

Faculty of Foreign Languages Preparatory Department Students' Perceptions of Service Quality and Trust in University*

Yeşim ÇİZMECİ ÖZÇELİK¹, Prof. Dr. Türkan ARGON²

¹Corresponding author, Inst., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, School of Foreign Languages, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3700-7807

²Prof., Dr., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education, Department of Education Sciences, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0744-8647

Email: cizmeci_y@ibu.edu.tr, turkanargon@hotmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research is to determine Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Preparatory Department's students' perceptions of service quality and trust in university. In accordance with this purpose, students' perceptions of service quality and trust in university were determined, and the relationship between service quality and trust in university was examined. According to the results of the research, students' perceptions of service quality were found at over-medium level, and the students' perceptions of trust were found medium-level. When students' perception of service quality was examined based on personal variables, only the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not demonstrated significant difference. The students' perceptions of trust showed significant difference based on birth places of students, age and the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not. There was found a medium level positive directional relationship between students' perception of service quality and students' perceptions of trust.

Key words: Higher education, service quality, trust, university.

Introduction

Universities have important roles and responsibilities today like meeting the need of qualified manpower, leading knowledge and culture flow between generations and contributing to individuals and in total to the societies (Baskan, 2001) and they have the biggest role to educate the manpower who is going to form the future. When missions, responsibilities and functions ascribed to universities are taken into consideration, one can easily notice that universities are more than just teaching-learning environments (Meray, 1971). Being able to be a member of information society, having power and responsibility, being an open communicator, being tolerant to the others, having a vision in life and having a vision for culture and art are just some of the outcomes of a university education (YÖK, 2007). However, universities have a complicated structure, and they need to have some certain features themselves first to be able to serve their recipients in an ideal way. These features are vital because they guarantee universities to function the way they need to be. Thus, universities should take care of the quality of these features to present a satisfactory service.

Service quality

As the world developed fast and became a global village, service quality has become the key factor for organizations to survive and to make a difference among the others. It is a notion whose significance has been valued in the modern world. Service quality is the key for customer satisfaction which means devoted customers in long term. Defined simply, service quality is the ability of giving service which is capable of meeting the customers' expectations (Okumuş and Duygun, 2008). Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985) defined service quality as the difference between expectations of customers and their perceptions of the given service. So, it is obvious that customers have expectations about the service before they receive it, and after the service they check up to what extend their expectations are met. If the expectation is higher than the quality of service, perceived service quality is found low; however, if the expectation is lower than the quality of service, perceived service quality is found high, which means a

satisfactory result for the customer at the end of the process. This proves that expectations of customers are one of the most important elements to determine perception of quality.

Although service quality is affected mostly from the expectations of customers, different kinds of services have other common qualities that need to be taken into consideration while evaluating one. Juran and Gryna (1988) found three common points to ease the evaluation of service quality for different organizations. They said that it is much harder to evaluate service quality than product quality; perception of service quality is a result of the customer's comparison between post-service reality and the personal pre-service expectation, and the customer determine the quality not only by evaluating the last product, but by evaluating the whole process which gives extra value to the way the service given as much as the service itself. As the service quality cannot be separated by certain lines for different sectors, also Parasuraman, Zeithamland Berry (1988) determined 10 sub dimensions of service quality as tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, competency, courtesy, credibility, safety, access, communication and the comprehension of the user. Tangibility is related to physical facilities, equipment, appearance of staff and materials used; reliability means that service is given thoroughly and in the way it is promised; responsiveness refers to the attitudes of the service provider in the process and also to the ideal time limits; competency shows that the service provider has the knowledge, skills and the experience related to the service given; courtesy is related to the service provider and staff who interacts with customers to behave sincerely in a respectful way; credibility means that the organization which gives the service should make the customers feel that their benefits are under protection by the organization, and by this way the organization should create a honest and reliable image; safety is the ability to isolate the customers from the possible risks and dangers during the service; access means that service can be reached easily; communication is the ability of staff to adapt the language according to different customer profiles and comprehension of the user is related to recognize the customer and identify their exclusive needs. First they were determined as 10, but later sub dimensions later were reduced to 5 as tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy. Tangibles refer to physical facilities, equipment and staff; reliability means performing what is promised; responsiveness is about being willing to help customers; assurance means staff to have knowledge and competency and with these two to gain customer's respect and trust; and empathy is about being able to understand customer needs and devote them close attention. With the determination of each sub dimension which focuses on another aspect of service quality, it partially solves the problem of evaluating services upon which criteria for any type of service should be based.

