

The Service Quality of Public and Foundation (Private) Universities in Turkey from the Perspectives of Turkish and International Students

Özgür Kökalan, İbrahim Güran Yumuşak, Seyit Ömer Gürleyen

Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Halkalı Cad. No: 281 Halkalı Küçükçekmece 34303, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract - The aim of this article is to compare the service quality expectations and perceptions of the students attending public and foundation universities in Turkey. In this research, quantitative analysis was used. This research was conducted with 875 students using the convenience-sampling method. In this research, SERVQUAL Scale, which is frequently used in measuring service quality in the world, was adapted and used for universities. According to the results of this study, it has been found that service quality expectations of the students attending the universities in Turkey are high, but the universities cannot fully meet these expectations. It has been seen that the international students compared to Turkish students have lower expectations. It has been also found that foundation universities meet the service quality expectations of their students more than the public universities. Some studies determine the service quality of universities in Turkey. But none of these studies have investigated the service quality of universities from the perspective of Turkish and international students.

Keywords – higher education; service quality; Servqual scale; Turkey, public/foundation university.

DOI: 10.18421/TEM112-40

<https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM112-40>

Corresponding author: Özgür Kökalan,
Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Turkey
Email: ozgur.kokalan@izu.edu.tr

Received: 13 March 2022.

Revised: 09 May 2022.

Accepted: 14 May 2022.

Published: 27 May 2022.

 © 2022 Özgür Kökalan, İbrahim Güran Yumuşak & Seyit Ömer Gürleyen; published by UIKTEN. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 License.

The article is published with Open Access at <https://www.temjournal.com/>

1. Introduction

The number of universities in Turkey has been increasing significantly since 2000. According to Higher Education of Turkey (YOK) data, there were only 32 universities in 1984; this number increased to 34 in 1990 and became 79 in 2000. In 2010, there were 168 universities in total, 109 of them being public universities and 59 foundation universities. In Turkey, in 2020, there are 208 universities, 130 public universities, 72 foundation universities, and 5 vocational schools. In Istanbul, in 2020, there are 62 universities in total; 13 public universities, 45 foundation universities, and 4 vocational schools [1]. In other words, the number of universities increased by nearly six times in 30 years. This increase gave rise to competition among universities and also caused them to develop strategies.

In parallel to the rise in the number of universities, there has been a significant increase in the number of students. According to YOK's data, the number of undergraduate students in Turkey was 281,703 in 1984; this number became 3,405,000 in 2014 and 7,940,133 in 2020. In 2020, there are 7,320,449 students attending public universities; 608,123 students attending foundation universities, and 11,561 are attending the private vocational schools. In 2020, in Istanbul, there are 1,001,834 students in both public and foundation universities [1].

Even though the number of universities increased to cover the local demand in Turkey at first, then, later, this increase, especially after the 2000s, caused universities to develop strategies toward international students because of the intensely competitive environment. Thanks to these strategies, the number of international students in Turkey has been significantly increased. According to the YOK's data, while 7,661 international undergraduate students were in 1990, this number reached 16,656 in 2000, 43,000 in 2012, 55,000 in 2014 and 178,000 in 2020 [2]. In 2020, according to the number of

international students, Turkey was among the first ten countries in the world and is planning to enter among the first five countries in a very short period [1].

Even though there has been a significant increase in universities quantitatively, it is essential to evaluate whether universities meet their students' quality expectations qualitatively. This study has two primary purposes. The first is to determine service quality expectations of the students from the universities and how much these universities meet these expectations. The study also aims to determine the service quality expectation of the international students whose population is constantly increasing in Turkish universities and to compare them with Turkish students. Determining the service quality perception of international students and taking precautions to improve their perception level will increase the preferability of Turkey in higher education and contribute to enhancing the quality of higher education in Turkey. Even though it is possible to come across studies that aim to determine the service quality of universities in Turkey (e.g. [3], [4], [5]), the service quality of universities is not evaluated from the perspective of international students too much. This side of this study renders it different from other academic studies and makes it unique.

