

# Evaluation of Medical Faculty Students 'Quality Perceptions In The Context of The Service Factors

Fatma BOLAÇ<sup>a</sup>, Barış KOYUNCU<sup>b</sup>

## ABSTRACT

It is possible for higher education institutions to improve the quality of educational services and to give students knowledge, attitudes and skills by creating an academic, social and cultural environment. This study aimed to determine the role of demographic characteristics and academic achievement on medical faculty students opinions about quality. For this purpose, students were asked two questions: "What is quality?" and "What Do You Think About the Quality of Your Faculty?". Demographic characteristics of the participants, OSYM exam scores and committee exam results were determined. Based on the obtained data, the difference between averages was examined by Mann Whitney U, Student-t and F tests.  $p > 0.05$  was considered statistically significant for the tests. Participating students ( $n = 190$ ) were from Mersin. University Medical Faculty during 2018-2019 session. The mean age of the students was  $20.87 \pm 1.18$ . Additionally, 48.9% of the students who participated in the study were female, with a GPA (grade point average) of  $67.78 \pm 6.31$ , and 61.6% were born in the Mediterranean region. Academically more successful students expressed positive views for the institution's diploma opportunities ( $p = 0,004$ ).

**Keywords:** Education, quality, quality perception, medical student, service quality, higher education

## Introduction

Higher education institutions have many different stakeholders (students, student parents, local people, NGOs and other administrative bodies, etc.) and all stakeholders are influenced and benefited by the service of the higher education institution and get ideas. All stakeholders are closely related to grad students studying at the higher education institution and to the process in which the product was created at varying proportions (Rowley 1997). The expectations of the students who are both input and output of the service process of higher education institutions may be to gain their knowledge, attitudes and skills in a comfortable, peaceful, social and cultural environment. The perceived quality of the service can be explained by the result of an evaluation process in which the expectations and perceptions of the students who receive and perceive the service are compared. At the end of the process, the perceived quality of service is formed. Therefore, the quality of service is explained as dependent on two variables: the

expected service and the perceived service (Grönross 2001). Services that match student expectations and perceptions are perceived as high quality. It is very important that higher education institutions are interested in the quality of education as well as the quality of service. That is why the quality of service directly improves the quality of education.

## Quality and Quality Perception

Quality is a relative concept. It means different things to different people. Quality gains meaning according to perception status of individuals and according to 'processes' or 'results' (Harvey & Green 2006). Quality is a subjective concept that can have different meanings because of the values, beliefs, behaviours and attitudes of individuals (Hogston, 1995). According to Garvin (1998), the eight dimensions of quality perceived by the consumer are performance, features, reliability, conformity, durability, service capability, aesthetics, and perceived quality (Garvin 1998). It is possible to examine quality in two ways as real quality and perceived quality. Real quality; The level of quality that is achieved if the efforts and costs for the delivery of a product or service reach the

<sup>a</sup>Near East University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, KKTC, fatmabolac@mersin.edu.tr

<sup>b</sup>Asst. Prof. Dr., American University of Cyprus, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, KKTC

specifications of the product or service. Perceived quality; It is the quality that a customer perceives and refers to the level of the product or service that supplies the customer's expectations (Calvo-Porrá, Lévy-Mangin, and Novo-Corti 2013). In fact, the perception of quality can be explained by that quality is a concept that varies according to the person and changes according to one's experience and expectations.