Service quality in university

Measuring service quality needs special treatment as services have common characteristics of perishability, intangibility, variability, and inseparability (Okumuş ve Duygun, 2008). For these reasons, some models were developed to measure quality within the context of services: SERVQUAL Model, Grönroos's Service Quality Model, SERVPERF Model, 4Q Service Quality Model by Gumesson, Synthesized Quality Model, Good and Bad Ring Model and Benchmarking. When all the models are inspected, one can notice that customer is one of the most vital elements in the process. So here, we face the question who the customer is in higher education. For this question Madu and Aheto, Kuei and Winokur (1996) defined two group of customers as internal customer and external customers. While internal customers consist of students, parents and educational staff, external customers consist of society and private sector. Akao (1990) discussed the question in a wider span by centering university in the middle. According to Akao(1990), evaluators for university include three groups as pre-university, during university and post-university. High schools, parents and students make up pre-university group. During university group includes students, educational staff, managers and other staff, and post-university group has business sector as customers of service in universities. This grouping is not very different from Madu's categorization because pre- and post-university group can be counted as external customers, and during university group can refer to internal customers in Madu's model (Mazur, 1996). Owlia and Aspinwall (1996) who study the notion of quality and customer in higher education have a different approach to the question of customer in higher education. They say that the notion of customer in education differs according to different quality elements. They categorized quality dimensions to 6 as tangibles,

competence, attitude, content, delivery and reliability. For tangibles which is related to physical facilities and equipment and for competence which refers to teaching ability of academic staff customers are students and academic staff. For attitude which is related to administrative staff's behaviors and delivery which includes notions like attitudes, objectivity and feedback, customers are students only. For content which includes curriculum, information and skills to be taught and supportive elements, for reliability which is related with keeping promises, complaints and finding solutions for problems customers are students, academic staff and other staff. Kanji and Tambi and Wallace (1999) separated customers into two groups as primary and secondary customers, and they also categorize customers as internal and external. Academic staff and supportive staff for education are categorized as primary internal customers. While students are regarded as secondary internal customers, students again and their parents are classified as secondary external customers. When different models are studied, customers of higher education can be sorted as students, graduates, candidate students, parents, private sector and even governments. Not one type is the only customer for higher education, however; it is easy to see one of them is always among the customers: students. Students are common customers among all different models, so it means that they are the focus point of evaluating service quality in higher education (Özdemir, 2002). What is more, student satisfaction is found highly related to learning (Guolla, 1999), which also emphasizes value of students' view about service quality in higher education.

So, what are effective factors in a student's view of services in a university? In 1982 Endo and Harpel investigated student-academic staff interaction which can affect students' educational satisfaction on a personal, social and intellectual base. Results showed that student-academic staff interaction and helpful academic staff is effective on student satisfaction. It also showed that informal extracurricular interaction is more effective on students than advisory interaction which focuses on lessons. Similarly, Clark, Walker and Keith (2002) found that students who interact more with academic staff about extracurricular issues grow intellectually more, show much effort for their careers and feel more satisfied about their education. Although extracurricular interaction between students and academic staff seems like being more effective than academic staff's advisory approaches, academic staff's performance in the educational process is also very important for student satisfaction. For this reason, Emanuel and Adams (2006) studied dimensions which effects academic staff's performance in lessons. These dimensions are reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles. Reliability is related with motivating students, being prepared for the lessons, showing a good performance in the lessons. Responsiveness refers to the willingness of academic staff to give response to the students' questions. Assurance means academic staff's attitudes towards students. So, a good academician should be consistent, open-minded, flexible and reliable. Being able to understand students and giving value to their opinions is related to empathy, and dimension of tangibles means the novice and creative point of view that the academician provided. Raushi (1993) and Ramos (1993) studied academic consultant as a factor for student satisfaction. If consultant is successful in leading students about academic issues and students' other needs, students feel more satisfied in university. Besides interaction with students, Thomphon (2001) stated that students' satisfaction is also affected by academic achievement. As many different studies suggested, students' satisfaction about university depends on different variables and it is complicated by its own nature.

