

Perceived Service Quality in Schools of Education: A Comparative Study between Drexel University and Gazi University

Figen Ereş, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
School of Education
Gazi University
Ankara, Turkey

Rebecca Clothey, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor
School of Education
Drexel University
Philadelphia, PA, USA

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the service quality perceptions of students being educated at Drexel University and Gazi University. The study is comprised of final year students in Schools of Education. 250 Turkish students and 101 American students have participated in the study. It has been determined through the data that the students of Drexel University are satisfied with service quality whereas the students of Gazi University are only partially satisfied. Students' views on sub-dimensions display a difference between universities. In particular, functional quality and professors-lecturers are important factors impacting perception of service quality. According to the results, the most important elements of service quality are competence, willingness, honesty, reliability, and the ability of expression. Implications for further research and practice are also discussed.

Keywords: Higher education; school of education; service quality.

Introduction

The fact that the development and knowledge brought forth by an information society is constantly being questioned has made development and innovation in education inevitable. The development of higher education institutions where knowledge is generated, questioned and developed is a part of this cycle (Eurydice, 2008). In addition, higher education systems are influenced by student demand, financial problems, and the increase of global innovations based on knowledge and research (Yang & Vidovich, 2002). This transformation displays differences in developed and developing countries. However, the lack of sufficient higher education institutions and the absence of qualified faculty in many of these institutions does not seem adequate in closing the gap between developed and developing countries (UNESCO, 1998). For this reason, The World Bank, which saw primary education as a priority in the 1980's and 1990's, now suggests to countries that have not developed their higher education sufficiently (Ekinci, 2009) that they prioritize the quality of higher education. The fact that the number of higher education institutions in a country is high does not necessarily mean that country has high quality higher education. This is so because education is a production of service (Davis & Swanson, 2001; Curran & Rosen, 2006). The service quality provided by higher education institutions, which are one of the most important institutions in which a qualified workforce is trained, is one of the basic elements that affects the quality of all sectors. For this reason, higher education faces the responsibility of enhancing student satisfaction and training individuals who have suitable mutual interests (Heck, Johnsrud, & Rosser, 2000). Therefore, it may be stated that the main purpose of higher education institutions is the satisfaction of students who are both the input and the output of the service process and the provision of a qualified workforce to the society. As a result higher education, performance, quality and profiles of universities are debated by policy-makers all over the world.

Theoretical Background on Service Quality

Service is defined as the abstract activity or benefit that a person or institution provides to another person or institution (Kotler, 1997).

In other words, service means carrying out an activity for another person (Goetsch & Stanley, 1998). The most important characteristics of service are that it's heterogeneous, changeable, simultaneous and abstract (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). When studied from an organisational point of view, service quality is the provision of necessary conditions for reaching the aims of the organisation and the quality aims of the organisation is first based on the satisfaction of customers. Service quality from the view of the customer is how or to what extent the organisation meets the needs of the customers (McColl, Callaghan, & Palmer, 1998). This perception is a result of the comparison between expectations and experience of the customer who obtained service (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Studies show that there is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction (Liu, 2005). Then, it can be said that service quality perception of students increases when education organizations fulfill conditions for expectations of students. Education organizations have to know needs of students to ensure these conditions.

The perception of service quality at universities is the perception of the difference between what the student expects from the university and what they receive (O' Neill & Palmer, 2004). For this reason, the students' perceptions of service quality are the premise of their satisfaction (Browne, Kaldenberg, Browne, & Brown, 1998). The service that an industrial institution provides, and that of an educational organization are not the same since the qualities and roles of those giving service in organizations are different from each other. Students enroll at school with the expectation of fulfilling their needs. This expectation is related to a process. It's not momentary like other organisations offer. The realization of the students' expectations on the process increases their satisfaction (Cheng, 1990; Tan & Sei, 2004) and consequently, students evaluate performance of the school (Holdford & Reinders, 2001). Students communicate with faculty-lecturers and administration staffs in this process and use learning resources. Therefore, qualification of communication and learning resources affect perceptions of students.

