Št./No. 1/2017
Str./pp. 144–158
ISSN 0038 0474

Marijana Županić Benić and Siniša Opić

Student Satisfaction and Final Grade Predictors in the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology Course at Faculties of Teacher Education in the Republic of Croatia

Abstract: A sample of 489 students attending teacher education faculties in the Republic of Croatia were surveyed to examine their satisfaction with the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course and identify the predictors of their final grades in that course. The results confirmed that students are satisfied with all composite variables (6), which measure different aspects of course quality, and the highest-rated composite variable was *course organization*. A Stepwise linear regression was used to identify the predictors of the final grades in the course. The analysis returned three hierarchical models with predictors that accounted for 14.6% of the variance in the criterion variable (final grade). An increase in the number of students in lectures, the number of classes missed, and the overall course satisfaction were predictive of higher final grades in the course. The assessment of student satisfaction with classes in higher education can identify the aspects of courses or study programmes that warrant further improvement. The students' satisfaction with a course mostly depends on the quality of their relationship with the teacher and the quality of the teacher's performance in class. Based on the results of previous studies, the assessment of teacher performance in class and the quality of the student-teacher relationships should not depend on the students' final grade.

Key words: Visual Arts Teaching Methodology, quality, students' satisfaction, students' final grade.

UDC: 378

Scientific article

Marijana Županić Benić, lecturer, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Teacher Education, Savska 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia; e-mail: marijana.zbenic@ufzg.hr

Siniša Opić, Ph.D., associate professor, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Teacher Education, Savska 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia; e-mail: sinisa.opic@ufzg.hr

Introduction

The quality of teacher education should be a priority for higher education institutions in the field of education. Surveying student satisfaction could be a useful method for improving the quality of specific courses or programmes of study. This paper will thus examine the current levels of student satisfaction with the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course and identify the predictors of the students' final grade in the course. That course is an essential constituent of educational theory and practice because it provides students with a system of knowledge and skills required to teach visual art classes.

Previous studies identified several determinants of student satisfaction with classes in higher education that can be used to measure student satisfaction (Caires et al. 2012; Centra 2003; Mai 2005; Ricijaš et al. 2006; Vranešević et al. 2007). Those determinants are: (a) teacher performance, (b) student teaching experiences, (c) assessment and grading, (d) course organization, (e) availability of learning materials and resources, and (f) student satisfaction with the development of teaching competencies.

Effective teacher performance is characterized by the teachers' ability to develop a collaborative relationship with their students, their ability to facilitate theoretical and practical learning, and their implementation of essential teaching skills in practice (Kyriacou 2001). For example, if teachers use the dialogue method to engage students in class discussions related to the content of a lesson, they will have a positive influence on the students' satisfaction with the course and their studies, whereas resorting to verbal aggression directed toward students in communication will reduce their academic satisfaction and motivation (Myers 2002). Ricijaš et al. (2006) found that student satisfaction depends primarily on the quality of student-teacher relationships, how interesting the course content is, and the quality of teacher performance in lectures, whereas the lack of relevant knowledge and skills after completing education are the main reasons why students in teacher education express dissatisfaction. Elementary school teachers in Croatia also reported that college professors in teacher education should use modern teaching

methods more often in their classes to improve student satisfaction and learning (Pavin et al. 2005).

Assessing and grading the achievements of students depends on the teachers' abilities to clearly define grading criteria and implement those criteria in practice to make the grading fair and objective. Although Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) reported that lenient grading criteria are associated with an increase in student satisfaction with a particular course, Centra (2003) found that the difference between the students' self-assessed grades and actual grades does not affect their evaluation of their teachers' performance. It was also found that the difficulty of the course can affect student satisfaction and is highest in those courses that the students consider to be appropriate for their level of knowledge, skills, and abilities, whereas the satisfaction with courses decreases when they are perceived to be too easy or too hard (Centra 2003). These results suggest that students expect the teachers to disclose the grading criteria in advance and that the criteria should be clear and objectively used to grade students.

