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Abstract

The main goal of our research was to examine the relationship between satisfaction with general and educational facilities and services, and whether international students chose the country again if they had the chance to choose again.

The study was conducted to reveal the opinions of full-time and part-time international students studying in Hungary, analysing their perceptions and attitudes towards educational services. A quantitative survey with a large sample size was performed: 1566 international students from 72 countries and studying at 27 Hungarian higher education institutions constitute the dataset.

Likert scales were used measuring students’ satisfaction of shopping, sport, entertainment, transport, and accommodation facilities, and their evaluation of education and services related to education quality.

Results show that in many cases, there is a significant relationship among the satisfaction with services, the evaluation of Hungary as an ideal educational destination, and the attitude towards choosing Hungary again. Students perceive Hungary as an ideal educational destination by a higher probability if they are satisfied with the following: academic programme, teaching methods, use of online tools on the courses, scientific prestige, relationship with other students, helpfulness of the tandem/buddy/mentor student, sport facilities (at the university), computer facilities (at the university), satisfaction with rented flat, accommodation facilities (in the city), and regularity of the payment of the scholarship.

The choice of the student is strongly influenced by the experienced helpful or hostile attitude in certain informal and formal situations, too. Those who perceived as if they met positive attitude in the different enlisted 12 informal and formal situations would like to come back in significantly higher proportion.
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1 INTRODUCTION

For educational institutions, international student mobility is an opportunity and a requirement at the same time, universities are under constant pressure to give their students international experiences that increase students’ competitiveness in the global labour market. At the same time, students also recognise the necessity of international study experience and develop their linguistic, social, and intercultural competencies. While the tourism industry is still not aware of the real size of this market segment worldwide, the number of students studying abroad is still growing. Different political and administrative virtues (government programs e.g. Stipendium Hungaricum, cheap travel costs) can contribute to the increase in the number of international students who study abroad (Mazzarol, 2012).

In the more and more competitive, global educational marketplace, universities and host countries have to be aware of the factors that underlie students’ choice of study destinations and international educational institutions. In our study, we examine these factors and verify their role in students’ choice, with regression analysis.

Our results come from a study on a large sample from 2016 (1566 international students), and the development of this recent study is based on previous research projects carried out on similar topics (Berács – Malota, 2011; Gyulavári – Malota, 2016; Malota – Mitev, 2013; Malota, 2014).
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Traveling abroad has long been considered as a significant educational and cultural experience, it is educationally enriching and contributes to personal growth (Dent, 1975). Educational tourism is a programme when participants travel to such a destination where the primary aim of the group is to participate in study experience (Rodger, 1998). Another definition claims that educational tourism is a travel of individuals or groups mainly for educational reasons, where the process of education can be based on human-created attractions as universities, language centres, or on historical heritages or natural resorts (Hilaly et al., 2012, p.171). In general, the idea of education-purposed travelling is not a novel idea (e.g. Kalinowski - Weiler, 1992), and the high reputation of this idea in the tourism industry is increasing continuously (Holdnak-Holland, 1996).

International student mobility is categorised under educational tourism different ways. E.g. according to Ankomah-Larson (2004) educational tourism has different sub-types as eco-tourism, historical heritage tourism, countryside/farm tourism, and student exchange programmes among educational institutions, while Hilaly et al (2012) categorize educational tourism dimensions as general interest towards education during traveling, educational tourism for elderly people, and educational tourism for students.

Ritchie et al (2003) concentrate on the mix of education and leisure: according to them educational tourism can be defined as individuals’ journey from one county to another to study in universities, language centres, or other types of schools, and to act like tourists in their free time. The role of tourism is significant in the choice of students – who apply for exchange semesters – about their target countries (Llewellyn-Smith - McCabe, 2008).

Students spending 4 months abroad during an exchange program often view it as a life changing experience that they consider valuable. American university students in a survey by Gmelch (1997) reported that they learned more from their travels than they did from their academic courses. Another study of 1,260 American students found that students traveled abroad appeared to become “less materialistic, more adaptable, more independent in their thinking, more aware of their home country and culture, and better able to communicate with others and to think critically” than the control group of students which did not go abroad (Hansel, 1988).

