

Perception of University Students towards Quality of Service: Sample of Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale

**Dr. Murat AKSU, Dr. Hacı Mehmet YILDIRIM &
Dr. Sinan GÖKDEMİR**

Travel Management and Tourist Guiding
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University
Turkey

Abstract

Quality of service is one of the important steps in creating customer satisfaction. In the past, the quality of service was important for only companies that produce just goods, now it has become important for companies that produce goods and services. Therefore, the aim of this study is to measure the service quality perceptions of university students. Accordingly, the questions were asked by using questionnaire technique to students of tourism department at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed with a return rate of 240. According to the results of the research and the perception of tourism students according to their classes, it is found that 4th grade students have more positive perceptions of teaching quality than the 2nd grade students. It was also found that students with a high GPA were more positive than low GPA students. According to the results of the regression analysis, participants' perception of teaching quality shows that they are satisfied with 41%. A unit increase in the variables of "good education" and "general skills" from the independent a variable was found to have a positive effect on satisfaction.

Keywords: Tourism, Education, Service Quality, Satisfaction

Introduction

The quality is an important indicator that is used to assess the services and goods. Especially, it becomes further important when it comes to services sector because the service is abstract, heterogeneous and something that cannot be held up, and because production and consumption occur simultaneously, and all these are significant elements. The universities that are established within the higher education system have added dynamism to the system in order to compete with it. This dynamism involves offering a choice to the students who will begin university study and creating a competitive environment to increase the quality. Therefore, the universities have increasingly improved and new universities are financed to be established. In the higher education, the importance of both elements of quality and evaluators is increased. This is where elements of quality and the concept of quality of service become important (Cevher, 2015: 804). It is very difficult for universities to maintain their existence only through providing education. Currently, the quality of education provided by universities and the how it is perceived by the students come into prominence as significant elements. Otherwise, it will be difficult for universities to survive in a competitive environment in the long term. The increased number of universities has caused universities to take action for improving the quality. The quality of higher education institutions is a concept that must be addressed in a quite comprehensive manner including the structure and characteristics of the institution, its ability to meet social requirements, and the quality of service rendered to the students. In other words, the concept of quality is considered a multidimensional concept by the higher education institutions (Bektaş and Ulutürk Akman, 2013: 123). Based on the issues provided above, the perception of students towards quality of service of education was interested; therefore this study was intended to measure the perception of tourism students towards education that received associate degree program and undergraduate education at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. In addition, recommendations are provided in the study for the academic members of department of tourism and tourism programs based on the results obtained from the study.

1. The Concept of Quality of Service

For businesses, the quality is a major element for the products to be perceived positively by customers in order to gain an advantage over the competitors. Considering the current level of education, the increasingly growing number of consumers, and the brutal competitive environment within which businesses are in, it becomes more important. Taner (1997:2) defines the quality as “a combination of features of a product that would provide satisfaction to customers that even goes beyond their expectation”. When we examine the definition of quality, we will see that the meaning of the term “quality” is perceived by the individuals and businesses more differently than it was before. Performance of a job, which was once considered enough to do a good job in the service sector, i.e., delivering the service to customer in one form or another is no longer enough for customer satisfaction. The requirement that the service provided should have a certain quality is essential for the success and sustainability of service (Tavmergen, 2002: 19-22). The sense of quality is a subjective concept that may be varied by characteristics, social status and economic status of consumers, and that may be formed in connection with different requirements and expectations. The requirements, expectations, social and economic environment, cultural and religious structure, traditions, economic level, technologies, climate, geography, education, common social judgement have a direct or indirect influence on the perception of quality by customers (Tütüncü, 2009: 63).

