

The Assessment of Non-academic and Academic Service Quality in Higher Education

Kashif Hussain*

Cem Birol**

Suggested Citation:

Hussain, K. & Birol, C. (2011). The assessment of non-academic and academic service quality in higher education. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 42, 95-116.

Abstract

Problem Statement: Higher education is the fastest growing service industry on the globe which needs appropriate methods and strategies to meet the current students' needs, keep them happy, and attract more recruitments. Recent research emphasizes how to improve service quality for student satisfaction, however, there is still no consensus on how best to measure and manage quality within higher education institutions.

Purpose of the Study: The aim of this study is to assess the perceived service quality of students and to determine the student satisfaction level in higher education. It attempts to diagnose the applicability of two different, non-academic (SERVQUAL) and academic (SEEQ), service quality frameworks to students of higher education. In the present study, the assessment of non-academic service quality is defined as 'the services provided by administrative units such as registrar, library, faculty/school offices, rector office, dormitories, sports and health centre etc.' and the assessment of academic service quality is defined as 'the services provided by instructors including courses and content' in a university setting.

Methods: The current study is based on three measures: service quality (non-academic services), instructional quality (academic services), and student satisfaction. The sample of the study consists of 330 students studying at a private university in North Cyprus. Descriptive analysis such as means, standard deviation, and frequencies were calculated. Reliability analysis, exploratory factor analysis, and regression analysis were performed.

* PhD Candidate, Near East University, Institute of Educational Sciences, kashif.hussain@msn.com (Corresponding Author)

** Prof. Dr. , Near East University, Institute of Educational Sciences, fsilman@neu.edu.tr

Findings and Results: The nature of service quality measurement instruments in this study is found to be uni-dimensional for both academic and non-academic services in higher education. Tangibles and empathy dimensions of non-academic service quality are found to be the significant predictor of student satisfaction, whereas, instructors' enthusiasm, course organization, breadth of coverage, group interaction, individual rapport, and assignments dimensions of academic service quality are found to be the significant predictor of student satisfaction. The remaining dimensions of non-academic and academic service quality found to be insignificant in predicting student satisfaction and needs priority to better influence students.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Service quality and student satisfaction are important factors in student retention; it is important that universities measure service quality and use the tools of continuous improvement. Identifying student perceptions of service quality in higher education allows management to better tailor marketing efforts to ensure that student needs are met. It is recommended by this study that higher education authorities should maintain their level of service delivery to keep the students satisfied.

Keywords: Higher education services, non-academic, academic, service quality, student satisfaction

Higher education is a fast growing service industry which is increasingly exposed to globalization processes on a daily basis (Mazzarol, 1998; Damme, 2001; O'Neil & Palmer, 2004). Today an enormous number of students, from almost every country, travel abroad for the sake of quality educational services. Also, the higher education sector in North Cyprus has undergone enormous growth in recent years and it is widely believed that future success in a globalised world economy belongs to those organizations that provide customers with world-class customer service. Currently, there are 40,000+ students, 25,000+ from Turkey and 4,000+ from 65 different countries, studying at six universities (three public and three private) in North Cyprus. These universities must continually assess their educational services. Outstanding service quality as perceived by students, can give any institution a competitive advantage. In order to acquire and maintain the competitive advantage, universities must determine where they stand in the eyes of their students.

Hennig-Thurau, Langer, and Hansen (2001) report that educational services "fall into the field of services marketing" (p. 332). Educational services are directed at people, and are "people based" rather than "equipment based" (Thomas, 1978). Due to the unique characteristics of services, namely intangibility, heterogeneity, inseparability, and perishability (Parasuraman, 1986), service quality cannot be measured objectively (Patterson and Johnson, 1993). In the services literature, the focus is on perceived quality, which results from "the comparison of customer

service expectations with their perceptions of actual performance" (Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry, 1990, p. 23).

During the last decade, quality initiatives in higher education have been the subject of numerous discussions among practitioners and academics. Moreover, the focus on service quality at various levels of higher education has become an imperative (Avdjieva & Wilson, 2002). Student satisfaction is often used to assess educational quality, where the ability to address strategic needs is of prime importance (Cheng, 1990). The conceptualization of service quality, its relationship to the satisfaction and value constructs, and methods of evaluation have been a central theme in the education sector during recent years (Soutar & McNeil, 1996; Oldfield & Baron, 2000). Measuring the quality of service in higher education is becoming increasingly important (Abdullah, 2006). Due to an increased competition in the field of higher education, while evaluating student services, students should be treated as customers (Tony, Stephen & David, 1994).

Today, several universities around the globe are targeting research on the satisfaction level of their students. Curriculum, course content, teaching methods, and the quality level of the lecturers have been questioned (Cannon & Sheth, 1994; Hampton, 1993; Brightman, Elliot & Bhada, 1993). Indeed, understanding value from the customers' perspective can provide information useful to management for allocating resources and designing programs that promise better satisfied students (Seymour, 1992). As emphasized by Bone (1995), this should elicit positive emotional responses from students with regard to their institution, and generate positive word of mouth.