International students are driven by push and pull factors, the push factors are on the home country level, motivating international students to leave their countries for an experience abroad, while pull factors were described as a host country factor, basically attracting international students (Mazzarol, 2002). Several push factors exist, e.g. difficulties to enter home country universities, higher quality perceived abroad, interest in different cultures and future migration. Major pull factors can be the host country awareness and image, social and cultural links between sending and receiving countries, cost of living and geographic location (Mazzarol, 2012). According to Fayeke and Crompton (1992) push factors tend to be good predictors of satisfaction and repeating the trip.

Mazanec (2002) based on a literature review groups the elements of destination image as functional elements (cultural and entertainment possibilities, environment) and affective elements (attitudes of locals and their hospitality towards foreigners). According to this model the second most important group of elements consists of e.g. shopping and accommodation facilities and the third one of e.g. transportation facilities. In our study we measured these factors to evaluate their importance in students’ choice of an educational destination.

Some other factors are also mentioned in the literature, e.g. according to Butt & Rehman (2010) lecturers’ expertise, courses offered, learning environment and classroom facilities are all positively linked to student satisfaction. In another study, city atmosphere, language learning opportunity, positive attitude towards the field, innovative teaching, quality of professors and the intercultural experience are the main satisfiers, while low professor performance (mainly the lack of language skills), unorganized university services are the key dissatisfiers (Joran van Aart, 2011). This study categorized satisfaction factors into 6 categories: academics (e.g. importance of reputation, education quality, professor’s knowledge and language skills, teaching methods, group works, interactive courses, friendly and approachable professors), personal and professional development, city and culture (city atmosphere, city size, surrounding area, travel options, local culture, communication with locals), cost and funding (free university services, low living costs in some countries), university services and facilities (website information, professionalism, well-organized communication channels, bureaucracy, complex administration, friendly and supportive faculty staff (service quality, delivery experience), welcome weekend organization) and social life (new friends with different cultural
backgrounds, student associations, student events, international atmosphere, cultural experience exchange).

As in case of any product or services category satisfaction can lead to both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty. The former one refers to feelings of students when they are emotionally committed to a given destination. The behavioural loyalty refers to their tendency to return to the country (Gyulavári, 2013).

3 METHODOLOGY

During the quantitative research an online questionnaire was used. It was sent to the email addresses of international students studying in Hungary, with the aid of Tempus Public Foundation and the contribution of the international coordinators. The survey was conducted in June 2016, and it was sent out several times. It took 15-20 minutes to fill out the questionnaire. The final sample size was 15661. The data was analysed with the help of IBM’s SPSS Statistics V22.0 statistical software.

The respondents came from 72 different countries to Hungary to study. 54 percent of the sample are men, 46 percent are women. The average age of the respondents is 24.1 years (standard deviation: 4.79, range: 17-54 years, mode: 20 years). Almost three quarters of the respondents (73 percent) are between 19 and 25 years old.

Responses of students from 27 Hungarian higher education institutions are present in the database. 44 percent of the respondents study at universities in the capital, 56 percent of them study at institutions in the countryside. In the sample, 12 institutions are in the countryside, and 15 are in Budapest.

84 percent of the respondents are full-time students. 16 percent of the students are part-time students.

A large proportion of Stipendium Hungaricum students are full-time students, and a large proportion of Erasmus students are part-time students. (Stipendium Hungaricum Programme was started in 2013 as a part of the Hungarian Government’s “Global Opening Policy”. As a result, now 51 partners from all over the world are able to send their students to Hungarian higher education institutions).

45 percent of respondents study in Bachelor program, 37 percent study in Master program, 13 percent study in Ph.D. program. Besides, 2% are students of a one-tier master program, 2% studies in preparatory programs (e.g. for Hungarian education), 1% takes part in specialization programs.