### Quality of Service in Education

The quality of education in higher education affects the society socially and economically. The suitability of the educational services produced to the expectations of the society and the degree of meeting the expectations of the society are defined as quality in education (Brennan & Teichler 2008; Dursun, 2020). Quality assurance is required to ensure quality in higher education. Quality assurance has been defined as systems, procedures, processes and actions that will lead to achieving, maintaining, monitoring and improving quality. The quality of education is examined in two ways. Fitness for purpose and design. Quality in design is related to both output (an academic program that meets students' needs) and process (Curriculum, tools and equipment, planning and other factors affecting the program) (Woodhouse, 1998). There are two factors that affect quality in education. Internal factors are managers, academic staff, training programs, educational environment and other employees. External factors are service areas, application areas, technological developments, social needs, families and higher educational institutions (Numanoğlu, 2001). Service quality is a comparison of perceived service performance with expected service. If the perceived service and the expected service are equal, the quality is acceptable and satisfactory. If the expected service is greater than the perceived service, that is, the difference is negative, the perceived quality is not satisfactory. If the expected service is lower than the perceived service, that is, the difference is positive, the perceived quality is high (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry 1985).

#### 3.1. Quality of Service in Higher Education

Quality in higher education is a multidimensional, multi-layered and dynamic concept that is related to the situational conditions of the educational model as well as the specific standards of a particular system, organization, program or discipline, corporate duties and objectives (Vlăsceanu, Grünberg, & Pârlea 2004). Student perceptions are the first step in

determining the quality level of educational services. With the analysis of student perceptions, the student's satisfaction with the quality of service emerges. The most important starting point in determining the standard of service quality is the determination of students' perceptions of the quality of education services. According to the results of the analysis of quality perceptions, retrospective information and responses should be obtained from students and necessary arrangements should be made to ensure the satisfaction of the student's service quality. Identifying and taking into account the successes or failures of the quality of offered service ensure to have findings to improve and promote the training process in the future (Özgeldi & Yamamoto 2008). Some research estimating the quality level of education services in higher education is available in the literature (Bryceland & Curry 2001; Oldfield & Baron 2000; O'Neill 2003; O'Neill & Palmer 2004; Tan & Kek 2004). The changing structure of higher education institutions through the increasing demands of society and the differentiation of the competition and teaching systems lead to questioning of quality in universities. Efforts for improving quality perception in education are aimed at determining the strategies of educational institutions, supplying stakeholder expectations and increasing quality by creating competition in the education sector. When searching for answers to the question "What is quality?", the factors of quality should be taken into account. Quality is to catch the standard. It is also to monitor and control the process defined by the experts of the subject and to evaluate the mentioned product or service. Students are the most important stakeholders of higher education institutions. Various studies are carried out by higher education institutions to evaluate the quality of service in education, to make the necessary arrangements for the services they provide, and to take measures. Studies in the literature, which estimate differences between students' perceptions of quality, were reviewed. Abdullah (2006) created a scale tested for its validity and reliability by utilizing the HEDPERF, which we used to measure the quality of service offered to students in higher education. It describes the methodological development of HEDPERF (Higher Education PERFORMANCE - only), a service quality measurement tool that captures the original determinants of service quality in the higher education sector (Abdullah, 2006). The training given in medical schools consists of two stages; pre-clinical and clinical. There are many factors that affect the academic success of students

in education (Ögenler & Selvi, 2014). The period of study at Mersin University Faculty of Medicine is 6 years. The integrated teaching and examination system is applied for the course boards in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd classrooms, each of which is considered as a separate course. Also, each of the internships in 4th, 5th and 6th classrooms is considered an apart course (Mersin University Faculty of Medicine 2019). The 2nd-grade students in the study group of this study have 639 hours of theoretical and 155 hours of practical, totally 794 hours of course hours on the course boards (Mersin University Faculty of Medicine 2019). Questioning the quality of the educational service in the background of factors affecting academic achievements can be difficult due to the length of the training, the broad curriculum it covers and integration.

It is possible for higher education institutions to improve the quality of educational services and to give students knowledge, attitudes and skills by creating an academic, social and cultural environment. In this study, taking into account the perceptions of quality concepts of medical faculty students, their opinions and suggestions were evaluated to obtain fundamental data to ensure that students are involved in the quality process and are permanent in the quality assessment process and to improve and disseminate quality in medical school.

In this context, the opinions of medical school students who benefit from education services for the profession of medicine are important.

