

Age and Residential Differences in Future Primary School Teachers' Perception of Teaching in Higher Education and the Correlation with Life Satisfaction

Lidija Miočić

Elementary school of Juraj Baraković, Ražanac

Abstract

This work provides insight into student/future primary education teachers' evaluation of course quality in higher education and its connection to life satisfaction. In the summer semester of academic year 2018/2019, the research was implemented with the goal of determining age and residential differences in evaluation of teaching quality and its connection with life satisfaction of future primary education teachers. The participants (N=294) were students of teacher education studies at the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb (departments in Zagreb and Čakovec) and at the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek. Student Course Experience Questionnaire (Ginns et al., 2007) and Satisfaction with Life Scale were utilised (Diener et al., 1985). The results indicate differences in evaluation of course quality in higher education with regard to students' place of residence and university they attend. Students who reside in urban areas assess the quality as higher. Students at Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek evaluate teaching quality as higher than students at the University of Zagreb. The research did not yield differences in evaluation of course quality at universities with regard to students' age. Besides, a positive correlation between student course experience and life satisfaction was found, but no statistically significant difference in life satisfaction was determined considering students' place of residence and age, nor with regard to university they attend.

Key words: curriculum; students; student course experience.

Introduction

Teaching quality at universities educating future teachers is of great significance because the way of implementing courses affects future teachers more than theoretical postulates so teachers in practice imitate their professors more than they apply didactical knowledge attained at their faculties (Bognar & Kragulj, 2010).

Teaching quality is reflected in the process of teaching that is planned by professors but nevertheless subject to changes. Course implementation based on the sedentary listening principle is not successful. However, if we include students in teaching as well, the course of activities and their duration cannot be fully planned, so teaching becomes a joint activity of lecturers and their students (Bognar & Kragulj, 2010). The role of professors is unquestionable because they are the main factor that influences the prevailing course atmosphere and how interesting a certain course will be.

Course teaching represents a complex process in which students and teachers are the main participants, i.e. students and lecturers in higher education. Namely, learning and teaching are sophisticated processes that require thorough planning, preparation and activities of all included parties (Matijević, 2010). Courses are an organised activity, and any organised activity includes the aforementioned preparatory activities, their implementation, and evaluation of the achieved effects, which all need to be compatible (Pastuović, 1999). Teaching quality is important not only for the participants of the teaching process itself but also for the overall society because high level of quality in education is implied in any developed society. Evaluation of the teaching process should be a component of professional practice of each professor because it serves the refinement of teaching: a good professor examines and questions his/her teaching practice, compares teaching competences and evaluates the teaching process with regard to those who learn (Brown et al., 2003, acc. to Bognar & Bungić, 2014).

Satisfaction, welfare and happiness have always been a subject of human interest and in recent times they are in the research focus of positive psychology. Life satisfaction is encompassed by subjective welfare and can be regarded not only as a general assessment but also satisfaction with various life areas, such as health, work and social relationships. People can be content in most areas but nevertheless feel overall dissatisfaction due to the influence of a single area alone. (Rijavec et al., 2008). We can discern cognitive and affective component in subjective welfare. Life satisfaction alone entails cognitive processing and presents a very important way in which people give assessments because many people do not consider all aspects of their lives, but base their evaluation on information that is currently important to them and affects their present mood (Rijavec et al., 2008). The affective side encompasses both positive and negative moods and emotions connected to everyday life. This component is often expressed as the relationship between positive and negative emotions (Watson et al., 1988, acc. to Rijavec et al., 2008). In assessment of life satisfaction, we take into consideration both components.

The correlation between education degree and happiness is not clearly delineated although its impact on the increase of happiness was proven, but via other factors such as better job or better income (Argyle, 2002, acc. to Brkljačić & Kaliterna Lipovčan, 2010). In this work, we explored the connection between evaluation of teaching quality at universities and self-assessment of life satisfaction of future primary education teachers and the differences in these evaluations with regard to their age and place of residence.

Teaching quality

It is possible to gain insight into course quality at universities from the perspective of teaching quality itself or through evaluation of students' knowledge and results (Pereira et al., 2018, acc. to Fajčikova & Fejfarova, 2019). Regarding the fact that university should satisfy and fulfil the needs of students, this work starts from student evaluation of teaching.

The quality of university teaching in Croatia has most frequently been evaluated on the basis of interviewing students at the end of an academic year. Before Croatia joined the European Union, many changes occurred in the overall Croatian education. One of those changes is introducing evaluation into education with the goal of securing quality in general, with special emphasis on evaluating teaching efficacy (Knežević & Frančić, 2007). The way in which student education is assessed requires sensitive indicators of quality because poor assessment can disrupt otherwise well-developed curricula (Dubovicki, 2013). The importance of teaching evaluation at universities in Croatia was recognised as early as in 1995, when the implementation of the national project *The Quality of Teaching in Higher Education* started (Dubovicki & Banjari, 2014) and continued with the TEMPUS project *SM Securing the Quality of University Teaching, Full Speed Ahead* in 2006 and 2007. Via three documents, this project endeavoured to develop awareness of how important it is to assure quality university teaching and to warn academic workers they are not the people who solely realise the teaching process and motivate learning in students but also understand societal and cultural reality they act in (Knežević & Frančić, 2007).

There are many factors influencing teaching quality in higher education. The results of research on the connection between course attendance and academic achievement have shown that attendance brings numerous benefits for students (Dolton et al., 2003). It was observed that students are dissatisfied with teaching in classrooms and lecture halls where mostly frontal instruction is implemented (Bognar & Kragulj, 2010). The research emphasizes the influence of professors on students' attitudes about their education (Stronge, 2018). It is stated that they value personal characteristics in teachers, their professional competences and relationships with students (Medallon & Martinez, 2014). Research on future teachers' standpoints on evaluation of teaching in higher education has shown that even students themselves consider its implementation necessary, and they feel the evaluation needs to be devised creatively (Dubovicki & Banjari, 2014).

A research on the quality of university teaching at the Faculty of Economy and Management in the Czech Republic yielded the conclusion that student evaluation of teaching quality is mostly influenced by whether students regard certain courses useful, interesting, logically structured and intelligible. Apart from the variables that influence student perception of university teaching, the mentioned research examined the existence of differences in the perception of teaching quality with regard to age, gender and the study programme. The results showed no correlation between the assessment of teaching quality and the study programme. It also found a correlation between students' age and course attendance, although the correlation was low (Fajčinkova & Fejfarova, 2019).

Student satisfaction with life

Satisfaction with studies and studying is one of the domains of overall students' life satisfaction and one of the basic factors of course quality. Research has shown that age, stress, physical health, life style, studying style and personality are the most significant determinants of life satisfaction among students (Chow, 2005). A research on life satisfaction and happiness of students at two Croatian universities in Zagreb found that students are satisfied with life, wherein they are the most satisfied with the sense of physical safety, relationships with friends and acceptance from the environment. On the other hand, they are the least content with free time (Brkljačić & Kaliterna Lipovčan, 2010).

A research into the factors of satisfaction among students of the Faculty of Economy in Zagreb has shown that faculty and organisation of studying have the most significant influence on students' satisfaction, while non-teaching staff effects their overall satisfaction the least (Vranešević et al., 2007).

A research on the degree of satisfaction with studies among students of teacher education at the Faculty of Philosophy in Split determined somewhat greater satisfaction with the study in relation to students of preschool education, and somewhat greater satisfaction with the study programme than with lecturers in both groups (Reić Ercegovac & Jukić, 2008).

The results of the study implemented with students of teacher and preschool teacher education at the University of Split have shown medium satisfaction with the studies. Somewhat greater satisfaction with the studies was found among students of teacher education in comparison to students of preschool education, and somewhat greater contentment with the study programme than with lecturers in both groups. It was also proven that the students who were guided by intrinsic motivation when enrolling in the faculty (interest in the work with children and teaching) are more satisfied with their studies (Mohorić, 2008).

A research on student life quality in Croatia has shown that, out of all analysed aspects of studying, students attributed the lowest assessments to satisfaction with the

study. According to the obtained results, there is a statistically significant difference in assessment of satisfaction with the study between students of undergraduate and graduate studies, wherein students at graduate studies express greater dissatisfaction. The results on life satisfaction have shown that students are relatively content with their lives. They are the most satisfied with the sense of physical safety, relationships with friends and acceptance from the environment, while they are the least satisfied with free time. Statistical differences were found regarding the level of study and gender. The results show that graduate students express greater satisfaction with their lives than undergraduate students do. The research also found a correlation between overall life satisfaction and contentment with their own studying, i.e. it was proven that students who expressed greater overall life satisfaction also express greater content with their own studying (Kovčo Vukadin, 2016).

Differences in life satisfaction with regard to gender were also found in foreign research, which proved that female students are more satisfied with life than male students (Diener & Diener, 1995; Ozben, 2013).

A research on social skills, life satisfaction and loneliness among Turkish students has yielded the conclusion that social skills and life satisfaction are negatively correlated to loneliness, while social skills are positively connected to life satisfaction (Ozben, 2013).