The total numbers of foreign students in Hungary were the following:

- Foreign students altogether: 2015/16 autumn: 26155 students, 2015/16 spring: 24398 students
  - Stipendium Hungaricum program: 2015/16 autumn: 1270 students, 2015/16 spring: 1339 students,
  - Erasmus program: (the most up-to-date data available) in 2013: 4764 incoming students,
  - CEEPUS program: in 2015/2016 academic year: 295 incoming students,

The majority of respondents in the sample (81 percent, 1269 students) are Stipendium Hungaricum students (a condition for the payment of their subsequent scholarship – September 2016 – was to fill out the questionnaire). The further part of the database is made up as follows: 12% (189 students) are Erasmus students, 5% (71 students) are self-financed students. In addition to that, some students (in total 2% of the whole sample) study in Hungary in the framework of CEEPUS, Erasmus Mundus, EEA Grants Scholarship programme, bilateral programme, or Science without Borders programme.

One fifth of the respondents arrived from East Asia, and 16% arrived from the Middle East, while more than 10% of the students came from the EU (European Union), and a further 10% came from North

---

1 The study is not representative, because the exact population of foreign students is not definable. However, a large proportion of Stipendium Hungaricum students responded, so valid conclusions are able to be drawn related to them (the questionnaire was sent to 1598 Stipendium Hungaricum students, and 1269 responded before the closure of the database).

2 database of Oktatási Hivatali Felsőoktatási Információs Rendszer [Education Office, Higher Education Information System]

3 http://tka.hu/palyazatok/1016/statisztikak

4 Tempus Public Foundation
Africa, Canada, USA, and Australia are put into the “other” category because their small sample sizes do not enable them to generate relevant groups for further analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>region</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Balkans</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 percent of our respondents spend one or more of their first to fourth semesters in Hungary, and only 8 percent study in Hungary during the later stages of their studies. 47 percent have spent two semesters so far in Hungary, 24 percent have spent four (the survey was conducted at the end of the 2015/16 academic year, in the second semester).

Students from economic science and engineering science are in proportionally higher numbers in the sample (19% and 15% respectively). Students from medical and health science, and from computer science represent 9-9 percent in the sample.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Satisfaction with the quality of Hungarian services

Students can be considered somewhat satisfied with the quality of the services they were asked about in the cities where they study. A mean of around 4 (between 3.61 and 4.26) was measured on a five-point scale (standard deviations linked to variable averages are between 1.01 and 1.23).

Foreign students are mostly satisfied with transport facilities (a mean of 4.26 on a five-point scale): 82 percent gave 4 or 5 for the quality of this service. 69 percent of the respondents are very or moderately satisfied with shopping facilities, but 13 percent gave the answer that they are less than moderately satisfied. The satisfaction index of entertainment facilities shows that 63% are more than moderately satisfied (they marked value 4 or 5), while 22% are moderately satisfied (they gave a mark of 3 to this factor). Accommodation and sport facilities are the most problematic among the listed items. Concerning sport facilities, 28 percent of the respondents gave only a value of 3, while 57 percent gave a value of 4 or 5, and 15 percent gave a value of 1 or 2. One fifth of the respondents evaluated accommodation facilities to a value of 1 or 2, and a further 17 percent are only moderately satisfied.
### Table 2. Satisfaction with some city-related possibilities/services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“How much are you satisfied with the following?”</th>
<th>total sample mean 2016 N=1566</th>
<th>Erasmus sample mean 2016 N=189</th>
<th>Stip. Hun sample mean 2016 N=1269</th>
<th>Budapest sample mean 2016 N=690</th>
<th>Countryside sample mean 2016 N=876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transportation facilities (in the city where you are studying)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td><strong>4.56</strong></td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping facilities (in the city where you are studying)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td><strong>4.17</strong></td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment facilities (in the city where you are studying)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td><strong>4.20</strong></td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport facilities (in the city where you are studying)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td><strong>3.74</strong></td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation facilities (in the city where you are studying)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td><strong>3.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages given by Erasmus students are higher than those given by Stipendium Hungaricum students, meaning they are more satisfied with these facilities.

Analysing sample averages of Budapest vs. countryside it can be recognised that students studying in the capital are more satisfied with everything except accommodation facilities. It was controlled that in the sample Erasmus students were overrepresented in Budapest and SH students were overrepresented in the countryside, but this does not affect the results: Erasmus students are more satisfied with every factor, both in the countryside and in Budapest.