In this study, first of all, the term service quality is defined, and service quality studies in universities are included. Then, the service quality of universities was measured using the SERVQUAL scale which was developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry adapted for universities for this research. In the last part, as a result of the analysis results, recommendations were made for universities to increase their service quality.

2. Service Quality

Today, many service sectors such as consulting, healthcare, and education have started to gain importance. Their place and importance in the economies of countries keep increasing, and therefore, applications related to the sector of service increase constantly [6]. The service sector, which has become even more attractive in recent years, has caused companies in this sector to enter into intense competition. Companies trying to understand the expectations of their customers in the intensely competitive environment have started to develop many different strategies to satisfy their customers. One of these strategies was based on improving the service quality. In the service sector, the quality is dependent on the opinion of the customers about the services offered by companies and/or institutions. Therefore, understanding the quality expectations of

customers has always been important for companies in the service sector [7].

In the literature, it is seen that there are many studies aiming to determine the service quality expectations of the customers of service businesses in different sectors (e.g. [8], [9], [10]). In addition, there are many service quality scales developed to measure service quality (e.g. [11], [12], [7]). Although different service quality scales have been developed for different sectors today, it is seen that the most frequently used scale in measuring service quality is still SERVQUAL Scale developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry in 1985. SERVQUAL scale was designed as universal scale. Therefore, each service business can easily measure its service quality with small changes made in the scale. As of December 2020, the scale has been used more than 57,000 times in different kinds of academic studies. The scale was used in more than 3200 academic articles only in 2020 [13].

The SERVQUAL Scale is based on gap theory. In SERVQUAL scale, all analysis are done based on the difference between expectation and perception of service quality of customers [14]

In this scale, there are five dimensions called as tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy.

Tangibles (S1); includes the topics such as the physical abilities of a company or organization in providing service, equipment and appearance of personnel

Reliability (S2); describes provision of the reliability to customers promised by companies. In other words, it can be expressed as the ability of the company to fulfill the service it promised to do on time and in a correct and reliable way

Responsiveness (S3); is about the staff being eager to help the customers, give the service to consumers quickly, and make the necessary announcements at the right time and transmit them to the customers through the right method.

Assurance (S4); includes the skills of the staff to be experienced, knowledgeable, polite, to avoid behavior that might cause suspicion in customers' minds, to care about the privacy of the customers' personal subjects and to raise the feeling of trust in customers

Empathy (S5); is the company or organization putting itself in customers' shoes, and showing the necessary interest to the customer to fulfill the needs of customer [7].

If you look at the literature, it is seen that the SERVQUAL scale is frequently used in the higher education to measure the higher education institutions' service quality ([14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20]). A majority part of these studies

aimed to determine the relationship between service quality of universities and their students' satisfaction. A comparative analysis has not been performed in almost any of these studies.

3. Service Quality in Higher Education

Ensuring customer satisfaction has always been important for all kinds of organizations. In higher education institutions, as in other organizations, great importance has been attached to student satisfaction, and many studies have been carried out to increase satisfaction. Many studies on higher education institutions have found a positive correlation between the service quality provided by higher education institutions and student satisfaction (e.g. [21], [14], [22]). In these studies and many other studies, student satisfaction was explained only by the results obtained from the SERVQUAL scale.

In the literature, it is seen that there are many studies that measure the service quality of higher education institutions. In a study in which the service quality of higher education institutions in Thailand was determined with the SERVQUAL scale, it was found that the service quality expectations of the students of Thai universities were high, and the universities could not meet the service quality expectations of the students in any quality sub-dimension [23].

In another study conducted on Iranian universities using the SERVQUAL scale, it was determined that Iranian universities generally failed to meet the service quality expectations of students, especially in the dimensions of "Responsiveness" and "Assurance" [21].

In another study conducted on Turkish students attending universities in Malaysia and Lithuania, the service quality provided by Malaysian and Lithuanian universities was compared and it was found that the service quality of universities in Lithuania was higher than Malaysian universities [20].