There are several models used to measure service quality. The most frequently used service quality scales are SERVQUAL and SERVPERF. SERVQUAL and SERVPERF measure functional quality. Functional quality includes qualification of human relations in organisations and a keyword of this relation is communication. Using functional quality to measure service quality is important but not sufficient for an educational organisation (Fjortoft & Lee, 1994; Holdford & Reinders, 2001). Students are not usually seen as customers at universities. For this reason, different models of service quality have been developed at universities. When these models are viewed it is seen that they have similar characteristics, although the dimensions of service quality are stated in a different way.

Although these dimensions have different names, it is understood that the content of these dimensions are faculty-lecturer and instruction; administrative staff and facilities and educational tools at universities (Shank, Walker, & Hayes 1996; LeBlanc & Nha, 1999; Sohail & Shaikh, 2004; Singh, Grover, & Kumar, 2008). A common feature of these studies is an emphasis on functional quality. Holdford and Reinders (2001) evaluated service quality in universities. Holdford and Reinders (2001) in their study on the perception of service quality in universities assessed both functional and technical quality as sub-dimensions of the service quality. Education service is a process and students generate an idea regarding outputs of education at the end of this process. Students use these outputs obtained to evaluate the school (Fjortoft & Lee, 1994). This assessment relates to the technical quality of the school. For this reason, both functional quality and technical quality are important to the measure of service quality in education organisations.

Faculty-lecturers, administrative staff and learning resources make up the functional quality of a university. These three sub-dimensions are connected and affect each other (Grönroos, 1984; Holdford & Reinders, 2001). The sub-dimension of faculty-lecturer is related to the instructors' attitude and behaviour towards the students, teaching skills and developing themselves (Holdford & Reinders, 2001). Studies show that the quality of faculty-lecturer has an important effect in providing a high quality education (Pereda, Airey, & Bennett, 2007). For this reason, faculty-lecturers are the most important factor that has an effect on student satisfaction and deeply affects the service quality perception of students (Pozo-Munoz, Rebollosso-Pacheco, & Fernandez-Ramirez 2000; Hill, Lomas, & McGregor, 2003). Studies show that characteristics of effective professors are empathetic, trustworthy, helpful, willing to answer questions, inspiring, competent. Thus, the attitude and behavior of faculty-lecturers are the basic determiners of student satisfaction in higher education (Gruber, Reppel, & Voss, 2010). So, it can be said that both qualifications and personal characteristics of professors affect perception service quality of students.

The sub-dimension of administrative staff is related to the attitudes and behaviors of university administrative staffs towards the students, their ability in fulfilling students' needs, and their communication skills (Holdford & Reinders, 2001). Apart from the educational service, students receive complementary services from administrative staff. The staff of administrative units such as the registration office, library and financial office support educational services and are the most important factor in solving students' problems (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Students consider important not only teaching but also other services for students (Bean & Bradley, 1986). Professional values and job satisfaction of administrative staff affect their attitudes and behaviors (McLean, 1996). For this reason, administrative staff is both staff and a part of service of a university (Trivellas & Dargenidou, 2009). Qualification of interaction between administrative staff and students contributes to the perception of service quality of students. The sub-dimension of learning resources is related to the sufficiency of educational tools, equipment, laboratories and libraries, and physical facilities. This sub-dimension affects services of faculty-lecturers and shapes perception service quality (Holdford & Patkar, 2003; Pereda, Airey, & Bennett, 2007).

The provider of learning resources is the university administration. Faculty-lecturers and administrative staff make functional these resources. Students are beneficiaries. Students use learning resources for both academic purposes and socialization. Therefore, learning resources are important for school satisfaction of students (Gibson, 2010). Another dimension of service quality is technical quality. The student evaluates service after receiving it. Thus, the service quality of education provided by trainers and administrative staff is the beginning of a process. Students' thoughts on the university after receiving the service are related to technical quality. Technical quality focuses on the result and is determined by the students' evaluation of the service they receive (Grönroos, 1984). It's understood in this evaluation whether what students receive from schools meet their expectations or not. Then, functional quality is how services are provided and technical quality is what is received for those services. In other words, technical quality means what students receive and functional quality means how students receive it (Holdford & Schulz, 1999). Functional quality and technical quality determine the image of an organisation (Grönroos, 1984).