Teaching is a fundamental function of the higher education institution (Li & Kaye, 1998). Teaching can be regarded as an unique type of service (Rowley, 1996). This requires that specific terms need to be used and a more careful generalization needs to be made when applying the general service quality framework in this particular field (Li & Kaye, 1998). Kotler and Fox (1985) proposed the use of service quality measurements of student service components when developing higher education strategies. Ruby (1998) applied adaptations of the Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) SERVQUAL measurement instrument to non-classroom (outside class) higher education environments. The non-classroom environment has been the focus of extensive research and comment as an important element of the higher education experience. Kotler (1967) suggested non-classroom service quality combines with the student's classroom experience (inside class) to form a general perception of quality teaching. Therefore, Rowley (1996) suggested the Marsh's (1982; 1987) SEEQ measurement instrument for classroom situations, which is useful in measuring instructional quality or teaching effectiveness. Tinto (1993) found that faculty actions within the traditionally defined classroom combine with faculty actions outside the classroom to provide a foundation by which the individual judges the quality of the institution. Such actions also contribute to student persistence at the institution. Thus, literature proposes the use of SERVQUAL instrument for non-classroom situations, non-academic service quality, and for the measurement of service quality (Ford, Joseph & Joseph, 1993; Oldfield & Baron, 2000; Kotler & Fox,

1985; Ruby, 1998; Kotler, 1967; Tinto, 1993). Literature also suggests that the use of SEEQ instrument for classroom situations, academic service quality, for the measurement of instructional quality or teaching effectiveness (Marsh's 1982, 1987; Marsh & Roche, 1997; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992; Rowley, 1996) for developing higher education service strategies.

In view of the above information, this study sets out to assess the delivery of non-academic service quality (outside classroom situations) and academic service quality (inside classroom situations) and determines the student satisfaction level in higher education. In the present study, the assessment of non-academic service quality is defined as 'the services provided by administrative units such as registrar, library, faculty/school offices, rector office, dormitories, sports, and health centre etc.' and the assessment of academic service quality is defined as 'the services provided by instructors including courses and content' in a university setting.

Conceptual Background of the Study

If service quality is to be improved, it must be reliably assessed and measured to gain a competitive advantage. According to the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1988), service quality can be measured by identifying the gaps between customers' expectations of the service to be rendered and their perceptions of the actual service delivered (called 'disconfirmation-based paradigm' in the literature). Parasuraman et al. (1988) define service quality as 'a global judgment or attitude relating to the overall excellence or superiority of the service' and they conceptualize a customer's evaluation of overall service quality by applying Oliver's (1980) disconfirmation model, the gap between *expectations* and *perception* (gap model) of service performance levels. Furthermore, they propose that overall service quality performance may be determined by a measurement scale called "SERVQUAL" which uses five generic dimensions:

- **Tangibles**—the physical surroundings represented by objects (for example, interior design) and subjects (for example, the appearance of employees);
- **Reliability**—the service provider's ability to provide accurate and dependable services;
- **Responsiveness**—a firm's willingness to assist its customers by providing fast and efficient service;
- **Assurance**—diverse features that instill confidence in customers (such as the firm's specific service knowledge, polite and trustworthy behavior from employees);
- **Empathy**—the service firm's readiness to provide each customer with personal service.

The importance of quality in the service industry has instigated many researchers to empirically examine service quality within a wide array of service settings, such as appliance repair, banks, hotels, insurance, and long distance telephone service (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1985; Zeithaml et al., 1990; Nadiri & Hussain, 2005). How service quality should be measured is a discussion that continues today (Cronin & Taylor, 1992, 1994; Parasuraman, Berry & Zeithaml, 1991). One of the most

controversial issues is the reliability of SERVQUAL, a scale developed by Parasuraman et al. (1985) to measure service quality based on five generic dimensions (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy). SERVQUAL has been used to measure service quality in business schools (Carman, 1990), banking, dry cleaning, fast food services (Cronin & Tayler, 1992), and in other service sectors. Carman (1990) analyzed the five dimensions of SERVQUAL by incorporating attributes pertinent to different situations; for example, the failure rate is higher for colleges and universities than for either business or government organizations (Cameron & Tschirhart, 1992). In measuring service quality in higher education, it is important to study the meaning of service quality as it relates to the situation under study.

Harvey (2003) notes that "it is not always clear how views collected from students fit into institutional quality improvement policies and processes" (p. 4). Moreover, establishing the conditions under which student feedback can give rise to improvement 'is not an easy task'. Indeed, Ford et al. (1993) point out that SERVQUAL might assess students' perceptions on the quality of their educational institutions', but not on the education itself. According to Oldfield and Baron (2000), student perceptions of service quality in higher education, particularly those elements not directly involved with content and delivery of course units, are researched using a performance-only adaptation of the SERVQUAL research instrument.

However, for an overall higher education quality experience, the delivery of content and course units cannot be ignored, because it includes instructors who actually deliver this service. In order to cover this gap, literature reports the term 'instructional quality', an approach to measure service quality of instructors, content, and course units in higher education. In the literature, instructional quality is known as 'teaching effectiveness' (Marsh, 1982). Teaching effectiveness is "the degree to which one has facilitated student achievement of educational goals" (McKeachie, 1979, p. 385). Marsh's (1982, 1987) presented Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) instrument which measures instructional quality of instructors, content and course units of higher education institutions. The SEEQ is based on nine generic dimensions:

- ***Learning/value of the Course***—challenge to students, value of material, amount of learning, increase in understanding;
- ***Instructors' Enthusiasm***—dynamism, energy, humor, style;
- ***Organization of Presentations and Materials***—use of previews, summaries, clarity of objectives, ease of note-taking, preparation of materials;
- ***Group Interaction***—stimulating discussion, sharing idea/knowledge exchange, asking questions of individual students, asking questions to entire class;
- ***Rapport or Student-teacher Relations***—friendliness toward students, accessibility, interest in students;

- **Breadth of Coverage**—contrasting implications, conceptual level, and giving alternative points of view;
- **Exams/grading**—value of examination feedback, fairness of evaluation procedures, content-validity of tests;
- **Assignments/readings**—educational value of texts, readings;
- **Workload/difficulty**—perceptions of course difficulty, amount of work required, course pace, number of outside assignments.

Therefore, the use of SEEQ model together with SERVQUAL model is recommended by this study and the notion teaching effectiveness can be defined as a 'predictable classroom experience delivered by a good teacher and largely consistent with student expectations' (whatever those expectations might be). Thus, the use of classroom experiences (academic service quality, SEEQ model) together with non-classroom experiences (non-academic service quality, SERVQUAL model) would bring fruitful contribution to higher education research, predicting student satisfaction from a quality perspective for overall educational experience/services.