In a study measuring the service quality of public universities in India, it was found that public universities in India did not meet the service quality expectations of the students [24].

It is seen that the results of similar studies conducted in many different countries of the world are quite similar, and universities generally do not meet the service quality expectations of the students.

There are also many studies aimed at determining the service quality of higher education institutions in Turkey.

Eser and Birkan (2005) compared the service quality perception of students attending foundation (private) and public universities in Turkey. Results revealed that the foundation (private) universities

provide better quality of service than public universities. Especially in "Tangibles" dimension, the foundation (private) universities were in a much better position [25].

In another study conducted with the SERVQUAL scale on public universities, it was determined that public universities could not meet the service quality expectations of the students. In this study, it was observed that "Assurance" is the most important service quality dimension; "Responsiveness" was found to be the least important service dimension for students [3].

Bozbay et al. (2020) aimed to determine the service quality expectation and perception of international students studying at Turkish universities. Results revealed that none of the Turkish universities meet service quality expectation of their international students.

Although this study and previous studies are similar, there is no study in the literature that compares the service quality of public and private universities in terms of both domestic and international students studying at the same universities. These comparisons were made in this study. Based on the literature, the hypotheses within the scope of the study are constructed as follows:

$H_1 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality expectation and service quality perception of the university students*

$H_2 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality expectation and service quality perception of the public university students*

$H_3 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality expectation and service quality perception of the foundation university students*

$H_4 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality perception of the public and foundation university students*

$H_5 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality expectations of Turkish and international students*

$H_6 =$ *There is a significant difference between the service quality perceptions of Turkish students attending the public universities and foundation universities*

4. Sampling

This study was made on the students who attend universities in Istanbul. There are 1,001,834 students in Istanbul in 2020 [1]. Convenience sampling method was used as the sampling method, 875 students from 4 public and 6 foundation universities completed the survey. Demographic information about the sampling is summarized in Table 1. below:

Table 1. Demographics characteristics of respondents

Gender		Frequency	Percent (%)
	Male	560	64
Female	315	36	
Total	875	100	
Age Interval	18 - 20	342	39,1
	21 - 23	364	41,6
	24 - 25	77	8,8
	25 >	92	10,5
	Total	875	100
Education Level	Voc. School	50	5,7
	Bachelor	735	89,7
	Master	67	97,4
	PhD.	23	100
	Total	875	100
Types of Accommodation	Dormitory	471	53,8
	With Family	247	28,2
	With Relative	7	0,8
	Student House	90	10,3
	Others	60	6,9
	Total	875	100
Types of Citizenship	Turkish Republic	769	87,9
	International	106	12,1
	Total	875	100
Number of students within University	Public	427	48,8
	Foundation	448	51,2
	Total	875	100
Types of University	Public	4	40,0
	Foundation	6	60,0
	Total	10	100

As seen in Table 1., 875 people attended the research in total. 64 % of the participants are male and 46 of them are female. 769 of the participants are Turkish citizens and 106 of them are international students. Although the number of Turkish and international students in the study is not close, the number of students belonging to both groups included in the sample proportionally represents the population. 48.8 % of students are in public universities and 51.2 % of them are attending foundation universities.

5. Data Collection Tools

In the literature, it is seen that there are frequently used three main instruments called as SERVQUAL [7], SERVPERF [26], HEdPERF [27], and HESQUAL [28] to measure service quality of universities. Although the HEdPERF scale was developed only to measure the service quality of

higher education institutions, it was not widely accepted because it was not as flexible as SERVQUAL [29]. Therefore, SERVQUAL, which is the most widely used service quality scale in the world, was used in this study.

The survey used in the research consists of three parts. The first part of the survey consists of 7 questions that aim to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second and third part of the survey, SERVQUAL scale with minor changes was used to determine the service quality expectation and perception of the students. In the scale, 7-likert-scale points from "I certainly disagree" and "I certainly agree" are used.