Student assessment and grading is important during the course because the students can improve their methodological competencies for working with pupils only if they receive relevant feedback from their teachers. Based on students' feedback from Croatian universities, there is a lot of room for improvement in relation to current assessment and grading practices. For example, Reić Ercegovac and Jukić (2008) found that students tend to be satisfied with the overall programmes of their studies, but they are usually not satisfied with the performance of some teachers and the assessment/grading methods used. Vranešević et al. (2007) also reported that implementing modern teaching methods and clear assessment/grading criteria are the best interventions for improving student satisfaction in higher education.

The aim of contemporary teacher education is to develop various professional teacher competencies such as planning classes; evaluating classes; communicating with pupils, colleagues, and parents; classroom management; and continuing professional development (Vršnik Perše et al. 2015). To achieve this aim, the teaching staff must effectively guide and supervise the students' classroom teaching practice to facilitate the development of their professional competencies, which they will need to present and manage lessons in the future. The students enrolled in the elementary school education study programme should also be allowed to participate in lesson planning and to work with pupils based on their own ideas, whereas the mentors should be responsible for providing support and feedback without directly interfering in the students' performance during supervised classes. Caires et al. (2012) found that pedagogy students rank supervised teaching experiences as the most stressful parts of their education, but they also believe that it has a positive effect on the development of their self-confidence, flexibility, and spontaneity, which they will need in their professional life. It was also reported that a student-teacher relationship that is based on collaboration and support can attenuate the stress students experience during supervised teaching and facilitate their professional development (Caires et al. 2012). A positive relationship between teachers and their students is evident when students receive advice and support from the teacher and

faculty staff during their initial education, and those relationships can be associated with the entire study programme or a particular course (Radić and Toussaint 2012).

The availability and quality of materials and resources for students, such as information technology, proved to be a significant determinant of student satisfaction (Mai 2005). Tallman (1994) points out that the availability of learning materials in the library at the faculty and the availability of information pertaining to professional training outside the university are important resources for students during their professional development.

The organization of specific courses, such as the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course, requires the coordination of theoretical and practical classes (visual arts exercises and methodology exercises) so that the course proceeds according to the plan and syllabus. The allocated number of lectures and practical classes should also be sufficient so that the students can develop their competencies. Student satisfaction surveys showed that even though students can be satisfied with their overall study programmes, they can be dissatisfied with the organization of specific courses (Reić Ercegovac and Jukić 2008). Civian and Brennan (1996) showed that mandatory courses usually have a negative effect on student satisfaction. They assumed that student satisfaction decreases when they are not able to enroll in those courses they are interested in, but they also recognized that other characteristics of courses could have affected student satisfaction in their study.

In the context of Visual Arts Teaching Methodology classes, the education of future teachers is not limited to providing students with theoretical knowledge and practical teaching skills for working with pupils in primary school. The classes must also contribute to the students' personal development. Personal development refers to various competencies that can be applied in different contexts such as communication and problem solving skills (Radić and Toussaint 2012). However, the personal development of students is usually not measured and studied as a determinant of their satisfaction with classes. For example, self-efficacy is one's belief in the ability to succeed and achieve goals and it effects motivation, decision-making, and persistence. Self-efficacy was found to be predictive of students' higher satisfaction with their studies (DeWitz and Walsh 2002). Motivation can be described as a process that encourages every individual to perform actions directed towards certain goals, whereas satisfaction results from the level of agreement between what we receive and what we had expected to receive (Reić Ercegovac and Jukić 2008). Satisfaction with classes is higher if the students' expectations are met, and that can have a positive influence on their overall achievement in their studies.

Research problem

The purpose of this study is to examine the specifics of student satisfaction with the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course in all Croatian faculties of teacher education. The student satisfaction ratings with course quality can provide guidelines for improving the course. The following research problems are addressed:

- Examine the overall student satisfaction with the course.
- Identify the predictors of final grades in the course at the faculties of teacher education.

