Cleary, 1999). Therefore, there has been a recent increase in the body of research on satisfaction, particularly those aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of education and training systems.

There have recently been a number of studies on student satisfaction in Turkey which has generally concentrated on the university level and often involves comparisons between faculties or departments. The present study can be regarded as important in connection to the satisfaction of students in one specific department. Specifically, in

the present study, the satisfaction levels of undergraduate students studying at the Guidance and Psychological Counseling Department (GPC) of the Faculty of Education at Uludag University were investigated. Given that psychological counseling education is a relatively new field of study, having started in Turkey for the first time in the 1960s at postgraduate level and then at undergraduate level as from the 1980s (Kuzgun, 1993; Özgüven, 1990), it is thought that the present study will make a significant contribution to the field of GPC.

1.1 Student Satisfaction in Higher Education

Student satisfaction in higher education is a field of study that deals with undergraduate students' expectations and whether or not they are met. Given that student satisfaction consists of students' subjective evaluations (Oliver & DeSarbo, 1989) of various experiences and output during their university education, a review of the relevant literature since the 1920s shows that there have been a number of studies conducted on the evaluation of lecturers or courses by students or on graduate feedback, and that more comprehensive satisfaction studies have emerged over time (Sarrico & Rosa, 2014). From the recent increase in interest in student satisfaction, both internationally and in Turkey, it is possible to conclude that the concept is important in terms of both evaluating and improving teaching quality (Schuh & Upcraft, 2000) and determining the marketing and institutional success strategies of universities in the increasingly competitive education sector (Thomas & Galambos, 2004).

Higher education institutions can become "brand" institutions competing internationally by using these research processes together with the various internal and external quality control systems (Aktan & Gencil, 2007; Arap, 2010). With the contribution of student satisfaction data, institutions that are among the high-ranking universities can attract the best professors and students, receive financial support and collect the highest student fees (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Furthermore, students with a high level of satisfaction may increase the level of preference for higher education institutions by talking more positively about their schools (Alves & Raposo, 2010; Kaynar et al., 2006; Yelkikalan, Sümer, & Temel, 2006).

It can be said that the research on student satisfaction in Turkey influences not only the private higher education institutions but also the state-run higher education institutions in terms of competitiveness. In addition, it can be said that the results of satisfaction studies are perhaps more important than ever in terms of increasing the quality in all higher education institutions.

1.2 Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction

1.2.1 Theories and Models

There have been various efforts in the relevant literature to develop theories and models aimed at explaining the factors affecting student satisfaction. Of those, Tinto's (1987) *Student Integration Model* and Bean's *Student Attrition Model* are regarded as the *loyalty/depreciation models* that deal with students' reliance on the university and the resultant factors connected to the attendance to the university. According to Tinto, students' (motivation and academic ability) and the institution's (academic and social characteristics) harmony increase their commitment to stay at the institution, which further increases the likelihood of continuing to study at the university. While Tinto's model emphasizes the impact of its activities on compliance and institutional commitment, in Bean's model (1980), the non-institutional factors (personal background variables such as students' educational objectives, family support, previous academic achievement, socio-economic status, student houses, distance from home and size of the city) may have an impact on student satisfaction.

In Michalos' (1985) *Multiple Discrepancies Theory*, the possible differences (e.g., their targets-success; their ideals-reality, what they have and what the group they take as reference have) in the six areas between the existing realities experienced by the students and their future wishes are emphasized, and it is thought that minimizing actually means increasing the level of satisfaction. In Bean and Bradley's (1986) *Student Satisfaction Model*, on the other hand, it is emphasized that external variables such as institutional harmony, academic integration, usefulness status, academic difficulty, social life, membership and year of study have an impact over the average grade (GAAG) and the GAAG has a mutual interaction relationship with satisfaction.

In Astin's Input-Environment-Output Model (1993, cited in Pattama, 2003), on the other hand, the input variables are dealt with in two categories: students' constant, invariant properties; and the properties that can change over time. For example, constant student characteristics such as gender, race, family size, income, education, and occupations of students' parents do not change over time; however, characteristics such as cognitive functioning, goals and expectations, self-worth, values and attitudes, behavioral patterns and educational background may do so. The environment is everything that affects the students throughout the schooling process. The main goal of this model is to help to arrange the input (the characteristics of the students

at admission to the school) differences in order to evaluate the impacts of the environment over the students (output) more objectively.

In Benjamin and Hollings' (1995) *Student Life Quality Theory*, student satisfaction is explained by the interaction of fifteen factors organized in three groups: (1) Situational factors-institutional characteristics, family background and student generation; (2) Independent factors-academic descriptors, social relationships, student expectations, cognitive differences and life events; and (3) Indirect factors-life arrangements, student meaning structures, family interaction patterns, personal identifiers, support level, health status and employment status. In Aldemir and Gülcan's (2004) *Student Satisfaction Model*, on the other hand, student satisfaction is explained by 4 factors: (1) Institutional factors (Academic factors, such as quality of education, communication with teachers in and outside the classroom, curriculum, course books and other teaching materials and instructors' evaluation of students; and Administrative factors, such as philosophy and practice of university administrators); (2) *Extracurricular activities* (in addition to the institution's all social, health, cultural and sporting activities, the services such as transportation and boarding that it can provide to the students, campus life); (3) *Expectations* (students' own preferences and expectations about the faculty); and (4) *Demographic factors*.

1.2.2 Other Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction

In addition to the efforts of developing theories and models, the findings of the studies on factors affecting student satisfaction indicate many different variables. As a result, student satisfaction can be affected by such "student characteristics" as *gender* (Astin, 1993; cited in Pattama, 2003; Knox, Lindsay, & Kolb, 1992; Wince & Borden, 1995), *age and year of study* (Astin, Korn, & Green, 1987; Barutçu-Yıldırım, Yerin-Güneri, & Çapa-Aydın, 2015; Gündüz, Çapri, & Gökçakan, 2012; Ören & Türkoğlu, 2006); *abilities, socio-economic situation and experiences* (Stage & Rushin, 1993), *grade averages* (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Pattama, 2003; Pike, 1991); *reporting their satisfaction in the middle or at the end of the academic term* (Pennington et al., 1989).