Trust

Trust in general is the key term for people, groups and organizations to function properly because even if trust is not noticed when it exists, the lack of it leads complete chaos in life (Çubukçu and Tarakçioğlu, 2010). As it is a base term, one may encounter lots of different definitions of trust. Deutsch (1958) define trust as the state of being optimistic about the result of an event even when it depends on someone else. Rotter (1967) calls trust as a person's expectation that the other person will act according to his words. Cook and Wall (1980) stated that trust is about how much one wants to regard the other person as being friendly and how much he wants to conform to the other's acts and words. Buttler and Cantrel (1984) referred trust as the expectation of other party to be precise, adequate, consistent and open. Rempel and Holmes (1986) noticed presence the elements of predictability, reliability and acceptability for trust. Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) defined trust as being volunteer to become vulnerable to other party's actions up to a certain extent. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) stated trust is the positive expectations of each part in risky times. Zaheer, McEvily and Perrone (1998) refer trust as the belief that one will fulfill

his imperatives, act matching his words and be fair even in profitable situations. Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis and Winograd (2000) emphasized that to build trust, one needs to be adequate, open, reliable and these features need to be in compatible with the aims, values and beliefs. To sum up, trust can be defined as the state that one has the belief that he will not get harmed in the situation.

Prerequisites of trust

When different definitions of trust are studied, we encounter some certain sub elements of it. These prerequisites are, risk, uncertainty, expectation and potential of imperial (Erdem, 2003). Risk is the possibility of facing an unexpected result from a person, a group or an organization (Demirdağ, 2015). When it comes to human relations, in each state of trust, risk and suspicion are also present (Terekli, 2010). And by its nature, trust includes taking risks at the same time (Zafer Güneş, 2014). These two notions, trust and risk, are interrelated; when trust necessitates taking risk, taking risk forms a basis for trust (Kalemci Tüzün, 2007). Uncertainty can be defined as the feeling of inadequacy when someone lacks the ability to control a case (Mollering, Bacmann and Lee, 2004). Although a person may feel himself in state of uncertainty in a case, he can take risks about the situation. These two notions, risk and uncertainty together lead to a rise trust (Pearce, Bigley and Branyiczki, 1998). Expectation, when it comes to inter personal relations, is the belief that the other part is adequate and keeps his promises. In organizations, while executives' expectation is the belief that their staff will make their best at their jobs, the staff's expectation is executives to take the responsibility for his position and behave accordingly. Potential of imperial is another prerequisite of trust. With this potential a person accepts the possibility of getting harmed without thinking about controlling the other party. When inter personal relations improve, this situation turns into the belief that one does not take advantage of the other party's weaknesses (Paker, 2009). All these prerequisites together are needed to form trust in personal and organizational level.

Organizational trust

By Baier (1986) organizational trust was defined as the belief that people fulfill their duties thoroughly and do not misuse their power or authority. Mishra (1996) stated that organizational trust consists of the expectancy of each parties being adequate, open, concerned and reliable. Polat and Celep (2008) regarded organizational trust as an element in organizations which consists of inter personal trust and organizational based trust. It facilitates positive interaction between people and groups, and in this way provides a healthy atmosphere in organizations. When many different definitions of trust are considered, saying the least of it, one may say organizational trust is the trust which is felt for organizations (Yılmaz and Sünbül, 2009). Within all different definitions, another attention grabber is some common elements of organizational trust: intra and inter personal trust and trust between groups and trust in organization itself.

When sub dimensions of organizational trust are examined we encounter trust in director, trust in organization and trust in colleagues (Cook and Wall, 1980). Even though they seem like separate notions, these sub dimensions are all interrelated to each other. Trust in director refers that executives to try to have consistency for their words and action in the areas beyond staff's power (Mayer, Davis and Schoorman, 1995). Thus, when executives behave ethically and fairly (Koç and Yazıcıoğlu, 2011), and be sensitive about the issues like knowledge, skill, understanding, protecting staff, they can manage to be trusted (KalemciTüzün, 2007). Apart from these, the most important factors effecting trust in directors are consistency, honesty, participative management approach, communication and concern (Tekingündüz, 2012). Trust in director provides a safe atmosphere for staff, and the lack of it leads to restless staff which effects organizational trust negatively. Trust in organization refers to staff's belief that the organization they are working for is well-grounded, so they feel confident about their future (Afşar, 2013). If executives can build a high-quality communication system and manage to convey the culture, policy and function of the organization, trust in organization develops (Narman, 2012). And when the staff feel supported, regard themselves as a part of the organization, share authority and responsibilities, are rewarded for their commitment and feel in a fair environment that encourage them to take risks, trust in organization rises (Joseph and Winston, 2005). Trust in colleagues develops when staff believe that their colleagues are caring, friendly, helpful, honest to each other and also adequate, fair, faithful to their words and ethical (Yeh, 2007). Trust in colleagues enhances loyalty and positive relationship among the staff