#### Data and methods

#### Results

Table 1. Academic achievements of students

Committee Notes	Total	Gender	Mean±SS	P
Committe 1	79,33 ± 6,37	Man	78,29±6,44	0,02
		Woman	80,40±6,15	
Committe 2	63,59 ± 10,64	Man	63,42±10,27	0,82
		Woman	63,77±11,06	
Committe 3	73,44 ± 8,70	Man	72,12±9,28	0,03
		Woman	74,81±7,86	
Committe 4	63,22 ± 10,89	Man	62,88±10,47	0,66
		Woman	63,58±11,35	
Committe 5	56,60 ± 13,04	Man	54,87±12,36	0,06
		Woman	58,39±13,54	
Committe 6	65,58 ± 7,33	Man	65,02±7,00	0,27
		Woman	66,18±7,66	
Final Grade	67,78 ± 6,31	Man	67,04±5,87	0,09
		Woman	68,56±6,68	
OSYM score*		Man	455,44± 94,08	0,06
		Woman	473,64 ± 3,37	

OSYM : Student Selection and Placement Center Score

This is a cross-sectional descriptive study that aimed to examine medical students' views on the quality assessment process in faculty of medicine. The study population comprises 291 students studying in the first grade at the Medical School in the period 2018-2019. With the permission of the medical school management, data regarding the students' gender, marital status, birth places, ages, scores received in OSYM, years of admission to the faculty, committee grades and their success status were obtained. In addition, students were asked two questions: "What is quality?" and "What Do You Think About Your Faculty Quality?". The questions were asked in an open-ended manner. 190 students answered the open-ended questions. The answers obtained from the students were coded and divided in terms of the factors of the "Quality in Educational Services Scale" (administrative aspect of the institution, academic aspect of the institution, image of the institution, accessibility, diploma programs offered by the institution, physical facilities of the institution). The status of supplying the expectations stated in the answers was coded by the researchers as positive, negative, and neutral. Answers not related to questions were excluded from evaluation. In this study, HEdPERF model was used to measure the quality of service offered to students in higher education.

The resulting data were compared to the codes configured by the researchers. Frequency, mean±standard deviation, Mann Whitney U, Student-t test were used to summarize the data, p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Of the 291 students who received education in the 2018-2019 education year, 190 attended the study. The mean age of the students was  $20.87 \pm 1.18$ . Of the students participating in the study, 48.9% (93) were female and 51.1% (97) were male. The grade point average (GPA) of the students was

$67.78 \pm 6.31$ . Female students were found to be more successful than men in the first ( $p=0.02$ ), third ( $p=0.03$ ) committee, and tended to be successful in the fifth committee ( $p=0.06$ ), final exam ( $p=0.09$ ) and university entrance point (OSYM exam) ( $p=0.06$ ) (Table 1).

**Table 2. Distribution of positive students according to academic achievement in terms of quality perception service factors**

Factors	Phrase	N	Final Grade	P*
Academic Aspects of the Institution	Positive	40	69,42	0,065
	No	150	67,35	
Image of Institution	Positive	36	67,11	0,476
	No	154	67,94	
Accessibility	Positive	8	69,00	0,469
	No	182	67,73	
Diploma Programs Offered by the Institution	Positive	47	70,06	0,004*
	No	143	67,04	
Physical Facilities of the Institution	Positive	48	68,85	0,149
	No	131	67,32	
Giving a Positive Answer to Any Factor	Positive	98	68,42	0,155
	No	89	67,11	

P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

The GPA of the students was  $67.78 \pm 6.31$ . There is no statistically significant difference between the academic achievements of the students who express a positive opinion for the academic aspect, image, and physical facilities of the institution ( $p > 0.05$ ). The academic achievements of students who give positive opinions for the institution's diploma opportunities are higher than those who do not give opinions, the difference is statistically significant ( $p = 0.004$ ), 17 students responded about the administrative aspect of the institution but did give neither a positive or a negative opinion, final grade of this students is 68,70. In the context of service factors of quality perception, there is no difference in academic achievement among students who think positively on any factor ( $p > 0,05$ ) (Table 2).