Moreover, the following are the "institutional factors" that have an effect on student satisfaction; *size of the institution, its type* (state-private), *its administration and status* (Trudeau, 1999); *living on the campus* (student house) (Knox, Lindsay, & Kolb, 1992); *the quality of student affairs office* (Shirk, 2002); *library facilities* (Medinets, 2004); *enhancing the security measures, improvements in the educational context, social climate, aesthetic aspects of the infrastructure and the quality of the services provided by the administrative staff* (Boylston, 2005; Wiers-Jenssen, Stenseaker, & Groggaard, 2002); *education and courses* (Douglas, McClelland, & Davies, 2008; Petruzzellis, D'Uggento, & Romanazzi, 2006); *teaching staff-student relationships* (Harnash-Glazer & Meyer, 1991; Hill, Lomas, & MacGregor, 2003; Kuh & Hu, 2001); *personalities of the lecturers* (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006); *quality of the lecturers, their feedbacks on the courses and assignments* (Hill, Lomas, & MacGregor, 2003); *extracurricular social activities* (Pattama, 2003).

1.2.3 Contributions of Satisfaction Studies to Higher Education Institutions

With the data from student satisfaction surveys, the university administrations can identify areas where they can or cannot provide good services, in addition to those that need to be improved in their institutions (Bryant, 2006). They can use these data in strategic planning and enterprise goal setting studies to determine operational objectives, and use them when directing their planning (Schertzer & Schertzer, 2004); they can gain insight into how corporate quality and reputation are perceived by the stakeholders (Elliott & Shin, 2002); they may predict that some students may leave the school due to dissatisfaction (Bryant, 2006; Kara & DeShields, 2004) and therefore, may prevent the institution's reputation from being badly affected (Miller, 2003); they may develop institutional strategies for students' regular attendance (Schertzer C. & Schertzer S., 2004) and may take investment measures to increase satisfaction (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Furthermore, it has been suggested that academic achievement can be increased with the improvement in the services and opportunities provided to students (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Gülcan, Kuştepel, & Aldemir, 2002) as a result of the findings of studies aiming to measure student satisfaction, evaluate the quality of education, and make institutional comparisons in this sense (Eskildsen et al., 2000). It is also known that the needs, expectations and satisfaction of students are influential on the social and cognitive development of students (Ulyatt, 2003).

1.3 Present Study

When we consider all the issues cited above, it becomes all the more important to investigate student satisfaction and the factors that affect it at universities. Moreover, the issue of quality management is an increasingly important issue at higher education institutions in Turkey, and institutions are expected to carry out studies related to quality assurance due to European standards, for example (Sarrico & Rosa, 2014). It is also important to investigate student satisfaction as a quality indicator in the context of psychological counselor education. In

the field of GPC in Turkey, in addition to the Daytime Education (DE) programs, which were opened in 1965, Nighttime Education (NE) programs have been conducted in the evenings as of 2004. Thus, it is important to consider the variable of the program type (DE, NE) as well as the year of study variable in examining the expectations and satisfaction levels of the students.

The present study aimed to reveal the expectations and satisfaction levels of the undergraduate students of the GPC program at the Faculty of Education of Uludağ University of the services and facilities provided by the university. With this purpose in mind, answers were sought to the following questions:

- 1) What are the opinions of the undergraduate students of the GPC program at the Faculty of Education of Uludağ University about their university and department of study?
- 2) What are the expectations of the undergraduate students of the GPC program at the Faculty of Education of Uludağ University from their university?
- 3) What are the observations of the undergraduate students of the GPC program at the Faculty of Education of Uludağ University about the services provided by the university?
- 4) Is there a significant difference between the expectations and observations of the undergraduate students of the GPC program at the Faculty of Education of Uludağ University with regards to the program type and year of study?

2. Method

2.1 Participant Characteristics

The study group of the present research is composed of 354 students who studied at the undergraduate program at the GPC Department of Faculty of Education of Uludağ University in the 2015-2016 academic year. Of the students included in the research, 93 were 1st year, 101, 2nd year, 84 3rd year and 76 4th year students. 171 of the participant students were the students of daytime education group and 183 of Nighttime Education group. 64% of the participants were female and 36% male.

2.2 Measures

In order to measure student satisfaction in the present study, the “Hacettepe University Students’ Expectations and Satisfaction Survey” (HUSESS) developed by Ekinçi and Burgaz (2007) was used. The survey consisted of 11 parameters. These parameters were identified as; Academic Services and Relationship with Student, Academic Advising Services, Academic and Social Climate, Administrative Services, Student Affairs, Library Services, Health Services, Nutrition, Laboratories and Other Activity Areas, Cleaning and Maintenance of Physical Spaces, Transportation, Security and Social Support. The survey consists of two separate sections, which include observations and expectations of students about student satisfaction. The views were rated on a seven-point scale. In the survey, there are 140 items; 70 in the 1st Section and 70 in the 2nd Section. HUSESS was subjected to tests of validity and reliability test in this study with 81 students selected from all the classes available.

Factor analysis was used to determine the structural validity of the scale. The suitability of preliminary data for factor analysis was tested by the Barlett Test of Sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling competence test. According to the Barlett Test of Sphericity, it was found that data of the 1st and 2nd Sections had multivariate normal distribution (1st Section: $\chi^2=5,577$, $p=.000$; 2nd Section: $\chi^2=3,303$, $p=.000$). It was calculated that 1st Section KMO value of the scale was .615, 2nd Section KMO value of the scale .896. Since this value was higher than the .60 recommended for KMO, the data were accepted to be appropriate for the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). As a result, it was observed that both sections presented a one-factor structure. According to the results of 1st Section analysis, which included behaviors of students, it was calculated that the percentage of variance explained by the factor was nearly 34.579%; according to the results of 2nd Section analysis, the percentage of explained variance of the factor was 58.283%.

