

Evaluating Students' Satisfaction with Their University and City: A Case in Turkey

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Üniversite ve Kent Memnuniyetinin Değerlendirilmesi: Türkiye'den Bir Örnek

Çağdaş Ümit YAZGAN

ABSTRACT

University satisfaction is not limited to academic processes, pedagogical interactions, or on-campus experiences. The city environment in which students live outside the university can also affect students' satisfaction levels. This research aims to define the city and university satisfaction levels of students enrolled in a state university in Turkey, and to determine the relationship between students' city and university satisfaction levels. The research was designed with a descriptive and relational design within the scope of quantitative research methods, and the sample consists of 1071 university students. A significant difference was found between city and university satisfaction and gender, education level, size of the family residence, and geographical region. The research concluded that city satisfaction is a significant variable in explaining university satisfaction. As students' city satisfaction increases, university satisfaction also increases. City satisfaction explains 33% of the total variance in university satisfaction. Services and facilities that will increase university students' city satisfaction positively affect university satisfaction. This result shows that the city and the university have complementary qualities. At the same time, the results show that university satisfaction of students cannot be reduced to pedagogical and academic activities and on-campus experiences. In this context, it is possible that the university satisfaction level of the young people who study in a city is high, where the level of city satisfaction is high in terms of basic needs, social and cultural interactions, feeling of safety, entertainment opportunities, sports activities, adequate transportation, and travel services.

Keywords: Satisfaction, City satisfaction, University satisfaction, University students, Youth sociology

ÖZ

Üniversite memnuniyetini akademik süreçler, pedagojik etkileşimler veya kampüs içi deneyimlerle sınırlandırmak mümkün değildir. Kent ortamı da öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeylerini etkileyebilmektedir. Bu araştırma, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinde eğitim gören öğrencilerin yaşadıkları kentten ve eğitim gördükleri üniversitelerinden memnuniyet düzeylerini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, nicel araştırma yöntemleri kapsamında ilişkisel tarama deseni ile tasarlanmış olup, örneklemini 1071 üniversite öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada kent ve üniversite memnuniyeti ile cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi, aile ikametgâhının büyüklüğü ve coğrafi bölge arasında anlamlı farklılıklar tespit edilmiştir. Kent memnuniyetinin üniversite memnuniyetini açıklamada önemli bir değişken olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Öğrencilerin kent memnuniyeti arttıkça üniversite memnuniyeti de artmaktadır. Şehir memnuniyeti, üniversite memnuniyetinin toplam varyansının %33'ünü açıklamaktadır. Kent memnuniyetini artıracak nitelikteki hizmet ve tesisler, üniversite memnuniyetini de olumlu yönde etkilemektedir. Bu sonuç, kentin ve üniversitenin birbirini tamamlayan niteliklere sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Öğrencilerin

Yazgan Ç. Ü., (2022). Evaluating students' satisfaction with their university and city: A case in Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education and Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 12(2), 472-479. <https://doi.org/10.5961/higheredusci.1118959>

Çağdaş Ümit YAZGAN (✉)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3290-4202

Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Department of Sociology, Nevşehir, Turkey

Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Nevşehir, Türkiye

cumityazgan@nevsehir.edu.tr

Received/Geliş Tarihi : 20.05.2022

Accepted/Kabul Tarihi: 15.08.2022



This work is licensed by "Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-4.0 International (CC)".