Methods

Participants and Instrumentation

The sample consisted of 489 students from Croatian faculties of teacher education in: Zagreb with remote departments in Petrinja and Čakovec, 169 (34.5%); Rijeka, 65 (13.3%); Zadar, 40 (8.2%); Osijek, 165 (33.8%); Pula, 19 (3.9%); and Split, 31 (6.3%). All Croatian faculties of teacher education participated in the study to improve the representativeness of the sample, and the survey was administered to fifth year college students who had completed and passed the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course.

The survey questionnaire of student satisfaction with the course was developed based on the *National Student Survey Questionnaire* (Higher Education Funding Council for England 2014), which was modified and adapted to the purpose of this study. The survey measured independent categorical variables, as well as 40 ordinal variables, which were measured on a five-point positively polarized scale and assigned the following values to each answer: 1 = completely agree, 2 = mostly agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = mostly disagree, and 5 = completely disagree.

Research methods

With regards to the research problem addressed in this study, a non-experimental research design was used. A bootstrapped one sample t-test was used to analyse the student satisfaction with the course. The application of a parametric test with a bootstrap method was justified based on the characteristics of the distributions (skewness and kurtosis) and the size of the sample. Bootstrapping allows us to make inferences regarding the characteristics of the population based on the sample and not on the parametric assumptions of the population (Opić 2015). The foundation for the application of bootstrapping is the approximation of the empirical distribution that has a fundamental role in hypotheses testing, determination of the confidence interval (Guthrie 2001, as cited in Opić 2015), and the calculation of the standard error of a given parameter.

To identify the predictors of the students' final grades in the course, a stepwise linear regression was used. The stepwise method of regression builds models using predictors (independent variables) that have the highest correlation with the criterion variable.

Results

The explanatory and confirmatory factor analyses did not uncover the underlying factor structure,[1] so we constructed composite variables that substantially suppress independent sets of manifested features of the satisfaction space with the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology course at the faculties of teacher education. A total of six composite variables were constructed. The descriptive statistics of each composite variable are shown in Table 1.

	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Stat	Std. Error	Stat	Stat	Stat	Std. Error	Stat	Std. Error
teacher performance	1.9812	.03190	.69093	.477	.492	.113	.031	.225
assessment and grading	2.0919	.04185	.92450	.855	.776	.111	-0.071	.221
student teaching experiences	2.1485	.02903	.63935	.409	.740	.111	.206	.221
course organization	**1.8704**	.03279	.72054	.519	.840	.111	.771	.222
availability of learning materials and resources	2.3868	.03471	.76290	.582	.355	.111	-0.109	.222
development of teaching competencies	1.9935	.03497	.73276	.537	.626	.117	.091	.233

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of composite variables

As shown in Table 1, the composite variable *course organization* has the highest evaluation score (Mean = 1.87; Mode = 1); i.e. compared to the other aspects of course quality, the students ranked *course organization* the highest, which means that the students are the most satisfied with that aspect of the course.

Course organization in the context of this course refers to the coordination of theoretical and practical lectures, the effective scheduling of classes and activities, the progression of lessons according to the plan and syllabus, and the allocation of a sufficient number of lessons. In previous studies that examined course organization, researchers found that student satisfaction is associated with tutorial-style classes, whereas theoretical classes and discussion groups were not associated with student satisfaction (Civian and Brennan 1996). In relation to the composite variables measured in this study, *course organization* is considered to be the most transparent. This is because problems associated with organization are quickly identified and removed and do not depend on the human element, unlike the other composite variables, including teacher performance, student teaching experiences, and assessment and grading. They also do not depend on the availability of financial resources, unlike the case with learning materials and resources.

[1] Eigenvalues > 1; eight principal components; Cattell scree plot, three principal components; promax rotation; kappa = default +/-.