which as a consequence enhances productivity of the organization (Demirdağ, 2015). These sub dimensions of organizational trust abovementioned are interrelated to each other meaning one of them or organizational trust as a whole cannot function properly in the absence of any other one.

Trust in university

By providing a trustworthy environment lots of organizations aim for having loyal customers (Sampio, Perin, Simones and Kleinowski, 2012). And in higher education, although there many different types of customers, the focus is always on students (Madu and others, 1996; Akao, 1990; Çavdar, 1999, Kanji and others, 1999). To ensure loyal customers, trust is a vital factor. That is why in higher education institutes it is very important to have organizational trust (Carvalho and Mota, 2010). Ghosh, Whipple and Bryan (2001) stated that trust in higher education is based upon five factors as specialty, concern, sincerity, openness, sincerity and strength. Specialty refers to university's technical adequacy in its educational field. Concern is about university's friendly attitude; openness includes clarify and interpret complicated issues in higher education. Sincerity means being honest and fulfilling promises, and strength is about university's reaching its goal without losing its ethical approach. In fact, each factor of trust in higher education here meets the needs of the students, and students whose needs are met feel more satisfied and secure, and as a consequent they trust in their university.

Trust is essential for universities to function properly because trust is not only needed in administrative level, but it also plays a role in student-academician interaction which is effective students' academic success in the long term (Lee, 2007). And in trustworthy academic environments, students can take risks, and their creativity, problem solving skills and social skills improves (Sandal, 2014).

Besides academic advantages for students, universities need students who trust them who will be their best advertiser later on. Students who have a positive university life in a trustworthy university will reflect their opinions which candidate students take into consideration while choosing theirs. Only a university which students trust in can reserve its presence and develop in the modern word.

In the light of such information, the aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of the students of Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University School of Foreign Languages Preparatory Department regarding the quality of service quality and trust in university. In this direction, following questions were searched for the survey:

1. What are the students' perceptions of service quality and trust in university?
2. Do students' perceptions of service quality and trust in university demonstrate significant difference based on personal variables?
3. Is there a meaningful relationship between students' perceptions of service quality and trust in university?

Method

The sample of the research was figured with relational survey model and the universe of the study consists of 638 students who study at the preparatory department in Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2015-2016 education year. All students were reached and feedback of 394 students was received. Research data were collected via Personal Information Form, Trust Scale which was developed by Özdoğan and Tüzün (2007) and Service Quality Scale for University which was developed by Bektaş and Ulutürk Akman (2013). Cronbach- α values of Trust Scale was found 0,73 and of Service Quality Scale for University was found 0,91. Mann-Whitney U test, ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis test and Spearman-Rho analysis were used on data analysis.

Findings

Table 1 shows that the students' perception of service quality for higher education and the sub dimensions; administrative aspect, academic aspect of the organization and accessibility are at over-medium level. The other sub dimensions; image of the organization, diploma programs the organization presented and physical opportunities are at medium-level.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for service quality perception in higher education

Scale	Sub dimensions	\bar{X}	(5-likert)	Ss (5-likert)
Service quality scale for university	Administrative aspect of the institute	35,04	3,50	0,72
	Academic aspect of the institute	23,89	3,98	0,68
	Image of the institute	9,40	3,13	0,93
	Accessibility	11,02	3,67	0,81
	Diploma programs the institute presented	9,76	3,25	0,95
	Physical opportunities of the institute	9,01	3,00	0,99
	Total	98,12	3,50	0,59

Table 2 shows that the students' perceptions of trust and its sub dimensions reliability, concern and openness were found medium-level.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for perception of trust in university

