

# UNIVERSITY STUDY QUALITY: UNDERSTANDING, IMPROVEMENT, INFLUENTIAL FACTORS

**Vincentas Lamanuskas**

University of Šiauliai, Lithuania

E-mail: v.lamanuskas@ef.su.lt

**Rita Makarskaitė-Petkevičienė**

Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Lithuania

E-mail: petkeviciene.r@gmail.com

## Abstract

*University study quality questions do not lose actuality. On the contrary, this becomes an object of intense discussions. Universities are in pursuit of study quality, because such is their purpose. However, in a public space, quite a big concern is observed in an insufficient, dissatisfying the clients study quality. It is necessary to understand, that students are not only passive study participants, they can and they should take the initiative in the improvement of the study quality. As competent study process participants, students have not only the obligation to learn, be active and responsible, but to require qualitative work from the other participants of this process. It happens quite often, that requirements are subjective, groundless. As studies are a continual process, every raised problem, correction or supplement made, contribute to the improvement.*

*It was sought by this research to ascertain university students' position regarding study quality questions. Eighty students from two Lithuanian universities participated in a qualitative research. Study quality is basically understood as a suitable study process organisation. According to the respondents' evaluation, academic process participant quality pursuit mostly determines the study quality. Study participant uncompetitiveness and study programme and their realisation inappropriateness worsen the study quality mostly. The essential personal effort seeking study process quality is self-motivation and responsibility.*

**Keywords:** *qualitative analysis, study quality, study improvement, university students.*

## Introduction

University study quality remains a very actual sphere of present education. Lithuania has joined the Bologna process activity, a unified study quality assurance system creation and improvement. National quality assurance system is functioning. National study quality assessment centre operates (<http://www.skvc.lt>). International study programme evaluation and accreditation has been carried on for more than a decade. Quality management systems QMS have also been started to implement at a university level. University net optimisation process has been started recently in Lithuania, when it is sought to reduce the number of universities enlarging them and so on. Not analysing all other factors, one of them is proper study quality assurance. Over the last few years different level research regarding quality assurance questions have been carried out in Lithuania. European Union integration in education field remains rather close. However, study and education quality differences remain. As stated by V. Pruskus, O. Palevičiūtė, E. Kocai (2015), a necessity emerges to objectively assess different country education system achievements, their action peculiarities. First of all, it is important carrying out study quality monitoring at all system levels, seeking adequate comparison. Study

quality questions are regulated by laws as well. In the Lithuanian Republic law on science and studies (article 40) it is said, that science and study institutions are responsible for science (art) activity, study and other activity quality (<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.C595FF45F869>).

It is obvious, that study quality assurance will remain an actual field in future as well. First of all it is because, that study quality is an aspiration. Thus, it can be improved, it can be sought, but this process is infinite, because conditions, learning technologies change, quality understanding also changes (Targamadzė, Petrauskienė, 2008). However, study process participant position is also very important. On the one hand, universities have to be constantly interested in the study quality, to research its condition, on the other hand, feedback is inevitably necessary for the improvement. J. Lakys, T. Tamošiūnas' and other (1998) research of one university students showed, that most of the students do not have clear study motivation. A research carried out later showed, that university study content has cognitive direction, therefore graduates lack practical preparation abilities (Čėsnaite, 2002). Another research carried out after a decade, in which first year students participated showed, that choosing studies the most important choice motif is qualitative studies. Also, students think, that enterprises, having perfect human resources, in other words, education institutions acknowledged by the state and society, can create the quality most (Žibėnienė, Dudaitė, 2012). The research by other authors showed, that first year students are mostly satisfied with the study quality, and later the attitude changes very much. This is understandable, because directly participating in the study process, the assessments are different: one is faced with objective and subjective problems, has to newly consider personal expectations. Students are interested in Lithuanian higher education actualities. However, an interest in European higher education questions is very poor. It has been stated, that university study choice was mostly determined by the probability for better career prospects. Personal initiative and parent advice are also important factors. However, teachers and friends basically did not have any influence in choosing university studies. A possible cause is - insufficient attention to professional career in comprehensive schools. It is interesting, that university study choice is not related to high prestige. Obviously prevail and are expressed pragmatic, practical interests (Lamanuskas, Augienė, Makarskaitė-Petkevičienė, 2012).