üniversite memnuniyetinin pedagojik ve akademik faaliyetlere ve kampüs içi deneyimlere indirgenemeyeceği anlaşılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda temel ihtiyaçlar, sosyal-kültürel etkileşimler, güvenlik duygusu, eğlence olanakları, spor aktiviteleri, yeterli ulaşım ve seyahat hizmetleri bakımından kentten memnuniyetinin yüksek olduğu ortamda üniversite memnuniyet düzeyinin yüksek olması olasıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Memnuniyet, Kent memnuniyeti, Üniversite memnuniyeti, Üniversite öğrencileri, Gençlik sosyolojisi

INTRODUCTION

As the competition among higher education institutions increases, these institutions may adopt various strategies to differentiate themselves from their competitors and attract as many students as possible. In this research, it is argued that cities have special importance in providing satisfaction with higher education institutions. In today's world, Universities are starting to focus more on meeting or exceeding the needs of their students. Therefore, numerous studies have been conducted to identify the most important factors affecting student satisfaction. However, in these studies, mostly university-based satisfaction is taken into account. In this study, unlike the others, university satisfaction is evaluated together with city satisfaction.

University life is not just an academic programme for students. Students want to have social, cultural, physical, and even spiritual experiences, as well as academic experiences during their university education (Sevier, 1996). For university students, the learning process is both a tool and an end. Students live in a unique time and space during their university education. The educational process frees students from the rhythm of family and professional life. In this way, it is possible to liken university life to a game played in space and time separated from the real world (Bourdieu & Paseron, 1979). In this respect, it should be noted that the place where the game is played, namely the city, has special importance in terms of student satisfaction.

University administrations mostly focus on the academic dimension of student experiences and bring up issues such as student-faculty ratios and program quality in their statements about satisfaction (Elliot & Shin, 2002). In research on satisfaction amongst university students, teaching-related activities or on-campus experiences are mostly highlighted (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017; Santini et al., 2017). Student satisfaction is not limited to academic processes, pedagogical interactions, or on-campus experiences. The city environment in which students live outside the university can also affect their satisfaction levels. However, it should be noted that research on university students' perceptions and satisfaction with the host city is limited in the literature (Insch & Sun, 2013). This research focuses on the relationship between university students' city satisfaction and university satisfaction, taking into account the stated limitation.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNIVERSITY SATISFACTION and CITY SATISFACTION

Student satisfaction expresses positive evaluations about educational outcomes and experiences, and is constantly shaped by repeated experiences of campus life (Oliver & DeSarbo,

1989). Student satisfaction is a short-term attitude based on the evaluation of the educational process. Services and conditions that meet or exceed expectations ensure student satisfaction. Educational life is a network of interconnected experiences that affect student satisfaction (Elliott & Healy, 2001). In this respect, satisfaction can be considered as a multidimensional construct affected by various factors (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). Undoubtedly, the city where students continue their education has a special position within the multidimensional structure that affects student satisfaction.

While higher education institutions are increasingly integrating with the cities and regions where they are established, cities are also looking for ways to activate their potential in a way that will support their contributions to the economic, social and cultural development of universities (Sankır, & Sankır, 2017). Social, cultural, and economic interactions (permanent and temporary) among city residents have deep meanings that shape satisfaction and expectations for the city (Insch & Florek, 2008). The capacity of the city to solve the problems that may be encountered in daily life (with issues such as accommodation, transportation, security, health, and cultural activities) can also affect the satisfaction of the citizens of the city. In this context, the interaction of university students, who are a part of the urban community, with the city in which they live, at various levels, can shape the perception towards the university by affecting satisfaction with the city.

Today, the idea that higher education is a service industry is more widely accepted (Elliott & Healy, 2001). It is not possible to think of higher education services independently of the city. Cities represent environments where various services are produced and consumed. Education also represents a complex service produced jointly with a wide range of services including city components (Cubillo et al., 2006). Campuses need goods and services shaped by local city conditions (Situmorang et al., 2020). Local urban communities host universities and college students (Hahn et al., 2020). It can be said that university students' expectations of, and satisfaction with, educational services are related to the city area. The city environment in which the university is located is of particular importance for university students, both in the selection process and in the learning process. As students spend most of their time outside the campus, the city environment becomes a critical factor affecting student satisfaction.