There is currently another concept that is used with quality. This concept is used as “Quality of service” in the literature. The quality of service occurs when “a consumer compares the quality of service delivered to that consumer (perceived service) with the quality of service shaped by the expectations before purchasing”, and is a consideration of which cognitive aspect outweighs (Altunışık, et al., 2007: 176). There are several concepts that are used with the quality of service. The most important ones are the quality of perceived service, the quality of expected service, and customer satisfaction. *Quality of perceived service* is a result of comparing the expectations of customer before they receive the service with the experience of actual service used by the customer, and defined by the extent and aspect of difference between the expectations of customer and the perceived performance (Parasuraman, et al., 1988: 17). *Quality of Expected Service* defines the expectations of customer for the service and the characteristics of service that are sought by the customer for them to be satisfied with the service (Yılmaz, 2007: 26). *Customer Satisfaction* is the association between the performance perceived by individuals towards goods and service and their expectation (Aktepe, et al., 2009: 8). These three concepts are used to describe the weighted quality of service because the customer will not be satisfied if the expected quality of service is higher than the perceived quality of service. If the expected quality of service equals to the perceived quality of service, then the customer is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. What matters here is that the perceived quality of service should be higher than what is expected by customer. If this occurs, then the customer is satisfied with the service provided.

In recent years, the increased interest in matters regarding quality of service is reported to be due to expectation of consumer for more services (Çiçek and Doğan, 2009: 203). Therefore, businesses feel the need to assess their quality of service. However, it is difficult to assess quality of service because consumer may use physical characteristics such as style, color, label, packing, and hardness to decide on the quality when they buy a product. When a service is purchased, there are only a few physical characteristics, or may not be any physical characteristics to decide on the quality. In this case, the consumer will tend to decide on the quality considering limited number of visible facilities of service business such as building, equipment, and personnel (Atan, et al., 2006: 165). In other words, the quality of service is subject to perception of customer. The service provider, technical outcome of service and general image of business delivered the service affect the quality of service (Küçükaltan, 2007: 60). The quality of service is measured by the person who receives that service. Thus, the quality of service varies from one individual to the other. One’s expectations is the basic reason for such variance. The education, culture, income and social level of individuals are considered the factors that affect the quality of service (Karahana, 2006: 18). In the end, the concept of quality of service refers to an assessment. For this assessment, the consumer visualizes a number of expectations regarding the service before receiving that service. The consumer then compares the service received and the service expected after experience of consumption. If the service received is better than what was expected, the quality of service will be higher. Otherwise, the quality of service will not be sufficient, and experience of consumption will result in dissatisfaction (Altunışık, et al., 2007: 176).

2. The Concept and Importance of University

The higher education institutions have to produce as with all other organizations. However, by education's nature it is not always possible to exhibit the elements of productivity as clearly as the organizations that produce goods. The quality can be addressed both as quality of design and quality of process in regard to quality of education. The educational institutions rather consider the quality of output (assessment of results) and quality of design (design of curriculum). The quality of process is slightly ignored. The emphasis on the quality of output may cause skipping many processes and have adverse influence on the formation of quality, is not always enough. If the process is properly designed and operated, the quality will reveal as a result (Özdemir, 2001: 254).

The universities have five distinctive characteristics. They are as follows (Bingöl, 2012: 43):

- A university is an institution where abstract, conceptualized and institutional information is generated and transferred.
- The information is generated and transferred by a person or persons who makes this their business.
- A university educates its members that will be needed for future, and does not consider scientific production and transfer to be a personal action but makes it a continuous institutional activity.
- It is now a prerequisite to complete a university in order to perform certain professions in the society and take certain responsibilities.
- A specific program is followed because education is provided for a specific purpose.

There are various studies on perception of higher education students towards quality in the relevant literature. The study by Karakaya, Kılıç and Uçar (2016) aimed at determining perception of university students towards quality of education. The perception of students of Vocational School of Çankırı Karatekin University towards quality of education in the dimensions of Mission, Educational Conditions, Education Programs and Academic Members. The authors found that female students considered the variables of education programs and academic members more quality as compared to male students. In addition, the mean of variables of Mission and Educational Conditions varied by residence of students, and there were differences between the students living with their family and the students staying in a dormitory or living in a student house. Yavuz and Gülmez (2016) performed a research to assess the perception of higher education students towards quality of service and used the scale HEdPERF for assessment. They did not find significant differences in perception of students towards quality of service between genders. The authors emphasized that establishment year and activities of university made significant differences for perception of quality of service.