In the first part of the SERVQUAL scale, there are 22 variables that represent the 5 service dimensions named "Tangibles", "Reliability", "Responsiveness", "Assurance" and "Empathy" that aim to determine the students' expectations. The second part aims to measure the service quality perceptions of the students. By comparing expectations and perceptions, it is assumed that the service provided meets the expectations of the customers or if it is higher than the expectations, then it is qualified. In the case that the perceived service cannot meet the expectations of the customer, it is concluded that the service is of poor quality. In the SERVQUAL scale, the questions 1-4 measure the dimension "Tangibles", 5-9 "Reliability", 10-13 "Responsiveness", 14-17 "Assurance" and 18-22 "Empathy" [7].

In the SERVQUAL scale, the questions like "the hardware and equipment used in universities being sufficient, the hardware and equipment being modern and looking pleasing to the eye etc." show the "Tangibles" dimension of service quality; the questions like "the personnel in universities fulfilling the needs of a person receiving service and providing the needed service on time etc." show the "Reliability" dimension of service quality; the questions like "the personnel developing solutions in response to complaints, giving accurate information about when the service will be provided etc." show the "Responsiveness" dimension; the questions like "the personnel being eager and ready to respond to the requests of those receiving service, the personnel having sufficient knowledge and capacity to meet the needs of those receiving service" show the "Assurance" dimension; the questions like "the university personnel interacting with the one receiving service one-to-one, and examining his/her complaints, organizing entrance-exit hours in a way that would fit the schedule of the users etc." show the "Empathy" dimension.

In order to use the SERVQUAL scale, some small changes should firstly be made on the scale. This study was carried out on service quality of

universities in Turkey and therefore the changes were made within this framework. After doing these small changes on scale, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done with AMOS to both expectation and perception part of the questionnaire in the first place. According to SERVQUAL expectation scale CFA, the fit indices results were determined as χ^2/df : 3.816; GFI: 0.874; AGFI: 0.846; CFI:0.901 and RMSEA: 0.078. As a result of the CFA applied to the SERVQUAL perception scale, the fit indices results were found as χ^2/df : 3.712; GFI: 0.883; AGFI: 0.847; CFI:0.911 and RMSEA: 0.076. The perception and expectation scale was found to be sufficient [30]. In the next step, reliability analysis for the scales were calculated and the Cronbach Alpha results were given in Table 2.

Table 2. Cronbach alpha values for SERVQUAL scale dimensions

	Cronbach Alpha	
	Expectation	Perception
Tangibles (S1)	0.775	0.830
Reliability (S2)	0.844	0.917
Responsiveness (S3)	0.882	0.896
Assurance (S4)	0.864	0.919
Empathy (S5)	0.841	0.803
SERVQUAL Score	0.852	0.864

It was found that the reliability analysis made on the sub dimension of SERVQUAL scale was scored to be between 0.775 and 0.919. According to the reliability results, both expectation and perception scale were accepted as reliable at a good level [30].

6. Findings

6.1. The Comparison Between Service Quality Expectation and Perception of Students

In this part, participants' expectations and perceptions about their universities are evaluated with regard to the 5 dimensions in the SERVQUAL scale and total condition. Since both of the data are normally distributed and have equal variation, students' expectations and perceptions are tested with paired sample t test. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. SERVQUAL scores of universities based on service dimensions

	Expectation	Perception	Expectation Ratio	
	Mean	Mean	B - A	$\frac{A}{B}$
S1	5.19	4.50	0.69	83.5%
S2	5.54	4.12	1.42	68.7%
S3	5.60	4.11	1.49	67.6%
S4	5.54	4.29	1.25	72.4%
S5	5.63	4.54	1.09	76.4%
Total	5.50	4.31	1.19	73.5%

As can be seen in Table 3., it is found that university students' expectations related to the service quality of universities are high and that universities cannot significantly meet these expectations in any service quality dimension ($p < 0.05$). Universities meet students' expectations related to the tangibles dimension (83.5 %) most; and they meet students' expectations related to responsiveness dimension (67.6%) least. It is found that universities meet 73.5 % of students' expectations on average. It is seen that the results of this analysis are in parallel with the results of many previous studies (e.g.[21], [20], [24], [14]).