The original SERVQUAL scale was composed of two sections. The first section contains 22-items for customer expectations of excellent firms in the specific service industry. The second section contains 22-items, which measure consumer perceptions of service performance of an organization being evaluated. The results from the two sections are then compared and used to determine the level of service quality. On the other hand, the original SEEQ instrument was based on 35-items comprising multi-dimensional construct for measuring instructional quality. SEEQ is a valid and reliable source of mean score data used to evaluate instructional quality of over a half-million students. Recent work (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; Marsh & Roche, 1997; Watkins, 1994) demonstrates that student course evaluations are valid measures of instructional effectiveness. In other words, students know what makes for a good educational experience and what makes for a bad one.

As mentioned above, the SERVQUAL instrument has been widely used to measure service quality in various service industries. According to Parasuraman et al. (1991) the concept of expectation has been emphasized as a key variable in the evaluation of service quality. However, Teas (1994) points out that some validity problems arise when customer expectation is used as a comparison standard. For example, expectation is dynamic in nature and may change according to customers' experiences and consumption situations. Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, and Zeithaml (1993) reject the use of expectation as a comparison standard for the measurement of service quality and recommend using performance-only measurement. The negative empirical findings concerning the measurement of expectations led to some doubt about its value. Some scholars maintain that measurement of expectations does not provide unique information for estimating service quality; they argue that performance-only (perceptions, called SERVPERF in the literature) assessment has already taken into account much of this information (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Babakus & Boller, 1992). In general, previous studies would recommend that SERVPERF measurement is sufficient.

Apart from the debate among the above researchers for the merits of disconfirmation-based paradigm over performance-based paradigm and vice versa, it seems, however, that on balance the emerging literature support the performance-based paradigm over the disconfirmation-based paradigm (Cronin & Taylor, 1994). This research bears on these conclusions and adapts the performance-based paradigm and aims to assess the perceived service quality of students and to determine the student satisfaction level in higher education.

Method

Research Design

There are three measures in this study: service quality (non-academic services), instructional quality (academic services), and student satisfaction. Among these measures, *service quality* and *instructional quality* are the multi-dimensional constructs and are independent variables of the study and *student satisfaction* is the dependent variable of the study. The *service quality* construct consists of five dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy, whereas, the *instructional quality* construct consists of nine dimensions: learning values, instructors' enthusiasm, course organization, breadth of coverage, group interaction, individual rapport, exams/grading policies, assignments, and workload difficulty.

Sample

The sample of the study consists of students studying at a private university in North Cyprus. Students were selected according to non-probability convenience sampling method (Aaker, Kumar & Day, 1995).

Participants in the study. The management of the university was informed about the purpose of the study and after permission gained, 500 questionnaires were distributed to students. Of these, 350 questionnaires were returned. In all, 330 questionnaires were found to be useful, which represents 66% response rate from the original sample of 500. The survey was conducted during April-June, 2008.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire was based on only service perceptions. There were 59-items in all—22-items for measuring service quality (non-academic services), based on SERVQUAL scale (adapted from Parasuraman et al., 1991, p. 446-449), and 33-items for measuring instructional quality (academic services), based on SEEQ scale (adapted from Marsh, 1982, p. 90-91) and 4-items for measuring student satisfaction (see table 4 and 5 for survey items). As a result of the pilot study, the instrument was reworded for measuring academic and non-academic perceived service quality for higher education. A five-point Likert scale (Likert et al., 1934) was used for data collection—with '1' being 'strongly disagree' and '5' being 'strongly agree'. Research shows that self-reported performance may lead to response bias. However, a meta-analytic review by Churchill, Ford, Hartley, and Walker (1985) demonstrates that self-report measures do not necessarily lead to response bias. In addition, the survey was prepared according to the back-translation method (McGorry, 2000) for Turkish

Cypriot national students. The survey instrument was applied in English to nationalities other than Turkish.

Data Analysis

SPSS 10.0 for windows was employed in order to access the particular results required for the scales measurement. Descriptive analysis such as means, standard deviation and frequencies were calculated. Reliability of the scale was tested and dimensionality of the scale was confirmed through an exploratory factor analysis. Regression analysis was performed.

Findings and Results

The findings of the study are grouped into three parts. The first part describes the characteristic of the respondents in the sample. The second part presents the reliability and dimensionality issues of the study. The third part presents perceptions of non-academic and academic service quality in higher education and the results of regression analysis.

Demographics of the Respondents

The characteristics of the respondents demonstrated that most of the respondents were males (59.1%). The majority of the respondents were between the ages of 21 and 25 (82.8%). With respect to education, 89.5% of the respondents were the students of undergraduate programs. Respondents' field of study was distributed in thirteen faculties and three schools, among them 15.6% students were from the faculty of engineering. Most of the respondents were in their second year of university education (42.7%). In terms of academic achievement, 30.9% of the students had a CGPA between 3.00-3.49. In terms of respondents' nationality, 28.2% were Turkish Cypriots, and the remaining was categorized as foreigners from various other countries (including Far East Asia, the Middle East, Europe, and Africa). To see whether any of these demographic characteristics have an effect on the non-academic and academic perceived service quality, one-way ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis test (for one independent variable) and factorial ANOVA (for multiple independent variables) analyses were carried out (Nunnally, 1978; Hair, Money, Samouel & Page, 2007). However, analyses did not produce any statistically significant results.

Reliability and Dimensionality of the Measurement Scales

Exploratory factor analysis using varimax rotation was employed to explore the dimensionality in the data set. For both non-academic and academic service quality scales, the results failed to demonstrate their distinct dimensions.