Understanding the expectations of students is important for university administration because these expectations may be a guide for the training programmes of universities and faculty-lecturers in evaluating educational methods (Hill, 1995). Studies show that there is a positive correlation between student satisfaction and learning and that student satisfaction has a positive effect on student motivation (Elliot & Shin, 2002). In addition to this, if the service quality perceptions of students are high, this means that the other candidates for universities will learn this and this will affect the future student profile of universities (Mavando, Tsarenko, & Gabbot, 2004). In this context, service quality is an important determiner of competition. Thus, service quality causes an organization to become different from other organisations and provides a sustainable competitive advantage. In addition to this, service provided in educational institutions is in a way performance produced by people working in that institution (Zeithaml & Bitner 2003). The factors which affect service performance also affect service quality. Thus, by measuring service quality, it is possible to get a general idea of professors and administration working at university.

The main aim of this study is to determine the service quality perceptions of students of Schools of Education in Drexel University, in Philadelphia, United States, and Gazi University, in Ankara, Turkey related to their respective schools, and to determine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of service quality at each institution. Examining the differences between the higher education systems of the two universities based on the data of the study makes up the secondary aim of the study. The main reason for carrying out the study is the fact that no comparison has been made to date between both countries and schools of education. The data obtained as a result of the study may offer new views on higher education management to educational decision makers and may set an example to researchers.

Methodology

Population and Sampling

The population of this collaborative study is final year students of Schools of Education at Drexel University and Gazi University. The main reason for selecting these two schools is that they have several characteristics in common. These schools have the same divisions, aims and vision. Drexel University is located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Gazi University is located in Ankara, Turkey.

To prevent the negative effect of a possible low return rate, the working sample size was identified as 400. There were 351 returned questionnaires from the distribution of 400 surveys. There were 250 students from Gazi University (71.2percent) and 101 students from Drexel University (28.8percent) who participated in the survey. The fact that the number of participants from Drexel University is lower is related to the fact that they have fewer students compared to Gazi University. Of the participants, 240(68.4percent) of the students in the sampling are females and 111(31.6percent) are males. The data was collected in 2012. The sample of the study is composed of a total of randomly selected students according to those who volunteered to participate in the research.

Data Analysis

In the study, the service quality scale developed by Holdford and Reinders (2001) was used. The sub-dimensions of the scale include aspects of functional quality and technical quality. Functional quality consists of the dimensions learning resources, faculty-lecturer and administrative staff. In this study, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test and Barlett tests were used to test whether the scale was suitable for factor analysis. According to the results of the test, the KMO levels are above 0.5 and the Barlett test is meaningful ($p < 0.05$). As a result of the factor analysis, the explanation percentage of the service quality scale for the total variance is 59percent. For the general service quality scale reliability was found as $\alpha = .97$. The reliability co-efficient for functional quality is $\alpha = .97$, the reliability co-efficient is $\alpha = .95$ for technical quality.

When the reliability co-efficient for the sub-dimensions are studied, the values are found as: $\alpha = .82$ for learning resources; $\alpha = .96$ for faculty-lecturer and $\alpha = .97$ for administration staff. A 5 – point Likert-type scale was used to measure the perceived service quality of university, with options ranging from 5 ('strongly agree') to 1 ('strongly disagree'). As a result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test used, it was determined that the data set was distributed as normal and the Independent Sample t test was used in the comparison of the two groups except for arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Elements developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988) and include items described by Holdford and Reinders (2001) in functional quality were analyzed apart from perceptions of functional quality and technical quality of students. The aim of this analysis was to examine functional quality deeply. These elements are tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, communication, credibility, security, competence, understanding-knowing the student, access, and courtesy.

Findings

Descriptive statistics regarding service quality are displayed in the tables and explained in this section.

Table 1. The comparison of the views of students on sub-dimensions according to universities.

	University	N	Mean	S	t	p
Functional Quality	Gazi	250	2.96	.71	-12.38	0.00
	Drexel	101	3.96	.61		
Learning Resources	Gazi	250	2.97	.87	-1.74	0.08
	Drexel	101	3.16	.97		
Faculty-Lecturer	Gazi	250	3.05	.75	-14.97	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.29	.58		
Administration Staff	Gazi	250	2.85	.88	-9.90	0.00
	Drexel	101	3.91	.95		
Technical Quality	Gazi	250	2.73	.98	-15.10	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.34	.68		
Overall Service Quality	Gazi	250	2.94	.70	-13.29	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.00	.60		

The service quality perceptions of students at Drexel University and Gazi University were studied separately within the aim of the study. Gazi University students agree with the items of general service quality at a medium level ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .70$). In other words, the satisfaction perceptions of Gazi University students are medium level. When service quality is studied in the context of sub-dimensions, the dimensions functional quality ($M = 2.96$, $SD = .71$) and technical quality ($M = 2.73$, $SD = .98$) and learning resources as the sub-dimension of functional quality ($M = 2.97$, $SD = .87$), faculty ($M = 3.05$, $SD = .75$) and administrative staff ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .88$) also show a medium level of satisfaction.

