# STUDENTS' PERCEPTION RELATED TO QUALITY OF UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL TOURIST GUIDANCE EDUCATION[1]

## LİSANS DÜZEYİNDE TURİST REHBERLİĞİ EĞİTİMİ KALİTESİNE İLİŞKİN ÖĞRENCİ ALGILARI

**Saadet Pınar TEMİZKAN[2] - Bircan ERGÜN[3]**

**Abstract**

This study aims to measure the quality of tourist guidance education at the undergraduate level according to the opinions of the students. The Tourist Guidance Education Quality Scale was applied to 916 students from nine universities, selected through multi-stage cluster sampling method. In data analysis, independent samples t-test, one-factor analysis of variance, Tukey test, and descriptive analysis were used. The study reveals that the students' perceptions on program and teaching quality, management and support services, teaching environment, teaching outcomes, and general quality were moderate, and their academic staff's quality perceptions were good. The gender, grade, and academic success of the tourist guide candidates did not show a significant difference on their perceptions of quality. In addition, it was revealed that the candidates' accommodation, career preferences, and ages had a significant difference in their perceptions of quality. This research is expected to serve in quality management practices in tourist guidance education.

**Keywords:** Tourism guidance, Tourism Education, Service Quality, Education Quality

**Öz**

Bu çalışma, öğrencilerin görüşlerine göre lisans düzeyinde turist rehberliği eğitiminin kalitesini ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma kapsamında çok aşamalı küme örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen dokuz üniversiteden 916 öğrenciye Turist Rehberliği Öğretimi Kalite Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde bağımsız örneklem t testi, tek faktörlü varyans analizi, Tukey testi ve betimsel analiz kullanılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda, öğrencilerin müfredat ve öğretim kalitesi, yönetim ve destek hizmetleri, öğretim ortamı, öğretim sonucu kazanımlar konularında ve genel kalite algılarının orta düzeyde, akademik personel kalite algılarının ise iyi düzeyde olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Turist rehberi adaylarının cinsiyetleri, sınıfları ve akademik başarı ortalamaları kalite algıları üzerinde anlamlı bir farklılığa yol açmamıştır. Bunun yanında adayların kaldıkları yer, kariyer tercihleri ve yaşlarının ise kalite algılarında anlamlı farklılık yarattığı ortaya koyulmuştur. Bu araştırmanın turist rehberliği eğitiminde kalite yönetimi uygulamalarına hizmet etmesi beklenmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Turist Rehberliği, Turizm Eğitimi, Hizmet Kalitesi, Eğitim Kalitesi

---

[2] Associate Prof.. , *Osman Gazi University, Faculty of Tourism, Turkey,* sptemizkan@ogu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-8200-9564

[3] *InstructorPhd., Afyon Kocatepe University, School of Foreign Language, Turkey,* bergun@aku.edu.tr, Orcid:0000-0002-8865-023X

## INTRODUCTION

Technological developments and increasing living standards have enabled the development of national and international tourism. People can easily travel around the world, get information about destinations and diversify their holiday options. Countries and businesses compete with other destinations and businesses to get a larger share of the tourism industry. Destinations that provide higher quality service become more advantageous than others. For this, trained personnel have become very important in tourism, which is a service-intensive sector. Many actors in the tourism sector play a role in this sense. Tourist guides are one of these actors. Especially in terms of promotion and image, tourist guides are among the people who affect tourists the most (Değirmencioğlu, 2001: 191).

Tourist guides are at the forefront of the tourism industry. They act as information providers for tourists, and they are representatives of the destination (Rabotic, 2010). Guides are of great importance to the success of a tour, and their service quality directly affects the industry's quality (Zhang & Chow, 2004). The tourism industry, media, and governments have realized that the guide's role is more than welcoming and informing tourists (Dahles, 2002). As frontline professionals, information providers, and translators, guides are representatives and ambassadors of a destination in tourists' eyes (Rabotic, 2010). Based on this, it can be said that the success of the tourism industry depends on tourist guides. The fact that they provide a quality service directly affects tourism quality (Zhang & Chow, 2004).

Tourist guides are the first to be seen by tourist groups coming to a country, which continues throughout the trip. Especially for first-time tourists, the image created by the guide becomes synonymous with the image of the society (Temizkan, 2005). Tourists perceive and interpret the countries they visit with the words and behaviors of the tourist guide. They experience the environment as described by the guide (Dahles, 2002). Besides, tourist guides take part in the use of the destination's resources and the economic and socio-cultural impact of tourism on the local community. As a result, tourist guides also affect the sustainability of destinations (Hu, 2007).