The factor loadings of non-academic service quality dimensions were found to be unidimensional – had eigenvalue greater than 1, explained 45.63% of variance, and all the factor loadings were found to be greater than 0.50 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Grablowsky, 1979) – indicating non-academic service quality to be unidimensional in this study. The Kaiser Meyer-Olkin statistic was found to be 0.78 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was 21503.45 ($p < 0.000$), which is an acceptable level as described by

Norusis (1985). On the other hand, the factor loadings of academic service quality dimensions were also found to be unidimensional—had eigenvalue greater than 1, explained 54.26% of variance, and all the factor loadings were found to be greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 1979)—indicating academic service quality also to be unidimensional in this study. The Kaiser Meyer-Olkin statistic was found to be 0.93 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was 6766.86 ($p < 0.000$).

The Cronbach alphas for non-academic and academic service quality were found to be 0.93 and 0.95 respectively at the aggregate level—which exceeds the minimum standard 0.70 (Churchill, 1979, Nunnally, 1978). When each dimension of non-academic and academic service quality was examined, the Cronbach alphas were also found to be higher than the minimum standard.

In the literature, it has been argued that the nature of the service-quality construct (especially with respect to the number of dimensions) might be industry-specific. In particular, the suitability of the five dimensions of SERVQUAL scale in different service activities has been questioned by several researchers like many times the SERVQUAL scale has been found unidimensional (Angur, Nataraajan & Jahera, 1999; Babakus & Mangold, 1992; Babakus & Boller, 1992) and sometimes with even ten dimensions (Carman, 1990) or two-dimensional (Karatepe & Avci, 2002; Ekinci, Prokopaki & Cobanoglu, 2003; Nadiri & Hussain, 2005). On the other hand, the present study was unable to identify the previous research which has criticised the dimensionality problem of SEEQ scale.

Evaluation Service Quality Values of Students

Non-academic Services. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations with respect to the evaluation of non-academic service quality in higher education. The results demonstrate that the students had a relatively high perception score (mean => 4.25) for 'modern looking equipment', 'physical facilities are visually appealing', 'safe transactions', 'individual attention', and 'convenience of operating hours'. However, there was a relatively low perception score (mean =< 4.15) for 'materials associated with service are visually appealing', 'performs the service right the first time', 'behaviour of employees instils confidence in students', and 'personal attention'. The low perception score(s) in the elements of tangibles, reliability, assurance, and empathy dimensions of non-academic service quality shows the students' sensitive areas, which needs considerable efforts for improvements.

The results in table 1 also show just a reasonable score for student satisfaction (mean = 4.15 and 4.39) in regards to non-academic services. To check whether evaluation non-academic service quality contributed to this score, the data were analyzed by regression analysis. The regression model significantly predicted student satisfaction with non-academic services ($R^2 = 0.63, F = 108.75, p < 0.000$). This analyses also indicated that the dimensions of tangibles ($\beta = 0.30, t = 5.18, p < 0.000$) and empathy ($\beta = 0.51, t = 8.22, p < 0.000$) were statistically significant whereas the dimensions of reliability ($\beta = -0.07, t = -0.97, p > 0.05$), responsiveness ($\beta = 0.09, t = 1.42, p > 0.05$), and assurance ($\beta = 0.03, t = 0.47, p > 0.05$) were statistically insignificant in predicting students' overall satisfaction with non-academic services. According to

the beta and probability values, higher education authorities should give priority to the reliability, responsiveness, and assurance elements of service to influence students' satisfaction in non-academic services.

Table 1
Evaluation of Non-academic Service Quality Values by Students

Dimensions / Items	Perceptions means (SD)
Tangibles	
The university has modern looking equipment.	4.28 (0.82)
The university's physical facilities are visually appealing.	4.28 (0.82)
The university's employees have a neat appearance.	4.19 (0.88)
Materials associated with the service are visually appealing at the university.	4.00 (0.84)
Reliability	
When the university promises to do something by a certain time, it does so.	4.21 (0.79)
When you have a problem, the university shows a sincere interest in solving it.	4.21 (0.91)
The university performs the service right the first time.	4.13 (0.90)
The university provides its services at the time it promises to do so.	4.22 (0.78)
The university insists on error-free records.	4.24 (0.81)
Responsiveness	
Employees of the university tell you exactly when services will be performed.	4.24 (0.82)
Employees of the university give you prompt service.	4.17 (0.86)
Employees of the university are always willing to help you.	4.21 (0.87)
Employees of the university are never too busy to respond to your requests.	4.18 (0.92)
Assurance	
The behavior of employees of the university instills confidence in students.	4.15 (0.89)
You feel safe in your transactions with the university.	4.26 (0.84)
Employees of the university are consistently courteous with you.	4.22 (0.89)
Employees of the university have the knowledge to answer your questions.	4.18 (0.81)
Empathy	
The university gives you individual attention.	4.26 (0.90)
The university has operating hours convenient to all its students.	4.34 (0.78)
The university has employees who give you personal attention.	4.03 (0.78)
The university has your best interest at heart.	4.22 (0.73)

Table 1 Contd.

Dimensions / Items	Perceptions means (SD)
Employees of the university understand your specific needs.	4.23 (0.76)
Non-academic Student Satisfaction with Services	
I am happy from the service quality of the university.	4.15 (0.93)
Overall, I am a satisfied student.	4.39 (0.73)

Note: SD: Standard deviation, all the standard deviations are in parenthesis.