Item-total correlations and Cronbach- α coefficient were calculated to determine the internal consistency of the scale. Varimax rotation was performed to determine the exact number of factors. It was found that the load values of the factors in the 1st section were between 0.606-0.938; and the load values of the factors in the 2nd section were between 0.606-0.938. Based on these results, there was no need to remove any items from the scale (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). It was calculated that the Cronbach- α coefficient of the 1st Section was 0.971; and the Cronbach- α coefficient of the 2nd Section 0.987. According to these results, it is possible to say that the power of discrimination of the items was “fairly good”; and in terms of internal consistency of the scale, it had high reliability.

2.3 Statistics and Data Analysis

For each parameter on the scale; values of the “Observation Index” (OI) and “Expectation Index” (EI) were calculated. Based on the calculated OI and EI values, “Real Observation Index” (ROI) was obtained (Shoura and Singh. 1998). OI and EI values were the arithmetic average of the total scores of the parameters.

$$G \dot{I} = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^n S_q}{n} \qquad G G \dot{I} = \frac{D \dot{I}}{B \dot{I}} k_1$$

The ROI values were calculated by the “ROI=(OI/EI)X k” formula. In the present study, the “fitness factor” (k) constant value was taken as 0.70.

OI=Observation Index

EI=Expectation Index

ROI=Real Observation/ Status Index

n=Number of items

Sq=The score obtained by a person in a category

k= Conformity coefficient

In the study, firstly the mean of the data obtained from 354 students and the correlations between the indices were calculated. In order to examine the effects of the program type and year of study on the observation and expectation scores, t-test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were applied. The data of the study were analyzed using SPSS package program 23.00.

3. Results

In this section, the results obtained from the current study will be presented in three sections: (1) Demographic information and opinions of the students according to the research groups (Program type, year of study, whole group), (2) Results regarding the observation and expectation values in the satisfaction parameters, (3) Results regarding the analyses of the effects of program type and year of study on observation and expectation scores.

3.1 The Results with Regards to the Demographic Information and Opinions of the Students According to the Research Groups

The participating GPC students’ demographic information as a whole group and opinions about the program type (DE-NE), year of study of the groups were calculated as a percentage and the results were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Students’ personal information and opinions about their university and department (%)

Demographic information/opinions		Program Type		Year of study			All Groups	
		DE	NE	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year		4th Year
Settlement area	Village	15.8	13	14	15.8	14.3	13.2	14.4
	Town	12.9	15.3	17	10.9	15.5	13.2	14.1
	City	33.3	41.1	32.3	41.6	35.7	39.5	37.3
	Metropolitan city	38	30.6	36.5	31.7	34.5	34.2	34.2
Monthly spending	100-200TL	15.2	9.3	12.9	9.9	11.9	14.5	12.1
	250-500TL	46.8	38.3	41.9	45.5	44	36.8	42.4
	500-750TL	19.3	23.5	20.4	21.8	20.2	23.7	21.5
	750-1000TL	14	20.2	18.3	18.8	15.5	15.8	17.2
	1000-2500TL	3.5	8.2	6.5	2.5	8.3	7.9	5.9
	2500TL and above	1.2	-	-	2.5	-	1.3	0.8
Expectations met by the	Under my expectation	40.4	33.3	57	40.6	40.5	27.6	36.7
	As expected	52.6	63.4	21.5	54.5	54.8	68.4	58.2

university	Above my expectation	7	3.3	6.5	5.0	4.8	3.9	5.2
Re-choose the university	No	24	19.7	21.5	23.8	19	22.4	21.8
	Yes	28	24.6	22.6	35.6	22.6	22.4	26.3
	Undecided	48	55.7	55.9	40.6	58.3	55.3	52.5
Re-choose the department	No	7.6	9.8	9.7	8	6	11.8	8.8
	Yes	76.6	63.4	67.7	75.2	72.6	61.8	69.8
	Undecided	15.8	26.8	22.6	16.8	21.4	26.3	21.5

As we can see from the demographic information about the students in Table 1, in all groups (program type, year of study, and whole group), cities and metropolitan cities were the most reported settlement places where the students grew up. The number of the students who grew up in villages and towns was almost the same, and lower than those in the other two groups. Again, in all groups, almost the half of the individuals in each group reported having monthly spending of 250-500 TL was. Monthly spending of 2500 TL and above and between 100 and 200 TL were the least reported amount of spending.

Considering the students' opinions about the universities' meeting their expectations, the likelihood of re-electing to study at the same universities and the possibility of re-electing to study at the same their departments, as it is seen in Table 1, the opinion that Uludag University did not meet their expectations was higher amongst the DE students than the NE students, and amongst the first-year students than the students in other years of study (57%). In all groups, the rate of students who found the university as expected consisted of more than half of the group. This was followed by the students who found the university below their expectations, and finally the number of those who found more than they expected was very few. If they were to make a choice again, the number of those who reported that they were undecided about studying at the same university was almost double of those who reported in all groups that they would choose to study again and they would not choose to study. The number of those who reported that they would choose to study at the same department was high and ranged between 63.4% and 76.6%.