Temizkan (2010) stated that tourist guides who do not convey the correct information will negatively affect the country's image and destination and cause other sectors and areas related to the tourism sector to lose in international competition. The tourism sector is one of the sectors where communication with citizens from foreign countries is the most intense. Therefore, foreign language knowledge is sought in this sector (Hussein, Temizkan, & Temizkan, 2008). Knowing that they need to take cultural differences into account in order to communicate effectively with international tourists, tourist guides and tourist guide academics advocate developing a wide range of communication skills. These skills are; language, motivation, entertainment, dealing with tourists, and dealing with difficult situations (Huang, 2011). As it can be understood from the above definitions, tourist guides should have information about vegetation, animal diversity, geographical location, climate, natural environment, ecosystem, state structure, population, traditions, local dances, languages, architectural structure, important historical events (Hu, 2007).

In Turkey, until 1995, the tourist guide teaching was conducted with the three and six-month courses, organized by the Ministry of Tourism, given to high school or university graduates with foreign language knowledge. Regional guide education was provided with three-month courses and national guide education with six-month courses (Çolakoğlu, Efendi, & Epik, 2010). Starting from 1995, it was aimed to provide tourist guidance education through faculties and colleges. Firstly, in 1997, in Erciyes University Nevşehir School of Tourism and Hotel Management, tourist guidance education was given at associate degree level. Thus, according to the Tourist Guidance Vocational Law enacted in 2012, a different

tourist guidance training system has emerged with the courses offered by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and associate, bachelor's or master's programs of the tourist guidance departments of universities (Yenipınar and Zorkirişçi, 2013; Avcıkurt, Alper and Geyik, 2009).

Quality is one of the most important ways to success. For the service sector, quality is the greatest foundation for competitive advantage. The disappearance of political boundaries and the workforce's easier movement with globalization has led to the concept of teaching quality. It has become more important for universities to improve their teaching quality (Artuner, Uzun, & Ilbars, 2012). Today, beyond being discussed academically, quality measures have become a managerial phenomenon that indicates how organizations ideally regulate their performance (Welsh & Dey, 2002).

Since tourism is a labor-intensive sector, it is necessary to employ qualified personnel to provide quality service (Şenol & Aliyev, 2015). Tourist guides should have a wide variety of knowledge and skills (Tetik, 2006). In this respect, since the tourist guiding profession requires advanced expertise and service quality, education quality must also be high.

There are many models developed for the measurement of service quality. The most well-known models are SERVQUAL and SERVPERF. The main difference between them is that SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988) measures service quality by comparing customer expectations and perceived service quality, while SERVPERF (Cronin & Taylor, 1992) measures only perceived service quality. Since the education sector is also included in the service sector, scales used to measure service quality in education are adapted from these (Güzel, 2006; Eraqi, 2006; Abdullah, 2005; Maksüdünov, Çavuş, & Eleren, 2016). Apart from scales for measuring service quality, scales aiming to measure teaching quality have also been developed. Examples of these scales are CEQ Model, HedPERF Model.

1800

CEQ (Course Experience Questionnaire) was introduced by Ramsden (1991) to measure teaching quality in higher education institutions. This model did not measure all aspects of teaching, such as the preparation of the programs, their timeliness, and the quality of the content. The CEQ scale consists of 30 items and five dimensions. These dimensions are Good Teaching: Teaching staff to be knowledgeable, willing, interested, and accessible; Clear Goals: Clear goals of the institution, curriculum, and courses; Appropriate Workload: The workload that the curriculum and courses require from students; Appropriate Assessment: Instructors' evaluations about the courses; Emphasis on Independence: Choice chance given to students.

The higher education performance (HEdPERF) model was introduced by Abdullah (2006) to measure the service quality in the higher education sector. The reason for the emergence of the model was that previous models viewed teaching only as academic but did not adequately consider non-academic aspects and students as primary stakeholders. A six-factor, a 41-item scale was developed to measure higher education quality. These six factors are non-academic aspects, academic aspects, reputation (professional image), access (accessibility and openness to communication), program issues, understanding (consultancy and health services).