The satisfaction perceptions of students at Drexel University are higher than medium level ($M=4.00, SD=.60$). Drexel University students have mostly given the answer 'I agree' to items related to technical quality ($M=4.34, SD=.68$) (e.g., "The school provided me with a high quality education") and functional quality ($M=3.96, SD=.61$). Based on this result, it can be said that Drexel University students are satisfied with service quality. Drexel University students have mostly responded with 'I agree' to the 17 items concerning faculty ($M=4.29, SD=.58$) (e.g., "In general, I believe my professors are knowledgeable enough to answer questions") and 14 items related to administration ($M=3.91, SD=.95$) (e.g., "In general, I believe that administrative staff show sincere interest in solving student problems") within the context of functional quality. They have responded as 'I partially agree' ($M=3.16, SD=.97$) to the 6 items in the dimensions of learning resources (e.g., "The physical facilities are convenient for students."). This result may be due to the fact that students who get online education from Drexel University were not able to use on-campus learning resources sufficiently. When the two universities are evaluated together, there is a meaningful difference between the thoughts of students at Gazi University and Drexel University $t(349) = -13.29, p < .05$. It may be said that Gazi University students' satisfaction about general service quality is lower than that of Drexel University students. On the other hand, there is no meaningful difference in the thoughts of students about general service quality in terms of gender $t(349) = 1.94, p > .05$.

Table 2. Correlations of among sub-dimensions according to universities.

	University	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Functional Quality	Gazi	1					
	Drexel	1					
2. Learning Resources	Gazi	0.72	1				
	Drexel	0.48	1				
3. Faculty- lecturer	Gazi	0.91	0.57	1			
	Drexel	0.83	0.25	1			
4. Administration Staff	Gazi	0.89	0.52	0.67	1		
	Drexel	0.88	0.19	0.56	1		
5. Technical Quality	Gazi	0.62	0.52	0.63	0.45	1	
	Drexel	0.64	0.22	0.72	0.47	1	
6. Overall Service Quality	Gazi	0.99	0.72	0.91	0.88	0.70	1
	Drexel	0.99	0.47	0.85	0.86	0.71	1

The sub-dimensions have high correlations with each other ($p < 0.05$). When the relationship between the sub-dimensions of service quality are studied, the relationship of technical quality ($r = .22, p < .05$), administrative staff ($r = .19, p < .05$) and professors ($r = .25, p < .05$) with learning resources was found as weak according to the thoughts of Drexel University students. The relationship between learning resources and functional quality is medium level. ($r = .48, p < .05$). This result may be due to the thoughts of Drexel University students who receive online education. When the other relational values are studied, the technical quality and functional quality relationship for both Drexel University ($r = .64, p < .05$) and Gazi University ($r = .62, p < .05$) is medium level. The relationship between perception of overall service quality and functional quality is strong for both Gazi University and Drexel University ($r = .99, p < .05$). The relationship between all sub-dimensions of functional quality and overall service quality is strong. Based on this result, it can be said that functional quality greatly affects service quality perceptions for both universities. Overall service quality also has a strong relationship with technical quality. For both universities, the relationship between thoughts on administrative staff and professors is medium level. In addition to this, the relationship between overall service quality and professors is strong for both Gazi University ($r = .91, p < .05$) and Drexel University ($r = .85, p < .05$). Based on this result, it can be said that overall service quality is greatly affected by the service of professors.

Table 3. The comparison of the elements on sub-dimensions according to universities.