Academic Services. The results in table 2 show that the students had a relatively high respondent perception score (mean => 3.60) for 'proposed objectives agree with those actually taught so you know where the courses are going', 'instructors present point of views other than his/her own when appropriate', 'instructors discuss current developments in subjects', 'you are encouraged to participate in class discussions', 'instructors make students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class', and 'courses' pace is fast'. However, low perception score (mean =< 3.40) was found for 'you are learning something which you consider valuable', 'instructors are dynamic and energetic in conducting the courses', 'Instructors contrast the implications of various theories', 'instructors present the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class', 'you are encouraged to express your own ideas and/or questions?', 'Instructors have a genuine interest in individual students', 'instructors are accessible to students during office hours or after class', and 'examinations/graded materials test course content as emphasized by instructors'.

The low perception score(s) in the elements of learning values, instructors' enthusiasm, breadth of coverage, group interaction, individual rapport and exams/grading policies are dimensions of academic service quality that identify the room for improvements.

The results in table 2 also show just a reasonable score for student satisfaction (mean = 3.81 and 3.90) in regards to academic services. Once again, to check whether evaluation academic service quality contributed to this score, the data were analyzed by regression analysis. The regression model significantly predicted student satisfaction with academic services ($R^2 = 0.58$, $F = 49.87$, $p < 0.000$). This analyses also indicated that the dimensions of instructors' enthusiasm ($\beta = 0.30$, $t = 5.18$, $p < 0.000$), course organization ($\beta = 0.83$, $t = 3.90$, $p < 0.000$), breadth of coverage ($\beta = -0.18$, $t = -2.53$, $p < 0.000$), group interaction ($\beta = 0.24$, $t = 3.43$, $p < 0.000$), individual rapport ($\beta = 0.30$, $t = 3.18$, $p < 0.000$) and assignments ($\beta = 0.34$, $t = 3.01$, $p < 0.000$) were statistically significant whereas the dimensions of learning values ($\beta = -0.07$, $t = -1.15$, $p > 0.05$), exams/grading policies ($\beta = 0.17$, $t = 1.80$, $p > 0.05$), and workload difficulty ($\beta = -0.29$,

$t = -1.41, p>0.05$) were statistically insignificant in predicting students' overall satisfaction with academic services. According to the beta and probability values, higher education authorities should give importance to the learning values, exams/grading policies and workload difficulty elements of service to influence students' satisfaction in academic services.

Table 2
Evaluation of Academic Service Quality Values by Students

Dimensions / Items	Perceptions means (SD)
Learning Values	
You find your courses intellectually challenging and stimulating.	3.53 (1.15)
You are learning something which you consider valuable.	3.39 (1.06)
Your interest in the subjects is increasing.	3.41 (1.12)
You learn and understood the subject materials in classes.	3.46 (1.19)
Instructors' Enthusiasm	
Instructors are enthusiastic about teaching courses.	3.44 (1.06)
Instructors are dynamic and energetic in conducting the courses.	3.19 (1.21)
Instructors enhance presentations with the use of humor.	3.42 (1.26)
Instructors' style of presentation holds your interest during class.	3.49 (1.19)
Course Organization	
Instructors' explanations are always clear.	3.45 (1.07)
Course materials are well prepared and carefully explained.	3.51 (1.04)
Proposed objectives agree with those actually taught so you know where the courses are going.	3.61 (0.93)
Instructors give lectures that facilitate taking notes.	3.49 (1.13)
Breadth of Coverage	
Instructors contrast the implications of various theories.	3.39 (1.30)
Instructors present the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class.	3.25 (1.15)
Instructors present point of views other than his/her own when appropriate.	3.71 (0.94)
Instructors discuss current developments in subjects.	3.72 (0.94)

Table 2 Contd.

Dimensions / Items	Perceptions means (SD)
Group Interaction	
You are encouraged to participate in class discussions.	3.75 (1.14)
You are invited to share their ideas and knowledge.	3.55 (1.05)
You are encouraged to ask questions and are given meaningful answers.	3.52 (1.28)
You are encouraged to express your own ideas and/or questions?	3.25 (1.07)
Individual Rapport	
Instructors are friendly towards individual students.	3.53 (1.05)
Instructors make students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class.	3.62 (1.07)
Instructors have a genuine interest in individual students.	3.30 (1.21)
Instructors are accessible to students during office hours or after class.	3.38 (1.04)
Exams/grading Policies	
Feedback on examinations/graded materials is valuable.	3.44 (1.10)
Methods of evaluating student work are fair and appropriate.	3.48 (1.09)
Examinations/graded materials test course content as emphasized by instructors.	3.25 (1.25)
Assignments	
Required readings / texts are valuable.	3.51 (1.26)
Readings, home-works, etc., contribute to appreciation and understanding of the subject.	3.55 (1.19)
Workload Difficulty	
Courses are difficult.	3.48 (1.09)
Workload of courses is heavy.	3.54 (1.06)
Courses' pace is fast.	3.66 (0.95)
Significant hours per week are required outside of class to study.	3.55 (1.16)
Academic Student Satisfaction with Services	
I am happy from the instructional quality of the university.	3.81 (1.15)
Overall, I am a satisfied student.	3.90 (1.19)

Note: SD: Standard deviation, all the standard deviations are in parenthesis.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has endeavored to highlight the characteristics of students and their evaluation of non-academic and academic service quality in higher education. This study makes two major contributions to the higher education literature. The first one is related to the testing of the modified SERVQUAL and SEEQ scales. The second one is related to the measurement of non-academic and academic service quality in higher education and its implications for the competitiveness of island in the Mediterranean education market.