The students reported being the least satisfied with the *availability of learning materials and resources*, i.e. the role of materials and resources in the realization of the course (Mean = 2.39). This variable refers to the learning materials and resources made available to the students and includes the number of literature sources in the faculty's library, the availability and quality of information technology, and the provision of the necessary materials and facilities for conducting course activities. In previous studies, the availability of learning materials in the library at the faculty (Tallman 1994) and the availability and quality of information technology were identified as significant determinants of student satisfaction (Mai 2005). The low satisfaction scores in relation to the availability of learning materials and resources appears to be an important source of dissatisfaction for students, which indicates that higher education institutions should provide students with adequate facilities and materials to learn and conduct methodology exercises throughout the course.

The distributions of the composite variables are asymmetric, which is consistent with the observations that their arithmetic means are elevated because of their positive preference toward composite variables of the quality assessment aspects of the course. Furthermore, the distributions of the variables vary from slightly platykurtic distributions (V2, V5) to slightly leptokurtic (V3, V4, V6), according to variation. The coefficient of variation for most variables is indicative of homogeneity (Cv ≤ 35%) and slight heterogeneity (Cv > 35%).

With regards to the direction of the measurement scale, the arithmetic means of the composite variables were elevated. Therefore, we wanted to know if we could determine whether the students were satisfied with the quality of the aspects of the course using inferential statistics, i.e. possible generalizations. From the field of inferential statistics, we used parametric tests, despite the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test, which was conducted on all composite variables, $p < .05$. However, as there was no indication of a pronounced asymmetry or leptokurtic or platykurtic distribution and the sample size was large (effect of the Central limit theorem (CLT), we decided to use parametric tests with a bootstrapped sample (resample)).

The test value of 3 (neither agree nor disagree) was selected as the threshold value. Thus, values less than 3 indicate satisfaction with an aspect of the course quality, and values greater than 3 indicate dissatisfaction. The results of the one-sample t-test are shown in Table 2:

	Test Value = 3					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
teacher performance	-28.397	410	**.000**	-0.97616	-1.0437	-0.9086
assessment and grading	-19.055	410	**.000**	-0.86618	-0.9555	-0.7768
student teaching experiences	-26.238	410	**.000**	-0.84359	-0.9068	-0.7804
course organization	-30.783	410	**.000**	-1.11533	-1.1866	-1.0441
availability of learning materials and resources	-15.917	410	**.000**	-0.60178	-0.6761	-0.5275
development of teaching competencies	-27.540	410	**.000**	-1.00568	-1.0775	-0.9339

Table 2: One-sample test

		Bootstrap[a]				
	Mean Difference	Bias	Std. Error	Sig. (2-tailed)	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
teacher performance	-0.97616	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-0.97616	-0.97616
assessment and grading	-0.86618	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-0.86618	-0.86618
student teaching experiences	-0.84359	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-0.84359	-0.84359
course organization	-1.11533	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-1.11533	-1.11533
availability of learning materials and resources	-0.60178	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-0.60178	-0.60178
development of teaching competencies	-1.00568	.00000	.00000	**.001**	-1.00568	-1.00568

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 1000 stratified bootstrap samples

Table 3: Bootstrap for one-sample test

Bootstrapping is a resampling method used to obtain an improved distribution and is needed to obtain more precise, accurate, and reliable results.

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, all composite variables have lower arithmetic means than the threshold value of 3 (negative mean difference). Considering the direction of the measurement scale, that means the students from the sample are satisfied with the quality of all aspects of course quality.

To investigate the predictors of the final grade of the final semester in the course, we used a linear regression analysis according to the stepwise model. The goal was to determine the predictors that affect the final grade in the course. The distribution of the criterion variable is as follows: satisfactory (5.2%), good (12.1%), very good (31.4%), excellent (51.3%). The descriptive values of the predictors in the regression model are shown in Table 4:

Predictors	Range	Min	Max	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Std. Error	Stat	Stat	Stat	Std. Error	Stat	Std. Error
Number of students in lectures	2	1	3	1.72	.035	.770	.592	.531	.110	-1.12	.220
Number of students in practical classes	2	1	3	2.61	.025	.549	.301	-1.01	.111	.011	.222
Number of students in supervised field classes in elementary schools	2	1	3	2.10	.028	.603	.363	-0.042	.113	-0.287	.225
Scholarship	1	1	2	1.57	.023	.496	.246	-0.268	.111	-1.93	.222
Number of classes missed	4	1	5	1.92	.039	.865	.748	.529	.111	-0.354	.221
Employed	1	1	2	1.59	.022	.493	.243	-0.362	.111	-1.87	.222
Experience working with children outside of college	1	1	2	1.38	.022	.485	.235	.509	.111	-1.74	.221
Visiting art exhibitions	4	1	5	1.93	.033	.725	.525	.463	.111	.22	.221
Extracurricular art education	1	1	2	1.62	.022	.487	.237	-0.482	.111	-1.77	.221
Duration of extracurricular art education (years)	17.00	.00	17.0	5.24	.243	3.27	10.7	.843	.181	.603	.359
Overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology	4	1	5	1.84	0.38	.840	.705	.889	.111	.634	.221

Legend: Number of students in lectures (1 = 49 or less; 2 = 50–99; 3 = 100 or more); number of students in practical classes (1 = 5–7; 2 = 8–15; 3 = 16–25); number of students in supervised field classes in elementary schools (1 = 5–7; 2 = 8–15; 3 = 16–25); scholarship (1 = yes; 2 = no); number of classes missed (1 = 0; 2 = 1; 3 = 2–3; 4 = 4–5; 5 = 5 or more); employed (1 = yes; 2 = no); experience working with children outside of college (1 = yes; 2 = no); visiting art exhibitions (1 = never; 2 = once per year; 3 = a few times per year; 4 = once per month; 5 = every week); extracurricular art education (1 = yes; 2 = no); duration of extracurricular art education in years (range 0–17); overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology (1 = completely agree, 2 = mostly agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 mostly disagree, 5 completely disagree).

Table 4: Descriptive values of initial predictors

The stepwise method of regression takes those predictors (independent variables) that have the highest correlation with the criterion variable as measured by Pearson's correlation coefficient (Table 4).

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.300[a]	.090	.085	.836	.090	16.813	1	170	.000	
2	.349[b]	.122	.112	.824	.032	6.183	1	169	.014	
3	.382[c]	.146	.131	.815	.024	4.694	1	168	.032	1.729

a. Predictors: (Constant), number of students in lectures.
b. Predictors: (Constant), number of students in lectures, number of classes missed.
c. Predictors: (Constant), number of students in lectures, number of classes missed, overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology.
d. Dependent Variable: final grade in Visual Arts Teaching Methodology.

Table 5: Model summary[d]

As shown in Table 5, of the aforementioned ten predictor variables, the stepwise model included only three (in models). The table also shows that all three models explain 14.6% of the variance in the criterion variable, that is 13.1%. Adjusted R^2; cross-validity of the regression model is good; i.e., had the regression model been derived from the population and not from the sample, it would have had only 1.0% of the variance less.

The *number of students in lectures* was found to be the most important predictor because it explains 9% of the changes/variability in the criterion variable, i.e. 9% of the changes in the final grade of the course can be predicted based on the number of students in lectures. In model 2, the predictor variables *number of students in lectures* and *number of classes missed* together explain 12.2% of the variance in the criterion variable. Finally, with the predictor *overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology*, the three models do not explain a lot of variance in the criterion variable (14.6%; adjusted = 13.1%).

That means the predictors have a small effect on the criterion variables. The results of the ANOVA ($p \leq .05$) support the statistical significance of the predictor (model) variables. The Durbin Watson test result indicates that there is no autocorrelation of the residuals.