Ölçüt	School	N	Mean	s	p
Tangibles	Gazi	250	2.97	.87	0.08
	Drexel	101	3.16	.97	
Reliability	Gazi	250	2.84	.89	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.08	.76	
Responsiveness	Gazi	250	2.82	.83	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.03	.78	
Communication	Gazi	250	2.95	.79	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.05	.73	
Credibility	Gazi	250	3.02	.83	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.26	.69	
Security	Gazi	250	2.98	.82	0.00
	Drexel	101	3.97	.92	
Competence	Gazi	250	3.32	.80	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.29	.64	
Understanding	Gazi	250	2.73	.90	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.09	.77	
Access	Gazi	250	2.83	1.06	0.00
	Drexel	101	3.87	1.25	
Courtesy	Gazi	250	2.93	.88	0.00
	Drexel	101	4.29	.71	

When the data obtained are studied in the context of elements determined by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, tangibles include the presence and use of teaching resources. Reliability includes consistency and keeping to promises in the behaviour of faculty-lecturer and ad-staff. Responsiveness includes being sufficient and willing in the provision of service. Communication includes explaining the service to the students in a way that they can understand. Credibility includes being honest and persuasiveness. Security includes confidentiality of transactions, freedom from doubt. Competence includes keeping up with developments and expertise in the field. Understanding includes showing effort to understand the needs of students. Access includes having access to faculty-lecturer outside classes. Courtesy includes treating students with respect and politeness(Holdford & Reinders, 2001).Students of Gazi University have responded as ‘I partly agree’and Drexel University students have responded as ‘I agree’.When the two universities are evaluated together, averages of Drexel University are higher than averages of Gazi University.

Table 4. Correlations of among elements according to universities.

	Üniversite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Tangibles	Gazi	1								
	Drexel	1								
2. Reliability	Gazi	.58	1							
	Drexel	.15	1							
3. Responsiveness	Gazi	.57	.80	1						
	Drexel	.19	.88	1						
4. Communication	Gazi	.52	.71	.80	1					
	Drexel	.17	.75	.77	1					
5. Credibility	Gazi	.55	.73	.81	.79	1				
	Drexel	.19	.70	.75	.71	1				
6. Security	Gazi	.54	.76	.84	.77	.84	1			
	Drexel	.30	.64	.75	.68	.80	1			
7. Competence	Gazi	.49	.63	.63	.70	.67	.63	1		
	Drexel	.16	.74	.78	.70	.73	.61	1		
8. Understanding	Gazi	.47	.67	.76	.71	.75	.73	.50	1	
	Drexel	.13	.81	.86	.70	.74	.61	.71	1	
9. Access	Gazi	.36	.51	.66	.55	.65	.59	.43	.58	1
	Drexel	.38	.25	.28	.25	.38	.36	.27	.17	1

When the relationship between these elements is studied, a high relationship has been found for both Gazi University and Drexel University between the dimensions responsiveness, communication, credibility and security.

The relationship values are higher for Gazi University. Based on these results, if faculty-lecturer and administrative staff are sufficient and willing, if they treat the students honestly, if they explain the service to the students clearly and if the student does not doubt the service given, this affects the students' service quality perception.

Discussions and Conclusions

The aim of this study was to determine the service quality perception levels of final year education faculty students towards their schools at Drexel University and Gazi University and to study the relationship between the sub-dimensions of service quality. According to the results of the study, the service quality perceptions of Gazi University students are average whereas the service quality perceptions of Drexel University students are above average. From this result, it can be understood that students of Drexel University are satisfied with service quality. The service quality that Gazi University students receive from their schools does not meet their expectations. The School of Education, which is the symbol of the foundation of Gazi University, fulfills the quality expected from itself with an average level. This result overlaps with study results carried out at Gazi University previously (Ereş,2011). Thus, it can be said that in studies carried out at Gazi University in different years and at different schools, students are satisfied with service quality and educational attainment with an average level.

The technical quality sub-dimension is related to the quality of education, individual development, academic expectation and the preparation for work life after graduation (Holdford & Reinders, 2001). Students evaluate educational services obtained in university and after this evaluation they decide how university contributes for their future. Drexel University students are also satisfied with this sub-dimension whereas Gazi University students are satisfied in the average level. Relationship between technical quality and functional quality is high for both universities. Based on the results obtained from Gazi University, it can be said that the expectations of students are not met sufficiently. When students' expectations are not met, their satisfaction regarding outputs of the school decrease. They find insufficient quality of outputs and professional competence.