The study by Özcan, Kenan (2013) was intended to determine the perception of undergraduate students towards quality of education as well as quality of education provided by different units of Adıyaman University and by faculty of education of five universities using the Course Experience Questionnaire developed by Ginns, Prosser and Barrie (2007). They used the literature review for their research. As a result, they found that there were no differences in quality of education between the faculties of education of newly established universities and developing universities. However, there were problems with quality according to perception of students. The study by Arslantürk (2010) attempted to determine the perception of students toward quality of service that received study on tourist guiding at higher education level. This study a total of 15 involved faculties, colleges and vocational schools that provided study of tourist guiding, bachelor degree and associate degree. The study identified a relative perception against vocational schools that provided two-year study in all of the sub-dimensions of quality of service. In other words, the quality of education provided by vocational schools delivering education at associate level should be improved. Kuo, Chang and Lai (2011) performed a study to determine the elements of quality of service at the higher education institutions that provided study on tourism and accommodation, using the Kano model and significance-performance analysis. They indicated that teachers needed to be realistic, fair and reasonable to assess performance of students. Another important result of their study was to emphasize that teachers should contribute to employment of students in future.

3. Objective and Method of the Research

The objective of this research was to determine perception of students receiving tourism study towards quality of education. The results of the research provide feasible measures and recommendations for such perception. For quality to gain importance in the higher education institutions, the structure and qualities and institutions, their ability to meet social requirements, and quality of service for students need to be addressed again in a very extensive manner (Bektaş and Ulutürk Akman, 2013: 123).

The quality of education plays an important role because of all of these mentioned above. In this sense, the hypotheses of this research are as follows:

- H₁:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to gender.
- H₂:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to whether they have received tourism education before.
- H₃:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to grade.
- H₄:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to grade point average.
- H₅:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to classroom size.
- H₆:** There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to departments.
- H₇:** There is a significant relationship between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according and the student satisfaction.

The questionnaire developed by Ginns, Prosser and Barrie (2007) was used for the research. This questionnaire was adapted to Turkish by Özcan (2013). The sample of the study included students receiving education at associate and undergraduate at Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale. 300 questionnaires were distributed between September 2016 and December 2017 and 250 of them were returned. 240 of the returned questionnaires were analyzed, which were identified eligible for analysis. The independent samples *t* test and one-way analysis of variance were carried out for the hypotheses.

4. Findings and Evaluation

This research aimed at determining the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of education, and the data obtained from the questionnaire was evaluated to have findings. So, the descriptive characteristics of students participated in the research are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of Students

| GENDERS | N | % | Prior Tourism Education | N | % |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Male | 125 | 52,1 | Yes | 78 | 67,5 |
| Female | 115 | 47,9 | No | 162 | 32,5 |
| Total | 240 | 100 | Total | 240 | 100 |
| | | | | | |
| Classroom size (person) | N | % | Grade Point Average | N | % |
| 20-34 | 127 | 52,9 | 1,00-1,99 | 42 | 17,5 |
| 35-49 | 61 | 25,4 | 2,00-2,99 | 154 | 64,2 |
| 50 and over | 52 | 21,7 | 3,00-4,00 | 44 | 18,3 |
| Total | 240 | 100 | Total | 240 | 100 |
| | | | | | |
| Departments | N | % | Grades | N | % |
| Tourism and Hospitality Management | 108 | 45,0 | Grade 2 | 124 | 51,7 |
| Travel Management and Tourism Guiding | 58 | 24,1 | Grade 3 | 50 | 20,8 |
| Tourism Management | 39 | 14,6 | Grade 4 | 66 | 27,5 |
| Tourism and Travel Services | 35 | 14,3 | Total | 240 | 100 |
| Total | 240 | 100 | | | |

According to Table 1, of participants, 52.1% were males and 47.9% were females. 67.5% of participants did not receive any study on education before and 51.7% were grade 2 students. As for grade point average, 64.2% ranged from 2.00 to 2.99. 52.9% received education in classrooms of 20-34 persons, and 45% received study on Tourism and Hospitality Management.