Scale	Sub dimensions	\bar{X}	(7-likert)	ss (7-likert)
Trust in university	Reliability	43,44	4,34	0,79
	Concern	13,31	4,43	1,00
	Openness	8,37	4,18	1,06
	Total	65,12	4,34	0,73

The students' perceptions of service quality in university in terms of gender variable did not show significant difference in total and sub dimensions except for physical opportunities institute presents sub dimension which demonstrates male students find physical opportunities institute presents more adequate than female students. In terms of department variable, students' perception of service quality in higher education did not showed significant difference in total and sub dimensions except for accessibility which shows that students studying at sociology find the university less accessible than the ones in other departments. Other variables birth places of students, income level of the family, age, faculty, high school type showed no significant difference in total and in all sub dimensions. Only the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not demonstrated significant difference in total and in all sub dimensions which shows that students who study in their department willingly find the service quality in the institution significantly higher than the ones who do not (Table 3).

Table 3. Man Whitney U Test results for service quality perception based on the condition of studying in the department willingly or not

The condition of studying in the department willingly or not	N	Mean Rank	Sum of orders	U	p

Academic aspect of the institute	Yes	313	207,6	64977,5	9516	0.001*
	No	81	158,49	12837,5		
Accessibility	Yes	313	204,45	63992,5	10501	0.016*
	No	81	170,65	13822,5		
Physical opportunities of the institute	Yes	312	203,66	63542	10558	0.022*
	No	81	171,35	13879		
Diploma programs the institute presented	Yes	313	206,04	64492	10002	0.003*
	No	81	164,48	13323		
Administrative aspect of the institute	Yes	313	205,36	64279	10215	0.007*
	No	81	167,11	113536		
Image of the institute	Yes	313	211,24	66118,5	8375	0.000*
	No	81	144,4	11696,5		
	Yes	313	208,38	65224,5	-3,73	0,000*
	No	81	155,44	12590,5		

*p<.05

The students' perceptions of trust in university didn't demonstrate significant difference based on gender in total and sub dimensions except for reliability which shows that male students find university more reliable than female students. Although students' perceptions of trust in university didn't demonstrate significant difference based on department variable in total, it demonstrated significant difference in all sub dimensions. Based on income level of the family, department, faculty and high school type the students' perceptions of trust in university demonstrated no significant difference. The students' perceptions of trust in university demonstrated significant difference based on birth places of students. According to the findings, students who were born in Mediterranean region trust in their university less than the students who were born in different regions in Turkey. Based on age variable, the students' perceptions of trust in university demonstrated significant difference in total and in reliability sub dimension. Findings show that 19-20 age group trust in the university more and find the university more reliable than the other age groups. And the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not showed significant difference in total and in reliability and openness sub dimensions. Students who study in their department willingly trust in the university more and find the university more reliable and open than the students who do not study in their department willingly (Table 4).

Table 4. Man Whitney U Test results for trust perception based on the condition of studying in the department willingly or not

The condition of studying in the department willingly or not		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Orders	U	p
Reliability	Yes	313	207,47	64938,5	9555	0.001*
	No	81	158,97	12876,5		
Concern	Yes	313	199,02	62293,5	12200	0.600
	No	81	191,62	15521,5		
Openness	Yes	313	204,31	63948	10546	0.018*
	No	81	171,2	13867		

	Yes	313	209,58	65597		
	No	81	150,84	12218	8897	0,000*
Total						

*p<.05

Finally, Table 5 shows that there is a medium level positive directional relationship between students' perception of service quality and students' perceptions of trust.

Table5. Results of Spearman Rho Correlation Analysis for the relationship between the perception of service quality and trust in university

Service quality for university	Reliability	Trust in University		
		Concer n	Openne ss	Trust in university total
Administrative aspect of the institute	,590**	,336**	,295**	,571**
Academic aspect of the institute	,512**	,252**	,235**	,481**
Image of the institute	,462**	,330**	,381**	,494**
Accessibility	,487**	,243**	,247**	,463**
Diploma programs the institute presented	,374**	,153**	,260**	,360**
Physical opportunities of the institute	,327**	,159**	,254**	,326**
Service quality for university total	,653**	,353**	,376**	,637**