A research on differences in life satisfaction of nursing and criminology students has found no statistically significant differences in life satisfaction of the researched students neither with regard to age nor regarding the year of study, age, marital status or the length of work experience (Živković et al., 2013).

Methodology

Research goal

The research goal was to examine the existence of differences in evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life satisfaction with regard to students' place of residence, study year and university they attend, as well as to examine whether there is a correlation between evaluation of course quality and self-assessment of life quality. In accord with the research aims, the research hypotheses were set:

- 1 It is assumed there is a statistically significant correlation between students' experience of teaching and life satisfaction.
- 2 It is assumed there is a statistically significant difference in evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life quality with regard to students' place of residence.
- 3 It is assumed there is a statistically significant difference in evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life quality with regard to university.
- 4 It is assumed there is a statistically significant difference in evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life satisfaction with regard to the study year.

Participants

The research included 294 students of teacher education faculties of the University in Zagreb (departments in Zagreb and Čakovec) and of the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek. Out of the total number of participants, most were female students (N=283), whereas there was only 11 male participants. The research encompassed students at all years of study, although students of the first year prevailed (N=131). There were 59 participants in the second year of study, 31 in the third year, 58 in the fourth year and 15 in their fifth year of study. Out of the total number of participants, 218 study at the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb (101 in Zagreb and 117 in Čakovec), and 76 participants study at the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek. With regard to the place of residence, 145 participants live in rural and 146 in urban environment.

Instruments

Student demographics, i.e. place of residence and the study year, were gathered. *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener et al., 1985) was used to obtain data on life satisfaction and *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* to examine teaching quality in higher education (Ginns et al., 2007).

Student Course Experience Questionnaire (Ginns et al., 2007) consists of 23 manifest claims of the Lykert type (from 1 – *I completely disagree*, to 5 – *I completely agree*) that entail five latent subscales: 1 *Good Teaching* (six claims), 2 *Clear goals and standards* (four claims), 3 *Appropriate assessment* (three claims), 4 *Appropriate workload* (four claims) and 5 *Generic skills* (six claims). The results on individual subscales are formed by summing together the claims included in an individual scale, with previous inventory of the results on items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17. The overall result is calculated by adding up the results on all five subscales, wherein higher result indicates higher evaluation of teaching quality. The reliability of the overall scale is 0,843. In order to examine the sampling adequacy of data for factor analysis, we implemented Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (0,836) and Bartlett's test ($X^2 = 2441,326; p < 0.01$).

In the exploratory factor analysis, the Kaiser-Guttman criterion of factor extraction was used according to which only those factors with characteristic root (eigen value) of 1 or over 1 are kept in the analysis. In such a way, five latent factors were obtained that confirm the original five-factor structure and jointly explain 59.36% of the variance. The communalities show the proportion of the explained variance for each variable. The seventeenth claim was proven the weakest, which means that it should be formulated differently or it should be excluded from the questionnaire. Furthermore, claim *The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means it can't all be thoroughly comprehended* was grouped in the third subscale, and not the fourth as was intended. All other items are grouped in the subscales as was intended by the original questionnaire (Table 1).

Table 1

Factor structure of student course experience obtained by exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation

Items	Factors					Communality (h ²)
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	
The degree course has developed my problem-solving skills. (GSS)	0.821					0.723
The degree course has helped me develop my ability to work as a team member. (GSS)	0.789					0.648
22. The degree course has improved my skills in written communication. (GSS)	0.785					0.657
19. The degree course has sharpened my analytic skills. (GSS)	0.780					0.655
23. My degree course has helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work. (GSS)	0.761					0.620
20. As a result of my degree course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems. (GSS)	0.631					0.526
The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work. (GTS)		0.789				0.634
The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I may be having with my work. (GTS)		0.768				0.634
The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going. (GTS)		0.762				0.591
The teaching staff of this degree course motivate me to do my best work. (GTS)		0.762				0.642
The teaching staff work hard to make their subjects interesting. (GTS)		0.676				0.552
My lecturers are extremely good at explaining things. (GTS)		0.510				0.378
The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means it can't all be thoroughly comprehended. (AWS)		0.480				0.257
The staff seem more interested in testing what I have memorised than what I have understood. (AAS)			0.793			0.664
Too many staff ask me questions just about facts. (AAS)			0.777			0.637
To do well in this degree all you really need is a good memory. (AAS)			0.746			0.580
It is always easy to know the standard of work expected. (CGS)				0.780		0.682

Items	Factors					Communality (h ²)
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	
The staff made it clear right from the start what they expected from students. (CGS)				0.765		0.650
I have usually had a clear idea of where I am going and what is expected of me in this degree course. (CGS)				0.559		0.530
It has often been hard to discover what is expected of me in this degree course. (CGS)				0.557		0.468
There is a lot of pressure on me as a student in this degree course. (AWS)					0.720	0.709
The workload is too heavy. (AWS)					0.715	0.671
I am generally given enough time to understand the things I have to learn. (ASW)					0.680	0.546
Characteristic eigenvalue	5.679	3.308	1.990	1.447	1.230	
The explained variance (%)	24.69%	14.38%	8.65%	6.29%	5.35%	

Table 2
Cronbach's alpha coefficients for subscales of Student Course Experience Questionnaire

	Cronbach alpha (α)	Number of claims
Good teaching	0.843	6 (1th-6th claim)
Clear goals and standards	0.677	4 (7th-10th claim)
Appropriate assessment	0.756	3 (11th-13th claim)
Appropriate workload	0.607	4 (14th-17th claim)
Generic skills	0.873	6 (18th-23rd claim)

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985) is a one-dimensional scale that includes five claims about life satisfaction. The participants marked the degree of agreement with a certain claim on a seven-degree Likert-type scale, from 1 – *I completely disagree* to 7 – *I completely agree*. According to Diner et al. (1985), Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency was 0.87, while the internal consistency in this research was 0.85.

In order to check the suitability of data for factor analysis, we utilized Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test for sampling adequacy (0.847) and Bartlett's Sphericity test ($X^2 = 603.09$; $p < 0.01$), which showed that Satisfaction with Life Scale was suitable for factorisation. With the use of exploratory factor analysis, alongside Kaiser-Guttman criterion of factor extraction, one factor was obtained that explains 63.59 % of the overall joint variance, which confirms the original one-dimensional structure of the questionnaire (Table 3).

Table 3

Factor structure of Satisfaction with Life Scale obtained with the use of exploratory factor analysis

Or.n.	Claims	Component	Communality
		1	
3	I am satisfied with my life.	0.836	0.648
2	The conditions of my life are excellent.	0.812	0.729
1	In most ways my life is close to my ideal.	0.792	0.715
5	If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	0.783	0.643
4	So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.	0.760	0.661
Characteristic eigenvalue			3.177
Explained variance			63.548
Reliability (Cronbach's alpha coefficient)			0.846

Research results

Before starting data processing, we checked the distribution's normality by calculating skewness and kurtosis coefficients. Besides, descriptive statistics was done for the results on *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* and *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Table 4).

Table 4

Descriptive dimensions of Student Course Experience Questionnaire and its subscales, and Satisfaction with Life Scale

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	Skewness coefficient	Kurtosis coefficient
Course experience	294	51	108	77.99	10.23	0.174	0.225
Good teaching	294	7	30	19.88	4.30	0.015	0.138
Clear goals and standards	294	8	20	15.12	2.65	-0.147	-0.501
Appropriate assessment	294	3	15	8.13	2.43	0.119	-0.208
Appropriate workload	294	5	18	11.00	2.74	0.164	-0.402
Generic skills	294	13	30	23.86	3.97	-0.221	-0.582
Life satisfaction	293	8	35	26.14	5.50	-0.736	0.371

Table 4 presents values of skewness and kurtosis coefficients for *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* and *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Since the values of these coefficients are under 2, we conclude that the distribution of results does not deviate significantly from normal, so we continue to use parametric methods.

Correlation between teacher education students' course evaluation and satisfaction with life

In order to examine the existence of a statistically significant correlation between the overall results on *Student Course Experience Questionnaire*, its subscales (good teaching, clear goals and standards, appropriate assessment, appropriate workload, and generic skills) and the overall result on *Satisfaction with Life Scale*, we used the Pearson correlation coefficient (Table 5).