3.2 Results regarding the Observation and Expectation Values in the Satisfaction Parameters

3.2.1 Results regarding the Program Types (DE-NE) in Satisfaction Parameters

Observation and expectation scores according to program types in satisfaction parameters and the real satisfaction index were presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Satisfaction parameter data of the DE and NE groups

Satisfaction Parameters	DE			NE		
	Observation	Expectation	Real	Observation	Expectation	Real
	Index	Index	Satisfaction	Index	Index	Satisfaction
	OI	EI	Index	OI	EI	Index
			ROI/RSI			ROI/RSI
	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	(%)	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	(%)
Academic Services and Relationships with Student	4.13	6.44	44.89	4.18	6.32	46.29
Academic Advising Services	3.47	6.40	37.95	3.60	6.28	40.79
Academic and Social Climate	3.57	6.31	39.60	3.63	6.29	40.39
Administrative Services	3.20	6.46	34.67	3.41	6.40	37.29
Student Affairs	3.54	6.52	38.00	3.47	6.49	37.42
Library Services	4.47	6.50	48.14	4.35	6.45	47.21

Health Services	3.92	6.54	41.95	3.75	6.42	40.88
Nutrition	4.12	6.56	43.96	4.08	6.52	43.80
Laboratories and Other Activity Areas	3.24	6.58	34.47	3.59	6.50	38.60
Cleaning and Maintenance of Physical Spaces	3.71	6.58	39.47	3.79	6.48	40.94
Transportation, Security and Social Support	4.17	6.54	44.63	4.04	6.56	43.11

When the results regarding the groups of DE-NE are examined in Table 1, it is seen that students in both groups reported that less than half of their expectations out of the 11 satisfaction parameters were met. The parameter with the highest real satisfaction was the “library services” for both DE and NE. Satisfaction of the first group in this parameter was higher. The parameter of “Academic services and relationship with the students” was the second highest parameter for both groups of students. The parameter where the real satisfaction, on the other hand, was the lowest was similar in both groups (“Laboratories and other activity areas”). In this parameter, DE students reported more dissatisfaction.

On the other hand, the students did not have any expectations regarding the hundred percent provision of these services/facilities. While the parameter with the FI students’ lowest expectation was “Academic and social climate”, the highest parameters were “Laboratories and other activity areas” and “Cleaning and maintenance of physical spaces”. The parameter with the lowest expectation of the NE students was “Academic advising services” and with a similar rate the “Academic and social climate”. The highest expectation of this group was the parameters of “Transportation, security and social support” and “Nutrition”.

3.2.2 Results Related to Year of Study in the Satisfaction Parameters

Scores for year of study in the satisfaction parameters related to observation and expectation together are given in Table 3 and the actual satisfaction index are given in Table 4.

Table 3. Student observation and expectation index scores for year of study

Satisfaction Parameters	1st Year		2nd Year		3rd Year		4th Year	
	Observation Index	Expectation Index	Observation Index	Expectation Index	Observation Index	Expectation Index	Observation Index	Expectation Index
	OI	EI	OI	EI	OI	EI	OI	EI
	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Academic Services and Relationships with Student	4,49	6,48	4,03	6,16	4,01	6,55	4,07	6,35
Academic Advising Services	3,67	6,52	3,61	6,05	3,42	6,54	3,56	6,22
Academic and Social Climate	3,81	6,38	3,67	6,26	3,42	6,53	3,46	6,28
Administrative Services	3,44	6,52	3,37	6,29	3,13	6,63	3,26	6,32
Student Affairs	3,69	6,62	3,64	6,28	3,37	6,67	3,24	6,47
Library Services	4,64	6,61	4,50	6,28	4,36	6,66	4,04	6,36
Health Services	4,16	6,59	3,82	6,27	3,93	6,68	3,35	6,39

Nutrition	4,56	6,69	3,87	6,33	4,17	6,69	3,77	6,46
Laboratories and Other Activity Areas	3,64	6,61	3,32	6,41	3,15	6,67	3,59	6,50
Cleaning and Maintenance of Physical Spaces	3,94	6,62	3,79	6,35	3,58	6,68	3,65	6,48
Transportation, Security and Social Support	4,38	6,67	4,08	6,29	4,01	6,71	3,89	6,57

Table 4. Student real satisfaction levels for year of study

Satisfaction Parameters	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
	Real Satisfaction Index	Real Satisfaction Index	Real Satisfaction Index	Real Satisfaction Index
	ROI/RSI	ROI/RSI	ROI/RSI	ROI/RSI
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Academic Services and Relationships with Student	48,5	45,8	42,85	44,86
Academic Advising Services	39,4	41,77	36,60	40,00
Academic and Social Climate	41,8	41,03	36,66	38,56
Administrative Services	36,9	37,50	33,04	36,10
Student Affairs	39,0	40,57	35,36	35,05
Library Services	49,13	50,16	45,82	44,46
Health Services	44,19	42,64	41,18	36,70
Nutrition	47,71	42,79	43,63	40,85
Laboratories and Other Activity Areas	38,54	36,25	33,06	38,66
Cleaning and Maintenance of Physical Spaces	41,66	41,78	37,51	39,43
Transportation, Security and Social Support	45,96	45,40	41,83	41,44

The results in Table 4 show that, in the parameter of “Library services”, except for the 50.16% rate of satisfaction reported by the 2nd year students, all the students in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th years reported that less than half of their expectations were met in all of the 11 parameters.

The parameters where real satisfaction was highest for the whole years were those of “Library services” and “Academic services and relationship with the students”. While for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years, the “Library services” was the most satisfying parameter, for the 4th years, the “Academic services and relationship with the students” was the most satisfying parameter.

Parameters with the lowest real satisfaction were the “Administrative services” for the 1st and 3rd years, the “Laboratory and other activity areas” for the 2nd years, and “Student affairs” for the 4th years. “Administrative services” for the 2nd and 4th years and “Laboratory and other activity areas” for the 1st years were the second lowest real satisfaction reported areas.