**p<0.01

Results, Conclusions and Recommendations

That the students' perception of service quality for higher education were found over-medium level can be interpreted as a positive result to some extent because it shows that students find the service quality in the university above average. Academic aspect of the organization sub dimension has the highest mean among all sub dimensions which means students are most satisfied with the academic services in the university. Similarly, it was found that the most effective factor effecting student satisfaction in university is academic staff in Tayyar and Dilşeker's (2012) study. The reason for this result may originate from students' main goal to start a university: getting academic knowledge. The second highest mean among the sub dimensions belongs to accessibility sub dimension which is related to academic staff again in terms of allocating enough time for students, giving feedback about students' development or being helpful in problematic situations. These findings together show students value academic services most in the university. Physical opportunities in the university have the lowest mean among all sub dimensions. This finding proves that students are not much satisfied with the quality of dormitories and social and academic facilities in the university. Similarly, in Cevher's studies in 2015 and 2016 students have complaints about dormitories, social facilities and sport facilities. And in Altaş's study in 2006 students found physical opportunities of Marmara University inadequate. That the students' perceptions of trust and its sub dimensions reliability, concern and openness were found medium-level shows that students do not trust in the university completely. In Kale's (2013) study which was conducted in six different universities in Turkey, it was found that students' level of trust in academic staff and university administration are medium level. Similarly, Polat and Taştan (2009) found that students' level of trust in the academic staff in Kocaeli University was at medium level. These findings can be interpreted as students in Turkey do not trust in their universities completely. These results may originate from lots of different reasons as trust can be affected by lots of different factors. In terms of personal variables, the students' perception of service quality for higher education showed no significant difference based on gender, birth places of students, income level of the family, age, department, faculty, high school type except for the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not. This finding

shows that being willing for students to study in their department is a determinant for the perception of the service quality in higher education. When students are willing to study in their departments, they perceive service quality higher, which means not the service itself but the students' own thoughts have the strongest effect on perceived service quality. The students' perceptions of trust didn't demonstrate a significant difference based on gender, income level of the family, department, faculty, high school type. However, birth places of students, age and the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not showed significant difference. According to the findings, students who were born in Mediterranean region trust in the university less than the other students who were born in different regions of the country. Mediterranean region is a touristic area in Turkey, and it has a different culture than most of the other regions. So, it may be said that living in a different culture may affect the perception of trust. Age is another determinant in trust in university. 19-20 age group has the highest mean in the study. 19-20 ages are the ideal ages to studying at the university in Turkey. So, the students who belong to this group can be more motivated than the other students, and this state reflects on the perception of trust in university. The last determinant factor in trust in university is the condition of students about studying in their department willingly or not. Students who study in their departments show a higher trust level in the university than the students who do not. This finding shows that willing and motivated students are tend to trust in the university more than the ones who are not so motivated. When the relationship was examined between perceptions of service quality and trust in university, there was found a medium level positive directional relationship between students' perception of service quality and students' perceptions of trust. This finding shows that perceptions service quality and trust in university are interrelated notions. In other words, if a student finds the service quality of the university high, he tends to trust in the university more, or if a student trusts in the university, he finds the service quality of the university higher. In Parasuraman and others'(1985) study it can be seen sub dimensions of service quality are closely related to trust. Another common point for service quality and trust is expectation. In service quality customers have expectations from the organizations and companies, and while evaluating the service quality, the customer uses his expectation as the focus point (Parasuraman and others, 1985; Cronin and Taylor, 1992). In a similar way, there is expectation again in trust. Expectation which is defined as the belief that the other part is adequate and will keep his promise for inter personal trust and defined as the belief that the executives will do their duty properly in organizational trust is one of the prerequisites of trust (Erdem, 2003). So, it can be said that service quality and trust in university are the two interrelated notions which should be treated together.

In accordance with the results, the following suggestions have been developed. Perception of service quality can be checked more frequently to reach desired results, and students can be informed well enough to have realistic expectations about the services a university presents. For candidate students to have an idea about universities and choose the university which meet their needs, some promotional works by introductory films, adverts, workshops, exposition and so on can be organized. And for increasing the students' trust levels in university, student platforms can be formed for students to question and able to get answers about the practices the university implements. Universities should provide an open approach about all implementations, and keep their promises, have a kind, helpful and tolerant approach to the students and inform students properly. For an ideal future in our world, service quality and trust should be taken into consideration seriously by the institutions which have a large share in forming the future.