Independence – the essential personality feature, which allows to properly choose learning and communication goals, devices and methods, to actively and productively work. Rutkienė, Tandzegolskienė (2014), referring to university student research data, notice that during the studies, it is important for the students to speak about the ability to independently organise and control learning process, the ability to assess learning process according to the presented study results and to assess one's own activity progress. The research results show, that in students' opinion, independence during the studies is related to motivation and personal responsibility. Students point out these independent learning stimulators: responsibility (74.1%), responsibility (51.1%), self-control (34.2%). The researchers stated, that an opportunity to choose oneself various independent learning account forms, an opportunity to discuss and express one's opinion and convictions, to receive grounded and competitive criticism, encourage students to independently learn. According to respondents, more diverse teaching method application in the study process would have influence as well.

Rutkienė, Tandzegolskienė (2014) notice that orientation to student and links with the study results are accentuated in the study programmes in the latter years. So, study results and abilities are directed not only to subject requirements, but also to society citizenship and employment demands. Such student directed learning allows students to find their own learning style, to perceive their demands and motivation level and to acquire effective learning skills. Having applied this attitude in practice would mean that lecturers have: to help students set goals; encourage students to assess themselves and colleagues; to help them work together in groups and to assure, that they know how to use all available learning resources.

Klanienė, Litvinas, Gelžinienė's (2011) research show that students' participation in community activity gets weaker, therefore social responsibility education/self-education problems emerge. In authors' opinion, students, participating in voluntary activity, improve their personal and social competence, get acquainted with real society problems and contribute to their solution. Student involvement in voluntary activity encourages oneself to educate social responsibility and helps oneself to educate typical for an active citizen features. Referring to research data, the authors assert, that students, being occupied in voluntary activity, self-educate the feeling of social responsibility, become more responsible, more self-reliable. Nevertheless, students would participate in voluntary activity more actively, if this activity was included as social-pedagogical practice at university. However, in this case an idea comes to mind, that voluntary activity is not a value for them, but preferably a pragmatic action.

In an international context, there is an abundance of research analysing study quality questions. Research are important, because student satisfaction is as an indicator of quality in higher education (Farahmandian, Minavand, Afshardost, 2013; Fulfors, 2013; Uka, 2014). It is important, that students themselves would involve in quality improvement actions more actively, would be active and conscious study process participants. The research carried out in Bulgaria shows, that students are critical towards the educational work and lecturers, however, they do not perceive themselves as active subject of studies, as active participant in the learning process and they look for the reasons behind some misfortunes outside themselves (Yaneva, Zlatanova, Petrova-Gotova, Popov, Lazarova, 2016). The research in five private Bangladesh universities showed, that status of students for scholarship, extracurricular activities, parents' education, age, previous result, and university they study in have a significant influence on perception about quality of higher education (Akareem, & Hossain, 2016). Study content component is very significant as ever. In the age of information abundance university course (module) quality is important. The research show that students still do not participate in courses as much as they should, perceiving them as not sufficiently stimulating (Dubovicki, Banjari, 2014). It has also been asserted, that there are a positive and significant correlation between the factors of advising, curriculum, teaching quality, financial assistance and tuition costs and facilities with student satisfaction (Farahmandian, Minavand, Afshardost, 2013).

Thus, it is hopeful, that regardless of all the existing obstacles and contradictions, quality management questions will be solved more effectively in Lithuania. A responsible higher school has to align to national and international quality management standards, to seek its carried out activity to satisfy the universal quality management standards. Universities, as service providers, should orientate to international quality standards in their activity and to really take a responsibility to satisfy their consumers' demands and to constantly improve service supply (Lamanauskas, 2014).

Thus, the main research *aim* is to ascertain what qualitative studies mean to students, what factors possibly worsen / improve study quality, and what are personal efforts seeking better study quality. It is hopeful, that empiric research results will help to effectively improve university studies.

## Methodology of Research

### *General Research Characteristics*

The research is qualitative, of a pilot type. The research was carried out in November 2016. The research is based on an attitude, that students' opinion and evaluation research are important, because they allow defining actual problems, specifying already known ones, foreseeing study improvement possibilities. Referring to the respondent recommendation and insight analysis, one can suggest problem solving ways, evaluate possible consequences. Opinion research are an effective means seeking to initiate changes, in this case, to improve university study quality.

### *Instrument*

In the research the authors' prepared instrument was used, in which five open-ended questions/tasks were presented.