In the next step, the service quality of public and foundation universities is evaluated separately, then, whether or not there is a difference between the perceptions of public and foundation universities is analysed. The results from the analysis are summarized in the tables below.

Firstly, public university students' expectations related to the service quality in public universities and their existing perceptions of service quality are tested. Analysis results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of students' expectations and perceptions of their universities' service qualities

	Expec. Mean	Perc. Mean	Diff. Betw. Expec. and Perc.	t value	p value
S1	5.19	4.50	0.69	19.599	0.000
S2	5.54	4.12	1.42	35.474	0.000
S3	5.60	4.11	1.49	38.454	0.000
S4	5.54	4.29	1.25	30.380	0.000
S5	5.63	4.54	1.09	24.559	0.000
Total	5.50	4.31	1.19	34.288	0.000

As can be seen in Table 4., it is found that public university students' service quality expectations are high and that public universities cannot significantly meet these expectations in any service dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Then, the same analysis is done for foundation university students. Analysis results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of public university students' expectations and perceptions of public universities' service qualities

	Expec. Mean	Perc. Mean	Mean Diff. Betw. Expec. and Perc.	t value	p value
S1	5.12	4.28	0.83	16.379	0.000
S2	5.48	3.97	1.50	25.795	0.000

S3	5.56	3.97	1.58	26.654	0.000
S4	5.48	4.14	1.34	21.749	0.000
S5	5.50	4.49	1.01	18.098	0.000
Total	5.43	4.17	1.25	20.128	0.000

As can be seen in Table 5., just like in the case of public universities, it is found that foundation university students' service quality expectations are high and that foundation universities cannot significantly meet these expectations in any service dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Finally, the difference between the perceptions level of public and foundation universities' students is analysed with independent sample t test. Analysis results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of public and foundation university students' service quality perceptions

		Mean	t value	p value
S1	Public	4.29	-6.879	0.000
	Foundation	4.71		
S2	Public	3.98	-4.042	0.000
	Foundation	4.26		
S3	Public	3.98	-3.772	0.000
	Foundation	4.25		
S4	Public	4.14	-4.081	0.000
	Foundation	4.44		
S5	Public	4.49	-0.866	0.387
	Foundation	4.55		
Total	Public	4.18	-4.327	0.000
	Foundation	4.44		

As seen in Table 6., there are significant differences between the perceptions of students in public and foundation universities related to the service quality in all dimensions except for the "empathy" dimension ($p < 0.05$). In general, students in foundation universities have higher service quality perceptions. In other words, foundation universities in Turkey provide better service quality to their students. It can be said that this result is not very surprising. Foundation universities in Turkey have high tuition, and students expect a high level of service quality as they pay high tuition. Since the management in foundation universities knows this situation and because of the intense competition among the foundation universities, they develop strategies to increase their service quality. So, the higher service quality perceptions of students studying at these universities can be seen as normal. The results of this analysis are similar to previous studies [25].

6.2. The Comparison Between Service Quality Expectations and Perceptions of Turkish and International Students

Turkish and international students' expectations and perceptions related to the service quality in universities are tested with paired sample t test. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of service quality expectations of Turkish and international students

		Mean	t value	p value
S1	Turkish	5.21	0.722	0.471
	International	5.15		
S2	Turkish	5.57	3.045	0.002
	International	5.36		
S3	Turkish	5.63	3.167	0.002
	International	5.42		
S4	Turkish	5.58	3.585	0.000
	International	5.32		
S5	Turkish	5.60	3.463	0.001
	International	5.36		
Total	Turkish	5.52	3.128	0.002
	International	5.32		