In terms of year of study, as in program type groups, 100% expectation that the students would be offered of these services and facilities was not reported. It is seen that the parameters with the lowest expectation of the students were similar according to the class levels. For the 1st years, “Academic and social climate” and “Academic services and relationship with the students”; for the 2nd years, “Academic advising services” and “Academic services and relationship with the students”; for the 3rd years, “Academic and social climate” and “Academic advising services”; and for the 4th years, “Academic advising services” and “Academic and social

climate” were the parameters with the lowest student expectation. The parameters with the highest expectations were; for the 1st years “Nutrition”, for the 2nd grade classes “Laboratory and other activity areas”; and for the 3rd and 4th years, “Transportation, security and social support”. The second highest expectation according to the classes were the parameters of “Transportation, security and social support”, “Cleaning and maintenance of physical spaces”, “Nutrition” and “Laboratory and other activity areas”.

3.2.3 Results of the Whole Groups in Satisfaction Parameters

The observation and expectation scores of the whole groups in the satisfaction parameters together with the actual satisfaction index are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Satisfaction parameter data of all groups

Satisfaction Parameters	Observation Index	Expectation Index	Real Satisfaction Index
	OI	EI	ROI/RSI
	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	(%)
Academic Services and Relationship with Student	4.16	6.38	45.64
Academic Advising Services	3.57	6.34	39.41
Academic and Social Climate	3.60	6.30	40.00
Administrative Services	3.57	6.43	38.86
Student Affairs	3.50	6.51	37.63
Library Services	4.41	6.47	47.71
Health Services	3.83	6.48	41.37
Nutrition	4.10	6.54	43.88
Laboratories and Other Activity Areas	3.39	6.54	36.28
Cleaning and Maintenance of Physical Spaces	3.75	6.53	40.20
Transportation, Security and Social Support	4.10	6.55	43.81

Correlations (r): OI-EI=0.654, OI-ROI=.988, BEI-RSI=.997

In Table 5, it is seen that less than half of the students’ expectations were reported to be met in all of the satisfaction parameters. The parameter with the highest real satisfaction was “Library services”, followed by the “Academic services and relationship with the students”, “Nutrition”, “Transportation, security and social support” and “Health services” parameters. The parameter with the lowest real satisfaction was “Laboratory and other activity areas”. This was followed by “Student affairs”, “Administrative services”, “Academic advising services”, “Academic and social climate”, and “Cleaning and maintenance of physical spaces”. Moreover, in all groups, the students did not report 100% expectations for the provision of these services/facilities. While the parameter with lowest expectation was “Academic and social climate”, the highest parameter was “Transportation, security and social support”.

3.3 Results regarding the Analyses of the Effects of Program Type and Class Level on Observation and Expectation Scores

In order to examine the effect of the program on the total scores of satisfaction observation and expectation, independent samples t-tests were conducted, but no significant difference was found between the groups. The results were presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Independent groups t-test results aimed at examining the effects of the program type on the satisfaction scores

Point	Groups	N	M	ss	t	Sd	p
Observation	DE	171	41.90	10.84	-.14	352	.89
	NE	183	42.06	10.51			
Expectation	DE	171	64.88	8.70	.76	352	.45
	NE	183	64.16	9.13			

ANOVA was applied to examine the effect of class level on total scores of satisfaction observation and expectation and this effect was statistically significant for both the observation [$F(3,350)=3.52, p=.02, 2=.02$] and expectation scores [$F(3,350)=3.58, p=.02, 2=.03$]. The comparisons performed with the Tukey test demonstrated that both the observation ($M=44.76$) and the expectation ($M=72.30$) scores of the 1st years were significantly higher than the observation ($M=39.88$) and expectation ($M=70.40$) scores of the 4th years. However, although the differences were statistically significant, the calculated effect sizes were small.

4. Discussion

The relevant literature has shown that student satisfaction has a diverse and multi-dimensional structure (Sener & Humbert, 2002), and for this reason, the construct has been researched in terms of the different dimensions of student satisfaction, or by using different measurement methods. For example, in some studies conducted at the faculty level, the focus was on the different aspects of experiences that the faculty could control or influence directly, such as: satisfaction of all students or a particular subgroup with respect to their experiences; satisfaction aimed at meeting the necessary conditions in the institution; satisfaction at the program level-satisfaction related to learning and teaching activities. For example, although feedback on how a particular topic or unit is handled and/or the students' assessment of the teacher can be researched at the program-level; the satisfaction with the services provided by the university can be investigated at the institution level (the university as a whole) (Harvey, 2001). In Turkey, there have been a number of studies on the factors determining the satisfaction levels of university students, the services and facilities offered to them by universities, and the areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Some of these studies examined the satisfaction of students of a particular faculty or department, others focused on satisfaction across the university in general. In the present study, on the other hand, all the services offered by a university were investigated at the department level-the GPC program of the Faculty of Education, at Uludag University.

In the present study, initially, results regarding the demographic characteristics of the students were obtained. Even though the psychological counseling candidates were in general from cities and metropolitan cities, it was found that they did not come from wealthy families. The fact that 80% of the students had monthly spending of less than 750TL and mostly between 250-500TL confirms this result. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the students who chose to study at the GPC undergraduate program did not come from wealthy families as it is the case with the undergraduate students at other departments.