Functional quality includes learning resources, faculty-lecturers and administration staffs. The learning resources sub-dimensions of functional quality are related to the use of educational tools, sports facilities, laboratories and the library by both students and faculty-lecturer. Although learning resources are present, it may be thought that these are not used sufficiently. According to OECD results, annual educational expenditure provided by the state is 4.648 dollars per student for higher education. On the other hand, the OECD average is 12.336 dollars (OECD, 2006). The insufficiency of financial resources allocated to Gazi University by the state is also reflected in these results. The number of students in Gazi University is about 80,000. If learning resources are not sufficient, students cannot benefit from these learning resources, even if they exist. Therefore, a lack of learning resources can affect the educational process negatively. This inadequacy can be associated with the importance given by university management and finances of university. According to this result, the feeling of dissatisfaction related to learning resources may originate from the inadequacy of the university administration to provide sufficient learning resources.

The faculty-lecturer sub-dimension is related to the behavior and attitude of faculty-lecturer towards students and their teaching, communication and interaction skills and the way they develop themselves. The administrative staff sub-dimension is related to the behavior and attitude of faculty management and administrative staff, their reliability and their skills to meet students' needs and their communication and interaction skills. Drexel University students are satisfied with these dimensions whereas Gazi University students are satisfied at an average level. According to correlation analysis, the relationship between general service quality and functional quality is high. Relationships between general service quality and both faculty-lecturers and administrative staffs are high. Thus human relations qualities of faculty-lecturers and administrative staffs, their communication and interaction skills, performances increase perception of general quality.

Averages of these sub-dimensions are low for Gazi University. It can be assumed that students have a communication problem with human resources of the university. When elements of functional quality are examined, it's understood that averages of Gazi University are low. Besides when relationships between elements are examined, there are high relationships among reliability, responsiveness, communication, credibility, security and understanding for Gazi University. Averages and results of correlations validate the assumption that students have a communication problem with human resources of the university. Based on the results of these relationships, it can be said that the concepts of sufficiency, willingness, honesty, interaction, reliability and the skill to express are priorities in the perception of service quality.

Performance of faculty-lecturers affects service quality and so students expect faculty-lecturers to understand them and show friendly behaviors towards them (Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007). Another analysis is that the faculty-lecturer plays an important role in general service quality. Studies show that the qualities of effective professors are interaction skills, enthusiasm, empathy, harmony and their use of real life in the class (Gruber, Reppel, & Voss, 2010). Some studies draw attention to the importance of the faculty's personality (Clayson, 1999; Curran & Rosen, 2006) and show that students relate teaching quality to the personality perceived (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006). Additionally, service quality is especially related to the performance of staff (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003). For this reason, it can be said that there is a performance problem with both academic and administrative staff at Gazi University. Studies show that there is an interaction between work performance and personal qualities (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Yelboğa, 2006) and organisational values (Rosete, 2006). The provision of a strong quality culture by organisational management may affect organisational performance positively (Flynn, Schroeder, & Sakakibara, 1995).

However, performance evaluation of a faculty –lecturer and administrative staff is not done at Gazi University. Besides, no specific criteria have been stated on the choice of academic staff and career development at Gazi University. If the university management forms a quality culture (Barandiaran-Galdos, Barrenetxea-Ayesta, Cardona-Rodriguez, Mijangos-Del-Campo, & Olaskoaga-Larrauri, 2012) and makes this culture sustainable, this may increase performance. According to the data obtained from previous research and this research, students expect teaching experience, teaching knowledge and abilities, effective human relations, willingness, and reliability from faculty-lecturers. It's important that faculty-lecturers show these behaviors both in classroom and out of classroom for students. Besides, empathetic, warm, trustworthy behaviors of administrative staffs affect service quality positively (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). Students get services from administrative staffs out of classroom. So, administrative staffs have a great importance in this service process. Opportunities given to students, services out of teaching hours and bureaucratic structure of university affect service quality perception considerably (Spencer, 1991). But faculty-lecturers and administrative staffs have some administrative problems like job satisfaction, professional development, and communication because of university structure (Antalyalı, 2011; Höbel & Karkin, 2013). These problems can affect behaviors of faculty-lecturers and administrative staffs negatively to students. Studies show that an innovative environment in a university is important for job satisfaction, motivation and organisational commitment (Jansen & Chandler, 1994; Dee, Henkin & Pell, 2002).