Table 5

Pearson correlation coefficients for the research variables

		Course experience	Life satisfaction	Good teaching	Clear goals and standards	Appropriate assessment	Appropriate workload	Generic skills
Course experience	<i>r</i>	-	0.228**	0.768**	0.664**	0.530**	0.512**	0.623**
	<i>p</i>		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Life satisfaction	<i>r</i>		-	0.130*	0.252**	-0.063	0.083	0.259**
	<i>p</i>			0.026	0.000	0.284	0.155	0.000
Good teaching	<i>r</i>			-	0.371**	0.269**	0.221**	0.332**
	<i>p</i>				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Clear goals and standards	<i>r</i>				-	0.237**	0.189**	0.366**
	<i>p</i>					0.000	0.001	0.000
Appropriate assessment	<i>r</i>					-	0.437**	0.005
	<i>p</i>						0.000	0.932
Appropriate workload	<i>r</i>						-	-0.002
	<i>p</i>							0.978
Generic skills	<i>r</i>							-
	<i>p</i>							

* statistically significant correlation, $p < 0.05$

** statistically significant correlation, $p < 0.01$

From the obtained results, we infer there is a small, but statistically significant positive correlation between the total result on *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* and life satisfaction ($r = 0.228, p < 0.01$). Students who achieve a higher result on the life satisfaction variable also evaluate their course experience higher, and vice versa. An insignificant correlation exists between variables life satisfaction and good teaching ($r = 0.130, p < 0.05$), while a relatively weak correlation was found between life satisfaction and clear goals and standards ($r = 0.252, p < 0.01$) and generic skills ($r = 0.259, p < 0.01$). We can conclude that students who are more satisfied with life evaluate teaching quality, clear goals and standards and generic skills higher. The correlation between appropriate assessment and appropriate workload and life satisfaction was not found.

Differences in evaluation of course quality in higher education and differences in self-assessment of satisfaction with life with regard to students' place of residence

In order to examine the existence of a statistically significant difference in course evaluation in higher education between students who reside in rural areas and those from urban environment, we used the t-test for independent samples.

Table 6

Results of the t-test for independent samples in examining the differences between students according to the place of residence in dimensions of course experience and satisfaction with life

	Rural environment			Urban environment			t-value	df	p
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD			
Course experience	145	76.75	9.67	146	79.27	10.32	-2.15	289	0.032*
Good teaching	145	19.37	4.09	146	20.41	4.40	-2.10	289	0.037*
Clear goals and standards	145	15.00	2.71	146	15.24	2.60	-0.77	289	0.442
Appropriate assessment	145	8.12	2.39	146	8.08	2.46	0.15	289	0.883
Appropriate workload	145	10.58	2.63	146	11.41	2.72	-2.65	289	0.009*
Generic skills	145	23.67	4.01	146	24.12	3.84	-0.97	289	0.331
Life satisfaction	144	26.15	5.81	146	26.17	5.12	-0.03	288	0.977

* statistically significant difference, $p < 0.05$

** statistically significant correlation, $p < 0.01$

Results of the t-test for independent samples have shown a statistically significant difference in course experience between students from rural and urban environment ($t = -2.15$; $p < 0.05$), wherein students from urban settings report better experience of teaching. Regarding satisfaction with studying, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups ($t = -0.03$; $p > 0.05$).

On the subscales of teaching quality and appropriate workload, there is a statistically significant difference between students from rural and urban surroundings, while no statistically significant difference was determined on other subscales. Students who live in urban environment report better experience of teaching quality ($t = -2.10$; $p < 0.05$) and appropriateness of workload ($t = -2.65$; $p < 0.01$) than their colleagues from rural environment.

Differences in student evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life satisfaction with regard to university

To examine whether there is a difference in evaluation of course quality and life satisfaction between students at different universities, the t-test for independent samples was implemented.

On the basis of the obtained results, we can conclude that students at the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek evaluate course quality as better than students studying at the University of Zagreb ($t = -4.18$; $p < 0.01$), while no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups with regard to life satisfaction ($t = 1.22$; $p > 0.05$).

In the subscales analysis, it is visible that students of the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek are significantly more satisfied with teaching quality ($t = -2.63$; $p < 0.01$), clarity of the set learning goals ($t = -3.14$; $p < 0.01$), the

appropriateness of assessment ($t = -3.83; p < 0.01$) and development of generic skills ($t = -2.38; p < 0.05$) than students at the University of Zagreb. No statistically significant difference was found between the two groups considering workload.

Table 7

Results of the t-test for independent samples in examining the differences between students studying at the University of Zagreb and University of Osijek in dimensions course experience and life satisfaction

	University of Zagreb			University of Osijek			t-value	df	p
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD			
Course experience	218	76.56	9.87	76	82.11	10.20	-4.18	292	0.000**
Good teaching	218	19.50	4.16	76	20.99	4.54	-2.63	292	0.009**
Clear goals and standards	218	14.84	2.64	76	15.93	2.54	-3.14	292	0.002**
Appropriate assessment	218	7.82	2.39	76	9.03	2.32	-3.83	292	0.000**
Appropriate workload	218	10.87	2.70	76	11.37	2.83	-1.38	292	0.169
Generic skills	218	23.54	4.074	76	24.79	3.52	-2.38	292	0.018*
Life satisfaction	217	26.38	5.57	76	25.49	5.26	1.22	291	0.225

* statistically significant difference, $p < 0.05$

** statistically significant difference, $p < 0.01$

To analyse the existence of differences in the evaluation of course quality according to individual cities, we utilized the variance analysis for independent samples normally used for testing three or more groups.

Table 8

The results of variance analysis on Student Course Experience Questionnaire considering the city of studying

	Zagreb			Čakovec			Osijek			F	df	p
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD			
Course experience	101	77.55	10.54	117	75.70	9.21	76	82.11	10.20	9.71	2	0.000**
Good teaching	101	19.52	4.12	117	19.47	4.21	76	20.99	4.54	3.45	2	0.033*
Clear goals and standards	101	14.83	2.67	117	14.85	2.63	76	15.93	2.54	4.92	2	0.008**
Appropriate assessment	101	8.47	2.26	117	7.26	2.37	76	9.03	2.32	15.03	2	0.000**
Appropriate workload	101	11.86	2.81	117	10.01	2.28	76	11.37	2.83	14.61	2	0.000**
Generic skills	101	22.87	3.97	117	24.12	4.09	76	24.79	3.52	5.64	2	0.004**

* statistically significant difference, $p < 0.05$

** statistically significant difference, $p < 0.01$

Based on the results from Table 8, a conclusion was made on the existence of a statistically significant difference between the cities in which the research was

implemented with regard to course experience ($F(2,291)=9.71; p < 0.01$), teaching quality ($F(2,291)= 3.45; p < 0.05$), clearly set learning goals ($F(2,291)= 4.92; p < 0.01$), appropriate assessment ($F(2,291)= 15.03; p < 0.01$), appropriate workload ($F(2,291)= 14.61; p < 0.01$), and generic skills ($F(2,291)= 5.64; p < 0.01$).

Table 9

Tukey's post hoc test of differences in course experience between students who study in Zagreb, Osijek and Čakovec

			Mean difference	Standard error	<i>p</i>
Course experience	Zagreb	Čakovec	1.85	1.35	0.357
	Zagreb	Osijek	-4.55*	1.51	0.008
	Čakovec	Osijek	-6.40*	1.46	0.000
Good teaching	Zagreb	Čakovec	0.05	0.58	0.995
	Zagreb	Osijek	-1.46	0.65	0.064
	Čakovec	Osijek	-1.52*	0.63	0.043
Clear goals and standards	Zagreb	Čakovec	-0.14	0.36	0.999
	Zagreb	Osijek	-1.10*	0.40	0.016
	Čakovec	Osijek	-1.09*	0.39	0.014
Appropriate assessment	Zagreb	Čakovec	1.21*	0.32	0.000
	Zagreb	Osijek	-0.56	0.35	0.250
	Čakovec	Osijek	-1.77*	0.34	0.000
Appropriate workload	Zagreb	Čakovec	1.85*	0.36	0.000
	Zagreb	Osijek	0.49	0.40	0.431
	Čakovec	Osijek	-1.36*	0.39	0.001
Generic skills	Zagreb	Čakovec	-1.25	0.53	0.051
	Zagreb	Osijek	-1.92*	0.59	0.004
	Čakovec	Osijek	-0.67	0.58	0.476

* statistically significant difference, $p < 0.05$

The use of Tukey's post-hoc test (Table 11) determined statistically better overall course experience in Osijek (82.11 ± 10.20) than in Zagreb ($77.55 \pm 10.54, p < 0.008$) and in Čakovec ($75.70 \pm 9.21, p < 0.05$). Statistically significant difference in the overall course experience between students studying in Čakovec and Zagreb was not found.

Furthermore, students from Osijek (20.99 ± 4.54) evaluate course quality as significantly better than students who study in Čakovec ($19.47 \pm 4.21; p < 0.05$). No statistically significant difference was found between students who study in Zagreb and Čakovec or between students who study in Zagreb and Osijek.

Students who study in Osijek evaluate the clarity of the set learning goals as significantly greater (15.93 ± 2.54) than students in Zagreb ($14.83 \pm 2.67, p < 0.05$) and Čakovec ($14.85 \pm 2.63, p < 0.05$). However, no statistically significant difference in the clarity of the set learning goals was found between students in Zagreb and Čakovec.

With regard to appropriate evaluation, students in Zagreb ($8.47 \pm 2.26, p < 0.05$) and Osijek ($9.03 \pm 2.32, p < 0.05$) are more satisfied compared to students in Čakovec

(7.26 ± 2.37), while students from Zagreb and Osijek are not significantly different when considering this variable.

With regard to appropriate workload, the situation is similar: students in Zagreb (11.86 ± 2.81, $p < 0.05$) and Osijek (11.37 ± 2.83, $p < 0.05$) are more satisfied compared to students in Čakovec (10.01 ± 2.28), whereas no statistically significant difference was found between students from Zagreb and Osijek.