Cronbach Alpha test was performed for reliability of research data, and the reliability of questionnaire was calculated to be 0.81, which indicates that questionnaire is highly reliable (Ural and Kılıç: 2005: 262). The factor analysis was performed on the dataset to determine the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of education. A factor analysis is performed to produce less number of new independent data from the interrelated data. This analysis is used to size the variables that are assumed to explain events under various factors. In addition, basic factors can be identified for each factor (Özdamar 2004). For this, relative weight of variables in each factor is considered. Barlett t test revealed 1783.05 and $p < .001$, and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.883. This value is within the acceptable limits. For principal component analysis performed on data, the varimax was used and the eigenvalues that were greater than one were considered. Furthermore, five expressions with communality less than 0.500 were removed from the analysis.

Table 2 shows the results of factor analysis. The results of “Generic Skills”, “Good Teaching”, “Level of Workload”, “Nature of Assessment”, and “Clarity of Goals and Standards”, the important components of perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching, were described. The factor I is “Generic Skills” which has 6 variables and accounts for 22.51% of total variance. When examined the variables of factor, the major variable is “The courses I receive improve my problem-solving skills in future” (.831). On the other hand, “The courses I receive have enhanced my confidence in solving new problems” (.823) is an important factor. Other important factors include “The courses I receive improve my written communication skills” and “The courses I receive help developing my skill to plan my works.” The factor II has 5 variables and accounts 19.41% of total variance. This factor is called “Good Teaching” of which major variable is the expression “The instructors provide me feedback on my performance of courses” (.812). The expression “The instructors motivate me to be more successful at courses” (.766) is a variable that also has a significant load. The factor III is called “Level of Workload” and has 2 variables. This factor accounts for 9.60% of total variance and its major variable is the expression “My workload is too heavy to bear” (.903). The factor IV has 3 variables and accounts for 8.72% of total variance. This factors is called “Nature of Assessment” of which major variable is the expression “The instructors appear to be more interested in assessing what I memorize than what I get from the course” (.810). The factor V is called “Clarity of Goals and Standards” and has 2 variables. This factor accounts for 8.54% of total variance and its major variable is the expression “It is always very easy to know the expected standard for our works” (.837).

Table 2: Results of Factor Analysis for Expressions of Attitude of Managers for Customer Relations

| Factor I | Communality | Load | |
|---|--------------------|-------------|--|
| Generic Skills | | | |
| The courses I receive improve my problem-solving skills in future. | ,751 | ,831 | Eigenvalue: 4,052 Variance: 22,51 Mean: 3,37 Reliability: 0,889 F-Value: 1,703 p-value: ,000 |
| The courses I receive have enhanced my confidence in solving new problems. | ,745 | ,823 | |
| The courses I receive improve my written communication skills. | ,723 | ,767 | |
| The courses I receive help developing my skill to plan my works. | ,716 | ,758 | |
| The courses I receive improve my ability of analytical thinking. | ,663 | ,747 | |
| The courses I receive contribute to develop my skills to work with a team/group. | ,526 | ,633 | |
| Factor II | Communality | Load | |
| Good Teaching | | | |
| The instructors provide me feedback on my performance of courses. | ,697 | ,812 | Eigenvalue: 3,493 Variance: 19,41% Mean: 3,04 Reliability: 0,866 F-Value: 6,348 p- value: ,000 |
| The instructors motivate me to be more successful at courses. | ,707 | ,766 | |
| The instructors guide me to overcome the challenges that I may encounter at my courses. | ,721 | ,757 | |
| The instructors spend too much time to assess my works. | ,619 | ,750 | |
| The instructors work hard to make their course more interesting. | ,648 | ,710 | |

| Factor III Level of Workload | Communality | Load | |
|--|--------------------|-------------|--|
| My workload is too heavy to bear. | ,826 | ,903 | Eigenvalue: 1,729 Variance: %9,60 Mean: 3,11 Reliability: 0,784 F-Value: 39,347 p- value: ,000 |
| I have too much workload as a student of this department. | ,819 | ,882 | |
| Factor IV Nature of Assessment | Communality | Load | |
| The instructors appear to be more interested in assessing what I memorize than what I get from the course. | ,689 | ,810 | Eigenvalue: 1,569 Variance: 8,72 Mean: 2,70 Reliability: 0,611 F-Value: 5,788 p- value: ,000 |
| Actually, all you need is a good memory to be successful at my department. | ,516 | ,688 | |
| Many of the instructors ask questions/facts that have an exact answer. | ,554 | ,597 | |
| Factor V Clarity of Goals and Standards | Communality | Load | |
| It is always very easy to know the expected standard for our works. | ,752 | ,837 | Eigenvalue: 1,537 Variance: 8,54 Mean: 3,62 Reliability: 0,621 F-Value: 19,709 p- value: ,000 |
| I have always a clear idea on where I go and what is expected from courses. | ,708 | ,809 | |