Accommodation facilities is the only exception from among the previous factors: programme type has a significant effect, while the effect of “countryside-Budapest” variable is not significant. This is because Stipendium Hungaricum students’ accommodation facilities are better (for the reason of their dormitory placement), and this is shown in the results.

Further analysis of demographic and educational demographic categories reveals the following: Men and women, and undergraduates, graduates, and PhD students are nearly equally satisfied with every factor. According to economic development, students from high income developed countries evaluate entertainment facilities better (with a mean of 4.10) than students from middle income developed, developing, and the least developed countries (3.76 is the mean of every group). Concerning transport facilities, the most satisfied are students from high income developed and the least developed countries (4.44 and 4.33), while the mean of students from middle income developed and developing countries are lower (4.12 and 4.19).

Analysing countries with large sample sizes, two significant results are observable. Turkish people are more than averagely satisfied with entertainment facilities (4.23 vs. 3.78 in the total sample). Jordanian, Chinese, and Japanese students are much more dissatisfied (means of 3.38-4.40). Students from Nigeria, Turkey, India, and Algeria consider transport facilities better than average (mean around 4.5 vs. 4.26 in the total sample).

There is no difference in the opinion of students about accommodation facilities between students who live in a dormitory (a mean of 3.59), and who live in a rented flat (a mean of 3.63). However, students who live in a rented flat perceive more positively the transport facilities than those who live in a dormitory. (Presumably this is because they could take transport into account when selecting their flat, whereas the dormitory locations were fixed.)

Concerning the duration of studies it can be said that the longer time a student has been studying in Hungary, the less satisfied he/she is with shopping facilities: the mean of those who spend one semester in Hungary is 4.05, the same of those who spend more than 5 semesters in Hungary is 3.72.

A connection was found between the above-mentioned variables and the decision whether the student would chose Hungary again or not. The detailed explanation of this is shown later.

Students were asked for their opinions on numerous informal and formal situations, too. They had to choose if they encountered mostly helpful, hostile, or rather indifferent behaviour.
4.2 Experiences in informal situations

Opinions are the most positive concerning restaurants and shops, in which approximately half of the respondents (52 and 48 percent) perceived primarily helpful behaviour in these situations, and only 6-7 percent perceived any hostile behaviour. The respondents encountered similarly helpful (37-38%), and indifferent behaviour (47-48%) on public transport and on the street, although 10-12% experienced negative behaviour.

Concerning bars and pubs, the students indicated positive and indifferent behaviour (36-36 percent). 43 percent of international students do not have any experience of situations with the family members of their Hungarian friends.

Behaviours perceived in casual situations are summarized in the following figure:

4.3 Experiences in formal situations

Behaviours experienced in university administration have the most favourable evaluation among formal situations. 63% encountered positive, helpful behaviour, one fourth of the respondents met indifferent behaviour. Conversely, 8% perceived that he/she was treated in a negative way.

In most of the formal situations, indifferent or helpful behaviour was typical. Hostile, negative behaviour was experienced by 4-14%, the least at the Embassy (4%), the most in the healthcare system and at the Office of Immigration and Nationality (11 and 14%).

Figure 1. Experienced behaviour in certain informal situations (%) N=1566

Figure 2. Experienced behaviour in certain formal situations (%) N=1566
Concerning the evaluation of university administration, there is no significant difference among undergraduate, graduate, and PhD students. SH students consider the situation more positively, whereas self-financed students consider it more negatively.

4.4 Satisfaction with certain university facilities/services

Factor analysis was applied to the relating variables in order to find the main factors and the connected variables that correlate with the aspect of satisfaction, and are applicable for further analysis. Principal component analysis with Varimax rotation gave a 3 factor result; statistical indices of factor analysis are appropriate (KMO value that shows the goodness of fit is 0.955, standard deviation interpreted by the factors is 62%).

The main explanatory factor concerning satisfaction is the quality of institutions and education; the second is the satisfaction with the infrastructure; and the third is the help in general orientation. Satisfaction with scholarships was analysed separately; it was not applied in the factor analysis.

Certain variables were organised in the table by the factor structure. Standard deviation of mean values are around 1, these were not indicated in the table by reason of easier transparency.