Considering the development of generic skills, students in Osijek (24.79 ± 3.52) express greater satisfaction than students in Zagreb (22.87 ± 3.97, $p < 0.05$), while statistically significant differences between students studying in Zagreb and Čakovec were not proven.

Differences in student evaluation of course quality in higher education and self-assessment of life satisfaction with regard to the year of study

To determine the existence of differences in evaluation of course quality and life satisfaction between students of different study years, we used the t-test for independent samples. Students were divided into two groups, namely older and younger. Fourth and fifth year students are in the older group, while the younger group includes students in the first, second and third year of study.

Table 10

Results of the t-test for independent samples in examining the differences between students at undergraduate and graduate studies with regard to course experience and life satisfaction dimensions

	Younger students			Older students			<i>t-value</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Course experience	221	78.21	9.73	73	77.33	11.68	0.58	106.89	0.56
Good teaching	221	19.99	4.18	73	19.57	4.67	-0.73	292	0.47
Clear goals and standards	221	15.02	2.62	73	15.41	2.76	1.07	292	0.29
Appropriate assessment	221	8.26	2.29	73	7.73	2.79	-1.64	292	0.10
Appropriate workload	221	11.33	2.75	73	9.97	2.46	-3.77	292	0.00
Generic skills	221	23.60	4.03	73	24.66	3.69	1.98	292	0.049
Life satisfaction	220	26.22	5.33	73	25.93	6.03	0.39	291	0.70

Based on the results of the implemented analysis, it was inferred no statistically significant difference in life satisfaction existed ($t = 0.39; p > 0.05$) between younger and older students. With regard to course experience, there is no statistically significant difference in the overall results ($t = 0.58; p > 0.05$) or on the subscales of course experience ($t = -0.73; p > 0.05$), clearly set learning goals ($t = 1.07; p > 0.05$) or appropriate assessment ($t = -1.64; p > 0.05$). On the appropriate workload subscale, students at the first three

years of study are more satisfied with the workload than students in their fourth and fifth year ($t = -3.77$; $p < 0.05$), whereas older students are more content with generic skills development ($t = 1.98$; $p < 0.05$).

Discussion

In this research, we examined age and residential differences in the course experience of future primary education teachers studying at the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb (departments in Zagreb and Čakovec) and the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek, and the correlation to life satisfaction. The results have proven a small, but statistically significant correlation between student course experience and life satisfaction ($r = 0.228$, $p < 0.001$) so the set hypothesis was confirmed.

Besides, the results have partially confirmed the set hypothesis and shown statistically significant differences in course evaluation in higher education with regard to students' place of residence. Students who reside in urban environment evaluate course quality as better, i.e. have better experience with courses. Such results could be associated with the results of research done at a Canadian university (Chow, 2005) which found that students of better social and economic status achieve better results and are more satisfied with their academic experience. It is possible that students from rural surroundings, coming from smaller schools with smaller classes, attain a more personal approach from teachers in the course of primary education, which is continued in secondary school to some extent, as opposed to teaching at faculties where lecturers cannot devote as much time and attention to each student. The influence of professors in forming students' attitudes toward education is significant (Stronge, 2018). Personal characteristics, competence in class management, professional competence and relationships with students are some of the aspects valued in professors (Medallon & Martinez, 2014). The obtained results on course experience subscales in this research are in line with this explanation. These results have shown that students who live in rural environment evaluate course quality as lower, especially the part regarding the attitude of professors towards students (does the professor provide useful feedback, motivate students, invest great effort in understanding the difficulties students might have in their work). Students from rural environment attribute lower assessments to the appropriateness of workload too and consider they have substantial workload, as well as that the teaching content is covered swiftly and thus cannot be thoroughly understood. A possible cause of such evaluation of course quality might be the adjustment and stress they experience.

The existence of a statistically significant difference in life satisfaction with regard to students' place of residence was not proven.

Previous research found that older students are more satisfied with life (Hong & Giannakopoulos, 1994; Kovčo Vukadin, 2016), and if we consider the fact that older students have attended more courses, and by this fact alone their opinion of teaching changes, a statistically significant difference in course quality evaluation between

students at undergraduate and graduate studies was expected. The difference was also expected if we consider the results of research by Kovčo Vukadin (2016), which found that graduate students show greater dissatisfaction with studying. Furthermore, the results of this research indicated no statistically significant difference in evaluation of course quality or in life satisfaction with regard to students' age. However, statistical significance was proven on appropriate workload dimension, wherein younger students assess workload as more appropriate, while fourth- and fifth-year students evaluate workload as less suitable. Older students state they are burdened more, have greater workload and do not have enough time. It is possible that students in their fourth and fifth year of study are already more tired from studying, and maybe they experienced burnout in the first three study years.

The results have shown statistically significant difference in evaluation of course quality with regard to university students attend, while no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups on life satisfaction. It was proven that students of the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek assess teaching quality as better than students of the Faculty of Teacher Education of the University of Zagreb. Further data analysis found a statistically significant difference in the evaluation of course quality by students at the University in Osijek and students at the University in Zagreb. It was determined that students at the Faculty of Education in Osijek evaluate courses statistically significantly better than students at the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb. No statistically significant difference in the experience of teaching quality was found between students studying in Čakovec and Zagreb.

Conclusion

Nowadays quality teaching is an imperative, i.e. courses should be founded on quality, and the need to improve teaching in higher education is on-going. Today professors strive for contemporary instruction which develops creativity and critical thinking in students and instils in them certain knowledge, skills and competences. In the last couple of years, Croatia has been investing more and more in the quality of higher education, and the evaluation of quality is based precisely on internal analyses of higher education institutions themselves. This research has shown how future teachers of primary education perceive teaching quality at the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb and at the Faculty of Education of Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek. The research found that residential differences influence student evaluation of teaching quality, while age was not proven as significant in evaluating course quality by future primary education teachers. The research has found a correlation between evaluation of teaching quality and satisfaction with the quality of life, but students' residential and age characteristics were not proven as significant in self-assessment of life satisfaction. This work is an incentive for further and more frequent evaluation of teaching quality. Besides, future research could focus on delineating the variables that cause the differences in evaluation of teaching quality at the two examined universities.

References

- Bognar, B., & Bungić, M. (2014). Mogućnosti evaluacije visokoškolske nastave [Possibilities of evaluating higher education]. *Život i škola*, 31(1), 139-159.
- Bognar, L., & Kragulj, S. (2010). Kvaliteta nastave na fakultetu [Course quality at faculties]. *Život i škola*, 24(2), 169-182.
- Brkljačić, T., & Kaliterna Lipovčan, Lj. (2010). Zadovoljstvo životom i osjećaj sreće kod studenata. [Student satisfaction with life and their feeling of happiness]. *Suvremena psihologija*, 13(2), 189-201.
- Chow, H.P.H. (2005). Life satisfaction among university students in a Canadian prairie city: a multivariate analysis. *Social Indicator Research*, 70(2), 139-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-7526-0>
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653-663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.653>
- Dolton, P., Marcenaro, O.D., & Navarro, L. (2003). The effective use of student time: a stochastic frontier production function case study. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(6), 547-560. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757\(03\)00027-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7757(03)00027-X)
- Dubovicki, S. (2013). Attitudes of future teachers towards evaluation of university courses. *Život i škola*, 31(1), 126-138.
- Dubovicki, S., & Banjari, I. (2014). Students' attitudes on the quality of university teaching. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 2, 42-59.
- Fajčionkova, A., & Fejfarova, M. (2019). Evaluation of teaching from the perspective of university students. *ERIES Journal*, 12(2), 34-40. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2019.120201>
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students' perception of teaching quality in higher education: The perspectives of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(5), 603-615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701573773>
- Hong, S.M., & Giannakopoulos, E. (1994). Effects of age, sex and university status on life-satisfaction. *SAGE journals*. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1994.74.1.99>
- Knežević, B., & Frančić, V. (2007). *Osiguranje kvalitete u sveučilišnoj nastavi [Ensuring the quality of university teaching]*. Sveučilište u Rijeci, Pomorski fakultet.
- Kovčo Vukadin, I. (2016). *Kvaliteta života studenata u Republici Hrvatskoj [Life quality of students in the Republic of Croatia]*. Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Matijević, M. (2010). Između didaktike nastave usmjerene na učenika i kurikulumске teorije [Between the didactics of student-focused teaching and curriculum theory]. In I. Ivanišić (Ed.), *Zbornik radova Četvrtog kongresa nastavnika matematike* (pp. 391-408). Školska knjiga.
- Medallon, M.C., & Martinez, G.O. (2014). Teaching effectiveness and student's learning acquisition in selected major courses in the International Tourism and Hospitality Management program. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 131-138.
- Mohorić, T. (2008). Automatske misli kod učenja i ispitna anksioznost kao odrednice subjektivnoga i objektivnoga akademskog postignuća [Automatic thoughts in learning and exam-related anxiety as determinants of subjective and objective academic achievement]. *Psihologijske teme*, 17(1), 1-14.