According to the results with regards to the opinions of the students about the universities and departments, while nearly 1/3 of the students were of the opinion that the university did not meet their expectation, a little more than half of the students stated that the university was in line with their expectations. These findings are in line with those of similar studies. For instance, in a study in which satisfaction level of the classroom teaching department students were investigated (Erginsoy-Osmanoğlu & Kaya, 2013), it was reported that the students expressed medium level of general satisfaction. Similarly, Ekinçi and Burgaz (2007), conducted a study which examined the expectations and satisfaction levels of the services offered by the university in two areas (academic services and relationships, academic advising) to the students studying at nine different faculties of Hacıpetepe university. They concluded that students attached much importance to the services in both dimensions; however, they were not very content with the quality of those services. Students of Fine Arts and Engineering faculties were satisfied with the services in the first dimension, and the students of Fine Arts and Pharmacy faculties were more satisfied with the services in the second dimension than the students of other faculties. The present study examined whether satisfaction varied according to the variables of program type and year of study. Examination of the evaluations regarding the students' expectations being met based on the program type (DE-NE), it was found that the expectations of DE students were higher than the NE students. However, this difference was not statistically significant in the subsequent analyses. In the relevant literature in general, there have been very few

studies related to the problems of DE students (Coşkun, Özer, & Tiryaki, 2010; Demirtaş, Cömert, & Özer, 2011; Güven, 2006; Özdemir, 2008; Tanrıöğen & Baştürk, 2008) and only one more recent study related to the GPC DE students (Yılmaz-Sayar, 2016). Specifically, in a study researching student belonging in terms of family and occupation scores, Yılmaz-Sayar found differences in favor of the DE psychological counselling candidates amongst the DE and NE students. No differences, on the other hand, were found between the groups with regards to family. Although the current study found that there were no significant differences in the satisfaction levels of DE and NE students of the GPC department, it is possible to say that the current findings contribute to the relevant literature.

In the current study, when we examine the satisfaction level of the students according to the years of study, although the expectation levels of the students in the 1st year were high, it was revealed that the observation of their expectations being met was low. Although their expectations dropped in the 2nd year, they increased again in the 3rd and 4th year. However, the scores regarding the observation of their expectations being met were low. Moreover, it was found that, the 4th years obtained significantly lower scores than 1st years regarding levels of observations and expectations. The finding that student satisfaction decreased as year of study increased is compatible with the literature. In previous studies (Liu & Jung, 1970; Cited in Bean & Breadley, 1986), this particular phenomenon was explained by the fact that because the students focused on campus life during the transition from high school to university, they used the facilities and services more. Then in the 4th year, as graduation approached, the apprehension regarding future careers increased, and they were less interested in campus life. However, in the present study, even though the difference between satisfaction levels of 1st and 4th years seemed to be statistically significant, the fact that this effect had a low power required us to be cautious in interpreting this particular result and it should be supported by further studies.

Another result of the present study is that, although 75% of the students reported indecision and negativity about choosing to study at the university again; when it came to choosing their own department, nearly 70% of them responded positively. The small number of those who made negative responses pointed out the effect of importance of the services and facilities offered by the university as a basic variable on the student satisfaction levels. Given the 11 satisfaction parameters used as a measurement tool in the present study, the fact that the parameter of “Academic services and relationship with the students” which questioned the PGC students about the lecturers and the courses had highest level of satisfaction seemed to support this view. This particular result was compatible with the result of the study conducted by Açıkan and Saydan (2009) in which the students of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Kafkas University were reported to be generally satisfied with the lecturers.

When it is evaluated in terms of service areas offered by the university, all the students thought that the services available in the parameters of “Laboratory and other activity areas” and “Student affairs” were at the lowest level. It is often seen that laboratory and other activity areas and student affairs were reported to be the problematic areas in previous satisfaction studies (Erginsoy-Osmanoğlu & Kaya, 2013; Eti-İçli & Vural, 2010; Shirk, 2002). Another problematic area was the services offered by the “Administrative services” parameter. Based on this result, it is possible to conclude that the students perceived their expectations from the university as a whole and dissatisfaction as an administrative problem (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Students' observations and expectations about the services offered by the university

As it is seen in Figure 1, the areas where student satisfaction was the highest were the services offered in the parameters of "Library services" and "Academic services and relationship with the students". Based on this, it is possible to conclude that the university in general emphasized the academic dimension significantly. This particular result of the present study seemed to be compatible with the results of the studies emphasizing the importance of student satisfaction related to library services (Medinets, 2004), and the quality of the lecturers and students' relationship with the lecturers (Barutçu-Yıldırım, Yerin-Güneri, & Çapa-Aydın, 2015; Harnash-Glazer & Meyer, 1991; Hill, Lomas, & MacGregor, 2003).

Another important result of the present study was that although students' expectations in general were at a high level ($M=6.46$), students' expectations in some satisfaction parameters were not so (For example, Academic and Social Climate (10%), "Academic Advising Services" (9.5%) and "Academic Services and Relationship with the Students" (9%)). One of the possible explanations of this result could be that nearly 10% of the students had the perception that their expectations in these areas would not be met anyway. Nevertheless, the fact that the students did not have 100% expectations from their university regarding academic climate, academic counselling or the other academic services measured in the study is another phenomenon that should be investigated.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, the results of the present study demonstrated that GPC students' satisfaction with their department and university was not affected by the program type (DE and NE) or year of study. The results of this study also revealed that even though the student were well informed in their choices to study at their departments, these informed choices were not supported by the opportunities and facilities offered by their university. It is possible to evaluate that this particular result had an impact over students' academic success and social developments. Given the fact that the studies on GPC students' satisfaction with their university and department in Turkey are limited, it is possible to conclude that more studies are needed be conducted on this subject.

Like any scientific research, the present study has a number of limitations, each of which can be a recommendation for future studies. First, in the present study, the areas where student satisfaction was low were identified. Specifically, laboratory facilities, student affairs and administrative services stood out as the areas that needed to be improved by the universities in order to enhance student satisfaction and quality of education. However, it was beyond the scope of the current study to investigate the details of this low satisfaction. More studies on this subject can be conducted. It is commonly known that the laboratory facilities in the field of GPC is one area that is reported to be greatly needed and debated in Turkey. It is crucial that the existing laboratory facilities be identified across the country, and for projects based on successful examples be developed. Second, the current data were obtained from only one GPC undergraduate program in Turkey. It is important to investigate the expectations and satisfaction of the GPC candidates of other universities where this undergraduate program is available. Sharing the findings from such studies with the counselling educators and administrators may contribute to the improvement of the quality of the programs in question.