It is a well-known fact that students' expectations of university life are not only related to education, but also include many issues such as social environment, entertainment, and recreation opportunities, shopping and working relations, nutrition and accommodation needs, transportation, and communica-

tion networks (Arslan, 2016; Ergun, 2014; Taşçı et al., 2011). The quality of the university location (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017) within the framework of services such as accommodation, transportation, security, entertainment, and employment related to the city environment is effective in measuring the level of student satisfaction. According to Hanssen and Solvoll (2015), who argue that there is a positive relationship between city satisfaction and university satisfaction, the satisfaction of university students is most affected by the attractiveness of the city after the reputation of the educational institution. According to Roostika (2017), city image affects university image, and university image affects students' destination satisfaction. In a study, it was found that university students especially care about the qualities of the host city such as accommodation, socialization, and sense of community, security, and cultural environment (Insch & Sun, 2013).

In this research, the city and university satisfaction of students studying at a state university located in a city in Turkey is examined. The "one university for every city" policy, which is implemented within the framework of revitalizing the commercial life in cities and meeting the increasing demand for university education in Turkey, has accelerated the increase in the number of universities since 2006. The number of universities, which was 75 in 2005, reached 209 in 2021 within the framework of the policies adopted since 2006. Although the "one university for each city" policy in Turkey has increased the number of universities and the rate of higher education enrollment, the problems such as the decrease in the demand for university education and the vacant quotas of private universities and newly established universities in small cities have turned into an important agenda item discussed in Turkish higher education. In this respect, it is anticipated that the subject of city-university interaction will be discussed more in Turkey in the coming period. Due to the increasing number of universities in Turkey and the limited number of studies on university-city interaction in the student perspective in the literature, it is thought that studies on the subject will fill the relevant gap to some extent.

This research aims to define the city satisfaction and university satisfaction levels of students enrolled in a state university in Turkey, to determine whether city satisfaction and university satisfaction differ according to demographic characteristics, and to determine the existence, direction, and strength of the relationship between city satisfaction and university satisfaction. The main questions the research seeks to answer are:

1. Is there a significant difference between university and city satisfaction and demographic characteristics of university students?
2. Is there a relationship between university students' city satisfaction and university satisfaction?
3. Does university students' city satisfaction predict university satisfaction?

METHOD

Research Design

Within the scope of quantitative research methods, this research was designed with a descriptive and relational design to describe the current situation and to investigate the existence, direction and strength of the relationships between two or more variables (Kumar, 2011; Gay et al., 2012). In the research, the students' city and university satisfaction levels, potential differences in satisfaction levels according to demographic variables, and the existence, direction and strength of the relationships between city and university satisfaction are examined.

Population and Sample

This research was conducted at Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University established in 2007 with 21,523 students. The university where the research was conducted is located in a Central Anatolian city. The student profile of this university is quite diverse as it includes students from different cities and regions of Turkey. The minimum sample size representing the universe consisting of 21,523 units with a confidence interval of 0.95 and a margin of error of 0.05 was determined as 377, using the sample calculation formula whose population is known (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Data were collected from 1,071 students, exceeding the number determined in this study. The proportional stratified sample selection technique was used in the study. Each of 8 faculties and 2 vocational schools in the central campus, and 6 vocational schools and 1 faculty outside the central campus, were considered as strata. A face-to-face questionnaire was applied to 1,071 students who were reached through simple random selection from the determined strata. The demographic characteristics of the students participating in the research are given in Table 1.

The average age of the students participating in the research is 20.53 ± 2.24 . 69.3% of the participants are female and 30.7% are male students. 36.4% of the students are in the 2nd grade, 30% are in the 1st grade, 18% are in the 3rd grade, and 15.6% are in the 4th grade. 52.1% of the student families live in the city, 32.9% in the district-town, and 15% in the village. 48.1% of the student families reside in the region (Central Anatolia Region) where the university where they study is located. 45.2% of the participants come from low-income families, 42.6% from middle-income families, and 12.2% from high-income families.