Based on the study, functional quality has the greater impact on perceptions of service quality than technical quality in schools of education. Especially, communication skill and competence of human resources in schools of education are keywords. Competence includes knowledge, skills and behavior and effects on performance. Then, it can be said that qualified administration, qualified faculty-lecturers and administrative staffs and also sufficient funds increase service quality perception in schools of education. These basic factors have a great importance for service quality in university. It is crucial for the schools of education to stay in touch with and understand the expectations and needs of students. New paradigms need to be developed to balance the opinions of the decision makers, administrators, faculty and staff with the preferences of the student body in Turkey. But, universities have no competitive and free environment due to centralized structure of universities in Turkey.

Also this centralized structure affects autonomy negatively in universities. According to the OECD (2000) report, the point of university autonomy of Turkey is 1.5 out of 8 (STP, 2005). It can be said that in order to speak of service quality at a university, the management has to have a vision of quality. Thus, a management system which is based on performance evaluation and which is accountable is important for service quality. It is unlikely that a faculty-lecturer or administrative staff could be 'dead wood' in such a place. According to the results that have been obtained, it's suggested that a new system, which is based on performance evaluation, accountability and autonomy in schools of education should be implemented. Another suggestion of the study is that academicians explore the quality of human resources in schools of education, their professional experience and personal characteristics.

The limitation of the study is that it was done only with final year students in Schools of Education. The findings cannot be generalized as they reflect only the ideas of that population. However, it may have implications for future studies. If service quality is evaluated with the view of the student, faculty, and staff and the comparison of service quality of other universities, this will contribute to the field.

The accuracy of the research results can be checked by other methods in addition to surveys (interviews, observations, etc.) and qualitative methods can be used to interpret the results in more detail.

References

- Antalyalı, L. (2011). Dimensions of organizational effectiveness in Turkish Universities. *The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 16(3), 285-309.
- Barandiaran-Galdós, M., Barrenetxea-Ayesta, M., Cardona-Rodríguez, A., Mijangos-Del-Campo, J., & Olaskoaga-Larrauri, J. (2012). Attitudes of Spanish university teaching staff to quality in education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(6), 647-658.
- Bean, J., & Bradley, R. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(4), 393-412.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task Performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 9-109.
- Browne, B., Kaldenberg, D., Browne, W., & Brown, D. (1998). Student as customers: Factors affecting satisfaction and assessments of institutional quality. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 8(3), 1-14.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1990). Conception of school effectiveness and models of school evaluation: A dynamic perspective. *Education Journal*, 18(1), 47-61.
- Clayson, D.E. (1999). Students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: Some implications of stability. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21(1), 68-75.
- Clayson, D.E., & Sheffet, M.J. (2006). Personality and the student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(2), 149-160.
- Curran, J.M., & Rosen, D.E. (2006). Student attitudes toward college courses: An examination of influences and intentions. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(2), 135-148.
- Davis, J.C., & Swanson, S.T. (2001). Navigating satisfactory and dissatisfactory classroom incidents. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 245-250.
- Dee, J. R., Henkin, A. B., & Pell, S.W.J. (2002). Support for innovation in site-based managed schools: Developing a climate for change. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25(4), 36.
- 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.
- Ekinci, E. (2009). Student Expenditures and Costs in Higher Education in Turkey. *Education and Science*, 34(154), 119-133.
- Ereş, F. (2011). Image of Turkish basic schools: A reflection from the province of Ankara. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104(6), 431-441.
- Eurydice. (2008). *Higher Education and Governance in Europe*. Brussels: European Commission (Directorate-General for Education and Culture) Publishing.
- Fjortoft, N.F., & Lee, M.W. (1994). Developing and testing a model of professional commitment. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 58(4), 370-378.
- Flynn, B.B., Schroeder, R.G., & Sakakibara, S. (1995). The impact of quality management practices on performance and competitive advantage. *Decision Science* 26(5), 659-691.
- Gibson, A. (2010). Measuring business student satisfaction: A review and summary of the major predictors. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(3), 251-259.
- Goetsch, D. L., & Stanley, D. (1998). *Understanding and implementing ISO 9000 and ISO standards*. USA: Prentice Hall.
- Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- Gruber, T., Reppel, A., & Voss, R. (2010). Understanding the characteristics of effective professors: The student's perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 20(2), 175-190.
- Heck, R.H., Johnsrud, L.K., & Rosser, V. (2000). Administrative effectiveness in higher education: Improving assessment procedures. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(6), 663-684.
- Hill, M. (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: The role of the student as primary consumer. *Quality Assurance Education*, 3(3), 10-21.
- Hill, Y., Lomas, L., & McGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance Education*, 11(1), 15-20.
- Holdford, D., & Schulz, R. (1999). Effect of technical and functional quality on patient perceptions of pharmaceutical service quality. *Pharmaceutical Research*, 16(9), 1344-1351.