As seen in Table 7., there are significant differences between Turkish and international students' expectations about the service quality of universities in all dimensions except for the tangibles dimension ($p < 0.05$). Looking generally, expectations of both Turkish and international students are high. Also, it is seen that Turkish students have higher expectations than those of the international students. There may be many reasons why Turkish students have higher expectations of service quality from their universities. First of all, a significant number of Turkish students do not have the opportunity to compare the service quality of Turkish universities with universities abroad and generally have a general belief that universities abroad have better service quality. International students are often going researched universities in other countries as well as Turkish universities before receiving education in Turkey and have more realistic expectations. Secondly, Turkish students attending foundation universities are paying high tuition according to the conditions in Turkey, and they expect a high level of service quality for the high price they pay. Turkey, especially when compared with many other foreign countries in recent years is a pretty cheap for international students and this situation is causing students to be lower than the quality of service expectations. Finally, the third reason may be due to the Turkish culture.

In the last step, perceptions of Turkish and international students related to the service quality of universities are analysed. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Comparison of Turkish and international students' service quality perception

		Mean	t value	p value
S1	Turkish	4.49	-1.207	0.228
	International	4.61		
S2	Turkish	4.08	-3.313	0.001
	International	4.44		
S3	Turkish	4.07	-3.514	0.000
	International	4.46		
S4	Turkish	4.26	-2.636	0.009
	International	4.56		
S5	Turkish	4.49	-2.586	0.010
	International	4.74		
Total	Turkish	4.28	-2.985	0.003
	International	4.56		

As seen in Table 8., there are significant differences between Turkish and international students' perceptions about the service quality of universities in all dimensions except the tangibles dimension ($p < 0.05$). In general, perceptions of both Turkish and international students about service quality are not very high. Also, it is seen that international students' perceptions of service quality are higher when compared to those of the Turkish students.

7. Conclusion

This research has been done with associate degree, undergraduate, graduate and PhD students. Although the number of universities in Istanbul is approximately 25 % of all universities in Turkey, there is a benefit in extending this research to include all the universities in Turkey. In further studies, satisfaction levels of international students should be determined, categorizing students according to where they come from, and based on the results that will be found, regional policies should be developed.

This research was carried out on 875 students attending to public and foundation universities in Istanbul. Resulting from the analyses made, it is seen that service quality expectations of students in Turkish universities are higher than their perceptions of service quality. Universities can meet students' expectations related to the tangibles the most (83.5 %), the responsiveness dimension the least (67.6 %). It is found that Turkish universities meet %73.5 of students' expectations. It is found that Turkish universities cannot meet students' expectation in any dimension of service quality. After investigating the service qualities of public and foundation

universities, it is determined that expectations of both public and foundation university students about service quality are high and public universities cannot meet these students' expectations in any dimension of service quality significantly. This result is supported by many previous studies (e.g. [21], [23], [20], [24], [14]). When service qualities of public and foundation universities are compared, it is seen that service quality perceptions of students in foundation universities are higher than those of students in public universities; in other words, service quality perception of foundation university students are higher. This result is also supported by previous study [25].

Resulting from the analysis of service quality expectations and perceptions of Turkish and international university students in Turkey, it is seen that the expectations of the Turkish students are higher than the expectations of the international students. It is seen that service quality perception of international students are higher when compared to those of Turkish students.

It is seen that public universities can meet the expectations of Turkish students related to the tangibles the most (79.5%), and the responsiveness the least (64.4%), and in general, they meet about 70 % of Turkish students' expectations related to service quality. It is seen that foundation universities can meet the expectations of their Turkish students related to the tangibles the most (86.5%), and the responsiveness the least (68.1%), and in general, they meet about 74 % of Turkish students' expectations related to service quality. In general, Turkish students' perceptions of service quality are not very high, neither for those in public universities nor foundation. But it is found that the Turkish students attending the foundation universities are more satisfied with their universities' service quality.