- What do qualitative studies *mean* to you? Please comment.
- What do you think study quality mostly *depend on*?
- What factors do you think, *improve* study quality?
- What factors do you think, *worsen* study quality?
- How do you personally seek study quality?

The questions include general students' understanding about study quality, factors determining study quality, and personal students' efforts.

### *Research Sample*

The fourth year students, pre-service teachers from two Lithuanian universities – Šiauliai University (42) and Lithuanian university of Educational sciences (38) participated in the research. Totally, 80 students participated in the research. Aforementioned universities are the main institutions preparing teachers in Lithuania. For the formation of sample, non-probability purposive research group formation method was chosen, when people included into a research group are the most typical in respect to the researched quality. Referring to Morse (1994), the sample of 30-50 participants is suitable for such kind of research. Qualitative sample size may best be determined by the time allotted, resources available, and study objectives (Patton, 1990). So, the attitude is hold, that such sample is sufficiently representative in the qualitative research and allows making certain conclusions.

### *Data Analysis*

The research data were expressed in written form. The received respondents' answers were coded. The most frequently repeating semantic units were grouped until the initial groups called sub-categories appeared. In the second stage the sub-categories were combined into categories. The qualitative research data were processed using *content* analysis, when in the informative array essential characteristics are distinguished. The obtained verbal data array, referring to conventional *content* analysis methods, was analysed in three stages:

- Multiple answer reading and analysis;
- Semantically related answers and "key" word search;
- Semantic unit interpretations and co-ordination.

In order to guarantee data analysis reliability, semantic unit distinction and later on grouping was carried out independently by two researchers. In the later stage the researchers were looking for a consensus due to sub-category attaching to categories. Co-ordination and proof-reading went on in two stages. A two-week break was made between the first and the second co-ordination stages. The co-ordination degree was higher than 90 %. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that it is enough for the reliability of data to find correspondence percentage higher than .70.

## **Research Results**

Having analysed respondent expressed opinions about qualitative study understanding, the corresponding categories were distinguished (Table 1).

**Table 1. Qualitative study understanding.**

Categories	N (%)	Subcategories	N (%)	Statements	N (%)
Proper study organisation	72 (60.9)	Study programmes, subjects, their conformity and proper realisation	41 (35.4)	Co-ordination between theoretical and practical preparation	12 (11.4)
				When only actual subjects are studied	8 (6.6)
				Broad spectrum knowledge is provided	8 (6.6)
				The obtained knowledge application in practice	5 (4.2)
				Various methods applied during the lectures	4 (3.3)
				Qualitative – first of all interesting studies	3 (2.5)
				Proper professional preparation	1 (0.8)
		Effective study organisation	31 (25.5)	Independently performed work (task) usefulness	10 (8.3)
				Obtained deep, strong knowledge	4 (3.3)
				Modern technology sufficiency and application	3 (2.5)
				Useful, effective, practical occupation	3 (2.5)
				Proper study environment	2 (1.6)
				Independently performed task variety, interest	2 (1.6)
				Qualitative studies when possibility is formed to improve yourself	1 (0.8)
				Guaranteed student's personal growth and improvement	4 (3.3)
Lecturer – study quality guarantor	46 (38.3)	Lecturer's work quality	18 (14.9)	High qualification lecturer work (perfect lecturers)	5 (4.2)
				Lecturer's ability to work creatively	5 (4.2)
				Qualitative lecturer's work	3 (2.5)
				Lecturer's ability to explain	2 (1.6)
				Lecturer's ability to make students interested	2 (1.6)
		Lecturers' practical experience in a concrete school	1 (0.8)		
		Assured system "lecturer-student" functioning	17 (14.2)	Harmonious lecturer and student relations	6 (5.0)
				Favourable lecturer and student's collaboration	6 (5.0)
				Polite and respectable lecturer's behaviour with students	5 (4.2)
				Respect of students' desires and ideas	5 (4.2)
Properly planned lectures	3 (2.5)				
Lecturer's ability to organise a university lecture/ academic activity	11 (9.2)	Purposeful study material presentation (clearness and so on.)	3 (2.5)		
Students – study quality guarantor	1 (0.8)	Academic group member relationship	1 (0.8)	Good relationship in the academic group	1 (0.8)



Quality is a complex and wide conception. Therefore it is natural, that students perceive it differently. As can be seen in Table 1, speaking about study quality they accentuate different things. The greater part of responsibility, according to respondents, lies on university shoulders. It depends on it whether studies will be organised properly. This category joins both study programme, subject conformity and programme realisation, and effective study realisation. A third of researchers expressed statement show, that students understand study quality as purposeful study programme subjects and their inter-conformity. The expression of this could be: theory and practice conformity, theory application in practice, studying of actual, innovative, integral subjects. At the same time students indicate study interest, various study method expression in the lectures.