### Discussion

In our study, we determined that the quality perceptions of the first-grade students of Mersin University Faculty of Medicine in terms of educational services factors were generally positive. More than half of the students expressed a positive opinion on any quality of service factor, indicating the existence of the quality of education provided in the medical school and the perception of this service by the students. The impact of educational service on the academic success of students in medical education and ensuring that

resources are used effectively and efficiently in achieving the objectives are worth investigating. The duration of the education given in medical schools is longer and more intensive than other faculties. There are studies that have found that different variables and quality of educational services play a role in students' academic achievement levels (Ataman & Adigüzel, 2019; Ögenler & Selvi, 2014).

In our study, the participating students included all the factors in their statements: administrative, academic, physical, accessibility, diploma and image aspect of the institution. The participated students expressed positive opinions mostly about the physical possibilities of the institution, and in second place is the academic aspect and image and the institution's diploma opportunity, respectively. The accessibility factor is last in line. Students who wrote statements about the administrative aspect mentioned this factor as a definition but did not give a positive or negative opinion. Similar to the present study, Ataman & Adigüzel (2019) investigated the perceptions of university students regarding quality in higher education and whether they differ according to the demographic characteristics of the students. Ataman & Adigüzel (2019) revealed that students considered almost all of the items on the quality scale as important in higher education. The participants were observed to found the expressions related to the 'management' sub-dimension the most important,

which were followed by the sub-dimensions of the "University's physical infrastructure and facilities, teaching-learning process, scientific and social activities, academic staff, other students", respectively. In our study, participants expressed a positive view in the academic aspect of the school of Medicine in terms of educational service quality perception. Academic staff need to be able to achieve universal quality level while fulfilling their research and teaching obligations. It is suggested that the primary purpose of universities at the beginning of the XX. century is to research according to the European model. Since 1980, students, families and society in general expect that teaching in the higher education process will be evaluated by the students and that scoring must be performed to the teaching process to prove the efficiency of teaching (Kalaycı, 2009). The reliability of student evaluations is high. It is important for the academic staff and the institutions to evaluate themselves.

The negative opinion reported by students in the present study is only about the physical aspect of the institution. The positive view of the students in terms of academic direction and the concentration of negative views on physical conditions are suggestive in terms of the possibilities of the institution. Giving an opinion by students was considered to be positive, such as the academic staff's mastery of the course subject, providing adequate communication in the classroom, having the knowledge to answer questions, willingness to teach, being kind and respectful to the student in the statements. Similar to our study, there are studies in the literature which obtained a positive result for faculty members in the medical faculty (Coşkun & Nasır 2018).

The statement of accessibility relates to the faculty member's sincere approach to their problems, giving the student enough time, giving feedback on the student's knowledge and skills. However, only eight students gave their opinions on accessibility, which is a warning that the academically successful faculty member is unreachable. Gizir et al. (2010) studied on students of Mersin University and found that students were socio-economically problematic. The most fundamental problems are on economic and family life (Gizir et al. 2010). It is important that Gizir's research added the problem of reaching the academic staff by students which is an indicator of the quality of educational services in addition to the similar features such as family life and economic situation. The presence of problems related to accessibility, which is the part of the academic aspect of the institution, indicates the

existence of negative factors that are difficult to measure in the quality of education services (Gizir et al. 2010). In the light of research findings aimed at improving the quality of service in higher education institutions, universities should take into account student opinions and pay attention to their opinions. The quality of the education services should be assessed and commissions should be established to assess the quality of service in education. Analyzing student perceptions by higher education institutions to increase their effectiveness in education will lead to positive improvements in student training and service processes (Bolaç & Ögenler 2017). The student counselling coordination commission at Mersin University Faculty of Medicine has been working on solving such problems since 2018 (Mersin University Faculty of Medicine 2018).