It is seen that public universities can meet the expectations of international students related to the empathy dimension the most (85.7%), and the responsiveness the least (74.6%). It is seen that public universities meet about 80 % of international students' expectations related to service quality. It is seen that foundation universities can meet the expectations of their international students related to the tangibles the most (89.6%), and the responsiveness the least (79.2%). It is seen that foundation universities meet about 84 % of international students' expectations related to service quality. In general, service quality perceptions of international students both in public and foundation universities are at an average level. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction levels of international students attending the public and foundation universities.

Looking at the research generally, it is seen that students attending public and foundation universities in Turkey are not adequately satisfied with the service quality of their universities. This creates the necessity of making some improvements for universities to increase the satisfaction levels of students. These improvements can be made in such areas:

- Improving the physical appearance of universities and making a set of innovations in order that their structure is more modern will positively affect students' satisfactions. For example, things such as improving the campus area, increasing the number of the areas where students can feel comfortable and study will work for the better of students' satisfaction.
- Taking the developing technology into consideration and renewing the equipment in universities accordingly will increase students' satisfactions. For this purpose, improving laboratories, libraries, social places to a point where they can fulfil students' needs will raise the level of students' satisfaction.
- A number of improvements such as producing alternative solutions should be made for the purpose of making the transportation to universities easier. Possible suggestions that could increase students' satisfaction in terms of transportation can be locating the dormitories near the universities, cooperating with municipalities or private companies to popularize the service buses.
- It should be made possible for the academic faculty to enhance their proficiencies in educating and teaching. It is necessary that the academic faculty use alternative education methods and measuring-grading techniques. For example, instead of classical way of teaching, methods that put the student in the centre and make the student active are suggested.
- Since the students in universities are Z generation and students of this generation are digital age generation, the faculty in universities are expected to have the necessary advancement to fulfil students' needs.
- If the administrative and other faculty in universities treat the students according to the standards in professional institutions, it will increase students' satisfaction.
- It is necessary that the Higher Education Institution in Turkey inspects universities with an approach that makes the student the centre, and it establishes regulations to increase service quality through proper procedures, and make sure that universities follow the new regulations.

- Some innovations should be done in light of the remarks of international students who are currently attending to school in Turkey, in order to increase the number of international students.

To conclude, students attending universities in Turkey have high expectations related to the service quality of their universities and universities cannot completely meet these expectations. It is seen that international students who are attending universities in Turkey have lower expectations of service quality from and higher perceptions of service quality of their universities, when compared to the Turkish students. It is found that generally, foundation universities satisfy their students' service quality expectation more.

References

- [1]. YOK .(2020). University Report. Retrieved from: <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr> [accessed: 03 March 2022].
- [2]. Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi (2020). University Report. Retrieved from: <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr> [accessed: 05 March 2022].
- [3]. Gerşil, M., & GÜVEN, H. (2018). Üniversitelerde hizmet kalitesinin servqual analizi ile ölçülmesi: Celal Bayar Üniversite'nde bir uygulama. *Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 111-125.
- [4]. Özgül, E., & Devedakan, N. (2005). Üniversitelerde Servqual tekniği ile algılanan hizmet kalitesinin ölçülmesine yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 93-116.
- [5]. Yılmaz, V., Filiz, Z., & Yaprak, B. (2007). Servqual Yöntemiyle Yüksek Öğretimde Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesi. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 299-315.
- [6]. Değermen, H. A. (2006). *Hizmet ürünlerinde kalite, müşteri tatmini ve sadakati:(Hizmet kalitesi ile müşteri sadakatının sağlanması ve GSM sektöründe bir uygulama)*. Türkmen Kitabevi. Retrieved from: <https://www.kitapyurdu.com/kitap/hizmet-urunlerinde-kalite-musteri-tatmini-ve-sadakati/83933.html> [accessed: 05 March 2022].
- [7]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of marketing*, 49(4), 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251430>
- [8]. Haron, R., Subar, N. A., & Ibrahim, K. (2020). Service quality of Islamic banks: satisfaction, loyalty and the mediating role of trust. *Islamic Economic Studies*, 28(1), 3-23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IES-12-2019-0041>
- [9]. Lee, S., & Lee, K. C. (2020). Comparative study of service quality on VIP customer satisfaction in Internet banking: South Korea case. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6365. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166365>
- [10]. Slack, N. J., & Singh, G. (2020). The effect of service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty and the mediating role of customer satisfaction: Supermarkets in Fiji. *TQM Journal*, 32 (3), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-07-2019-0187>