One-fourth of the statements illustrate, that studies will be effective only when the students themselves, will be actively involved in studies: will participate in practical activities, will perform interesting and various independent work tasks, will use technologies and will study in an attractive environment adapted to this. Also, it is emphasised, that academic and social support system existing at university, helping students to improve, encouraging their personal growth and motivation and current international mobility possibilities have influence on study effectiveness.

The study process participants - lecturers and students – guaranteeing study quality, according to respondents' understanding, take up a different role. Assessing students' specified statements about study process participants and study quality, it has been stated, that lecturers take up almost 48 times more responsibility than students. And this is that students' role understanding quality limits itself only to good relationship in the academic group. Students (about 15%) expect from their lecturers high qualification, creative and qualitative work, didactic abilities: to explain, to make them interested. Lecturers' practical experience in a concrete sphere/school was also mentioned. A similar part of students understand qualitative studies as functioning of the system "lecturer-student", based on harmonious relations, collaboration, respectful behaviour with each other. Of course, collaboration is very important for both study process participants, otherwise it will be difficult to understand one's own role as a team member. Almost one-tenth of the analysed statements show, that students' study quality understanding limits itself to university lecture quality (planning, methodological material, taking into consideration students' demands and interests).

Having analysed the respondents' expressed opinions about what determines mostly proper study quality, the corresponding categories were distinguished (Table 2).

**Table 2. Study quality determining aspects.**

Categories	N (%)	Subcategories	N (%)	Statements	N (%)
Academic process participant quality aspiration	66 (67.5)	Lecturer – study quality determining factor	33 (33.8)	Qualified lecturers	18 (18.5)
				Lecturers' competence	8 (8.2)
				Lecturers' ability to make someone interested	3 (3.1)
				Adequate students' assessment	2 (2.0)
				Lecturers' ability to convey information	1 (1.0)
				Lecturers' erudition	1 (1.0)
		Student – study quality determining factor	22 (22.5)	Students' motivation to learn	10 (10.2)
				Student's personal interest, inclination	8 (8.2)
				Perception of the meaning, usefulness of the studies	3 (3.1)
		Harmony of the system "Student – lecturer" and orientation to quality	11 (11.2)	Students' activeness	1 (1.0)
				Good relationship between students and lecturers	6 (6.1)
				Lecturer and students' collaboration	4 (4.1)
Proper study programmes and their management	32 (32.5)	Study programme corresponding to students' expectations and successful SPC activity	16 (16.2)	University community orientation to quality	1 (1.0)
				Well prepared study programme	6 (6.1)
				Constant student encouragement, motivation	6 (6.1)
				Proper independent activity planning	2 (2.0)
				Proper study subject planning	1 (1.0)
		University ability to guarantee high study quality	16 (16.3)	Proper and adequately applied teaching methods	1 (1.0)
				Proper university provision with studying equipment	5 (5.1)
				Proper study environment	5 (5.1)
				Proper higher education management	4 (4.1)
				University prestige	2 (2.0)

Having analysed students' opinions, as can be seen in table 2, the aspects have been distinguished, influencing study quality. 2/3 of students' expressed ideas are directed towards study process participants, i.e., to how they seek study quality, the remaining one-third – towards study programme management. The latter category consists of two subcategories: study programme corresponding to students' expectations and successful SPC (study programme committee) activity and University ability to assure high study quality (study surroundings, material resources, university image, prestige, management), having gathered a similar number of significant statements.

Analysing the respondents' opinion, how study process participants are in pursuit of the study quality, can be seen, that students express their bigger expectations to their lecturers (lecturer – study quality factor). They speak about qualified, competitive (able to make interested, objectively evaluating), high erudition lecturers. One-third less of the statements, but still quite a lot, receive the students (student – study quality determining factor). According to respondents, if a student is motivated, interested in his studies, active and he sees the meaning in his studies, he also can guarantee higher study quality.