Data Collection Tool

A data collection form including an introductory information form, higher education life satisfaction, and city satisfaction scales was used in the research.

Introductory information form

There are 10 questions in the introductory information form that aim to determine sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, family monthly income, etc.).

Higher education life satisfaction scale

The Higher Education Life Satisfaction Scale developed by Erol and Yıldırım (2016) aims to measure the university life satisfac-

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Students

	n	%
Gender		
Female	742	69.3
Male	329	30.7
Grade		
1. Grade	321	30
2. Grade	390	36.4
3. Grade	193	18
4. Grade	167	15.6
The family's place of residence		
Village	161	15
Town-Strict	352	32.9
City	558	52.1
Area of residence of the family		
Central Anatolia Region*	515	48.1
Other	556	51.9
Income		
Low	449	45.2
Medium	423	42.6
High	122	12.2

* The region of the university where this research was conducted.

tion of students attending higher education institutions. The scale can measure overall university satisfaction. The lowest 29 and the highest 145 points can be obtained from the 5-point Likert scale, which consists of 29 items. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.93. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.88.

City satisfaction scale

The scale developed by Karadağ and Yücel (2020) aims to measure university students' city satisfaction. The scale measures the satisfaction of university students with the city where they study in the areas of urban and intercity transportation, security, entertainment, sports, relations with tradespeople, public attitudes, social and cultural activities, entertainment and sports services, health services. The lowest 10 and the highest 100 points can be obtained from the scale consisting of 10 items in the form of a 10-point Likert scale. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.96. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.86.

Data Collection Process

Ethics Committee approval was obtained before the study could be conducted (Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Scientific Research and Ethical Board Protocol Number: 10476336-100-E.26669, Date: 08.11.2019). The data of the study were collected between January 1 and January 30, 2020. Questionnaires were administered face-to-face after obtaining

informed consent from students who agreed to participate voluntarily. A survey was answered in an average of 19 minutes.

Analysis of Data

The data were coded and evaluated with the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows 25.0) package program. Descriptive statistics such as number and percentage distributions, mean and standard deviation were used in the evaluation of descriptive information. Kurtosis and Skewness values were examined to determine whether the research variables showed a normal distribution. In the relevant literature, it is accepted as a normal distribution that the results of Kurtosis and Skewness values of the variables are between +2.0 and -2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010). The normal distribution of the data was evaluated by examining Kurtosis and Skewness values. A two independent sample t-test was used to compare two groups in homogenous distributed data, One-way ANOVA was used to compare multiple groups. The Tukey test was used to determine the group that made a difference as a result of the ANOVA test. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency test was used to test the internal consistency of the scales. Correlation analysis was applied to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between university and city satisfaction. Simple linear regression analysis was applied to determine the predictive power of city satisfaction - which was accepted as an independent variable in the study - on university satisfaction. The $p < 0.05$ level was taken as the basis statistical significance of the results.

RESULTS

University and city satisfaction score averages of the students were determined.

It was determined that the university satisfaction score average of the students was 86.296 ± 16.836 , and the average city satisfaction score was 37.348 ± 18.502 (Table 2).

It was examined whether the averages of university and city satisfaction scores differed according to the demographic characteristics of the students.

A significant difference ($t = -2.857$; $p = 0.004$) was found between the mean city satisfaction scores of female and male students. It was determined that the mean city satisfaction score of male students ($\bar{X} = 39.76 \pm 19.05$) was higher than that of female students ($\bar{X} = 36.27 \pm 18.16$). A significant difference was found between the students' grade level and the mean scores of university ($F = 7.659$; $p = 0.001$) and city ($F = 6.550$; $p = 0.001$) satisfaction. University ($\bar{X} = 89.04 \pm 16.67$) and city ($\bar{X} = 40.02 \pm 20.17$) satisfaction scores of first-year students were higher; it was determined that third-year students had lower mean scores for university ($\bar{X} = 82.13 \pm 17.01$) and city satisfaction ($\bar{X} = 32.62 \pm 17.16$). A significant difference was found between the quality of the place of residence of the students' families and the mean scores of the students' university satisfaction ($F = 5.513$; $p = 0.004$). A significant difference was found between the size of the residence of the student's families and the average scores of the students' city satisfaction ($F = 9.536$; $p = 0.001$). The university ($\bar{X} = 88.23 \pm 15.71$) and city ($\bar{X} = 42.27 \pm 19.83$) sat-