This study indicates that the measurement of service quality in higher education can reliability be assessed by non-classroom situations (outside class) together with classroom situations (inside class) as non-academic and academic service quality. As competition for students has increased in higher education, student retention has received increased attention. Since service quality and student satisfaction are important factors in retention, it is important that universities measure service quality and use the tools of continuous improvement. Coate (1990) reports that quality is what our customers tell us it is, not what we say it is. Progress can only be determined and improved by measurement. Identifying student perceptions of service quality in higher education allows management to better tailor marketing efforts to ensure that student needs are met. As a result the authorities can recognize, prioritize, and improve areas of service weaknesses and allocate important resources to the most effective areas. Thus, the results from this research may have some significant implications for higher education management and authorities:

- Students are likely to become more demanding in terms of the level of service they consider to be satisfactory. It is obvious from the results that tangibles, empathy, instructors' enthusiasm, course organization, breadth of coverage, group interaction, individual rapport, and assignments dimensions of non-academic and academic service quality are the predictors of student satisfaction in higher education. Higher education authorities should maintain their level of service delivery to keep the students satisfied.
- According to the non-significant beta and probability values found in the results, higher education authorities should give priority to the reliability, responsiveness, assurance, learning values, exams/grading policies, and workload elements of service to influence students' satisfaction for non-academic and academic service quality in higher education.
- For non-academic services, higher education authorities should ensure that employees are well trained and understand the level of service that the university expects to provide for their students. Ensuring that employees are well trained, and paying attention to other factors that are required for the provision of a high level of service quality might incur increased costs, but will result in improved student satisfaction. Thus, authorities are expected to allocate more financial resources for the human resource applications, revealing that recruiting and selecting the most suitable candidates for the vacant posts and training staff permanently that will result in qualified personnel being able to provide students

with caring, individualised attention and convenient operating hours. The allocation of financial resources for the human resource applications will equip employees with a better understanding of service excellence.

- On the other hand, for academic services, higher education authorities must inform instructors to maintain the delivery of instructional service at adequate level of students' expectations.

In general, this study provides higher education service quality researchers useful guidelines for future research that would result in more rigorous theoretical and methodological processes. The terms "student satisfaction" and "quality" have been a central higher education authorities' philosophy, and their importance continues with the promise of a renewed, foreseeable prosperity for the higher education of the future. Nevertheless, higher education research has not, on the whole, developed any substantive theories and innovations. Partial responsibility for this necessity lies in the method driven research traditions of the past. Therefore, using modified SERVQUAL and SEEQ scales with performance-only paradigm, one of the apparent implications of this study turns out to be that higher education authorities should improve their non-academic and academic service levels.

This research has certain limitations, and interpretation of its findings therefore needs to be undertaken with caution. First, the sample in this study is small and is limited to students studying at only a private university. There are total six universities in North Cyprus; other universities should also be included in the sample for further research on service quality in higher education. Second, the concept of 'disconfirmation-based paradigm' (proposed by Parasuraman et al., 1988, afore mentioned), measuring service quality by comparing expectations with perceptions might bring different results (gap theory). Futher, Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1993) contend that expectations can be scaled as 'desired' or 'adequate' and presents the concept of "zone of tolerance" for measuring service quality. An extension of this study based on these concepts might bring fruitful results for measuring higher education services literature. Third, many of the issues in service quality literature remain to be explored—for example, how marketing strategies can be designed to manage perceived service quality and how the higher education sector can use the service quality concept to formulate marketing strategies effectively.

References

- Aaker, D. A., Kumar, V. & Day, G. S. (1995). *Marketing research*. New York: John Wiley.
- Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: three instruments compared. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 29(1), 71-89.
- Angur, M. G., Natarajan, R. & Jahera, J. S. (1999). Service quality in the banking industry: An assessment in a developing economy. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(2), 132-150.
- Avdjieva, M. & Wilson, M. (2002). Exploring the development of quality in higher education. *Managing Service Quality*, 12(6), 372-383.
- Babakus, E. & Mangold, G. W. (1992). Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: An empirical investigation. *Health Services Research*, 26(6), 767-86.
- Babukus, E. & Boller, G. W. (1992). An empirical assessment of SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 24(3), 253-268.
- Bone, P. F. (1995). Word of mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgments. *Journal of Business Research*, 32(3), 213-223.
- Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R. & Zeithaml, V. A. (1993). A dynamic process model of service quality: From expectations to behavioral intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(1), 7-27.
- Brightman, H. J., Elliot, M. & Bhada, Y. (1993). Increasing the effectiveness of student evaluation of instructor data through a factor score comparative report. *Decision Science*, 24(1), 192-199.
- Cameron, K. S. & Tschirhart, M. (1992). Postindustrial environments and organizational effectiveness in colleges & universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(1), 87-108.
- Cannon, J. P. & Sheth, J. N. (1994). Developing a curriculum to enhance teaching of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 16(2), 3-14.
- Carman, J. M. (1990). Consumer perceptions of service quality: An assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Retailing*, 66(1), 33-5.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1990). Conception of school effectiveness and models of school evaluation: A dynamic perspective. *Education Journal*, 18(1), 47-62.
- Churchill, A. G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Churchill, A. G., Ford, N. M., Hartley, S. W., & Walker, O. C. (1985). The determinants of salesperson performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22(2), 103-118.
- Coate, L. E. (1990). Implementing total quality management in a university setting: TQM at Oregon State University. *Journal for Quality and Participation*, 13(6), 90-95.

- Cronin, J. J. & Tayler, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68.
- Cronin, J. J. & Tayler, S. A. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: Reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 125-131.
- Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 41(4), 415-441.
- Ekinci, Y., Prokopaki, P. & Cobanoglu, C. (2003). Service quality in Cretan accommodations: Marketing strategies for the UK holiday market. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 22(1), 47-66.
- Ford, J. B., Joseph, M. & Joseph, B. (1993). Service quality in higher education: A comparison of universities in the United States and New Zealand using SERVQUAL. *Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing: Proceedings of the American Marketing Association Annual Summer Educators' Conference* (75-81). Boston: American Marketing Association.
- Greenwald, A. & Gillmore, G. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1207-1217.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Grablowsky, B.J. (1979). *Multivariate data analysis with readings*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Petroleum Publishing Company.
- Hair, J. F., Money, A. H., Samouel, P. & Page, M. (2007). *Research methods of business*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hampton, G. (1993). Gap analysis of college student satisfaction as a measure of professional service quality. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 9(1), 115-127.
- Harvey, L. (2003). Editorial: Student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 3-20.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Langer, M. F. & Hansen, U. (2001). Modeling and managing student loyalty: An approach based on the concept of relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(4), 331-44.
- Karatepe O. M. & Avci, T. (2002). Measuring service quality in the hotel industry: Evidence from northern Cyprus. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 13(1), 19-32.
- Kotler, P. & Fox, K. F. A. (1985). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. (1967). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning and control*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Li, R. Y. & Kaye, M. (1998). A case study for comparing two service quality measurement approaches in the context of teaching in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2), 103-113.