It is possible to come across some studies on teaching quality and service quality in education in the literature. These studies are briefly evaluated below:

Güzel (2006) measured the extent to which student expectations in tourism education were met by using the SERVQUAL model in the study titled "Tourism Education and Service Quality in Higher Education". As a result of the research, it was observed that the satisfaction levels of the students were low. Taşkın and Büyük (2002) measured the quality of educational

services on private tutoring students in their study. In the study, they concluded that there was a significant linear relationship between the perceptions of the students about the quality of the educational service they receive and their opinions about the effect level of the private teaching institution in the university entrance exam. Sakarya (2006) used the SERVQUAL scale to measure the service quality for students in higher education but stated that the dimensions of this scale were insufficient in measuring a complex process such as higher education. Okumuş and Duygun (2008) used a scale by adapting the SERVQUAL scale to measure service quality in marketing education services. In the study, it was concluded that there was a difference between expected service quality and perceived service quality, and there was also a positive relationship between perceived service quality and customer satisfaction.

Li and Kaye (1998) compared SERVQUAL and SERVPERF as two alternatives that can be used to measure service quality in higher education and found that the SERVPERF scale gives better results than the SERVQUAL scale. Senthilkumar and Arulraj (2011) stated that the scales used to measure the service quality of higher education institutions have a very narrow scope and are insufficient to measure students' satisfaction levels with academic and non-academic phenomena.

Maksüdünov, Çavuş and Eleren (2016) developed a scale with the help of SERVPERF and SERVQUAL scale to measure the service quality perceptions of Kyrgyzstan - Turkey Manas University students. They used the dimensions of enthusiasm, reliability, hygiene and environmental cleanliness, physical facilities, ease of transportation, and empathy in their scales. As a result of the study, it was observed that the perceptions of students regarding the quality of service provided were generally above the middle level. At the same time, the dimensions of environmental cleanliness and hygiene were high.

Tayyar and Dilşeker (2012) measured the service quality, image, satisfaction, recommendation, and loyalty levels in their study on students studying at two state universities and one foundation university. As a result of the study, the researchers found that service quality has a multidimensional structure, and these dimensions are physical characteristics, support services, internationalization, academic staff, and non-academic staff. In addition, Küçük, Arslan, and Nur (2018), using the scale developed by Tayyar and Dilşeker (2012) found a positive and strong relationship between the service quality offered by Harran University to its students and their level of satisfaction.

In the study conducted by Bayrak (2007), the expected and perceived service quality of business students studying at universities in Istanbul was investigated. As a result of the research, it was determined that the universities were insufficient to meet the expectations of the students. In a different study, Ayaz and Arakaya (2017) aimed to measure Karabük University Student Affairs Unit's service quality by using the SERVQUAL scale. As a result of the study, they stated that student affairs' service was not sufficient.

Although the authorities set quality standards, the decision of quality is entirely up to the customer. Service quality perceptions vary from person to person. The concept of quality is often ambiguous as it is perceived in various ways. For this reason, an enterprise that will work on quality measurement and development should look from the perspective of the customer (Rahman, 2012). In order to measure and increase the quality of tourist guidance teaching, this situation should be viewed from the perspective of the student. When the literature is examined, there is no study that measures the quality of tourism guidance education at the undergraduate level. The aim of this study is to measure the quality of tourism guidance education at the undergraduate level in Turkey. To this end, a self-evaluation scale was resorted to answer the research questions in the following:

1. What are the quality levels of institutions providing tourist guidance teaching at the undergraduate level according to the opinions of the students?

2. Does the perception of quality measured according to various dimensions in tourist guidance teaching show significant differences according to the gender, grade, accommodation, career preference, age, and academic success of the students?

## METHOD

### Research Design

In measuring the quality of tourism guidance teaching at the undergraduate level, the "Tourist Guidance Teaching Quality Scale" developed for the doctoral thesis was used (Temizkan & Ergün, 2020). The scale prepared according to the Likert-type five-point grading consists of 47 closed-ended statements under five dimensions (Program and Teaching, Academic Staff, Management and Support Services, Teaching Environment and Teaching Outcomes). For the reliability of the whole scale, the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found 0.937. The internal consistency coefficients calculated according to the factors are as follows. The values obtained show that this scale is a reliable measurement tool.

**Table 1:** Internal Consistency Reliability of Factors

| Factors | Cronbach's Alpha | Items |
|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | .940 | 12 |
| Academic Staff Quality | .945 | 11 |
| Management and Support Services | .935 | 10 |
| Teaching Environment | .919 | 8 |
| Teaching Outcomes | .866 | 6 |
| Total | .937 | 47 |

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated for all items, sub-dimensions, and the entire scale. Pearson's correlation coefficients between the sub-dimensions of the scale were significant at the 0.01 level (2-sided).