The insights pertaining to the contribution of predictor variables (by the model) to the explanation of the variance in the final grade in the course are shown in Table 6.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Correlations		
B		Std. Error	Beta		t	Zero-order	Partial	Part	
1	(Constant)	4.921	.162		30.288	.000			
	Number of students in lectures	-0.363	.089	-0.300	-4.100	.000	-0.300	-0.300	-0.300
2	(Constant)	5.365	.240		22.367	.000			
	Number of students in lectures	-0.427	.091	-0.352	-4.692	.000	-0.300	-0.339	-0.338
	Number of classes missed	-0.169	.068	-0.187	-2.487	.014	-0.088	-0.188	-0.179
3	(Constant)	5.609	.263		21.359	.000			
	Number of students in lectures	-0.388	.092	-0.320	-4.231	.000	-0.300	-0.310	-0.302
	Number of classes missed	-0.169	.067	-0.187	-2.513	.013	-0.088	-0.190	-0.179
	Overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology	-0.177	.082	**-0.158**	-2.167	.032	-0.212	-0.165	-0.154

a. Dependent Variable: Final grade in Visual Arts Teaching Methodology

Table 6: Coefficients

The values of non-standardized coefficients (betas) show an association between the criterion variable and every predictor. All beta values are negative, which indicates that as the values of the predictor variables increase, the values of the criterion variables decrease. In compliance with the stepwise regression model, the beta values show how strongly each predictor influences the criterion variable independently, while the effects of the other predictors on the criterion variable are controlled, that is they are kept constant.

Model 1 contains the predictor variable *number of students in lectures*; the beta (-0.363) indicates that for each increase in the predictor variable *number of students in lectures* by 1 unit on the scale, the value of the predictor variable decreases by 0.363 units, whereas the standardized regression coefficient (beta) indicates that an increase of 1 standard deviation in the predictor variable is associated with a decrease of 0.3 standard deviations in the criterion variable.

In models 2 and 3, according to the logic of the stepwise model, it is possible to see the "pure" effect of each predictor independently while the other predictors in the model are controlled. Therefore, of the ten predictors associated with the final grades in the course, we found that only three were statistically significant. The most significant predictor was the *number of students in lectures*, followed by the *number of classes missed* and the *overall satisfaction with Visual Arts Teaching Methodology*. Based on the values of beta coefficients (analogue and partial correlations), we can predict that the students' final grades in the course will be lower when

the number of students in each class is higher and when non-attendance rates are higher. This relationship between the predictor variables and the criterion variable is expected as it is difficult for teachers to establish collaborative relationships with students and engage them in classes when they are working with a lot of students. Therefore, although students may attend their classes, large numbers of students in lectures can reduce their final exam grades.

Students who attend classes and complete their coursework probably have a greater interest in and motivation towards the course compared to students who are often absent. Therefore, their ability to connect the theoretical and practical aspects of the course could explain why higher attendance rates are associated with higher final grades.

The third statistically significant hierarchical predictor in the regression is the overall satisfaction with the course. The beta value is negative, meaning that a higher level of reported satisfaction with the course predicts a better final grade.

Based on those results, it is possible to suggest that students who express greater satisfaction with the course are actually more motivated and are more interested in the course compared to students who report lower overall satisfaction. This would explain why higher grades are associated with higher satisfaction with the course.

Another possible explanation is that students who are interested in the arts and visual arts specifically are more creative and have an aptitude for visual expression and creation, which helps them to complete assignments such as planning and conducting lessons; in other words, they can connect theory and practice more quickly and easily than other students, and so receive higher grades.

A further explanation may be the role of the teachers, who can use different approaches to motivate their students and form collaborative relationship with them. Thus, the teachers can affect the students' satisfaction with the course and their interest in engaging with the course, which reflects on the students' preparations and learning for the final exam.

Reverse causality between satisfaction and the final grade is also a possible explanation of the result. For example, students who received a higher grade on the final exam decided to report higher overall satisfaction with the course; although, Centra's (2003) findings rule out this possibility and it is highly unlikely that this explanation is correct. However, because the surveys were administered once the students had completed the course and the final exam, it is not possible to empirically determine the direction of causality between final grades and student satisfaction.