Table 3. Satisfaction with certain university facilities/services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;How much are you satisfied with the following?&quot;</th>
<th>total mean 2016 N=1566</th>
<th>Erasmus sample mean 2016 N=189</th>
<th>SH sample mean 2016 N=1269</th>
<th>self-financed sample mean 2016 N=71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality of institution and education</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usage of internet and online tools in courses</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic program at your University/College</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific prestige of your University/College</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of lectures and seminars at your University/College</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English knowledge of your teachers</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety of courses at your University/College</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching methods your professors use at your courses</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of lecture notes, teaching materials</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campus security</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library facilities of your University/College</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer facilities at your University/College</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-academic (leisure) programs at your University/College</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sporting facilities of your University/College</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help in general orientation</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpfulness of University/College staff in administrative issues</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services of the International Office</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation programme at the beginning of your studies</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information provided on the website of the University/College</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpfulness of the tandem/buddy/mentor student partner</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpfulness of Hungarian students</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organized intercultural programmes</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information received prior to arrival</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bureaucracy level of your University/College</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your relationship with your fellow students</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your relationship with your teachers</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of grant/scholarship</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>not relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning general traits (academic programme, course variety, scientific prestige) among higher education institutions, satisfaction has a value of around 4: the mean values are between 3.70 and 3.80 to the relating variables; the average of variables is 3.74 on the five point scale. The proportion of the moderately satisfied in these questions is between 33-50%. The proportion of the dissatisfied respondents (value 1 and 2) is between 10-17%.

As regards education quality, satisfaction is similar to in 2013. A greater improvement was seen in the use of online tools (a mean of 3.81 instead of 3.38). Distributions are somewhat similar in the questions concerning education quality: the proportion of those who gave four or five to the given factors is 64-67%, the same value of those who are moderately satisfied is around 20%, and the proportion of those who gave an evaluation of one or two is 13-16%.

The opinions about infrastructure have improved since 2013: a higher mean was received for four of the five factors, with non-academic programmes suffering a slight decline. The averages for computer and sport facilities indicated the greatest improvement. 12-20% is the proportion of dissatisfied respondents to the related questions, while 20-30% is the proportion of moderately satisfied respondents. In the case of campus security, the rate of satisfied respondents is the highest (72% gave a mark of 4 or 5). The rate of satisfied respondents is the lowest for non-academic programmes, and for sporting facilities (where 47% and 48% gave a mark of 4 or 5).

Among the questions measuring help in general orientation, the service quality of the international office, and the helpfulness of administrative staff has the highest value, with means of 3.84 and 3.89 respectively. Only 14-14% evaluated this question with a mark of one or two. Helpfulness of Hungarian students and mentor student partners is evaluated to a value of 3.6, and the same mark was awarded to orientation and intercultural programmes. The appropriateness of information provided on the website of the university has a mean of 3.62. Respondents are satisfied with information received prior to arrival on a level of 3.5. 17-19% were very or considerably dissatisfied with the above-mentioned factors. The majority gave a value of 3 or higher.

Students favourably evaluate their relationship with their fellow students and professors. Means of 4.14 and 4.16 were received for these questions. Students are only a little bit more than moderately satisfied with the amount of their grant/scholarship (3.19): 11% are very dissatisfied, 22% gave a mark of two on satisfaction, 18% are moderately satisfied, 29% are rather satisfied, and 17% are very satisfied, while 3% indicated that the question is irrelevant because they do not receive a scholarship.

Indicators created for the given factors (the means of satisfaction variables tied to the factors were averaged) are shown in the following figure. It can be observed that Stipendium Hungaricum students are the most satisfied with education quality, infrastructure, and help in general orientation. Erasmus students are a little bit more dissatisfied with every factor, whereas self-financed students are much more dissatisfied with these factors. Erasmus students evaluate the amount of their scholarship as more appropriate than SH students.
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Would the students choose Hungary again?