The quantitative data obtained by applying the scale to a certain sample group. The research is a descriptive field survey using a quantitative method. A quantitative method was selected to obtain data from a large number of students studying in different universities. Descriptive research was deemed appropriate to reveal the existing situation. Quantitative research methods allow the data to be collected numerically to make perceptions or behaviors towards different events, objects, or people observable, measurable, and comparable (Punch, 2011: 6; Kozak, 2015: 61). Descriptive research is a type of research that aims to define a given situation as fully and carefully as possible (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012: 22). Survey studies are conducted on relatively larger samples compared to other types of research, in which participants' views or characteristics such as interests, attitudes, and skills are determined (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012: 177).

### Participants

The population of the study consists of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th-grade students studying undergraduate-level tourism guidance in Turkey. Since there are items about vocational courses in the scale and these courses are mostly given in grade 2 and above, the first graders were not included in the study. About 4000 students study tourism guidance at the undergraduate level in 24 higher education institutions in Turkey. Stratified and cluster-step

sampling technique was used for sampling from this population. The research was applied in 9 institutions. It was applied in Adnan Menderes University, Afyon Kocatepe University, Akdeniz University, Balıkesir University, Batman University, Hacı Bayram Veli University, Mersin University, On Dokuz Mayıs University and Sinop University. The demographic characteristics of the participants were given in table 2.

**Table 2:** Distribution of Participants According to Their Characteristics

| Groups | Number (f) | Percentage (%) | Groups | Number (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 493 | 53,8 | Dormitory | 386 | 42,1 |
| Male | 423 | 46,2 | Home | 442 | 48,3 |
| *Total* | *916* | *100* | Homestay | 88 | 9,6 |
| | | | Total | *916* | *100* |
| 2nd grade | 326 | 35,6 | I want to be a guide | 397 | 43,3 |
| 3rd grade | 342 | 37,3 | I don't want to be a | 206 | 22,5 |
| 4th grade | 248 | 27,1 | guide | 313 | 34,2 |
| *Total* | *916* | *100* | I have not decided yet | *916* | *100* |
| | | | Total | | |
| Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 5,0 | age 19-20 | 239 | 26,1 |
| Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 31,3 | age 21-22 | 429 | 46,8 |
| | 239 | 26,1 | age 23-24 | 171 | 18,7 |
| Average (2.5-3.0) | 181 | 19,8 | Age 25 and over | 47 | 5,1 |
| Good (3.0-3.4) | 34 | 3,7 | Unspecified | 30 | 3,3 |
| Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 129 | 14,1 | Total | *916* | *100* |
| Unspecified | *916* | *100* | | | |
| Total | | | | | |

1803

### Data Collection Instruments and Data Analysis

Questionnaire technique was used to collect data in the study. The questionnaire was conducted between December 2018 and June 2019. A total of 1100 questionnaires were distributed to students, but 916 questionnaires were evaluated and analyzed.

Arithmetic mean ranges in the evaluation of research findings were interpreted as; 1.00-1.80 "Not Agree at All", 1.81-2.60 "Slightly Agree", 2.61-3.40 "Moderately Agree", 3.41- 4.20 "Strongly Agree" and 4.21-5.00 "Completely agree". Independent samples t-test was used for two groups (gender) to compare the participants' views on the quality of tourist guidance teaching. For variables involving more than two groups (age, grade, accommodation, GPA, career preference), one-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. Tukey test, one of the Post-Hoc tests, was used in cases where the variances were equal to determine the difference between the groups with significant differences. The data obtained in the study were analyzed with the SPSS package program.

### FINDINGS

This study aimed to measure the quality of tourist guidance teaching at the undergraduate level according to the opinions of the students. For this purpose, the average and standard deviation values of the tourism guidance teaching quality scale dimensions were given in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Dimensions of Tourism Guidance Teaching Quality

| Dimensions | n | x̄ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | 916 | 3.16 | 0.81 |
| Academic Staff Quality | 916 | 3.66 | 0.77 |
| Management and Support Services | 916 | 3.22 | 0.75 |
| Teaching Environment | 916 | 3.39 | 0.81 |
| Teaching Outcomes | 916 | 3.35 | 0.85 |
| **Total** | **916** | **3.36** | **0.68** |

When the table is examined, it is seen that the academic staff quality is in the range of "strongly agree", while other dimensions were perceived as "Moderately agree". T-test and variance analysis were conducted to determine whether the students' opinions on the quality of tourist guidance teaching differ significantly according to their characteristics.