- Ozben, S. (2013). Social skills, life satisfaction and loneliness in Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 41(2), 203-213. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.2.203>
- Pastuović, N. (1999). *Edukologija: integrativna znanost o sustavu cjeloživotnog obrazovanja i odgoja [Educology: integrative science on the system of lifelong education]*. Znamen.
- Reić Ercegović, I., & Jukić, T. (2008). Zadovoljstvo studijem i motivi upisa na studij. [Satisfaction with university studies and the motives of enrollment] *Napredak*, 149(3), 283-295.
- Rijavec, M., Miljković, D., & Brdar, I. (2008). *Pozitivna psihologija [Positive psychology]*. IEP-D2
- Stronge, J.H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers*. ASCD
- Vranešević, T., Mandić, M., & Horvat, S. (2007). Istraživanje činitelja zadovoljstva studenata [Research on the factors of student satisfaction]. *Poslovna izvrsnost Zagreb*, 1(1), 83-92.
- Živković, A., Čopić, I., Rončević, T., & Sindik, J. (2013). Zadovoljstvo životom u studenata sestrištva i studenata kriminalistike [Life satisfaction among nursing and criminology students]. *Sestrinski glasnik*, 18(1), 24-28. <https://doi.org/10.11608/sgnj.2013.18.006>

Lidija Miočić

Elementary school of Juraj Baraković, Ražanac

Ražanac X 9, 23248 Ražanac, Croatia

lidijamiočić2@gmail.com

Dobne i rezidencijalne razlike procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja i povezanost sa zadovoljstvom životom

Sažetak

U radu se daje uvid u procjenu kvalitete sveučilišne nastave budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja i njezinu povezanost sa zadovoljstvom životom. U ljetnom semestru akademske godine 2018./2019. provedeno je istraživanje s ciljem utvrđivanja dobnih i rezidencijalnih razlika u procjeni kvalitete nastave i povezanosti sa zadovoljstvom životom budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja. Ispitanici (N = 294) bili su studenti učiteljskih studija Učiteljskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (Središnjica u Zagrebu i Odsjek u Čakovcu) i Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta Josip Juraj Strossmayer u Osijeku. Korišteni su Upitnik studentskih iskustava nastave (Ginns, Prosser i Barrie, 2007) i Skala zadovoljstva životom (Diener, Emmons, Larsen i Griffin, 1985). Rezultati istraživanja ukazuju na razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave s obzirom na prebivalište studenata i s obzirom na sveučilište koje pohađaju. Studenti s prebivalištem u gradskoj sredini kvalitetu nastave procjenjuju boljom. Studenti Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku procjenjuju kvalitetu nastave boljom od studenata Zagrebačkoga sveučilišta. Istraživanjem se nisu pokazale razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave s obzirom na dob studenata. Istraživanje je pokazalo pozitivnu povezanost između studentskih iskustava nastave i zadovoljstva životom, ali se pokazalo kako ne postoji statistički značajna razlika u zadovoljstvu životom s obzirom na prebivalište i dob studenata, kao ni s obzirom na sveučilište koje pohađaju.

Ključne riječi: *kurikul; studenti; studentska iskustva nastave.*

Uvod

Kvaliteta nastave na fakultetima koji obrazuju i odgajaju buduće učitelje od velike je važnosti jer na buduće učitelje više utječe način izvođenja nastave od teorijskih postavki

pa učitelji u praksi više oponašaju svoje profesore, nego što primjenjuju didaktičko znanje stečeno na fakultetu (Bognar i Kragulj, 2010).

Kvaliteta nastave ogleda se u nastavnom procesu koji planiraju profesori i koji je podložan promjenama. Nastava koja se realiziraju profesori prema slušalačko-sjedilačkom principu nije uspješna. Ako u nastavu uključimo i studente, tijekom aktivnosti i njihovo vremensko trajanje ne mogu se planirati te nastava postaje zajednička aktivnost profesora i studenata (Bognar i Kragulj, 2010). Uloga profesora nije upitna jer o njemu ovisi hoće li nastava biti zanimljiva i kakvo ozračje će u nastavi prevladavati.

Nastava predstavlja složeni proces u kojemu su glavni sudionici učenici i nastavnici, a u sveučilišnom obrazovanju su to studenti i profesori. Učenje i poučavanje je složen proces za koji su potrebni temeljito planiranje, priprema i aktivnosti svih sudionika nastavnoga procesa (Matijević, 2010). Nastava je organizirana aktivnost, a organizirana aktivnost uključuje spomenutu pripremu aktivnosti, njezino izvođenje i vrednovanje postignutih učinaka koji trebaju biti usklađeni (Pastuović, 1999). Kvaliteta nastave je bitna, ne samo za sudionike nastavnoga procesa, već i za društvo u cjelini jer ono očekuje visoku razinu kvalitete obrazovanja. Evaluacija nastavnoga procesa trebala bi biti sastavni dio profesionalne prakse svakog profesora jer služi unapređenju nastavne prakse, a dobar profesor je onaj koji preispituje svoju nastavnu praksu, unapređuje nastavničke kompetencije i vrednuje nastavni proces s obzirom na one koji uče (Brown i sur., 2003 prema Bognar i Bungić, 2014).

Zadovoljstvo, dobrobit i sreća oduvijek su predmet ljudskoga zanimanja, a u novije vrijeme proučava ih pozitivna psihologija. Zadovoljstvo životom pripada u subjektivnu dobrobit te se može promatrati kao općenita procjena, ali i kao zadovoljstvo različitim područjima kao što su zdravlje, posao, socijalni odnosi. Ljudi mogu biti zadovoljni u većini područja, ali zbog utjecaja samo jednoga područja, ipak sveukupno mogu biti nezadovoljni (Rijavec, Miljković i Brdar, 2008). Kod subjektivne dobrobiti razlikujemo kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu. Samo zadovoljstvo životom podrazumijeva kognitivno procesuiranje te je jako važan način na koji ljudi daju procjene jer mnogi ljudi ne razmatraju sve aspekte svojega života, već svoje procjene temelje na informacijama koje su im trenutačno važne i na koje utječe njihovo trenutačno raspoloženje (Rijavec i sur., 2008). Afektivna strana obuhvaća pozitivna i negativna raspoloženja i emocije povezane sa svakodnevnim životom te se ova komponenta često izražava kao odnos između pozitivnih i negativnih emocija (Watson i sur., 1988 prema Rijavec i sur., 2008). Kod procjene zadovoljstva životom u obzir uzimamo i jednu i drugu komponentu.

Povezanost između stupnja obrazovanja i sreće nije jednoznačno utvrđena, iako se pokazalo kako obrazovanje može utjecati na povećanje sreće, ali putem drugih čimbenika kao što su bolji posao ili bolja primanja (Argyle, 2002 prema Brkljačić i Kaliterna Lipovčan, 2010). U ovom radu istraživala se povezanost procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i samoprocjene zadovoljstva životom kod budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja i razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i samoprocjene zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na dobne i rezidencijalne razlike među studentima primarnoga obrazovanja.

Kvaliteta nastave

Uvid u kvalitetu sveučilišne nastave možemo imati iz perspektive kvalitete samog poučavanja ili evaluacijom znanja i rezultata studenata (Pereira, Araujo i Machando-Taylor, 2018 prema Fajčikova i Fejfarova, 2019). Ovaj rad polazi od procjene kvalitete nastave studenata čije bi potrebe sveučilište trebalo zadovoljiti i ispuniti.

Kvaliteta sveučilišne nastave u Hrvatskoj najčešće je procjenjivana na osnovi anketiranja studenata krajem akademske godine. Prije priključenja Hrvatske Europskoj uniji došlo je do mnogih promjena u cjelokupnom hrvatskom obrazovanju, a jedna od promjena je i uvođenje vrednovanja u obrazovanje u svrhu osiguranja kvalitete općenito, s posebnim naglaskom na vrednovanje učinkovitosti nastave (Knežević i Frančić, 2007). Način na koji se procjenjuje studentsko obrazovanje zahtijeva osjetljive pokazatelje kvalitete jer loše procjene mogu narušiti inače dobro razvijene kurikule (Dubovicki, 2013). Važnost procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave u Hrvatskoj prepoznata je još 1995. godine kada je počela provedba nacionalnoga projekta *Osiguranje kvalitete u sveučilišnoj nastavi – The Quality of Teaching in Higher Education* (Dubovicki i Banjari, 2014), a nastavila se TEMPUS projektom *SM Osiguranje kvalitete u sveučilišnoj nastavi, Svom snagom naprijed – Quality Assurance in University Teaching, Full Ahead* 2006. i 2007. godine. Njime se kroz tri dokumenta nastojalo razviti svijest o važnosti osiguranja kvalitete sveučilišne nastave, ali i upozoriti akademske djelatnike kako nisu samo osobe koje realiziraju nastavni proces i potiču učenje studenata, već razumiju društvenu i kulturnu zbilju u kojoj djeluju (Knežević i Frančić, 2007).