In some respondents' opinion, both students and lecturers have to work together, as a mechanism. Only then study quality will be guaranteed. Such a system “lecturer=student”, grounded on collaboration, feedback exchange and self-analysis would assure satisfaction with the studies and study quality.

Having analysed the respondents' expressed opinions about factors, improving study quality, the corresponding categories were distinguished (Table 3).

**Table 3. Factors improving study quality.**

Categories	N (%)	Subcategories	N (%)	Statements	N (%)	
Pursuit of study quality of the participating sides in the study process	53 (48.5)	Lecturers' qualification	24 (21.8)	Lecturers' qualification and professionalism	8 (7.4)	
				Lecturers' improvement and qualification raise	5 (4.5)	
				Lecturers' erudition	5 (4.5)	
				Lecturers' innovativeness	4 (3.6)	
				Lecturers having international experience	2 (1.8)	
		Lecturer and students' relationship based on collaboration	18 (16.8)		Student and lecturers' communication, collaboration	12 (11.4)
					Mutual understanding	3 (2.7)
					Lecturers' understanding, good relationship	2 (1.8)
		Students' attitude to studies	11 (9.9)		Tolerance to each other	1 (0.9)
					Student motivation	5 (4.5)
					Personal efforts	3 (2.7)
Dutifulness	2 (1.8)					
				Inclination to learn all life	1 (0.9)	



				Bigger attention to seminars, trainings and so on	15 (14.2)
				Proper study devices	8 (7.5)
				Theory and practice conformity	6 (5.5)
				Interesting lectures	5 (4.5)
		Study organisation	45 (41.6)	Lecture actuality and usefulness	4 (3.6)
High school responsibility	53 (48.8)			Interesting information presentation	4 (3.6)
				Various teaching methods	2 (1.8)
				Student demand satisfaction	1 (0.9)
		University possibilities/ AM internal factors	8 (7.2)	Proper modern programmes	4 (3.6)
				University material basis	3 (2.7)
				Proper study environment	1 (0.9)
Country policy	3 (2.7)	Country policy	3 (2.7)	Bigger financial support for students	2 (1.8)
				Future profession prestige	1 (0.9)

Having analysed the respondents' opinions, two equivalent categories were distinguished (see Table 3). One of them – pursuit of study quality of the participating sides in the study process. Lecturers' subcategory is grounded on researcher expressed opinions about lecturer qualification and its improvement, professionalism and innovations, erudition. Besides, students would positively value lecturers, having international experience. Another subcategory is called "lecturer and students' relationship based on collaboration" joins the statements about lecturer and students' communication and collaboration. It is obvious, that students are convinced, that a good agreement between both education process participants, tolerance to each other, would serve in the pursuit of a common result.

In addition, the respondents express their opinion regarding students as well. Thus, some students perceive, that one of the study quality improvement factors is they themselves. Study quality, satisfaction with studies depend on student's attitude, motivation, dutifulness, responsibility, personal efforts and understanding that one needs and will need to learn all his life.

Study process takes place in a certain university environment, therefore the factor not less important is – higher school itself, the attitude of its managers, responsible workers, obligation in pursuit of study quality. Student opinion analysis allows distinguishing two subcategories. One of them – study organisation received 5 times more of the statements. Most often students mention proper training, seminar organisation, possibility to use various devices, theory and practice conformity. The other statements about a programme, material basis, study environments are assigned to university possibility subcategory.

Not many of the analysed statements are oriented to the country policy. Still, students tend to think, that bigger financial support given from the state would allow them to study more seriously. It is thought, that poor prestige of the chosen profession has influence on the study quality as well.

Having analysed the expressed opinions about the factors, reducing study quality, the corresponding categories were distinguished (Table 4).