Analysis of principal component analysis with varimax rotation. Total variance accounted for: 68, 78%

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy: 88,3%; Barlett sphericity test: $X^2:1783,053$ s.d.:153, $p<0,001$
The findings for hypotheses generated to determine the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching are as follows.

H₁: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to gender.

According to independent samples t test, there were no significant differences in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to gender ($p>0,05$). This hypothesis is rejected. This is consistent with the study by Yavuz and Gülmez (2016) but not with the study by Karakaya, Kılıç and Uçar (2016).

H₂: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to whether they have received tourism education before.

According to independent samples t test, there were no significant differences in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to whether they have received tourism education before ($p>0,05$). This hypothesis is rejected.

One-way analysis of variance was performed to analyze whether there were differences in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to grade. The results of Levene Test were used to determine whether variances had homogeneous distribution. Scheffe test was carried out for the dimensions with variance that had homogeneous distribution, and Tamhane test was performed for the dimensions with variance that did not have homogeneous distribution.

According to results of Levene test performed for hypothesis developed to analyze the difference between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the grade, the variance had homogeneous distribution in all the dimensions of quality of teaching except the dimension "Level of Workload".

H₃: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to grade.

According to results of analysis, there were no significant differences only in the dimension "Level of Workload" between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the grade [$F=5,521$; $p<,05$].

Based on the results, a significant difference was found between the mean of total points for opinion of students at grade 2 on quality of teaching ($\bar{X} = 2,88$) and the mean of total points for opinion of students at grade 4 on quality of teaching ($\bar{X} = 3,36$). This finding indicates that opinion of students at grade 4 on quality of teaching was more positive than that of students at grade 2.

According to results of Levene Test for hypothesis developed to analyze the difference between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the grade point average, the variance had homogeneous distribution in all the dimensions of quality of teaching except the dimension "Nature of Assessment".

H₄: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to grade point average.

According to results of analysis, there were no significant differences only in the dimension "Clarity of Goals" between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the grade point average [$F = 3,391$; $p < ,05$]. Based on the results, a significant difference was found between the mean of total points for opinion of students with grade point average ranging 1.00 to 1.99 on quality of teaching ($\bar{X} = 3,38$) and mean of total points for opinion of students with grade point average ranging 3.00 to 4.00 on quality of teaching ($\bar{X} = 3,84$). This finding indicates that opinion of students with higher grade point average had more positive opinion on quality of teaching than that of students with lower grade point average.

According to results of Levene Test for hypothesis developed to analyze the difference between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the classroom size, the variance had homogeneous distribution in all the dimensions of quality of teaching except the dimension "Nature of Assessment".

H₅: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to classroom size.

According to results of analysis, there were no significant differences only in the dimension "Generic Skills" between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the classroom size [$F = 6,208$; $p < ,05$]. Based on the results, a significant difference was found between the mean of total points for opinion of students with classroom size of 20-34 ($\bar{X} = 3,56$), mean of total points for opinion of students with classroom size of 35-49 ($\bar{X} = 3,13$) and mean of total points for opinion of students with classroom size of 50 and over ($\bar{X} = 3,20$). This finding indicates that the students that had smaller classroom size had more positive opinion. According to results of Levene Test for hypothesis developed to analyze the difference between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the departments, the variance had homogeneous distribution in all the dimensions of quality of teaching except the dimension "Good Teaching" and "Clarity of Goals".

H₆: There is a significant difference in perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according to departments.

According to results of analysis, no significant differences were observed in any of the dimensions between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the departments. This finding may be interpreted that the departments do not have any influence on the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching.

The hypothesis for determining the relationship between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching and the student satisfaction was tested by multiple regression analysis. The results of the regression analysis are provided in Table 3.