Na kvalitetu sveučilišne nastave utječe mnogo faktora. Rezultati proučavanja povezanosti pohađanja nastave i akademskoga postignuća pokazali su kako pohađanje predavanja (nastave) donosi brojne dobrobiti studentima (Dolton, Marcenaro i Navarro, 2003). Uočeno je kako su studenti nezadovoljni nastavom u učionicama u kojima se izvodi uglavnom frontalna predavačka nastava (Bognar i Kragulj, 2010). Naglašava se utjecaj profesora na stavove studenata prema njihovu školovanju (Stronge, 2018). Navodi se kako se kod profesora vrednuju osobne karakteristike, profesionalne kompetencije i odnos sa studentima (Medallon i Martinez, 2014). Istraživanje stavova budućih učitelja o evaluaciji sveučilišne nastave pokazalo je kako i sami studenti smatraju da ju je potrebno provoditi u sveučilišnoj nastavi te da je evaluaciju potrebno kreativno osmisлити (Dubovicki i Banjari, 2014).

U istraživanju kvalitete sveučilišne nastave na Fakultetu ekonomije i menadžmenta u Češkoj došlo se do zaključka kako na studentsku procjenu kvalitete nastave najviše utječe smatraju li studenti pojedini kolegij korisnim, zanimljivim, logički strukturiranim i lakim za razumijevanje. Navedenim istraživanjem, osim varijabli koje utječu na percepciju kvalitete sveučilišne nastave kod studenata, ispitivalo se postoji li razlika u percepciji kvalitete s obzirom na dob, spol i studijski program. Rezultati su pokazali kako nema povezanosti između procjene kvalitete nastave i spola te kako nema povezanosti između procjene kvalitete nastave i studijskoga programa. Istraživanje je pokazalo povezanost između dobi studenata i pohađanja predavanja, ako je ta povezanost mala (Fajčikova i Fejfarova, 2019).

Zadovoljstvo životom kod studenata

Zadovoljstvo studijem i studiranjem jedna je od domena ukupnoga životnoga zadovoljstva studenata te jedan od osnovnih čimbenika kvalitete studija. Istraživanja su pokazala kako su dob, stres, tjelesno zdravlje, životni stil, stil studiranja i osobnost najznačajnije odrednice zadovoljstva životom kod studenata (Chow, 2005). Istraživanjem u kojemu se ispitalo zadovoljstvo životom i osjećaj sreće kod studenata na dva hrvatska sveučilišta u Zagrebu došlo se do zaključka kako su studenti zadovoljni životom, a najzadovoljniji su osjećajem fizičke sigurnosti, odnosima s prijateljima i prihvaćanjem od strane okoline, dok su najmanje zadovoljni slobodnim vremenom (Brkljačić i Kaliterna Lipovčan, 2010).

Istraživanje činitelja zadovoljstva kod studenata Ekonomskoga fakulteta u Zagrebu pokazalo je kako najznačajniji utjecaj na zadovoljstvo studenata ima nastavno osoblje i organizacija studija, dok nenastavno osoblje ima najmanji utjecaj na njihovo cjelokupno zadovoljstvo (Vranešević, Mandić i Horvat, 2007).

Ispitivanjem stupnja zadovoljstva studijem studenata učiteljskoga studija i studija predškolskoga odgoja Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu utvrđeno je nešto veće zadovoljstvo studijem studenata učiteljskog studija u odnosu na studente predškolskoga odgoja te nešto veće zadovoljstvo studijskim programom, nego nastavnicima, i to u obje studijske skupine (Reić Ercegovac i Jukić, 2008).

Rezultati istraživanja provedenoga među studentima učiteljskoga studija i studija predškolskoga odgoja Splitskog sveučilišta pokazuju osrednje zadovoljstvo studijem. Utvrđeno je nešto veće zadovoljstvo studijem studenata učiteljskoga studija u odnosu na studente predškolskoga odgoja te nešto veće zadovoljstvo studijskim programom, nego nastavnicima, i to u obje studijske skupine. Pokazalo se da su studenti koji su pri upisu studija bili vođeni intrinzičnim motivima (zainteresiranost radom s djecom i poučavanjem), zadovoljniji studijem (Mohorić, 2008).

Istraživanje kvalitete života studenata u Hrvatskoj pokazalo je kako su od svih analiziranih aspekata studiranja, studenti najlošije procijenili zadovoljstvo studijem. Prema dobivenim rezultatima, postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni zadovoljstva studijem kod studenata preddiplomskih i diplomskih studija tako da studenti diplomskih studija izražavaju veće nezadovoljstvo studijem. Rezultati koji su ispitali zadovoljstvo životom pokazali su da su studenti relativno zadovoljni svojim životom. Najzadovoljniji su osjećajem fizičke sigurnosti, odnosima s prijateljima i prihvaćanjem od okoline, dok su najmanje zadovoljni slobodnim vremenom. Utvrđene su statistički značajne razlike s obzirom na razinu studija i s obzirom na spol. Rezultati pokazuju kako studenti diplomskoga studija iskazuju veće zadovoljstvo životom od studenata preddiplomskih studija. Istraživanjem je utvrđena i povezanost između ukupnoga zadovoljstva životom i zadovoljstva vlastitim studiranjem, odnosno pokazalo se kako studenti koji su iskazali veće ukupno zadovoljstvo životom, iskazuju i veće zadovoljstvo vlastitim studiranjem (Kovčo Vukadin, 2016).

Razlike u zadovoljstvu životom s obzirom na spol utvrdila su i inozemna istraživanja kojima se pokazalo kako su studentice zadovoljnije životom od studenata (Diener i Diener, 1995; Ozben, 2013).

Istraživanjem socijalnih vještina, zadovoljstva životom i usamljenosti među turskim studentima došlo se do zaključka kako su socijalne vještine i zadovoljstvo životom negativno povezane s usamljenošću, dok su socijalne vještine pozitivno povezane sa zadovoljstvom životom (Ozben, 2013).

Istraživanje razlika u zadovoljstvu životom studenata sestrinstva i kriminalistike pokazalo je kako ne postoje statistički značajne razlike u zadovoljstvu životom kod studenata sestrinstva i kriminalistike, a razlike nisu pronađene ni s obzirom na godine studija, godine starosti, s obzirom na bračno stanje i duljinu staža (Živković, Čopo, Rončević i Sindik, 2013).

Metodologija

Cilj istraživanja

Cilj istraživanja bio je ispitati postoje li razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na prebivalište studenata, studijsku godinu te sveučilište na kojem studiraju, kao i ispitati postoji li povezanost procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i samoprocjene kvalitete zadovoljstva životom. U skladu s ciljevima istraživanja postavljene su hipoteze istraživanja:

1. Pretpostavlja se da postoji statistički značajna povezanost između studentskih iskustava nastave i zadovoljstva životom.
2. Pretpostavlja se da postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na mjesto prebivališta studenta.
3. Pretpostavlja se da postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na sveučilište.
4. Pretpostavlja se da postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na studijsku godinu koju studenti pohađaju.

Ispitanici

U istraživanju su sudjelovala 294 studenta učiteljskih studija Učiteljskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (Središnjica u Zagrebu i Odsjek u Čakovcu) i Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta Josip Juraj Strossmayer u Osijeku. Od ukupnoga broja ispitanika većina je bila ženskoga spola (N = 283), dok je muških ispitanika bilo 11. U istraživanju su bili zastupljeni studenti svih godina, iako su prevladavali studenti 1. godine (N = 131). Ispitanika s druge godine studija je bilo 59, s treće godine 31, s četvrte godine 58, a s pete 15. Od ukupnoga broja ispitanika 218 ih studira na Učiteljskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (101 u Središnjici u Zagrebu i 117 u Odsjeku u Čakovcu), a 76 ih studira na Fakultetu za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta

Josip Juraj Strossmayer u Osijeku. Za mjesto prebivališta 145 ispitanika označilo je da žive u seoskoj sredini, a 146 da žive u gradskoj sredini.

Instrumenti

Prikupili su se podatci o demografskim obilježjima studenata, tj. prebivalištu i studijskoj godini. Za prikupljanje podataka o zadovoljstvu životom koristila se *Skala zadovoljstva životom* (Diener, Emmons, Larsen i Griffin, 1985), dok se za ispitivanje kvalitete sveučilišne nastave koristio *Upitnik studentskih iskustava nastave* (Ginns, Prosser i Barrie, 2007).

Upitnik studentskih iskustava nastave (Ginns, Prosser i Barrie, 2007) sastoji se od dvadeset i tri manifestne tvrdnje Likertova tipa (od 1 – *u potpunosti se ne slažem* do 5 – *u potpunosti se slažem*) koje čine pet latentnih podskala: 1. *Kvaliteta poučavanja* (šest tvrdnji), 2. *Jasno postavljeni ciljevi učenja* (četiri tvrdnje), 3. *Primjerenost vrednovanja* (tri tvrdnje), 4. *Primjerenost radnoga opterećenja* (četiri tvrdnje) i 5. *Razvoj generičkih vještina* (šest tvrdnji). Rezultat na pojedinoj podskali formira se zbrajanjem pripadajućih tvrdnji za tu skalu, uz prethodno inventiranje rezultata na česticama 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 i 17. Ukupan rezultat dobiva se zbrajanjem rezultata na svih pet podskala, a veći rezultat ukazuje na višu procjenu kvalitete nastave. Pouzdanost cijele skale iznosi 0,843. Kako bismo ispitali prikladnost podataka za faktorsku analizu, proveden je Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinov test adekvatnosti uzorka (0,836) i Bartlettov test ($X^2 = 2441,326$; $p < 0,01$).