Acknowledgement

*This study has been produced from the master's graduate thesis completed by Yeşim ÇİZMECİ ÖZÇELİK under the consultancy of Prof. Dr. Türkan ARGON, which was carried out at the Institute of Educational Sciences of Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2018.

References

- Afşar, L. (2013). *Örgütsel Sessizlik ve Örgütsel Güven İlişkisi: Konuya İlişkin Bir Araştırma*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul
- Akao, Y. (1990). *Quality Function Deployment: Integrating Customer Requirements Into Product Design*. New York: Productivity Press.

- Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96(2), 231-260.
- Baskan, G. (2001). Türkiye’de yükseköğretimin gelişimi. *G.Ü. Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21,1 (21-32).
- Bektaş, H., and Ulutürk Akman, S. (2013) Yükseköğretimde hizmet kalitesi ölçęęi: Güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik analizi, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Ekonometri ve İstatistik Dergisi*, 18 (116-133).
- Buttler, J. and Cantrell, R. (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modelling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 558-583.
- Carvalho, S. W. and Mota, M. O. (2010). The role of trust creating value and student loyalty in relational exchanges between higher institution and their students. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 20(1), 145-165.
- Cevher, E. (2015) Yükseköğretimde hizmet kalitesi ve kalite algısının belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8, 39 (804-814).
- Cevher, E. (2016). Hizmet kalitesi açısından üniversitelere yönelik şikayetlerin incelenmesi. *Journal of Yasar University*, 11(43), 163-171.
- Clark, R., Walter, M. and Keith, S. (2002). Experimentally assessing the student impacts of out-of-class communication: Office visits and the student experience. *Journal of Collage Student Development*. 43(6), 824-837.
- Cook, J. and Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53(1), 39-52.
- Cronin, J. J. and Taylor A.S. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal Of Marketing*. 56(3), 55-68.
- Çavdar, E. (2009). Yükseköğretimde hizmet kalitesi unsurları ve bir uygulama. *Niğde Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 2 (2), 100-115.
- Çubukçu, K. And Tarakçıođlu, S. (2010). Örgütsel güven ve bağıllık ilişkisinin otelcilik ve turizm meslek lisesi öğretmenleri üzerinde incelenmesi. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), 57-78.
- Demirdağ, Ş.A. (2015). *Örgütsel Güven ve İş Tatmini Arasındaki İlişki*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. December (1).
- Emanuel, R. and Adams, J. N. (2006). Assessing college student perceptions of instructor customer service via the quality of instructor service to students (QISS) Questionnaire. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 31(5), 535-549.
- Endo, J. and Harpel, R. (1982). The effect of student faculty interaction on students’ educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*. 16(2), 115-136.
- Erdem, F. (2003). *Örgütsel Yaşamda Güven. Sosyal Bilimlerde Güven*. Ankara: Vadi Yayınları
- Ghosh, A., K., Whipple, T., W. and Bryan, G. A. (2001). Student trust and its antecedents in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(3), 322-340.
- Guolla, M. (1999). Assessing the teaching quality to student satisfaction relationships: Applied customer satisfaction research in the classroom. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 7(summer), 87-97.
- Joseph, E. E. and Winston, B. E. (2005). A Correlation of servant leadership, leader trust and organisational trust. *Leadership Organization development Journal*, 26, 6-22.
- Juran, J.M. and Gryna F.M. (Ed). (1988). *Juran’s Quality Control Handbook*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Kale, M. (2013). Perception of collage of education students in Turkey towards organizational justice, trust in administrators, and instructors. *The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 66, 521-533.
- Kalemci Tüzün, İ. (2007). Güven, örgütsel güven ve örgütsel güven modelleri. *Karamanođlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2, 93-118.
- Kanji, G.K., Tambi, A. M. B. A. and Wallace, W. (1999). A comparative study of quality practices in higher education institutions in the US and Malesia. *Total Quality Management*. 10(3), 357-371.
- Koç, H. and Yazıcıođlu, İ. (2011). Yöneticiye duyulan güven ile iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki: kamu ve özel sektör karşılaştırması. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 12(1), 46-57.
- Lee, S. J. (2007). The relations between student-teacher trust relationship and school success in the case of Korean middle schools. *Educational Studies*, 33(2), 209-216.
- Lewicki, R. J. and Bunker, B., B. (1996). Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relationships. R. M. Kramer, T.R. Tyler (Eds.) *Trust in Organizations, Frontiers of Theory and Research* (114-139). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Madu, C., Aheto, J., Kuei, C. H. and Winokur, D. (1996). Adaptation of strategic total quality management philosophy. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*. 13(3), 57-72.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J.H. and Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.