- [11]. Agariya, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2020). Development and validation of service quality scale for Indian telecom sector. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 37(4), 477-508. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSOM.2020.111820>
- [12]. Shafiq, M., Lasrado, F., & Islam, A. (2018). Service Quality scale Development for Higher Education Institutions: The Asian Context. *J. Qual. Technol. Manag*, 15, 37-55.
- [13]. Kökalan, Ö., Yumuşak, İ.G. & Bingöl, A. (2021). The service quality of the conventional and Islamic banks In Turkey. *Market trziste*, 33(1), 1-24.
- [14]. Bozbay, Z., Baghirov, F., Zhang, Y., Rasli, A., & Karakasoglu, M. (2020). International students' service quality evaluations towards Turkish universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 28(3), 151-164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-06-2019-0061>
- [15]. Gregory, J. L. (2019). Applying Servqual: Using service quality perceptions to improve student satisfaction and program image. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 11(4), 788-799. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-12-2018-0268>
- [16]. Leonnard, L. (2018). The performance of Servqual to measure service quality in private university. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, 11(1), 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2018.110103>
- [17]. Rasli, A., Shekarchizadeh, A., & Iqbal, M. J. (2012). Perception of service quality in higher education: Perspective of Iranian students in Malaysian universities. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, 1(1), 201-220.
- [18]. Quinn, A., Lemay, G., Larsen, P., & Johnson, D. M. (2009). Service quality in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 20(2), 139-152.
- [19]. Mamun-ur-Rashid, M., & Rhman, M. Z. (2017). Quality of higher education in Bangladesh: Application of a modified SERVQUAL model. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 75(1), 72.
- [20]. Rasli, A., Sekliuckienė, J., Baghirov, F., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Assessment of services quality and satisfaction: comparative study of Turkish students in Lithuanian and Malaysian universities. In *Transformations in business & economics* (Vol. 15, No. 2 (38), pp. 131-147).
- [21]. Akhlaghi, E., Amini, S., & Akhlaghi, H. (2012). Evaluating educational service quality in technical and vocational colleges using SERVQUAL model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5285-5289.
- [22]. Tan, K. C., & Kek, S. W. (2004). Service quality in higher education using an enhanced SERVQUAL approach. *Quality in higher education*, 10(1), 17-24. doi: 10.1080/1353832242000195032
- [23]. Yousapronpaiboon, K. (2014). SERVQUAL: Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1088-1095.
- [24]. Islam, A., & Bag, S. (2020). Assessing service quality in higher education: A study in Indian public universities. *Shodh Sanchar Bulletin*, 10(38), 70-78.
- [25]. Eser, Z., & Birkan, I. (2005). Marketing education in Turkey: A comparative study between state and private universities. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 16(2), 75-101. https://doi.org/10.1300/J066v16n02_05
- [26]. Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of marketing*, 56(3), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252296>
- [27]. Abdullah, F. (2006). The development of HEDPERF: a new measuring instrument of service quality for the higher education sector. *International journal of consumer studies*, 30(6), 569-581. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2005.00480.x>
- [28]. Teeroovengadum, V., Kamalanabhan, T. J., & Seebaluck, A. K. (2016). Measuring Service Quality in Higher Education: Development of a Hierarchical Model (HESQUAL). *Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective*, 24(2), 244-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-06-2014-0028>
- [29]. Brochado, A. (2009). Comparing alternative instruments to measure service quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 17(2), 174-190. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880910951381>
- [30]. Meydan, C. H., & Şeşen, H. (2011). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi AMOS uygulamaları*. Detay Yayıncılık.