It is noteworthy that students wrote statements about the administrative structure from the sub-factors of educational service quality, but did not give positive or negative opinions. This determination is thought to be stimulant about the power distance that exists in the community. The power distance accepts the centralization of power and is often located within the structure created by the administrators and in a position waiting for their directives.

The birthplace of more than half of the participating students is the Mediterranean region. There are no differences between the reported opinions in terms of places of birth, but it is noteworthy that students who report negative views are from the same region because they affect each other. There are no studies in the literature that measure educational service perception according to regions. However, there are studies reporting that the distinctions in rural and urban areas in terms of education service are high (Temurçin & Şenol 2008).

The academic achievement of female students in our study is significantly higher than that of male students. However, there are no significant differences between educational service quality perceptions in terms of gender. Similarly, the study conducted Temel et al. (2006) found no relationship between students' perceptions of faculty and gender and grade point average variables (Temel, et al. 2006). However, Özdemir (2016) conducted a research to determine the relationship between the academic achievements of undergraduate students at Gaziantep University and their views on the quality of teaching processes and learning resources in higher education institutions and concluded that the relevant variables had a significant share in student success (Özdemir,

2016). As a result of the study conducted by Taylan (2015), Bektaş & Ulutürk Akman (2013), the quality of service by administrative and academic staff perceived by students according to gender variable is at the same level (Bektaş & Ulutürk Akman 2013; Taylan, 2015). Students' satisfaction and dissatisfaction differ according to age groups. There is no relationship with age in our study.

In our study, participants expressed positive views on the image of the institution in terms of education service quality perception. Tayyar & Dilşeker (2012) found that student satisfaction had an effect on loyalty and advice; the variables affecting student satisfaction are the quality of service and image. Universities need to improve their academic staff, internationalisation and image to increase student satisfaction (Karacabey, Özdere, & Bozkuş, 2016).

The students who had high academic success gave statistically positive opinions compared to others in our study about the institution's diploma opportunities. This gives an idea that the quality of education services after graduation offered by the institution is perceived positively by the student. The positive opinion of first-grade students about diplomas may indicate that the diploma opportunities of the institution are taken into account considering the quality of educational service as the reason for university preference. According to Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley (2009), it becomes increasingly important for countries to ensure the quality of programmes in other countries, as international student mobility in higher education tends to increase. Concerns such as the elimination of problems for the recognition of equivalence of diplomas received from other countries are among the factors that make quality assessment necessary in higher education. Especially peer review based studies and the creation of institutional structures for quality assurance in higher education are considered positive, while qualification assessment studies are relatively new in Europe and therefore not widespread (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumble 2009). Mersin University Faculty of Medicine was accredited by the Association for Evaluation and Medical Education Programs Evaluation and Accreditation Association (TEPDAD) since 2012 (Medical Education Programs Evaluation and Accreditation Association 2012). Universities are one of the most important structures of education that build our future. While responding to ever-increasing and changing expectations, they also have to protect our values coming from the past, adapt to the world of today and be ready for the

future. The raw stuff and input of universities are students. Their output is also grad students. The quality of grad students to supply the needs of the sectors related to their professions plays a key role in shaping the future and in maintaining the existence of universities as institutions. The fact that the students in our study have a positive opinion about the diploma opportunities of the institution is very important in terms of the educational service quality perception of the institution.

### Conclusion

Students' opinions are an important, valid and reliable resource for providing quality education (Penny, 2003). Since perception varies from individual to individual, students' perceptions, opinions, suggestions and priorities about quality should not be ignored in the process. The value of this article lies in the comprehensive but simple handling of the subject.