isfaction mean scores of the students whose families reside in the villages are higher than the university ($\bar{X}=84.68\pm 16.74$) and city ($\bar{X}=42.27\pm 19.83$) satisfaction scores of the students whose families live in the cities. There is a significant difference between the geographical region where the families of the students live and the mean scores of students' satisfaction with the university ($t=3.529$, $p=0.001$) and the city ($t=3.787$, $p=0.001$). University ($\bar{X}=88.18\pm 16.69$) and city ($\bar{X}=39.55\pm 18.75$)

satisfaction scores of the students whose families reside in the region where the research university is located, mean university ($\bar{X}=84.56\pm 16.80$) and city ($\bar{X}=35.30\pm 18.04$) satisfaction scores of the students residing in other regions is higher than the average score. It was determined that there was no significant difference between the monthly income of the students' families and the average score for university and city satisfaction ($p>0.05$), (Table 3).

Table 2: Students' University and City Satisfaction Scores Average

	n	Number of items	Minimum score	Maximum score	\bar{X}	SD
University satisfaction	1071	29	29	145	86.296	16.836
City satisfaction	1071	10	10	100	37.348	18.502

Table 3: Average of University and City Satisfaction Scores According to the Demographic Characteristics of the Students

	n	University satisfaction	City satisfaction
		$\bar{X}\pm SD$	$\bar{X}\pm SD$
Gender			
Female	742	86.49 \pm 16.80	36.27 \pm 18.16
Male	329	85.88 \pm 16.94	39.76 \pm 19.05
Evaluation		$t=0.549$; $p=0.583$	$t=-2.857$; $p=0.004$
Grade			
1. Grade	321	89.04 \pm 16.67	40.02 \pm 20.17
2. Grade	390	86.87 \pm 16.41	37.51 \pm 18.34
3. Grade	193	82.13 \pm 17.01	32.62 \pm 17.16
4. Grade	167	84.53 \pm 16.94	37.26 \pm 15.87
Evaluation		$F=7.659$; $p=0.001$	$F=6.550$; $p=0.001$
The family's place of residence			
Village	161	88.23 \pm 15.71	42.27 \pm 19.83
Town-Strict	352	87.99 \pm 17.26	38.25 \pm 18.32
City	558	84.68 \pm 16.74	35.35 \pm 17.93
Evaluation		$F=5.513$; $p=0.004$	$F=9.536$; $p=0.001$
Area of residence of the family			
Central Anatolia Region*	515	88.18 \pm 16.69	39.55 \pm 18.75
Other	556	84.56 \pm 16.80	35.30 \pm 18.04
Evaluation		$t=3.529$; $p=0.001$	$t=3.787$; $p=0.001$
Income			
Low	449	87.20 \pm 16.76	36.97 \pm 17.96
Medium	423	85.83 \pm 16.35	37.54 \pm 17.67
High	122	85.95 \pm 17.98	39.27 \pm 20.42
Evaluation		$F=0.812$; $p=0.444$	$F=0.768$; $p=0.464$
Type campus			
Central campus	769	86.43 \pm 17.27	38.14 \pm 17.90
Off-central campus	302	85.93 \pm 15.68	35.17 \pm 19.82
Evaluation		$t=0.437$; $p=0.662$	$t=2.255$; $p=0.024$

* The region of the university where this research was conducted.