**Table 4. Factors, reducing / worsening study quality.**

Categories	N (%)	Subcategories	N (%)	Statements	N (%)		
Academic process participant incompetence	78 (61.9)	Lecturers' incompetence	40 (31.7)	Lecturers' incompetence	10 (8.0)		
				Lecturers' unprofessionalism, poor preparation	8 (6.2)		
				Not objective evaluation	6 (4.8)		
				Learners' conservativeness, inability to accept novelties	5 (4.0)		
				Lecturers' indifference	3 (2.3)		
				Distrust in students, preconceived opinion	2 (1.6)		
				Lecturers' reticence	2 (1.6)		
				Lecturers poorly know their students	2 (1.6)		
				Lecturers, not loving their work	1 (0.8)		
		Demotivating university employees	1 (0.8)				
		Negative students' position	24 (19.2)			Weak students' motivation	12 (9.6)
						Lecture nonattendance	6 (4.8)
						Negligent / inappropriate students' attitude to studies	2 (1.6)
						Students' irresponsibility	2 (1.6)
						Students' competition for scholarship	1 (0.8)
						Hostility between students	1 (0.8)
		Collaboration problems	14 (11.0)			Weak student and lecturers' collaboration	9 (7.1)
						Unrespectable behaviour with students, poor relations	4 (3.1)
Inappropriate, tense study atmosphere	1 (0.8)						

Inappropriateness of study programmes and their realisation	44 (34.9)	Study programme shortcomings	31 (24.5)	Unexhausted , theoreticized studies	6 (4.8)
				A weak link with school practice	5 (4.0)
				Unfavourable theory and practice relationship in the studies	5 (4.0)
				Too big study independent work load	4 (3.1)
				Limited choice freedom (e.g., of the study modules)	4 (3.1)
		Not understanding of essence unclear study content	3 (2.3)		
		Inconsequently, inappropriately formed study programmes	2 (1.6)		
		Uneven, unequal/ selective evaluation	1 (0.8)		
		Useless, unmodern subject existence	1 (0.8)		
		Neglected students' expectations	13 (10.4)	Ignoring the students, neglecting their opinion	6 (4.8)
Student demand disrespect / negligence	5 (4.0)				
Student expectation ignorance	2 (1.6)				
Inappropriate policy	4 (3.2)	Society. University and country policy	4 (3.2)	Inappropriate, inadequate society attitude to university	2 (1.6)
				Orientation to quantity, but not to quality	1 (0.8)
				Constantly changing study system	1 (0.8)

Factors reducing study quality at university are analysed in Table 4. Most of the statements are assigned to the category “Academic process participant incompetence”. Usually students and lecturers are as study process participants, though sometimes high school administration, which indirectly participates in the study process, has influence on study process. Almost half of the statements ascribed to this category are related to lecturers’ incompetence, which, according to a survey participants, manifests itself differently: unprofessionalism, not objectiveness, indifference to students. Students doubt not only about lecturers’ qualification, but also about their devotedness, preparation to do this work. And lecturers working “without fire” will hardly ever become example for their students. Lecturers’ conservativeness, inability to accept novelties are also unacceptable to students.

Almost twice as less reproach was expressed to the other side of the process participants – students. This subcategory is called “Negative student’s position”. Students negatively value their counterpart indifferent attitude to studies. They notice, that lecture and other activity nonattendance, unhealthy competition between course friends, fight for scholarships do harm to the studies.

The third subcategory joins the statements about study process participant collaboration problems. Students are worried about poor lecturer and student collaboration, which is followed by disrespect to each other, ill atmosphere. Under such situation, it is difficult for the students to perceive themselves as a member of a team.

The other factor, reducing study quality is – study programme itself: its structure and realisation problems. Students’ opinions split here: some of them state, that study programme is theoreticized, a lot of theoretical activities, poor relationship with practice, i.e., school, the others on the contrary – point out being a lot of independent work. Students would like themselves to choose study modules, would wish more modern subjects, inter-harmonious separate subject certification.

One more factor strongly related to the study programme realisation is – “Neglected students’ expectations”. It is difficult to speak about study quality, if a student feels ignored, unappreciated, perceives, that his opinion is neglected.

Study process participants, study programme - this is what directly every student experiences. Quite often external factors remain unnoticed. Still, not a big part of the respondents noticed what is going on outside auditorium or university boundaries. This part of respondents discerns study quality problems in society (inadequate attitude toward university), in education policy (study system constantly changes; study basket policy is oriented to quantity but not to quality).

Having analysed respondent expressed opinions about their personal efforts to seek study quality, the corresponding categories were distinguished (Table 5).