Similar results were reported in previous studies, which found that student satisfaction with courses in Croatian higher education institutions depend on teacher performance, student assessment, and grading (Reić Ercegovac and Jukić 2008). Specifically, it was suggested that the modernization of teaching methods and the development of clear grading criteria are essential for improving student satisfaction with higher education quality (Vranešević et al. 2007). The objectivity of grading was the most common complaint associated with assessment and grading. This needs to include the observation and assessment of students' learning throughout the academic year and not just during examinations; teaching classes in smaller groups; the frequent assessment of written, oral, and practical activities; the pro-

vision of feedback to students; and the quality of the collaboration between the teacher and the students (Pavin et al. 2005).

In view of the regression analysis results (model), it is important to note that the generalizations should be made carefully because the assumptions of homoscedasticity and linearity are questionable (according to the pattern of the residuals in the P–P plot; normal probability–probability).

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the satisfaction of students attending faculties of teacher education in the Republic of Croatia with the Visual Arts Teaching Methodology courses and identify the predictors of final grades for that course. The following six aspects of course quality were measured in this study: (a) teacher performance, (b) student teaching experiences, (c) assessment and grading, (d) course organization, (e) availability of learning materials and resources, and (f) student satisfaction with the development of teaching competencies. Overall, the students were satisfied with the quality of the course, but significant differences were observed among the reported satisfaction scores of those six aspects. The highest student satisfaction scores were observed in relation to the organization of the course, possibly because satisfaction with the organization of a course is not susceptible to subjective influences such as teacher performance, assessment and grading, and student teaching experiences. The students reported being the least satisfied with the availability of learning materials and resources; the composite variable refers to the quality of the working conditions provided during the course; the financial expenses required to complete the course requirements; the availability of books, information technology, and other learning materials; and the availability of educational materials and tools for methodology exercises in elementary schools.

The analysis of the predictors of final grades in the course showed that the number of students in lectures, the number of times students are absent from classes, and the overall satisfaction with the course are statistically significant predictors of the final grades. Those results are consistent with expectations because being frequently absent from class can be an indicator of low motivation levels, lack of interest, or being overwhelmed with other obligations. Students who do not attend their classes for those reasons cannot or do not want to complete all tasks they are given in the course. Furthermore, a higher number of students in lectures was predictive of lower final grades in the course, which implies that working in large groups has a negative effect on the quality of classes because the teacher cannot build strong relationships with students to support and engage them in coursework, reducing final grades accordingly.

The increase in the students' overall satisfaction with the course was associated with an increase in their final grades. One possible explanation is that students who report higher satisfaction with the course are more motivated and interested in the course than other students, so they are also more likely to prepare and do better in the final exam. Another possible explanation is that some students were

already interested in the arts before enrolling in the course. The teachers can also stimulate the students' interest in the course by using teaching approaches that motivate students and build collaborative relationships with them; this could explain why students who are satisfied with the course also prepare and do better in their final exams than students who are less satisfied.

References

Caires, S., Almeida, L. and Vieira, D. (2012). Becoming a teacher: Student teacher's experiences and perceptions about teaching practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, issue 2, pp. 163–178.

Centra, J. A. (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education*, 44, issue 5, pp. 495–518.

Civian, J. T. and Brennan, R. T. (1996). *Student and course factors predicting satisfaction in undergraduate courses at Harvard University*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED394440.pdf (Accessed on 02.11.2016).

DeWitz, S. J. and Walsh, W. B. (2002). Self-efficacy and college student satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 10, issue 3, pp. 315–326.

Greenwald, A. G., Gillmore, G. M. (1997). No pain, no gain? The importance of measuring course workload in student ratings of instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, issue 4, pp. 743–751.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (2014). *National Student Survey 2014 Questionnaire*. Retrieved from http://www.thestudentsurvey.com/content/ NSS2015_Questionnaire.pdf (Accessed 24.02.2016).

Kyriacou, C. (2001). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća: Metodički priručnik za uspješno poučavanje i učenje*. Zagreb: Educa.

Mai, L. W. (2005). A comparative study between UK and US: The student satisfaction in higher education and its influential factors. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21, issue 7–8, pp. 859–878.