It was determined that there was no significant difference between the type of faculty in which the students continued their education and the satisfaction of the university and the city ($p>0.05$). It was determined that there was no significant difference between the university satisfaction scores of the students according to the type of campus where they continue their education ($p>0.05$). However, it was determined that the city satisfaction of the students who continue their education on the central campus is significantly higher than the students who continue their education off- the central campus ($p<0.05$) (Table 3). In the research, correlation analysis was applied to determine the relationships between city satisfaction and university satisfaction.

Table 4: The Relationship Between Urban Satisfaction and University Satisfaction

	City Satisfaction
University Satisfaction	.575**

** $p<0.01$.

There is a high level (Cohen, 1988) and positive correlation between the participants' city satisfaction and university satisfaction ($r=0.575$, $p<0.01$). According to these findings, as students' city satisfaction increases, university satisfaction increases, or as university satisfaction increases, city satisfaction increases (Table 4).

Simple linear regression analysis was applied to determine the predictive power of city satisfaction - which was accepted as an independent variable in the study - on university satisfaction.

According to the results, it is seen that city satisfaction significantly explains university satisfaction ($R=0.575$; $R^2:0.331$; $F=527.897$). In the regression equation, a significant and positive relationship was found between city satisfaction and university satisfaction ($\beta=0.575$; $p<0.01$). According to the regression analysis, the city satisfaction (independent variable) of the participants explains the rate of 33% of the university satisfaction (dependent variable) (Table 5).

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

In this research, which aims to determine the university and city satisfaction of university students, the university and city satisfaction of the participants was examined according to various variables. In a study conducted in Turkey, it was stated that the attitudes of city residents towards students and university differ according to various variables (Taşçı et al., 2011). Similarly, in this study, it was determined that university students' satisfaction with both the city and the university differed according to various variables.

Table 5: Simple Linear Regression Analysis of City Satisfaction's Prediction of University Satisfaction

	B	SE	Beta	t	P
Constant	66.756	0.949		70.344	0.001
City satisfaction	0.523	0.023	0.575	22.976	0.001
Evaluation	R:0.575	R ² :0.331	F: 527.897	p: 0.001	P<0.01

In this study, it was determined that male students' city satisfaction was higher than that of female students. In a study examining university students' use of city space in Turkey from a gender perspective, it is stated that female university students' relationships with city space are limited compared to men (Tuysuz, Gürel, & Gülmez, 2020). The limited relationship of female students with the city area can be considered as a factor that reduces city satisfaction.

In this study, it was determined that university satisfaction was higher in the first years of university life. In other studies (Yıldırım, Güneri, & Aydın, 2015; Bean and Bradley, 1986) it was concluded that first-year students have higher university satisfaction. Newcomers to the university can focus more on the services and facilities of the university. Classes, classrooms, faculty members, clubs, library, cafeteria and campus environment, etc. for new students can be used more as units waiting to be discovered with excitement. Therefore, the satisfaction of these students can increase. In the last years of university education, factors such as anxieties about life after graduation and being indifferent to the campus (Bean and Bradley, 1986) can reduce satisfaction. In this research, it has been determined that the city satisfaction of the students who have just started university is high. Students who have just started university may have more intense interactions with the city. New students may be more engaged with the city's services such as socializing, having fun, working, and transportation. At the same time, the "university student identity" gained by students who have just started university can enable them to use the city space more freely compared to their previous lives. This situation can increase the city satisfaction of the new students.

In this research, it has been concluded that the university and city satisfaction of the students whose families live in the geographical region where the university is located is higher than that of other students. In studies focusing on the factors affecting university choice (Nuseir, & Refae, 2021; Azzone & Soncin, 2020; Drewes & Michael, 2006), it is stated that closeness to family is an important criterion for students in the university choice process. In a study examining university students' university satisfaction in Turkey (Yakut, 2021), it is stated that there is a significant difference between the geographical region variable and satisfaction. The fact that the preferred university and the city's student family are close to the settlement can increase student satisfaction. Continuing education in a city close to the family and at a university can positively affect both city and university satisfaction due to advantages such as reducing security anxiety, lowering education costs, and the comfort of studying in an environment similar to the socio-culturally familiar culture.