**Table 4:** Evaluation of the Dimensions of Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Gender

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Gender | N | $\overline{x}$ | Sd | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Female | 493 | 3.13 | 0.79 | 1.03 | 0.30 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.19 | 0.83 | | |
| Academic Staff Quality | Female | 493 | 3.66 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.66 | 0.77 | | |
| Management and Support Services | Female | 493 | 3.21 | 0.75 | 0.52 | 0.60 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.24 | 0.75 | | |
| Teaching Environment | Female | 493 | 3.37 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 0.32 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.42 | 0.79 | | |
| Teaching Outcomes | Female | 493 | 3.34 | 0.86 | 0.63 | 0.52 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.37 | 0.84 | | |
| **Total** | Female | 493 | 3.34 | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.45 |
| | Male | 423 | 3.37 | 0.68 | | |

Table 4 shows the results of the t-test conducted to determine whether the opinions of the participants on the quality of tourist guidance teaching differ significantly according to their gender. According to the t-test results in the table, no significant difference was found between the participants' genders ($p > 0.05$). The results showed that the gender of the students did not affect their perception of teaching quality.

**Table 5:** Evaluation of the Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Grade

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Grade | N | $\overline{x}$ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | 2. grade | 326 | 3.17 | 0.81 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.18 | 0.85 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.10 | 0.74 |
| Academic Staff Quality | 2. grade | 326 | 3.67 | 0.79 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.66 | 0.80 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.64 | 0.69 |
| Management and Support Services | 2. grade | 326 | 3.27 | 0.78 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.24 | 0.73 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.13 | 0.72 |
| Teaching Environment | 2. grade | 326 | 3.41 | 0.85 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.45 | 0.77 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.30 | 0.79 |
| Teaching Outcomes | 2. grade | 326 | 3.38 | 0.86 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.35 | 0.88 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.31 | 0.80 |
| **Total** | 2. grade | 326 | 3.38 | 0.72 |
| | 3. grade | 342 | 3.38 | 0.70 |
| | 4. grade | 248 | 3.30 | 0.61 |

According to the means of the answers in Table 5; the highest mean of 3.67 was seen in the 2nd grade in the academic staff quality dimension. The lowest mean was in the 4th grade, with 3.10 in the program and teaching quality dimension. When the data were examined, it was seen that all grades gave answers at the level of moderately agree on the dimensions of program and teaching quality, management and support services, teaching outcomes, and in general. In terms of academic staff, all grades answered in the range of strongly agree. In contrast, in the teaching environment dimension, 2nd and 3rd grades answered strongly agree, and 4th graders answered moderately agree range. According to the results of variance analysis, no significant difference was found between the participants' grades and the dimensions of tourist guidance teaching. The results show that the grades of the students do not affect their teaching quality perceptions.

**Table 6:** Evaluation of the Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Accommodation

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Accommodation | n | $\overline{x}$ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Dormitory | 386 | 3.20 | 0.80 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.16 | 0.83 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 2.94 | 0.73 |
| Academic Staff Quality | Dormitory | 386 | 3.69 | 0.75 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.65 | 0.77 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 3.56 | 0.79 |
| Management and Support Services | Dormitory | 386 | 3.25 | 0.73 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.23 | 0.75 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 3.08 | 0.80 |
| Teaching Environment | Dormitory | 386 | 3.40 | 0.85 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.40 | 0.78 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 3.32 | 0.78 |
| Teaching Outcomes | Dormitory | 386 | 3.37 | 0.85 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.38 | 0.85 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 3.15 | 0.85 |
| **Total** | Dormitory | 386 | 3.38 | 0.69 |
| | Home | 442 | 3.36 | 0.68 |
| | Homestay | 88 | 3.21 | 0.68 |

1805

According to the means of the answers in Table 6, the highest mean was seen in academic staff quality, with students staying in dormitories with 3.69. The lowest mean was found in homestay students' responses with 2.94 in the dimension of program and teaching quality. When the data were examined, it was seen that all students gave answers at the level of moderately agree on the dimensions of program and teaching quality, management and support services, teaching environment, teaching outcomes. In terms of academic staff, all students answered at a strongly agree level.