H₇: There is a significant relationship between the perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching according and the student satisfaction.

Table 3: Results of Multiple Regression Analysis for Perception of Quality of Teaching

| Dependent Variables | Independent Variables | B Values | T | SIG. |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|--------|-------|
| Satisfaction | Good Teaching | 0,362 | 5,689 | 0,000 |
| | Clarity of Goals and Standards | -0,033 | -0,602 | 0,548 |
| | Nature of Assessment | 0,065 | 1,281 | 0,201 |
| | Level of Workload | -0,052 | -1,031 | 0,304 |
| | Generic Skills | 0,377 | 5,894 | 0,000 |
| Multiple R=0,647 ; R square=0,418 ; Adjusted R square=0,4068 ; F=33,643; Sig.F=0,000 | | | | |

In the regression analysis, the coefficient for descriptiveness (R^2) indicates how much of variance in dependent variables is explained by independent variables. The perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching is able to account for 41% of variances in satisfaction. When other independent variables in the multiple regression equation are kept constant, the variance was 0.362 unit in dependent variable of satisfaction for an increase of one unit in the variable of good teaching ($p=0,000$). In addition, when other independent variables in the multiple regression equation are kept constant, the variance was 0.377 unit in dependent variable of satisfaction for an increase of one unit in the variable of generic skills ($p=0,000$). In the light of this information, the good teaching and generic skills-the perceptions of quality of teaching- were positively affected in the satisfaction of students receiving tourism education. The contribution of dimensions other than those two dimensions to student satisfaction was not deemed significant. In this sense, improvements for teaching and generic skills would also provide increase of satisfaction level.

5. Results

According to results of research conducted to measure perception of university students towards quality of service, the number of male and female participants was similar. The classroom size was often 30-34 persons and almost half of the participants were from the department of tourism and hotel management. 2/3 of the participants had received study on tourism before. The half of the participants were students at grade 2. According to the factor analysis performed for perception of students receiving tourism education towards quality of teaching, the factor with the highest mean was "clarity of goals and standards" with 3.62. This was followed by the factor "generic skills" with 3.37, the factor "level of workload" with 3.11, the factor "good teaching" with 3.04, and the factor "nature of assessment" with 2.70. Based on the findings for hypotheses, no differences were found according to gender of students receiving tourism education. There were no differences according to whether participants had received tourism education before. In regard to perception of students receiving tourism education according to grades, the perception of students at grade 4 towards quality of teaching was more positive than that of students at grade 2. Furthermore, the students with higher grade point average were more positive than the student with lower grade point average. The students that received the courses in smaller classroom size were more positive than the students that received the courses in greater classroom size. No differences were found when examined by departments of tourism students. According to results of regression analysis performed for the difference between the perception of tourism students towards quality of teaching and the satisfaction, the participants were satisfied with quality of teaching by 41%. One unit of increase in the independent variables of "good teaching" and "generic skills" had positive effect on the satisfaction. The other three variables did not have any effect on the satisfaction. Based on the results, the followings recommendations may be made:

- The higher education institutions should carry out activities to improve the quality. For example, each university should set and publish quality systems on their website. The accreditation activities are particularly important in this regard.
- The departments or programs should develop lesson plans that would improve generic skills of students. This is where the cooperation with the sector gains importance.
- The instructors should provide clear and understandable answers to students in regard to courses. Thus, it is important to plan the lessons in more interesting manner.
- The load of courses to be delivered to students should be correctly calculated by the departments or programs. The excessive workload may result in failure with students.
- When assessing the students, the instructors should assess the students merely with what is written in the textbooks. Otherwise, the system would be based on memorizing. The answers to questions asked should be shared with the students later on.

- The students must be guided to set their own goals and standards at universities. It is especially important to establish career centers.

This research had several limitations as with any research. The sample had to be small due to time and expense. In addition, it only included the tourism students at Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize the research. Studies that should be performed by investigators both with academic members and students would allow having better results. Furthermore, it would be useful to compare the research with a foreign higher education institution.