- The findings of our study provide an idea of the strengths and weaknesses aspects of medical school.
- Students' views on the quality of educational services can be a guide in improving and maintaining the quality of the service provided by the faculty.
- Students' perceptions should be taken into account, participation in the quality process should be ensured and it should be noted that the persistence of this process will affect the quality of service in higher education.
- For this reason, improvement efforts for quality of education should be done primarily by learning the perceptions, opinions and suggestions of the students about quality.
- Based on these reasons, positive features in the faculty should be reinforced and negative features should be tried to be resolved with planning.

As a result, as such studies will show, valuing students' perceptions, opinions and suggestions about quality, will contribute to the improvement of the quality of service in education.

### References

- [1] 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): 569–81. doi: 10.1111/j.1470-6431.2005.00480.
- [2] Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L. & Rumbley, L. E.

- (2009). Trends in global higher education: tracking an academic revolution. Paris: UNESCO.
- [3] Ataman, O. & Adıgüzel, A. (2019). Quality perception in higher education: sample of Duzce University. *Electronic Journal Of Education Sciences* 8(15): 53-70.
- [4] Bektaş, H. & Ulutürk Akman, S. (2013). Service quality scale in higher education: reliability and validity analysis. *Istanbul University Faculty of Economics Journal of Econometrics and Statistics* 18(18): 116-133.
- [5] Bolaç, F. & Ögenler, O. (2017). Evaluating a group of medical school students' opinions in terms of quality. *Sanitas Magisterium* (3): 17-24. doi:10.12738/SM.2016.1.0021.
- [6] Brennan, J., & Teichler, U. (2008). The future of higher education and of higher education research. *Higher Education* 56(3): 259-264. doi: 10.1007/s10734-008-9124-6.
- [7] Brysland, A. & Curry, A. (2001). Service improvements in public services using SERVQUAL. *Managing Service Quality* 11(6): 389-401. doi: 10.1108/09604520110410601.
- [8] Calvo-Porrá, C., Lévy-Mangin, J.P., & Novocorti, I. (2013). Perceived quality in higher education: an empirical study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 31(6): 601-619. doi:10.1108/MIP-11-2012-0136.
- [9] Coşkun, S. S. & Nasır, S. (2018). Evaluation of performance quality of higher education services offered in medical schools. The 3rd International Higher Education Studies Conference-IHEC 2018, Kayseri, Turkey).
- [10] Dursun, E. (2020). The Relationship between Work-Family Conflict and Work Life Quality of Air Transportation Sector Employees, *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica*, 5, 1179-1184
- [11] Garvin, D. A. (1998). *Managing quality*. New York: The Free Press.
- [12] Gizir, C., Gizir, S., Aktaş, M., Göçer, S., Ömür, S., Yüce, G., & Kırık, N. C. (2010). Mersin University student profile. Mersin, Turkey: Mersin University Health, Culture and Sports Department, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Center.
- [13] Grönroos, C. (2001). An applied service marketing theory. *European Journal of Marketing* 16(7): 30-41. doi:10.1108/EUM0000000004859.
- [14] Harvey, L. & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 18(1): 9-34. doi: 10.1080/0260293930180102.
- [15] Hogston, R. (1995). Quality nursing care: a qualitative enquiry, *Journal Of Advanced Nursing* 21(1): 116-124. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.1995.21010116.x.
- [16] Kalaycı, N. (2009). Methods used in the evaluation process of faculty members' teaching performance in higher education institutions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice* 15(60): 625-656.
- [17] Karacabey, M. F., Özdere, M., & Bozkuş, K. (2016). Organizational image perceptions of university students. *The Journal of Academic Social Science* 4(33): 459-473. doi:10.16992/ASOS.3457.
- [18] Medical Education Programs Evaluation and Accreditation Association (2012). Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Medical Education Programs [electronic resource]. Turkey: TEPDAD. Accessed 6/11/2019 on-line at <http://tepdad.org.tr/akredite-egitim-programlari>
- [19] Mersin University Faculty of Medicine (2018). Mersin University Faculty of Medicine Student Counseling Coordination Committee [electronic resource]. Mersin: Mersin University. Accessed 6/11/2019 on-line at <http://www.mersin.edu.tr/akademik/tip-fakultesi/kurullar-ve-komisyonlar>
- [20] Mersin University Faculty of Medicine (2019). Mersin University Faculty of Medicine Principles of Teaching and Examination [electronic resource]. Mersin: Mersin University. Accessed 6/11/2019 on-line at <http://www.mersin.edu.tr/akademik/tip-fakultesi/pano>
- [21] Mersin University Faculty of Medicine (2019). Mersin University Faculty of Medicine Education Guide [electronic resource]. Mersin: Mersin University. Accessed 6/11/2019 on-line at
- [22] Numanoglu, G. (2001). Total quality management in education. *Ankara University Journal of the Faculty of Educational Sciences* 34 (1): 113-123. doi:10.1501/Egifak 0000000051.
- [23] 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. doi: 10.1108/09684880410517423.
- [24] Oldfield, B.M. & Baron, S. (2000). Student perceptions of service quality in a UK University Business and Management Faculty. *Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective* 8 (2): 85-95. doi: 10.1108/09684880010325600.
- [25] O'Neill, M. (2003). The influence of time on student perceptions of service quality: the need for longitudinal measures. *Journal of*