Myers, S. A. (2002). Perceived aggressive instructor communication and student state motivation, learning, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports*, 15, issue 2, pp. 113–121.

Opić, S. (2015). Neki izazovi kvantitativne metodologije u istraživanjima odgoja i školskoj pedagogiji. In: S. Opić, V. Bilić and M. Jurčić (eds.). *Odgoj u školi*. Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet, pp. 279–303.

Radić, I. and Toussaint, I. (2012). Zadovoljstvo studenata nekim vidovima nastave pedagogije. *Ekvilibrij: Časopis studenata pedagogije Hrvatske*. Retrieved from http://www.pedagogija.hr/ekvilibrij/zadovoljstvo-studenata-nekim-vidovima-studija-pedagogije.html (Accessed on 02.11.2016).

Reić Ercegovac, I. and Jukić, T. (2008). Zadovoljstvo studijem i motivi upisa na studij. *Napredak*, 149, issue 3, pp. 283–295.

Ricijaš, N., Huić, A. and Branica, V. (2006). Zadovoljstvo studijem i samoprocjena kompetentnosti studenata nekih pomagačkih profesija. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 42, issue 2, pp. 51–68.

Tallman, F. D. (1994). Satisfaction and completion in correspondence study: The influence of instructional and student-support services. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 8, issue 2, pp. 43–57.

Vranešević, T., Mandić, M. and Horvat, S. (2007). Istraživanje činitelja zadovoljstva nastavom. *Poslovna izvrsnost: znanstveni časopis za promicanje kulture kvalitete i poslovne izvrsnosti*, 1, issue 1, pp. 83–92.

Vršnik Perše, T., Ivauš Grmek, M., Bratina, T. and Košir, K. (2015). Zadovoljstvo studenata praksom u nastavi u sklopu studijskog programa za obrazovanje učitelja. *Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje*, 17, issue 2, pp. 159–174.

Marijana ŽUPANIĆ BENIĆ in dr. Siniša OPIĆ (Univerza v Zagrebu)

ZADOVOLJSTVO ŠTUDENTOV IN NAPOVEDNIKI KONČNE OCENE PRI PREDMETU DIDAKTIKA LIKOVNEGA POUKA NA UČITELJSKIH FAKULTETAH V REPUBLIKI HRVAŠKI

Povzetek: Proučili smo vzorec 489 študentov učiteljskih fakultet v Republiki Hrvaški z namenom ugotoviti zadovoljstvo študentov s študijskim predmetom Didaktika likovnega pouka in napovednike njihovih končnih ocen pri tem predmetu. Izsledki so potrdili, da so študenti zadovoljni z vsemi sestavljenimi spremenljivkami (6), ki merijo različne vidike kakovosti predmeta, najvišje ocenjena sestavljena spremenljivka pa je bila *organizacija predmeta*. Za ugotavljanje napovednikov končnega uspeha pri predmetu Didaktika likovnega pouka smo uporabili postopno linearno regresijo. Analiza je pokazala tri hierarhične modele, kjer so napovedniki pojasnili 14,6 % variance pri kriterijski/odvisni spremenljivki (končna ocena). Napovedniki končnega uspeha pri Didaktiki likovnega pouka so število študentov pri predavanjih, število izostankov s predavanj in splošno zadovoljstvo. Ocena zadovoljstva študentov s predmeti v visokošolskem izobraževanju lahko razkrije vidike predmetov oziroma študijskih programov, ki kličejo po dodatnih izboljšavah. Zadovoljstvo študentov s posameznim predmetom je najbolj odvisno od kakovosti njihovega odnosa s predavateljem in od kakovosti predavateljevega dela pri pouku. Upoštevajoč prejšnje raziskave, ocena predavateljevega dela pri pouku ter kakovost odnosa med študenti in učitelji ne smeta biti odvisni od končnega uspeha študentov.

Ključne besede: didaktika likovnega pouka, kakovost, zadovoljstvo študentov, končne ocene študentov

Elektronski naslov: marijana.zbenic@ufzg.hr