- Mazur, G.H. (1996). *Design a course in total quality management (TQM)*. University of Michigan College of Engineering. Yokohoma: Proceedings of ICQ'96.
- Meray, S.L. (1971). Üniversite kavramları ve modelleri. *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26(1), 13-66.
- Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational Responses to Crisis: The Centrality of Trust. Roderick M., Thomas, T. (Eds.) *Trust in Organizations*(261-278). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mollering, G., Bachman, M. and Lee, S. H. (2004). Introduction: Understanding organizational trust foundations, constellations and issues of operationalization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 556-570.
- Narman, A. (2012). *Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Güvenleri ile Örgütsel Adanmışlıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi: Ümraniye İlçesi Örneği*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Okumuş, A. and Duygun, A. (2008). Eğitim hizmetlerinin pazarlanmasında hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü ve algılanan hizmet kalitesi ile öğrenci memnuniyeti arasındaki ilişki. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 8(2), 17-38.
- Owlia, M.S. and Aspinwall, E.M. (1996). A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 4(2), 12-20.
- Özdemir, S. (2002). Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi. *Kırgızistan- Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 2, 253-270.
- Özdoğan, F. and Tüzün, İ. (2007) Öğrencilerin üniversitelere duydukları güven üzerine bir araştırma. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 2(15), 639-650.
- Paker, N. (2009) *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Güvenleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişki (Sakarya İli Örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A.V., and Berry L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*. 64(1), 12-40.
- Parasuraman, V.A., Zeithaml, V. and Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*. 49(4), 41-50.
- Pearce, J., L., Bigley, G. A. and Branyiczki, I. (1998). Procedural justice as modernism: Placing industrial/organizational psychology in context. *An International Review*, 47, 371- 396.
- Polat, S. and Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 54(2008), 307-331.
- Polat, S. and Taştan, M. (2009). Yüksek öğretim öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarına güven düzeyi ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*. 1C0043, 4(2), 558-574.
- Ramos, M. (1993). *Evaluation, Recognition and Reward of Academic Advising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Raushi, T. (1993). *Developmental Academic Advising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rempel, J. and Holmes, J. (1986). How do I trust thee? *Psychology Today*, February, 1986, 28-34.
- Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale of measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 651-665.
- Sampaio, C. H., Perin, M. G., Simones, C. and Kleinowski, H. (2012). Students' trust value and loyalty. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 22(1), 83-100.
- Sandal, İ. (2014). *Örgütsel Güven ile Verimlilik Arasındaki İlişki*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Türk Hava Kurumu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Shockley- Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. and Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means why it matters?. *Organizational Development Journal*, 18(4), 35-49.
- Tayyar, N. and Dilşeker, F. (2012). Devlet ve vakıf üniversitelerinde hizmet kalitesi ve imajın öğrenci memnuniyetine etkisi. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Bahar 2012, 28, 184-203.
- Tekingündüz, S. (2012). *Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerinde Örgütsel Güven ve İş Tatmininin Etkisinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Alan Çalışması*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Terekli, G. (2010). *Örgütsel Güven Boyutları ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi: Tekstil İşletmesinde Bir Araştırma*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Thompson, M. (2001). Informal student-faculty interaction.: Its relationship to educational gains in science and mathematics among community collage students. *Community Collage Review*. 29(1), 35-57.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YÖK) (2007). Türkiye'nin Yüksek Öğretim Stratejisi. Ankara: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu.

- Yeh, T., J. (2007). *Leadership Behavior, Organizational Trust and Organizational Commitment Among Volunteers in Taiwanese Non-Profit Foundations*.YayımlanmamışDoktoraTezi. University of Incarnate Word, San Antonio, TX.
- Yılmaz, E. AndSünbül, A. M. (2009). Öğretmenlerin yaşam doyumları ve okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyi. *Journal of QafqazUniversity*, 26(2009), 174-179.
- Zafer Güneş, D. (2014). *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Güven ve Kolektif Yeterlik Algıları ile Örgütsel Farkındalık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Zaheer, A., McEvily, B. and Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organizational Science*, 9(2), 141-159.