- Likert, R., Roslow, S. & Murphy, G. A. (1934). A simple and reliable method of scoring the turnstone attitude scales. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 5(1), 228-238.
- Marsh, H. W. & Dunkin, M. J. (1992). Students' evaluation of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In J. Smart (Eds). *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Marsh, H. W. & Roche, L. (1997). Making students evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197.
- Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A reliable, valid and useful instrument for collecting students' evaluations of university teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52(1), 77-95.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for further research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 253-388.
- Mazzarol, T. (1998). Critical success factors for international education marketing. *International Journal of Education Management*, 12(4), 163-175.
- McGorry, S. Y. (2000). Measurement in a cross-cultural environment: Survey translation issues. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(2), 74-81.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. *Academe*, 65(6), 384-397.
- Nadiri, H. & Hussain, K. (2005). Perceptions of service quality in North Cyprus hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6), 469-480.
- Norusis, M. J. (1985). *Advance statistics guide: SPSS X*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- O'Neil, 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.
- Oldfield, B. M. & Baron, S. (2000). Student perceptions of service quality in a UK university business and management faculty. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 8(2), 85-95.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460-469.
- Parasuraman, A. (1986). Customer-orientated organizational culture: A key to successful services marketing. In M. Venkatesan, D. M. Schmalensee, & C. Marshall (Eds). *Creativity in services marketing: What's new, what works, what's developing* (73-7). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L. & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420-450.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml V. A. & Berry L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- 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.
- Patterson, P. G. & Johnson, L. W. (1993). Disconfirmation of expectations and the gap model of service quality: An integrated paradigm. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 6(1), 90-9.
- Rowley, J. (1996). Measuring quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), 237-55.
- Ruby, C. A. (1998). Assessing satisfaction with selected student services using SERVQUAL, a market-driven model of service quality. *NASPA Journal*, 35(4), 331-341.
- Seymour, D. T. (1992). *On Q: Causing quality in higher education*. New York: Macmillan Press.
- Soutar, G. & McNeil, M. (1996). Measuring service quality in a tertiary institution. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(1), 77-82.
- Teas, K. R. (1994). Expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: An assessment of a reassessment. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 132-9.
- Thomas, D. R. E. (1978). Strategy is different in service businesses. *Harvard Business Review*, 56(4), 158-165.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college* (2nd Eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tony, C., Stephen, M. & David, Y. (1994). Strategic planning in higher education: Who are the customer. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(6), 29-36.
- Watkins, D. (1994). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness: A cross-cultural perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(2), 251-266.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A. & Berry, L. L. (1990). *Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L. & Parasuraman, A. (1993). The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(1), 1-12.

Yüksek Öğrenimde Akademik ve Akademik Olmayan Hizmet Kalitesininin Değerlendirilmesi

(Özet)

Problem Durumu: Dünyanın en hızlı genişleyen hizmet sektörü olan yüksek öğrenim öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını karşılayabilmek, onları memnun edebilmek ve sayılarını daha da artırmak için gerekli uygun yöntem ve stratejileri geliştirmelidir. Her ne kadar güncel alanyazın öğrencileri memnun edebilmek için sunulan hizmet kalitesinin artırılması gerektiğini vurgulasa da, yüksek öğrenim kurumlarında hizmet kalitesinin tam olarak nasıl ölçüleceği veya yönetileceği konusunda herhangi bir görüş birliğine varılmış değildir. Algılanan hizmet kalitesi ve öğrenci tatmini arasındaki ilişkinin, hem kavram hem de uygulama alanlarında, geliştirilebilmesi için daha önce yapılan çalışmaların tekrarlanması ve/veya güncel bilgilerin genişletilmesinin gerekliliği tartışılmaktadır. Günümüzde hemen hemen her ülkeden sayısız öğrenci kaliteli bir eğitim hizmeti alabilmek için kendi ülkelerinden başka ülkelere gitmektedirler. Bu bağlamda rekabet üstünlüğünü elde edebilmek için kaliteli hizmetin sağlanması ve bu kalitenin korunmasını sorumluluğu yüksek öğrenim kurumlarına düşmektedir.

Araştırmmanın Amacı: Bu çalışmanın amacı yüksek öğrenimlerini görmekte olan öğrencilerin memnuniyetlerini belirlemek için onların hizmet kalitesi konusunda algılarını ölçmektedir. Çalışma ayrıca, biri eğitim kökenli (SEQ) biri de genel hizmet kökenli (SERVQUAL) olmak üzere, iki farklı hizmet kalitesi modelinin yüksek öğrenim hizmetleri alanında uygulanabilirliklerini ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır. Bu çalışma bağlamında akademik olmayan hizmet kalitesi 'öğrenci işleri, kütüphane, fakülte/bölüm sekreterlikleri, rektörlük, yurtlar birimi, spor ve sağlık gibi idari ve destek birimleri tarafından sunulan hizmetlerle ilgili kalite algılamaları' şeklinde tanımlanırken, akademik hizmet kalitesi 'öğrencilerin öğretim elemanlarının vermekle oldukları dersler ve içerikleriyle alakalı sundukları hizmetlere yönelik kalite algılamaları' olarak tanımlanmıştır.