References

- Akbaba, A. (2007). Konaklama İşletmelerinde Hizmet Kalitesi Yönetimi: Kuram ve Endüstriden Uygulamalar. Gümüsoğlu vd. (Editörler). 1. Baskı, Hizmet Kalitesi: Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar ve Uygulamalar. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık, 209-231.
- Aktepe, C., Baş, M. and Tolon, M. (2009). Müşteri İlişkileri Yönetimi, 1. Baskı, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Altunışık, R., Özdemir, Ş. and Torlak, Ö. (2007). Pazarlamaya Giriş, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Arslantürk, Y. (2010). Yükseköğretim Düzeyinde Turist Rehberliği Eğitimi Veren Öğretim Kurumlarında Uygulanan Eğitime Yönelik Öğrenci Algılamaları, Aksaray Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi, 2 (1): 63-78.
- Atan, M., Baş, M. and Tolon, M. (2006). Servqual Analizi İle Migros ve Gima Süpermarketlerinde Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesine Yönelik Bir Alan Çalışması. Gazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi, 7(2): 159-180.
- Bektaş, H. and Ulutürk Akman, S. (2013). Yükseköğretimde Hizmet Kalitesi Ölçeği: Güvenirlilik ve Geçerlilik Analizi, İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Ekonometri ve İstatistik, 18:116-133.
- Bingöl, B. (2012). Üniversite Özerkliğinin Değişen Tanımı ve Üniversitelerin Yeniden Yapılandırılması, Hacettepe Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 2(2): 39-75.
- Cevher, E. (2015). Yükseköğretimde Hizmet Kalitesi ve Kalite Algısının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma, Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 8(39): 804-814.
- Çiçek, R. and Doğan, İ. C. (2009). Müşteri Memnuniyetinin Artırılmasında Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma: Niğde İli Örneği. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, XI(1):199-217.
- Ginns, P., Prosser, M. and Barrie, S. (2007). Students' Perceptions of Teaching Quality in Higher Education: The Perspective of Currently Enrolled Students, Studies in Higher Education, 32(5): 603–615.
- Karahan, K. (2006). Hizmet Pazarlaması, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.
- Karakaya, A., Kılıç, İ. and Uçar, M. (2016). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Öğretim Kalitesi Algısı Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Özel Sayı 2: 40-55.
- Kuo, N. T., Chang, K. C. and Lai, C. H. (2011). Identifying Critical Service Quality Attributes for Higher Education in Hospitality and Tourism: Applications of The Kano Model and Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA), African Journal of Business Management, 5(30): 12016-12024.
- Küçükaltan, G. (2007). Hizmet Kalitesi Kavramına Genel Bir Yaklaşım ve Hizmet Kalitesinin Önemi. Gümüsoğlu vd. (Editörler). 1. Baskı, Hizmet Kalitesi: Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar ve Uygulamalar, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık, 57-71.
- Özcan, K. (2013). Üniversitedeki Lisans Öğrencilerinin Öğretimin Kalitesine İlişkin Algıları, Eğitim ve Bilim, 38 (169): 142-158.
- Özdamar, K. (2004). Paket Programlar İle İstatistiksel Veri Analizi, Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.
- Özdemir, S. (2001). Eğitimde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi, Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 1(2): 253-270.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality, Journal of Retailing, 64(1): 12-37.
- Taner, B. (1997). Konaklama İşletmelerinde Çalışanlarda Hizmet Kalitesi Bilincinin Değerlendirilmesi ve Kaliteli Bir Hizmet Yönetimine İlişkin Öneriler. Turizm Geliştirme ve Eğitim Vakfı (TUGEV). Turizmde Seçme Makaleler, 28: 1-20.
- Tavmergen, İ. P. (2002). Turizm Sektöründe Kalite Yönetimi, 1.Baskı, Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Tütüncü, Ö. (2009). Ağırlama Hizmetlerinde Kalite Sistemleri, 1. Baskı, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Ural, A. and İbrahim, K. (2005). Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi, 1.Baskı, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Yavuz, M. and Gülmez, D. (2016). The Assessment of Service Quality Perception in Higher Education, Education and Science, 41(184): 251-265.
- Yılmaz, İ. (2007). Otel İşletmelerinde Hizmet Kalitesinin Müşteriler ve Yöneticiler Açısından Ölçülmesi: İzmir Örneği. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Anabilim Dalı, İzmir.