**Table 5. Personal efforts in pursuit of study quality.**

Categories	Subcategories	Statements		
Self-motivation and responsibility	69 (65.6)	Responsible attitude to studies 57 (54.4)	Regularly attend the lectures	16 (15.8)
			Do all tasks on time	14 (13.2)
			Try to prepare for all lectures and seminars	8 (7.6)
			Actively participate in lectures, ask, discuss	6 (5.7)
			Use consultation provided possibilities	5 (4.7)
			Read articles, literature	4 (3.7)
			Learn step by step and responsibly	4 (3.7)
			Try to constantly motivate myself	8 (7.6)
			I am motivated (a) to learn	2 (1.8)
			Student's efforts to discern the meaning of the studies	2 (1.8)

				I am interested in a lot of things independently	10 (9.4)
				I am extra interested in what is related with future profession	6 (5.7)
				Participate in conferences and/or seminars	3 (2.8)
				Participate in Erasmus+ programme	2 (1.8)
		Active student's life position	25 (23.3)	Participate in university association activity	1 (0.9)
				Participate in students' embassy activity	1 (0.9)
Collaboration and activeness	36 (33.5)			Do voluntary work	1 (0.9)
				Go deep into profession secrets	1 (0.9)
				Seek to collaborate with lecturers	5 (4.7)
		Collaboration abilities seeking study quality	11 (10.2)	Keep good relations with lecturers	3 (2.8)
				Communicate with the other people of this field	2 (1.8)
				Collaborate with the academic group friends	1 (0.9)
Indifference to study quality	1 (0.9)	Indifference to study quality	1 (0.9)	I do not pay big attention to this	1 (0.9)

As can be seen in table 5, 2/3 of the statements are assigned to “Self-motivation and responsibility” category. Student’s self-motivation can reveal itself differently. Most often student’s responsible attitude to studies motivates. Responsibility is an obligation to answer for your choice consequences, including learning, its results. A student, having a developed responsibility, takes up adequate responsibilities: he attends lectures and actively participates in them, comes to activities prepared, uses up consultation hours and so on. Thus, some of them the understanding “I must do this” motivates, the others – meaningful tasks, systematic work. Very often, having started to work and having noticed the results, an inspiration comes, a desire to finish the started work. However, speaking about study quality, student’s motivation is not enough, he has to know, why he performs these tasks, for what reason he prepares them, what competencies or abilities he educates, performing one or another task. One does not have to forget, that one of the lecture content’s criterion is sense - that is, student’s ability to discern benefit for himself. Properly chosen self-motivation method helps oneself to control a study situation, to evaluate study quality and purposefully move forward towards new challenges.

The third of the statements is ascribed to another category “Collaboration and activity”. Students being active prepare for the teacher’s career and educate competencies not only in lectures but also in practical activities and devote a part of their free time to this. Besides, they participate in conferences, Erasmus+ programme, are active members of scientific associations, student embassy members, do voluntary job.

Studies are grounded on collaboration. A student, accepting adequate responsibilities, trusts himself, it is important for him to keep good relations, therefore he tends to collaborate with lecturers, academic group members, to make arrangements.

Of all students having participated in the research, only one pointed out, that he did not pay attention to study quality. It might be, that not qualification, acquired competencies are necessary for that person, but only a university science diploma.

## 44 Conclusions

Qualitative studies are understood as proper study process organisation and lecturer work and activity quality. For study process participants – lecturers and students – guaranteeing study quality, falls a different role. A poor (low) student responsibility for study quality level is fixed. Lecturers get almost 48 times more responsibility than students.

It has been stated, that students express bigger expectations to lecturers (lecturer – study quality factor), and much smaller - to students. Nevertheless, students receive quite a lot (student – study quality determining factor). Student motivation, interest in their studies, activeness and so on, can also guarantee a higher study quality. System “lecturer=student”, is grounded on collaboration, feedback exchange and self-analysis, basically assures satisfaction with studies and study quality.

Lecturers’ qualification is one of the most important factors, determining study quality, the least important is – country policy. Of course, an obvious thing comes to light, that university study and science quality policy should be focused on science and study interaction strengthening, on student oriented study development, study interdisciplinarity and internationality, innovativeness and so on.

It is obvious, that academic process participant incompetence (or insufficient competence), study programme shortcomings and neglected students’ expectations make study quality poorer. Study quality problems are discerned in society as well (inadequate attitude to university), in education policy (study system constantly changes; study basket policy is oriented to quantity, but not to quality) and so on.

Self- motivation and responsibility are treated as the main personal effort seeking study quality. Properly chosen self-motivation method helps oneself to control a study situation, to evaluate study quality and purposefully move towards new challenges.