Araştırmının Yöntemi: Sunulan yüksek hizmet kalitesi bir yandan öğrenci memnuniyetini artırırken diğer yandan da öğrencilerin okullarını başkalarına tavsiye etmelerine neden olur. Eğer hizmet kalitesi artırılmak isteniyorsa, öncelikle güvenilir bir şekilde ölçülüp değerlendirilmesi gerekmektedir. Literatürde yer alan çalışmalar eğitimle ilgili kapsamlı bir sonuca varabilmek için; sınıf dışı aktivitelerin SERVQUAL, sınıf içi aktivitelerin ise SEQ ölçekleri kullanılarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini vurgulamaktadırlar. Bu doğrultuda bu çalışmada kullanılacak yöntem geliştirilirken üç ana boyut belirlenmiştir; akademik olmayan hizmetlerle ilgili 'hizmet kalitesi', 'öğretim kalitesi' ve 'öğrenci memnuniyeti'. Bu boyutlardan hizmet kalitesi ve öğretim kalitesi alt-boyutları olan bağımsız

değişkenler olarak ele alınırken öğrenci memnuniyeti bağımlı değişken olarak incelenmiştir. Hizmet kalitesi boyutu beş değişkenden oluşmaktadır: somut faktörler, güvenilirlik, tepkisellik, güven ve empati. Öğretim kalitesi ise dokuz değişkenden oluşmaktadır: dersin kalitesi, eğitimcisinin coşkusunu, dersin planlanması, grup etkileşimi, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisi, dersin içerik zenginliği, sınavlar/notlandırma, verilen ödevlerin ve kullanılan materyallerin niteliği ve dersin zorluk derecesi. Çalışmanın örneklemi Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde yer alan bir özel üniversitede okuyan 330 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmada betimleyici analizlerden olan ortalama, standart sapma ve frekans değerleri hesaplanmıştır. Çalışmada kullanılan ölçegin güvenilirliği ve boyutluluğu betimleyici faktör analizi kullanılarak test edilip onaylanmıştır. Çalışmada ayrıca kurulan hipotezlerin testi için regresyon analizi yapılmıştır.

Araştırmacıların Bulguları: Betimleyici faktör analizi sonuçlarına göre 'hizmet kalitesi' ve 'öğretim kalitesi' tekli boyut özellikleri göstermişlerdir. Diğer bir deagine, içerdikleri alt değişkenler beklendiği gibi ayırmamışlardır. Yine analiz sonuçlara göre hizmet kalitesine ait ortalama ve standard sapma değerleri eğitimsel kalitedekilere göre yüksek/düşük çıkmıştır. Regresyon analizi sonuçları hizmet kalitesi boyutuna ait olan somut faktörler ve empatinin öğrenci memnuniyetini etkilediğini göstermiştir. Aynı şekilde öğretim kalitesi değişkenlerinden olan; eğitimcisinin coşkusunu, dersin planlanması, dersin içerik zenginliği, grup etkileşimi, öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisi, sınav ve notlandırma değişkenlerinin, öğrenci memnuniyetini etkilediği gözlenmiştir. Bunların dışında kalan hizmet kalitesi ve öğretim kalitesi değişkenlerinin öğrenci memnuniyetini etkilemediği görülmüştür.

Araştırmacıların Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Bu çalışmanın sonuçları 'hizmet kalitesi' ve 'öğretim kalitesi' değişkenlerinin genel olarak yüksek öğrenim kurumlarında hizmet kalitesinin belirlenmesinde yeterli olduğunu göstermiştir. Yüksek öğrenim hizmetlerindeki rekabetin giderek arttığı günümüzde öğrencilerin memnuniyeti büyük önem kazanmıştır. Öğrencilere sunulan genel hizmet kalitesinin ve öğrenci memnuniyetinin onları kurumda tutmak için ne kadar önemli oldukları düşünülürse, yüksek öğrenim kurumlarının sundukları hizmetin kalitesini belirleyip mevcut seviyeyi daha da artırmak için sürekli bir takım önlemler almaları gerekliliği inkar edilemez. Mevcut öğrencilerin genel hizmet kalitesi algılamalarının belirlenmesi kurumların yeni öğrenciler kazanmak için kullandıkları pazarlama faaliyetlerini daha başarılı bir şekilde gerçekleştirebilmelerini sağlayacaktır. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, yüksek öğrenim kurumlarının öğrencilerinin memnuniyet seviyelerini artırmabilmeleri için öncelikle sundukları genel hizmet kalitesini yüksek tutmalarının gerekliliğini bir kez daha ortaya çıkarmaktadır.

Akademik olamayan konular kapsamında; kurumların çalışanlarının iyi yetiştirilmiş olduğunu emin olmaları, özellikle hizmet kalitesinin iyi

bir şekilde sağlanması ve korunması konularında sürekli ve güncel eğitim vermeleri gerekmektedir. Diğer taraftan akademik kalitenin sağlanabilmesi için öğrencilerin öğretim kalitesi konusundaki bekłentilerinin yerine getirilmesi gerekmektedir. Bu çalışmada modifiye edilerek kullanılan SERVQUAL ve SEEQ ölçeklerinin başarılı bir şekilde uygulanması, yüksek öğrenim kurumlarının sundukları genel hizmetlerin kalitesini artırmak için hem akademik (eğitimsel) hem de akademik olmayan (hizmet) kalitelerinin artırılması konusuna önem vermelerinin gerekliliği bir kez daha ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yüksek öğrenim hizmetleri, akademik olmayan hizmetler, akademik hizmetler, hizmet kalitesi, öğrenci memnuniyeti