U eksploratornoj faktorskoj analizi korišten je Kaiser-Guttmanov kriterij ekstrakcije faktora prema kojem se zadržavaju samo oni faktori koji imaju karakteristični korijen (eigen vrijednost) jednak ili veći od 1. Na taj način dobiveno je 5 latentnih faktora, čime je potvrđena originalna petofaktorska struktura, a faktori zajedno objašnjavaju 59,36 % varijance. Vrijednost komunaliteta pokazuje proporciju objašnjene varijance za svaku varijablu. Najslabijom se pokazala 17. tvrdnja što može značiti da bi tvrdnju trebalo drugačije formulirati ili je izbaciti iz upitnika. Također, 17. tvrdnja („Veliki opseg nastavnoga sadržaja koji smo prošli na ovom stupnju obrazovanja znači da ga ne možemo temeljito shvatiti.“) grupirala se s trećom podskalom, a ne s četvrtom kako je bilo predviđeno. Sve ostale čestice grupirane su po podskalama kako je predviđeno u originalnom upitniku (Tablica 1).

Tablica 1.

Tablica 2.

Skala zadovoljstva životom (Diener, Emmons, Larsen i Griffin, 1985) je jednodimenzionalna skala koja se sastoji od pet tvrdnji koje se odnose na zadovoljstvo životom. Sudionici na Likertovoj skali od sedam stupnjeva označuju stupanj slaganja s određenom tvrdnjom, gdje 1 označava najmanje slaganje (1 – *uopće se ne slažem*), a 7 najviše slaganje (7 – *u potpunosti se slažem*). Prema Dineru i sur. (1985) Cronbachov alpha koeficijent interne konzistencije iznosio je 0,87, dok je u ovom istraživanju unutarnja konzistencija iznosila 0,85.

Kako bismo provjerili prikladnost podataka za faktorsku analizu, provedeni su Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test za adekvatnost uzorka (0,847) i Bartlettov test sfericiteta ($X^2 = 603,09$; $p < 0,01$), koji su pokazali da je Skala zadovoljstva životom pogodna za faktorizaciju. Eksploratornom faktorskom analizom, uz Kaiser-Guttmanov kriterij ekstrakcije faktora, dobiven je jedan faktor koji objašnjava 63,59 % ukupne zajedničke varijance i time je potvrđena originalna jednodimenzionalna struktura upitnika (Tablica 3).

Tablica 3.

Rezultati

Prije početka obrade podataka provjerena je normalnost distribucije podataka pomoću koeficijenta asimetrije i zaobljenosti. Uz to napravljena je i deskriptivna statistika za rezultate na Upitniku studentskih iskustava nastave i Skali zadovoljstva životom (Tablica 4).

Tablica 4.

Iz Tablice 4 možemo iščitati vrijednost koeficijenta asimetrije i koeficijenta zaobljenosti za Upitnik studentskih iskustava te za Skalu zadovoljstva životom. Budući da su vrijednosti koeficijenta manje od 2, zaključujemo da distribucija rezultata ne odstupa značajno od normalne te dalje koristimo parametrijske metode.

Povezanost procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i zadovoljstva kvalitetom života kod studenata Učiteljskoga studija

Kako bismo provjerili postoji li statistički značajna povezanost između ukupnoga rezultata na upitniku studentskih iskustava nastave, podskala kvalitete poučavanja, jasno postavljenih ciljeva učenja, primjerenost vrednovanja, primjerenost radnoga opterećenja, razvoj generičkih vještina i ukupnoga rezultata na skali zadovoljstva životom, proveden je Pearsonov koeficijent korelacije (Tablica 5).

Tablica 5.

Iz dobivenih podataka zaključujemo da postoji mala, ali statistički značajna pozitivna povezanost između ukupnoga rezultata na upitniku studentskih iskustava nastave i zadovoljstva životom ($r = 0,228$, $p < 0,01$). Studenti koji postižu viši rezultat na skali zadovoljstva životom, procjenjuju i iskustvo nastave boljom, i obrnuto. Između varijabli zadovoljstva životom i kvalitete poučavanja postoji neznatna korelacija ($r = 0,130$, $p < 0,05$), dok između zadovoljstva životom i jasno postavljenih ciljeva učenja ($r = 0,252$, $p < 0,01$) te razvoja generičkih vještina ($r = 0,259$, $p < 0,01$) postoji relativno slaba korelacija. Možemo zaključiti da studenti koji su zadovoljniji životom ocjenjuju kvalitetu poučavanja, jasno postavljanje ciljeva i razvoj generičkih vještina višim. Povezanost između primjerenosti vrednovanja i primjerenost radnoga opterećenja sa zadovoljstvom života nije pronađena.

Razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i razlike u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na prebivalište studenata

Kako bismo ispitali postoji li statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave između studenata koji imaju prebivalište u seoskoj sredini i onih koji žive u gradskoj sredini, korišten je t-test za nezavisne uzorke.

Tablica 6.

Rezultat t-testa za nezavisne uzorke pokazao je da postoji statistički značajna razlika u iskustvu nastave između studenata koji žive u seoskoj sredini i onih koji žive u gradskoj sredini ($t = -2,15; p < 0,05$) te studenti iz gradske sredine izvješćuju o boljem iskustvu nastave. Što se tiče zadovoljstva studiranjem nije pronađena statistički značajna razlika između dvije skupine ($t = -0,03; p > 0,05$).

Kod podskala kvalitete poučavanja i primjerenosti radnoga opterećenja postoji statistički značajna razlika između studenata koji žive u seoskoj sredini i onih koji žive u gradskoj sredini, dok za ostale podskale nije pronađena značajna razlika. Studenti koji žive u gradskoj sredini izvješćuju o boljem iskustvu u kvaliteti poučavanja ($t = -2,10; p < 0,05$) i primjerenosti radnoga opterećenja ($t = -2,65; p < 0,01$) od kolega koji žive u seoskoj sredini.

Razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i razlike u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na sveučilište

Kako bismo ispitali postoji li razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i zadovoljstvu života između studenata na različitim sveučilištima, proveden je t-test za nezavisne uzorke.

Tablica 7.

Na temelju dobivenih rezultata može se zaključiti da studenti Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku procjenjuju kvalitetu nastave boljom od studenata u Zagrebu ($t = -4,18; p < 0,01$), dok za zadovoljstvo životom ne postoji statistički značajna razlika između dvije skupine ($t = 1,22; p > 0,05$).

Kod analize podskala vidljivo je da su studenti Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku značajno zadovoljniji kvalitetom poučavanja ($t = -2,63; p < 0,01$), jasnoćom postavljenih ciljeve učenja ($t = -3,14; p < 0,01$), primjerenošću vrednovanja ($t = -3,83; p < 0,01$) i razvojem generičkih vještina ($t = -2,38; p < 0,05$) nego studenti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Za primjerenost radnoga opterećenja nije pronađena statistički značajna razlika između dvije skupine studenata.

Kako bismo analizirali postoji li razlika u procjeni kvalitete nastave za pojedinačne gradove, provedena je analiza varijance za nezavisne uzorke kojom se testira postojanje razlike između tri ili više skupina.

Tablica 8.

Na temelju rezultata iz Tablice 8 zaključujemo da postoji statistički značajna razlika između gradova u kojima je provedeno istraživanja, a s obzirom na iskustvo studiranja ($F(2,291) = 9,71; p < 0,01$), kvalitetu poučavanja ($F(2,291) = 3,45; p < 0,05$), jasno postavljene ciljeve učenja ($F(2,291) = 4,92; p < 0,01$), primjerenost vrednovanja ($F(2,291) = 15,03; p < 0,01$), primjerenost radnoga opterećenja ($F(2,291) = 14,61; p < 0,01$), razvoj generičkih vještina ($F(2,291) = 5,64; p < 0,01$).

Tablica 9.

Tukey post-hoc testom (Tablica 11) utvrđeno je statistički značajno bolje ukupno iskustvo nastave u Osijeku ($82,11 \pm 10,20$) u odnosu na Zagreb ($77,55 \pm 10,54, p < 0,008$) i u odnosu na Čakovec ($75,70 \pm 9,21, p < 0,05$). Statistički značajna razlika u ukupnom iskustvu nastave između studenata koji studiraju u Čakovcu i Zagrebu nije dobivena.

Nadalje, studenti koji studiraju u Osijeku ($20,99 \pm 4,54$) ocjenjuju kvalitetu poučavanja značajno boljom od onih koji studiraju u Čakovcu ($19,47 \pm 4,21; p < 0,05$). Između Zagreba i Čakovca te Zagreba i Osijeka nije pronađena značajna razlika.