- Holdford D., &Reinders, T.P. (2001). Development of an instrument to assess student perceptions of the quality of pharmaceutical education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 65(2), 125-131.
- Holdford, D., &Patkar, A. (2003). Identification of the service quality dimensions of pharmaceutical education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 67(4), 1-11.
- Höbel, Z., &Karkin, N. (2013). Organizational and Professional Problems of Administrative Personnel in University: The Case of Pamukkale University. *Journal of Labour Relations*, 4(1), 135-159.
- Jansen, E., & Chandler, G. N. (1994). Innovation and restrictive conformity among hospital employees: Individual outcomes and organizational considerations. *Hospital & Health Services Administration*, 39(1), 63-80.
- Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, implementation and control*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall International.
- LeBlanc, G., & Nguyen, N. (1999). Listening to the customer's voice: Examining perceived service value among business college students. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 13(4), 187-198.
- Liu, C.M. (2005). The multidimensional and hierarchical structure of perceived quality and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Management*, 22(3), 426-435.
- Mavondo, T., Tsarenko., Y., &Gabbott, M. (2004). International and local student satisfaction: Resources and capabilities perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 14(1), 41-60.
- McCull, R., Callaghan, B., & Palmer, A. (1998). *Services Marketing: A Managerial perspective*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- McLean, J. (1996). Hearing from the forgotten workforce: The problems faced by general staff women working in universities. *Australian Universities Review*, 39 (2), 20-27.
- OECD. (2006). Education at a glance: OECD indicators. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/bookshop>
- O'Neill, M. A., & Palmer, A. (2004). Importance-performance analysis: A useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 12(1), 39-52.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multi-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of the service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Pereda, M., Airey, D., & Bennett, M. (2007). Service quality in overseas education: The experience of overseas students. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 6(2), 55-67.
- Pozo-Munoz, C., Reboloso-Pacheco, E., & Fernandez-Ramirez, B. (2000). The ideal teacher: Implications for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 25(3), 253-263.
- Rosete, D. (2006). The impact of organisational values and performance management congruency on satisfaction and commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 44(1), 7-24.
- Shank, M.D., Walker, M., & Hayes, T. (1996). Understanding professional service expectations: do we know what our students expect in a quality education? *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 13(1), 71-89.
- Singh, V., Grover, S., & Kumar, A. (2008). Evaluation of quality in an educational institute: A quality function deployment approach. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 3(5), 156-162.
- Sohail, S., & Shaikh, N.M. (2004). Quest for excellence in business education: A study of student impression of service quality. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(1), 58-65.
- Spencer, R. (1991). After the registration revolution. *College and University Journal*, 66(4), 209-212.
- State Planning Organization. ([STP], 2000). Report of Higher Education Commission. Ankara: Başbakanlık Yayınları.
- Tan, K.C., & Kek, S. (2004). Service quality in higher education using an enhanced servqual approach. *Quality in Higher Education*, 10(1), 17-24.
- Trivellas, P., & Dargenidou, D. (2009). Leadership and service quality in higher education. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 1(3), 294-310.
- UNESCO (1998). Higher education in the twenty-first century: Vision and action. World conference on higher education. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm#world_declaration.
- Voss, R., Gruber, T., & Szmigin, I. (2007). Service quality in higher education: The role of student expectations. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 949-959.
- Yang, R., & Vidovich, L. (2002). Positioning universities in a context of globalisation. *Educational Sciences Theory & Practice*, 2(1), 209-222.
- Yelboğa, A. (2006). Assessment of relation between personality characteristic and work performance. *The Journal of Industrial Relations & Human Resources*, 8(2), 196-211.
- Zeithaml, V.A., & Bitner, M.J. (2003). *Services Marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm*. New York: McGraw-Hill.