References

- Açan, B., & Saydan, R. (2009). Öğretim Elemanlarının Akademik Kalite Özelliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Kafkas Üniversitesi İİBF Örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(2), 225-253.
- Aksu, M. (2002). *Eğitimde Stratejik Planlama ve Toplum Kalite Yönetimi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Aktan, C. C., & Gencil, U. (2007). *Yükseköğretimde akreditasyon*. Erişim. Retrieved from <http://www.canaktan.org/egitim/akreditasyon/aktan-akredit.pdf>
- Aldemir, C., & Gülcan, Y. (2004). Student Satisfaction in Higher Education: A Turkish Case. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 16(2), 109-122. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v16-art19-en>
- Alves, H., & Raposo, M., (2010). The influence of university image on students behaviour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(1), 73-85. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541011013060>
- Arap, S. K. (2010). Türkiye yeni üniversitelerine kavuşurken: Türkiye’de yeni üniversiteler ve kuruluş gerekçeleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 65(1), 1-29.
- Astin, A., Korn, W., & Green, K. (1987, Winter). Retaining and satisfying students. *Educational Record*, 36-42.
- Barutçu-Yıldırım, F., Yerin-Güneri, O., & Çapa-Aydın, Y. (2015). University Students’ Satisfaction Level and Related Variables. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama/Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 11(2), 521-533.
- Bean, J. P. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: The synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 155-187. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00976194>
- Bean, J. P., & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 393-412. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1980994>
- Benjamin, M., & Hollings, A. (1995). Towards a Theory of Student Satisfaction: An Exploratory Study of the “Quality of Student Life”. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 574.
- Boylston, M. T. (2005). *Adult Student Satisfaction in An Accelerated Rn To Bsn Program* (Doctorate Dissertation). Immaculate University, Pennsylvania.
- Bryant, J. L. (2006). Assessing expectations and perceptions of the campus experience: The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. In *New Directions for Community Colleges* (p. 134). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.234>
- Ceylan, M. (1997). Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi ve müşteri memnuniyeti. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(1), 23-29.
- Clayson, D. E., & Sheffet, M. J. (2006). Personality and the Student Evaluation of Teaching. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(2), 149-161. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0273475306288402>
- Coşkun, E., Özer, B., & Tiryaki, E. N. (2010). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının özel alan yeterlik algılarının değerlendirilmesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27, 123-136.
- Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M., & Özer, N. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının özyeterlik inançları ve öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36(159), 96-111.
- Douglas, J., McClelland, R., & Davies, J. (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(1), 19-35. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880810848396>
- Ekinci, C. E., & Burgaz, B. (2007). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Bazı Akademik Hizmetlere İlişkin Beklenti Ve Memnuniyet Düzeyleri (The Expectation And Satisfaction Levels Of The Students At Hacettepe University With Respect To Academic Services). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* (H. U. Journal of Education), 33, 120-134.
- Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197-209. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080022000013518>
- Erginsoy Osmanoğlu, D., & Kaya, H. İ. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının yükseköğretime dair memnuniyet durumları ile öznel iyi oluş durumlarının değerlendirilmesi: Kafkas Üniversitesi örneği [Evaluation of Prospective Teachers’ Satisfaction Regarding Higher Education and Self-Self-Wellbeing: The Case of Kafkas University]. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*, 12, 45-70.
- Eroğlu, E. (2005). Müşteri memnuniyeti ölçüm modeli. *İ.Ü İşletme Fakültesi İşletme Dergisi*, 34(1), 7-25.

- Eskildsen, J. K., Martensen, A., Grønholdt I., & Kristiansen K. (2000). Benchmarking student satisfaction in higher education based on the ECSI methodology. *Sinergie rapporti di ricerca*, 9(18), 385-402.
- Eti İçli, G., & Vural, B. B. (2010). Toplam Kalite Yönetimi ve Uygulamaları Çerçevesinde Kırklareli Üniversitesi Meslek Yüksekokulları Öğrenci Memnuniyeti Araştırması. *Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 28(1), 335-349.
- Gülcan, Y., Kuştepelı, Y., & Aldemir, C. (2002). Yükseköğretimde öğrenci doyumı: Kuramsal bir çerçeve ve görgül bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 99-114.
- Günbayı, İ. (2000). *Örgütlerde İş Doyumu ve Güdüleme*. Ankara: Özen Yayıncılık.
- Gündüz, B., Çapri, B., & Gökçakan, Z. (2012). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19, 38-55.
- Güven, S. (2006). Öğretim teknolojileri ve materyal geliştirme dersinin kazandırdığı yeterlikler yönünden değerlendirilmesi (İnönü üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi örneği). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 1-16.
- Harnash-Glezer, M., & Meyer, J. (1991). Dimensions of satisfaction with collegiate education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 16, 95-107. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260293910160201>
- Harvey, L. (2001). *Student Feedback: A Report to The Higher Education Funding Council For England*. Centre for Research into Quality. The University of Central England, Birmingham. Retrieved from <http://www.uce.ac.uk/crq/publications/studentfeedback.pdf> 15.03.2005
- Hellriegel, D., Slochum, J. W., & Woodman, R. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*. Cincinnati: South Western College Publishing.
- Hill, Y., Lomas, L., & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' Perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1), 15-20. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880310462047>
- Kara, A., & DeShields, O. W. (2004). Business student satisfaction, intentions and retention in higher education: An empirical investigation. *Marketing Educator Quarterly*, 3(1), 1-25.
- Kavrakoğlu, İ. (1998). *Değişme ve Yaratıcılık*. İstanbul: Kalder Yayınları (Doğru. Metin içindeki düzeltilecek).
- Kaynar, A., Şahin, A., Bayrak, D., Karakoç, G., Ülkü, F., & Öztürk H. (2006). Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Trabzon Sağlık Yüksekokulu hemşirelik öğrencilerinin doyum düzeyleri. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 10(3), 12-19.
- Knox, W. E., Lindsay, P., & Kolb, M. N. (1992). Higher education, college characteristics and student experiences: Long-term effects on educational satisfactions and perceptions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63, 303-328. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1982017>
- Kuh, G. D., & Hu, S. (2001). The relationships between computer and information technology use, student learning, and other college experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 217-232.
- Kuzgun, Y. (1993). Turk eğitim sisteminde rehberlik ve psikolojik danışma [Guidance and counseling in Turkish education system]. *Eğitim Dergisi*, 6, 3-8.
- Langford, D. P., & Clearly, B. A. (1999). *Eğitimde Kalite Yönetimi* (Çev: Meltem Süngür). İstanbul: Kalder Yayınları.
- Medinets, A. F. (2004). *Determinants of School Effectiveness and Student Satisfaction in Colleges and Universities* (Doctorate Dissertation). Rutgers Business School Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.
- Metle, M. K. (2003). The Impact of Education on Attitudes of Female Government Employees. *Journal of Management Development*, 22(7), 603-626. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621710310484759>
- Michalos, A. C. (1985). Multiple Discrepancies Theory (MDT). *Social Indicators Research*, 16, 347-413. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00333288>
- Miller, R. (2003). *Student satisfaction and institutional success*. Paper presented at the 43rd annual AIR Forum, Tampa, FL.
- Oliver, R. L., & DeSarbo, W. S. (1989). Processing satisfaction response in consumption: A suggested framework and research proposition. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, 2, 1-16.