Studenti koji studiraju u Osijeku ocjenjuju jasnoću postavljenih ciljeva značajno većom ($15,93 \pm 2,54$) nego studenti u Zagrebu ($14,83 \pm 2,67, p < 0,05$) i u Čakovcu ($14,85 \pm 2,63, p < 0,05$). Dok između studenata u Zagrebu i Čakovcu nije pronađena statistički značajna razlika u jasnoći postavljenih ciljeva.

Što se tiče primjerenosti vrednovanja, studenti u Zagrebu ($8,47 \pm 2,26, p < 0,05$) i u Osijeku ($9,03 \pm 2,32, p < 0,05$) zadovoljniji su u odnosu na studente u Čakovcu ($7,26 \pm 2,37$), dok se Zagreb i Osijek ne razlikuju značajno u toj varijabli.

Kod primjerenosti radnoga opterećenja slična je situacija te su studenti u Zagrebu ($11,86 \pm 2,81, p < 0,05$) i u Osijeku ($11,37 \pm 2,83, p < 0,05$) zadovoljniji u odnosu na studente u Čakovcu ($10,01 \pm 2,28$), dok između Zagreba i Osijeka nema značajne razlike.

Za razvoj generičkih vještina studenti u Osijeku ($24,79 \pm 3,52$) navode veće zadovoljstvo nego studenti u Zagrebu ($22,87 \pm 3,97, p < 0,05$), dok značajne razlike između Zagreba i Čakovca te Čakovca i Osijeka nisu dokazane.

Razlike u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave i razlike u samoprocjeni zadovoljstva životom s obzirom na studijsku godinu koju studenti pohađaju

Kako bismo ispitali postoji li razlika u procjeni kvalitete nastave i zadovoljstva životom između studenata različitih studijskih godina, koristili smo t-test za nezavisne uzorke. Studenti su podijeljeni u stariju i mlađu grupu. U starijoj grupi su studenti četvrte i pete godine, dok su u mlađoj grupi studenti prve, druge i treće godine.

Tablica 10.

Na osnovi rezultata provedene analize zaključujemo da ne postoji statistički značajna razlika u zadovoljstvu životom ($t = 0,39; p > 0,05$) između mlađih i starijih studenata. Što se tiče iskustva nastave, kod ukupnoga rezultata ne postoji statistički značajna razlika ($t = 0,58; p > 0,05$), kao ni na podskalama kvalitete poučavanja ($t = -0,73; p > 0,05$), jasno postavljenih ciljeva ($t = 1,07; p > 0,05$) i primjerenosti vrednovanja ($t = -1,64; p > 0,05$).

Na podskali primjerenosti radnoga opterećenja studenti nižih godina zadovoljniji su radnim opterećenjem od studenata viših godina ($t = -3,77; p < 0,05$), a studenti viših godina zadovoljniji su razvojem generičkih vještina ($t = 1,98; p < 0,05$).

Rasprava

U radu su se ispitale dobne i rezidencijalne razlike procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja Učiteljskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu (Središnjica u Zagrebu i Odsjek u Čakovcu) te Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku i povezanost sa zadovoljstvom životom. Rezultati su pokazali malu, ali statistički značajnu pozitivnu povezanost između studentskih iskustava nastave i zadovoljstva životom ($r = 0,228, p < 0,001$) te je potvrđena postavljena hipoteza.

Rezultati su djelomično potvrdili postavljenu hipotezu i pokazali kako postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete sveučilišne nastave s obzirom na mjesto prebivališta studenata. Studenti s prebivalištem u gradskoj sredini kvalitetu nastave procjenjuju boljom, tj. imaju bolja iskustva s njom. Ovakve rezultate mogli bismo povezati s rezultatima istraživanja provedenoga na kanadskom sveučilištu (Chow, 2005) koje je pokazalo kako studenti boljega socijalnoga i ekonomskoga statusa postižu bolje rezultate i zadovoljniji su akademskim iskustvom. Moguće je kako studenti iz seoske sredine, koji dolaze iz manjih škola s manjim razrednim odjelima, dobiju tijekom osnovnoškolskoga obrazovanja više osobniji pristup od strane učitelja, što se donekle nastavlja i u srednjoj školi za razliku od nastave na fakultetu gdje se profesor ne može posvetiti svakom studentu u tolikoj mjeri. Utjecaj profesora igra veliku ulogu u formiranju stavova studenata prema školovanju (Stronge, 2018). Kod profesora se vrednuju osobne karakteristike, upravljanje razredom, profesionalne kompetencije i odnos sa studentima (Medallon i Martinez, 2014). Ovom objašnjenju idu u prilog dobiveni rezultati na podskalama iskustva nastave koji su pokazali kako su studenti koji žive u seoskoj sredini kvalitetu poučavanja ocijenili nižom, posebice u dijelu pitanja koji se odnose na pristup profesora prema studentu (pruža li profesor korisnu povratnu informaciju, motivira li studenta, ulaže li veliki trud kako bi razumio poteškoće koje bi student mogao imati u svojem radu). Studenti koji žive u seoskoj sredini ocjenjuju nižom i primjerenost radnoga opterećenja te smatraju kako imaju veliki opseg posla, kako se nastavni sadržaj brzo prolazi i kako se ne može temeljito shvatiti. Moguće je da su prilagodba i stres uzrok ovakve procjene kvalitete nastave od strane studenata koji žive u seoskoj sredini.

Pokazalo se kako ne postoji statistički značajna razlika u zadovoljstvu životom s obzirom na prebivalište studenata.

Dosadašnja istraživanja pokazala su kako su stariji studenti zadovoljniji životom (Hong i Giannakopoulos, 1994; Kovčo Vukadin, 2016), a ako uzmemo u obzir i činjenicu da su stariji studenti odslušali više kolegija pa im se samim time mijenja i mišljenje o nastavi, očekivala se statistički značajna razlika u procjeni kvalitete nastave između

studenta preddiplomskih i diplomskih studija. Razlika se očekivala i uzевši u obzir rezultate istraživanja Kovčo Vukadin (2016) koji su pokazali da su studenti diplomskih studija pokazali veće nezadovoljstvo studijem. Rezultati su pokazali kako ne postoji statistički značajna razlika ni u procjeni kvalitete nastave, ni u zadovoljstvu životom s obzirom na dob studenata, ali se pokazala značajnim primjerenost radnoga opterećenja. Mlađi studenti radno opterećenje ocjenjuju primjerenijim, dok studenti četvrte i pete godine radno opterećenje ocjenjuju manje primjerenim. Stariji studenti navode da su više opterećeni, imaju velik opseg posla i nemaju dovoljno vremena. Moguće je da su studenti na višim godinama studija već umorni od studiranja, a možda doživljavaju i *burnout*, odnosno doživjeli su sagorijevanje na prve tri godine studija.

Rezultati su pokazali statistički značajnu razliku u procjeni kvalitete s obzirom na sveučilište koje studenti pohađaju, dok za zadovoljstvo životom ne postoji statistički značajna razlika između dvije skupine. Rezultati su pokazali kako studenti Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku procjenjuju kvalitetu nastave boljom od studenata Učiteljskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Daljnja analiza podataka pokazuje kako postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni iskustva nastave Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku u odnosu na Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Utvrđeno je da studenti Fakulteta za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku statistički značajno procjenjuju iskustvo nastave boljim od studenata Učiteljskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Statistički značajna razlika u iskustvu nastave između studenata koji studiraju u Čakovcu i Zagrebu nije dobivena.

Zaključak

Kvalitetna nastava je imperativ današnjega vremena. Nastava treba biti utemeljena na kvaliteti, a potreba unaprjeđivanja sveučilišne nastave nikada ne prestaje. Profesori danas teže suvremenoj nastavi u kojoj se razvijaju kreativnost i kritičko mišljenje, usvajaju se određena znanja, vještine i kompetencije. U posljednjih nekoliko godina Hrvatska sve više ulaže u povećanje kvalitete visokoga obrazovanja, a procjena kvalitete počinje upravo od internih analiza samih ustanova visokoga obrazovanja. Ovo istraživanje pokazalo je kako kvalitetu nastave na Učiteljskom fakultetu u Zagrebu i Fakultetu za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Sveučilišta *Josip Juraj Strossmayer* u Osijeku doživljavaju budući učitelji primarnoga obrazovanja. Pokazalo se kako na procjenu kvalitete nastave od strane studenata utječu rezidencijalne razlike, dok se dob nije pokazala značajnom kod procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave budućih učitelja primarnoga obrazovanja. Istraživanje je pokazalo kako postoji povezanost između procjene kvalitete nastave i zadovoljstva kvalitetom života, ali se rezidencijalne i dobne karakteristike studenata nisu pokazale značajnima kod samoprocjene zadovoljstva životom. Ovaj rad poticaj je za daljnje i učestalije procjene kvalitete sveučilišne nastave te na daljnja istraživanja i stalni rad na poboljšanju kvalitete nastave. Također, buduća istraživanja mogla bi ići u smjeru otkrivanja varijabli koje utječu na razlike u procjeni kvalitete nastave na dva istraživana sveučilišta.