- Educational Administration 41(3): 310–24. doi: 10.1108/09578230310474449
- [26] Ögenler, O. & Selvi, H. (2014). Variables affecting medical faculty students' achievement: a Mersin University Sample. *Iran Red Crescent Med J.* 16(3): e14648. doi:10.5812/ircmj.14648.
- [27] Özdemir, M. (2016). Determination of the relationship between quality of teaching processes and learning resources with student achievement: the case of Gaziantep University. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences* 15(58): 738-751. doi:10.17755/esosder.47373.
- [28] Özgeldi, M. & Yamamoto, G.T. (2008). A Research on specifying factors affecting customer satisfaction in training service. *Journal of Economics, Business and Finance* 23(266): 21-50. doi:10.3848/iif.2008.266.7200.
- [29] 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. doi:10.1177/002224298504900403.
- [30] Penny, A.R. (2003). Changing the agenda for research into students' view about university teaching: four shortcomings of Srt research. *Teaching in Higher Education* 8 (3): 399-411. doi:10.1080/13562510309396.
- [31] Rowley, J. (1997). Beyond service quality dimensions in higher education and towards a service contract. *Quality Assurance in Education* 5(1): 7-14. doi:10.1108/09684889710156530.
- [32] Tan C. K. & Kek, W.S. (2004). Service quality in higher education using an enhanced SERVQUAL approach. *Quality in Higher Education* 10(1): 17-24. doi:10.1080/1353832242000195032
- [33] Taylan, Ş. & Titrek, O. (2015). Measurement of service quality in higher education: the case of Sakarya University. VII. National Graduate Education Symposium Proceedings Book, SAU Institute of Educational Sciences, Sakarya, Turkey, May 14-15, 2015.
- [34] Tayyar, N. & Dilşeker, F. (2012). The effect of service quality and image on student satisfaction at state and private universities. *Mugla University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences* (28): 184-204.
- [35] Temel, N., Yelkikalan, N., Sümer, B. & Temel, S. (2006). Student perceptions in the evaluation of faculties: a research on the students of Biga Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University Journal of Social and Economic Research* 2006(1): 144-160.
- [36] Temurçin, K. & Şenol, P. (2008). Transformation of public services in rural areas and spatial effects: Isparta province case. *Suleyman Demirel University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences* 2008(18): 195-214.
- [37] Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., & Pârlea, D. (2004). Quality assurance and accreditation: a glossary of basic terms and definitions. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- [38] Woodhouse, D. (1998). Quality assurance in higher education: the next 25 years. *Quality in Higher Education* 4(3), 257–273. doi: 10.1080/1353832980040306.