## References

- Akareem, H. S., & Hossain, S. S. (2016). Determinants of education quality: what makes students’ perception different? *Open Review of Educational Research*, 3 (1), 52-67.
- Čėsnaitytė, B. (2002). Studijų kokybė: aukštųjų mokyklų absolventų vertinimai [Quality of studies: Graduates evaluation]. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 3, 27-34.
- Dubovicki, S., Banjari, I. (2014). Students’ attitudes on the quality of university teaching. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 2, 42-59.
- Farahmandian, S., Minavand, H., Afshardost, M. (2013). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 12 (4), 65-74.
- Fulfors, A. (2013). Satisfaction, settlement and exposition: Conversation and the university tutorial. *Ethics and Education*, 8 (2), 114-122.
- Yaneva, R., Zlatanova, T., Petrova-Gotova, T., Popov, N., Lazarova, M. (2016). Quality of education process through the eyes of students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 6 (1), 93-102.
- Klanienė, I., Litvinas, Š., Gelžinienė, J. (2011). Studentų socialinės atsakomybės ugdymas/is savanoriška veikla [Development of students’ social responsibility in voluntary work]. *Tiltai / Bridges*, 3, 159-168. Retrieved from <http://etalpykla.lituanistikadb.lt/fedora/objects/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2011~1367176284443/datastreams/DS.002.0.01.ARTIC/content>.
- Lakis, J., Tamošiūnas, T., Ignatavičius, S., Poklad, T. (1998). Universitetinis pedagogų rengimas: profesinio brendimo problemos [Teacher training at universities: Occupational maturation problems]. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 3, 49-55.
- Lamanuskas, V. (2014). Some education quality management sketches. *Quality Issues and Insights in the 21st Century*, 3 (1), 4-6.
- Lamanuskas, V., Augienė, D., Makarskaitė-Petkevičienė, R. (2012). Universitetinių studijų problematika: studentų pozicija [University study problems: Students’ position]. *Švietimas: politika, vadyba, kokybė / Education Policy, Management and Quality*, 1 (10), 6-21.



- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. USA.
- Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S., *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (pp. 169-186). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pruskus, V., Palevičiūtė, O., Kocai, E. (2015). Studentų studijų kokybės vertinimas ir jų lūkesčiai (LEU atvejis) [Students' evaluation of the quality and their expectations]. *Santalka: Filologija, Edukologija / Coactivity: Philology, Educology*, 23 (1), 14–25.
- Rutkienė, A., Tandzegolskienė, I. (2014). *Studentų savarankiškumo skatinimas studijuojant universitete. Mokslo studija* [Enhancing student autonomy while studying at a university]. Vilnius. Retrieved from [http://www.vdu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/SMF\\_Rutkiene\\_9.pdf](http://www.vdu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/SMF_Rutkiene_9.pdf).
- Targamadžė, A., Petrauskienė, R. (2008). Nuotolinių studijų kokybė technologijų kaitos sąlygomis [The quality of distance learning in the situation of technological change]. *Aukštojo mokslo kokybė / The Quality of Higher Education*, 5, 74-93.
- Uka, A. (2014). Student satisfaction as an indicator of quality in higher education. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 4 (3), 6-10.
- Žibėnienė, G., Dudaitė, J. (2012). Studijų kokybės samprata: pirmojo kurso studentų požiūris [Study quality concept: The first course student approach]. *Societal Innovations for Global Growth*, 1 (1), 1098-1111.

Received: December 14, 2016

Accepted: December 30, 2016

<p><b>Vincentas Lamanuskas</b></p>	<p>PhD., (HP) Professor, Department of Education &amp; Psychology, University of Šiauliai, 25 P. Višinskio Street, LT-76351 Šiauliai, Lithuania.                  E-mail: <a href="mailto:v.lamanuskas@ef.su.lt">v.lamanuskas@ef.su.lt</a>                  Website: <a href="http://lamanuskas.puslapiai.lt">http://lamanuskas.puslapiai.lt</a>  <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vincentas_Lamanuskas">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vincentas_Lamanuskas</a></p>
<p><b>Rita Makarskaitė-Petkevičienė</b></p>	<p>PhD., Professor, Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, 39 Studentų Street, LT-08106 Vilnius, Lithuania.                  E-mail: <a href="mailto:petkeviciene.r@gmail.com">petkeviciene.r@gmail.com</a>                  Website: <a href="http://www.leu.lt">http://www.leu.lt</a></p>