In this study, it was determined that those whose families live in villages and towns/districts have higher university and city satisfaction. In another study, it was concluded that the university satisfaction of village and town-based students was at the highest level (Eriş & Anıl, 2016). The fact that the village and town/district environment has limitations compared to the city in terms of social and cultural interactions and various services can increase the satisfaction level of students whose families live in villages and towns/districts compared to students of urban origin. In this research, it was determined that there is a positive relationship between students' city satisfaction and university satisfaction, and that city satisfaction explains 33% of the total variance of university satisfaction. This result supports the research of Hanssen and Solvoll (2015), which found that the attractiveness of the city affects university satisfaction positively. According to Hanssen and Solvoll's (2015) research, the most important factor affecting student satisfaction, after the reputation of the educational institution, is the attractiveness of the city.

The results obtained in this research about the relationship between city and university satisfaction support the results of Roostika (2017) research focusing on the interconnections between city image, university image, and satisfaction. According to Roostika (2017), the image of the city affects the image of the university, and the image of the university positively affects the destination satisfaction of the students. In studies focusing on university preference, it is stated that the attractiveness of the city and the image of the city are critical factors that play a role in university selection (MORI, 2001; Cubillo et al., 2006). In this study, it was concluded that city satisfaction is an important determinant of university satisfaction. This result indicates that university services cannot be considered independently of the city.

It can be concluded that city satisfaction is a significant variable in explaining university satisfaction. Services and facilities that will increase university students' city satisfaction positively affect university satisfaction. This result shows that the city and the university have complementary qualities. At the same time, the results show that university satisfaction of students cannot be reduced to pedagogical and academic activities and on-campus experiences. In this context, it is possible that the university satisfaction level of the young people who study in a city is high, where the level of city satisfaction is high in terms of basic needs, social and cultural interactions, feeling of safety, entertainment opportunities, sports activities, adequate transportation, and travel services. This result shows the importance of considering the needs of university students while designing the city.

The competition between higher education institutions has made student satisfaction a more important issue. Universities can develop various strategies to ensure student satisfaction in order to differentiate with their competitors. In this research, it has been determined that cities have a special role in the satisfaction of university students. In this context, it becomes inevitable to strengthen the university-city cooperation very tightly in terms of the satisfaction of university students.

It is possible to evaluate the urban environment, which has a special importance for the satisfaction of university students, within the framework of the concept of "right to the city", which has an important place in the literature of urban sociology. Lefebvre (2000) considers the right to the city as the right of the residents to be at the forefront in the design of the urban space and in the decision-making processes related to the city. Having a say in the decision-making processes of the university youth, which has a special place in the urban area in terms of both quantity and quality, in the context of the right to the city, will contribute to the city's belonging and city satisfaction. It is predicted that increasing city satisfaction will increase university satisfaction in the context of the results achieved in this research. The fact that the city administrations pay more attention to the university administrations and university students in their decision to organize the city may contribute to the satisfaction of the students both with the city and with the university. This research was conducted with students enrolled in only one state university. In the future, comparative studies covering more than one university can be conducted by considering criteria such as region, size or private-state distinction.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, F. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin şehirle kurduğu ekonomik ve sosyal ilişkilerden memnuniyet analizi: Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi örneği. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(4), 1103-1120.
- Azzone, G., & Soncin, M. (2020). Factors driving university choice: a principal component analysis on Italian institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(12), 2426-2438.
- Bean, J. P., & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(4), 393-412.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1979). *The inheritors: French students and their relation to culture*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cubillo, J. M., Sánchez, J., & Cerviño, J. (2006). International students' decision-making process. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(2), 101-115.
- Drewes, T., & Michael, C. (2006). How Do Students Choose a University: An Analysis of Applications to Universities in Ontario. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(7), 781-800.
- Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4), 1-11.
- Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197-209.
- Eriş, H. M., & Anıl, D. (2016). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Yaşam Kalitesi Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(3): 491-504.
- Ergun, C. (2014). Üniversite ve kent ilişkisi üzerine görüşler: Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi örneği. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(31), 216-237.
- Erol, M., & Yıldırım, İ. (2016). Yükseköğrenim Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 12(1), 221-243.

- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 10th Edition, Pearson, Upper Saddle River.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update*. 10th Edition, Pearson, Boston.
- Hahn, M. B., Kemp, C., Ward-Waller, C., Donovan, S., Schmidt J. I. & Bauer S. (2020) Collaborative climate mitigation and adaptation planning with university, community, and municipal partners: a case study in Anchorage, Alaska, *Local Environment*, 25(9), 648-665.
- Hanssen, T.E.S., & Solvoll, G. (2015), The importance of university facilities for student satisfaction at a Norwegian University. *Facilities*, 33(13/14), 744-759.
- Insch, A., & Florek, M. (2008). A great place to live, work and play: Conceptualising place satisfaction in the case of a city's residents. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(2), 138-149.
- Insch, A. & Sun, B. (2013). University students' needs and satisfaction with their host city. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 6(3), 178-171.
- Karadağ, E., & Yücel, C. (2020). *Öğrenci dostu üniversite şehirleri*. Üniversite Araştırmaları Laboratuvarı Yayınları.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Kumar, R. (2018). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Sage.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writings on Cities* (E. Kofman & E. Lebas Eds. & Trans.) Blackwell.
- MORI. (2001). *Student Living Report 2001*. UNITE, MORI, Bristol.
- Nuseir, M. T., & El Refae, G. A. (2021). Factors influencing the choice of studying at UAE universities: an empirical research on the adoption of educational marketing strategies. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2020.1852467>
- Oliver, R. L., & DeSarbo, W. S. (1989). Processing satisfaction response in consumption: A suggested framework and research proposition. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, 2, 1-16.
- Roostika, R. (2017). The role of city and host university images on students' satisfaction with the assigned destination. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 6(1), 250-261.
- Sankır, H., & Sankır, Ş. (2017). Toplumsal değişim açısından üniversite-kent etkileşimi ve algısı: Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi örneği. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, (3), 473-483.
- Santini, F. D. O., Ladeira, W. J., Sampaio, C. H., & da Silva Costa, G. (2017). Student satisfaction in higher education: a meta-analytic study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 27(1), 1-18.
- Sevier, R. A. (1996). Those important things: What every college president needs to know about marketing and student recruitment. *College and University*, 71(4), 9-16.
- Situmorang, R., Antariksa, S., & Wicaksono, A. D. (2020). The perception of stakeholders on studentification in malang city, Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(2), 3028-3033.
- Taşçı, D., Gökalp, E., Genç-Kumtepe E., Kumtepe A. T., & Toprak, E. (2011). Kentin üniversite algısı: Anadolu Üniversitesi ve Eskişehir örneği. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 44(2), 131 - 146.
- Tuysuz, S., Gürel, M. E., & Gülmez, R. (2020). Kent hakkı ve toplumsal cinsiyet bağlamında mekânın siyaseti: Erzincan KYK yurtları örneği. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, (61), 85-105.
- Weerasinghe, I. S., & Fernando, R. L. (2017). Students' satisfaction in higher education. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 533-539.
- Yakut, S. (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinde memnuniyet algısının dinamikleri: Bozok Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Journal of International Social Research*, 14(78). 311-328.
- Yıldırım, F. B., Güneri, O. Y. ve Aydın, Y. Ç. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyi ve ilişkili değişkenler. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 11(2), 521-533.