At the end of the questionnaire, before the demographic questions, the synthesizing question was asked as to whether the student would choose Hungary again if he/she had the chance to choose again. More than two thirds of the respondents (70 percent) would choose Hungary again (this proportion was 73% in the survey of 2013). 26 percent believe that maybe they would come to study in Hungary again (22% in 2013), and only 4 percent think that their choice would not be Hungary again (5% in 2013). It can be said that – compared to the 2013 data – there is a minimal (a few percent) shift from the option “yes, definitely” towards the option “maybe”.

Analysing demographic and educational demographic variables, the following results are observed. The proportion of students coming from the least developed countries is higher among the respondents who would choose Hungary again than in the total sample (73% vs. 70%). The proportion of the uncertain (36% vs. 26%) is higher among students coming from middle income developed countries, whereas the proportion of students coming from high income developed countries is higher among respondents who gave negative answers (19% vs. 4%).

Analysing the ten countries that have large sample sizes it can be concluded that respondents who would come to study in Hungary again are overrepresented among Jordanian and Tunisian students, while those who would not come again are overrepresented among Turkish students. Moreover, Japanese and Mongolian students are more uncertain than the total sample.

Analysing the data by regions, it turns out that students from EU countries are less likely to come back (8% vs. total sample 4%), East Asians are more unsure, and South Asians are more likely to choose Hungary again than the average.

By field of study it can be seen that 82% of law students would come back (vs. 70% in the total sample), students from medical and health science are proportionally more uncertain than the total sample (34%), or more likely would not choose Hungary again (15%). Self-financed students are overrepresented among students from medical and health science, and this may affect results, but the relationship is nevertheless significant, and is not influenced by programme type. Results are affected by the fact that there are more students coming from high income developed countries among them.

Among those who evaluate their academic performance much or a bit lower than the average, uncertain students form the largest group (46% and 37% vs. 26% in the total sample). Among those who speak English as if it was their mother tongue, there are twice as many students who would not choose Hungary again than in the other groups (9% vs. 4%). (They are overrepresented from high income developed countries, but controlling the variable of country development the relationship is significant, and not only a pseudo-relationship.)

Men would come back (74% of them), while the proportion of those who are uncertain (28%) is higher among women compared to the total sample. Among Stipendium Hungaricum students, more respondents answered a definite yes (72%); among self-financed students, more respondents answered a definite no (27%), or a maybe option (35%).

Summarizing the research results it can be said that (similarly to data from 2010 and 2013) there is a significant (and positive from many aspects) relationship among the satisfaction with services, and the evaluation of Hungary as an ideal educational destination, and the attitude to choose Hungary again. (Naturally, there is a close connection between the latter two variables. Those who would come back to study in Hungary gave a mean of 5.87, those who would perhaps come back gave a mean of 4.70, and those who would not come back to the country gave a mean of 2.89 on the seven point scale to the question whether Hungary can be perceived as an ideal educational destination.)

An ideal educational destination

Linear multiple regression was employed to test for relationships between the dependent and independent variables. We used a stepwise regression analysis, which accepted additional variables as long as the F-ratio for the new variable was significant at the 0.05 level. (Mcintyre, 1983).

As a consequence of satisfaction with the following factors, students perceive Hungary as an ideal educational destination by a higher probability (the R² indicator of regression analysis is 0.29): academic programme, teaching methods, use of online tools on the courses, scientific prestige, relationship with other students, helpfulness of the tandem/buddy/mentor student, sport facilities (at
the university), computer facilities (at the university), satisfaction with rented flat, accommodation
facilities (in the city), regularity of the payment of the scholarship.

The idea to choose Hungary again

For all the 42 questions related to satisfaction the relationship is clear between higher satisfaction and
the choice whether the respondents would choose Hungary again.

The choice of the student is strongly influenced by the experienced helpful or hostile attitude in certain
informal and formal situations, too. Except for the situations experienced with the family of the
Hungarian friend, or with the police, significant connections were found in every listed situation. Those
who perceived positive attitudes in the different 12 informal and formal situations would like to come
back in significantly higher proportion. At the same time, those who perceived negative behaviour or
attitudes would like to come back in lower proportion.

To sum up, universities and host countries should be aware that these factors affect students’ choice
of study destinations and international educational institutions and should use this information in their
strategy both in attracting students and evaluating their own performance. .
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