- Ören, N., & Türkoğlu, H. (2006). Öğretmen Adaylarında Tükenmişlik. *Muğla Sıtkı Kocaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, 55-70.
- Özdemir, S. M. (2008). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretim sürecine ilişkin özyeterlik inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 54, 277-306.
- Özguven, E. (1990). Ülkemizde psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik faaliyetlerinin durumu ve bugünü [The past and the present of psychological counseling and guidance activities in our country]. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 1(1), 4-15.
- Pattama, R. (2003). *Student Satisfaction in Thai Private Vocational Schools* (Doctorate Dissertation). Department of Educational Administration and Foundations Illinois State University.
- Pennington, D. C. et al. (1989). Change in College Satisfaction across an Academic Term. *Journal of College Development*, 2(1), 49-57.
- Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggetto, A. M., & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian Universities. *Managing Service Quality*, 16(4), 349-364. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09604520610675694>
- Pike, G. R. (1991). The Effects of Background, Coursework, and Involvement on Students' Grades and Satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(1), 15. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00992830>
- Sallis, E. (1996). *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Sarrico, C. S., & Rosa, M. J. (2014). Student satisfaction with Portuguese higher education institutions: The view of different types of students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(2), 165-178. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.900108>
- Schertzer, C. B., & Schertzer, S. M. B. (2004). Student satisfaction and retention: A conceptual model. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 14(1), 79-91. https://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J050v14n01_05
- Schmuck, P., & Sheldon, K. M. (2001). Life goals and well-being: To the frontiers of life goal research. In P. Schmuck, & K. M. Sheldon (Eds.), *Life goals and well-being: Towards a positive psychology of human striving* (pp. 1-17). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Schuh, J. H., & Upcraft, M. L. (2000). Measuring student satisfaction and needs. In M. J. Barr, M. K. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sener, J., & Humbert, J. (2002). *Student Satisfaction with Online Learning: An Expanding Universe*. Sloan ALN Workshop IV, Lake George, NY.
- Shirk, W. G. (2002). *A Study of the Relationship between Student Satisfaction and Ethnicity, Gender, and Grade Point Average at a Private, Non-Denominational, Midwestern University* (Doctorate Dissertation). Faculty of the Oral Roberts University.
- Shoura, M., & Singh, A. (1998). Motivation parameters for engineering managers using Maslow's theory. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 15(5), 44-55. [https://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(1999\)15:5\(44\)](https://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(1999)15:5(44))
- Stage, F. K., & Rushin, P. W. (1993). A combined model of student predisposition to college and persistence in college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34, 276-282.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tanrıoğen, A., & Baştürk, R. (2008). İkinci Öğretim Öğrencilerinin İkinci Öğretim Programına İlişkin Görüşlerinin Meslek Seçimi ve İlgilerine Göre Analizi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(13), 13-23.
- Thomas, E. H., & Galambos, N. (2004). What satisfied students? Mining student opinion data with regression and decision tree analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 45, 251-269. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:RIHE.0000019589.79439.6e>
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Trudeau, C. S. (1999). *A Study of Overall Student Satisfaction and the Factors Influencing Satisfaction at a Midwestern Church Related College* (Doctorate Dissertation). Education in the Department of Higher Education Indiana University.

- Ulyatt, D. (2003). *Satisfaction of Students and Administrators toward Support Systems in Online Degree Programs: A Case Study* (Doctorate Dissertation). Seton Hall University, New Jersey.
- Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Grøgaard, J. B. (2002). Student satisfaction: Towards and empirical construction of the concept. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8, 183-195. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1353832022000004377>
- Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. *Higher Education*, 64(5), 627-645. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9516-5>
- Wince, M. H., & Borden, V. (1995). *When does student satisfaction matter?* Paper presented at the Annual Forum for Institutional Research (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED386990).
- Yelkikalan, N., Sümer, B., & Temel, S. (2006). Fakültelerin Değerlendirilmesinde Öğrenci Algılamaları: Biga İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Karaman İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(10), 144-160.
- Yetim, Ü. (2001). *Toplumdan Bireye Mutluluk Resimleri*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz-Sayar, D. (2016). *Psikolojik Danışman Adaylarının Ait Olma Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi: Uludağ Üniversitesi Örneği*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).