**Table 7:** Variance Analysis Results by Accommodation

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Between Groups | 5.010 | 2 | 2.505 | 3.808 | **.023** |
| | Within Groups | 600.509 | 913 | .658 | | |
| | Total | 605.519 | 915 | | | |
| Academic Staff Quality | Between Groups | 1.297 | 2 | .648 | 1.089 | .337 |
| | Within Groups | 543.560 | 913 | .595 | | |
| | Total | 544.857 | 915 | | | |
| Management and Support Services | Between Groups | 2.200 | 2 | 1.100 | 1.939 | .144 |
| | Within Groups | 518.121 | 913 | .567 | | |
| | Total | 520.322 | 915 | | | |
| Teaching Environment | Between Groups | .591 | 2 | .295 | .447 | .640 |
| | Within Groups | 603.936 | 913 | .661 | | |
| | Total | 604.527 | 915 | | | |
| Teaching Outcomes | Between Groups | 3.917 | 2 | 1.958 | 2.685 | .069 |
| | Within Groups | 665.887 | 913 | .729 | | |
| | Total | 669.804 | 915 | | | |
| Total | Between Groups | 2.209 | 2 | 1.105 | 2.335 | .097 |
| | Within Groups | 431.842 | 913 | .473 | | |
| | Total | 434.052 | 915 | | | |

In Table 7, variance analysis results are given for the comparison of the participants' opinions on the quality of tourist guidance teaching according to their accommodation. According to the results of the analysis of variance, a significant difference (p=0.023<0.05) was observed only in the program and teaching quality dimensions.

Tukey multiple comparison analysis was conducted to determine which accommodation variables differ significantly. According to the results, it was determined that the difference between dormitory ($\bar{X}$ = 3.20) and homestay ($\bar{X}$ = 2.94) was significant (p=0.017). Students living in dormitories perceived the quality of program and teaching higher than those living with their families. The results show that the place where students live changes their perception of teaching quality.

**Table 8:** Evaluation of the Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Career Preferences

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Career Preferences | n | $\bar{x}$ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.19 | 0.81 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.10 | 0.84 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.16 | 0.79 |
| Academic Staff Quality | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.72 | 0.77 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.57 | 0.82 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.64 | 0.72 |
| Management and Support Services | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.27 | 0.75 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.13 | 0.80 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.22 | 0.71 |
| Teaching Environment | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.41 | 0.83 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.30 | 0.81 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.43 | 0.77 |
| Teaching Outcomes | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.47 | 0.84 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.18 | 0.89 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.32 | 0.82 |
| **Total** | I want to be a tourist guide | 397 | 3.41 | 0.68 |
| | I don't want to be a tourist guide | 206 | 3.26 | 0.73 |
| | I have not decided yet | 313 | 3.35 | 0.65 |

According to the answers in Table 8, the highest mean of 3.72 was found in the academic staff quality dimension with students who want to work in the guidance profession. The lowest mean was seen among students who did not want to work in the guidance profession with 3.10 in program and teaching quality. When the data were examined, it was seen that all students gave answers at the level of moderately agree on the dimensions of program and teaching quality, management, and support services. In terms of academic staff, all students answered at strongly agree level. In the teaching environment dimension, students who want to do the guidance profession and who have not made a decision yet answered at the level of "Strongly agree", while those who do not want to do the guidance profession answered at the level of "moderately agree". In terms of teaching outcomes and in general, those who want to do the guidance profession answered at the level of ``strongly agree''. The other groups responded at the level of ``moderately agree''.

**Table 9:** Variance Analysis Results by Career Preferences

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Between Groups | 1.029 | 2 | .514 | .777 | .460 |
| | Within Groups | 604.491 | 913 | .662 | | |
| | Total | 605.519 | 915 | | | |
| Academic Staff Quality | Between Groups | 3.241 | 2 | 1.621 | 2.732 | .066 |
| | Within Groups | 541.615 | 913 | .593 | | |
| | Total | 544.857 | 915 | | | |
| Management and Support Services | Between Groups | 2.991 | 2 | 1.495 | 2.639 | .072 |
| | Within Groups | 517.331 | 913 | .567 | | |
| | Total | 520.322 | 915 | | | |
| Teaching Environment | Between Groups | 2.140 | 2 | 1.070 | 1.622 | .198 |
| | Within Groups | 602.387 | 913 | .660 | | |
| | Total | 604.527 | 915 | | | |
| Teaching Outcomes | Between Groups | 11.538 | 2 | 5.769 | 8.002 | **.000** |
| | Within Groups | 658.266 | 913 | .721 | | |
| | Total | 669.804 | 915 | | | |
| Total | Between Groups | 3.281 | 2 | 1.640 | 3.477 | **.031** |
| | Within Groups | 430.771 | 913 | .472 | | |
| | Total | 434.052 | 915 | | | |

Table 9 shows the results of variance analysis for the comparison of the participants' opinions on the quality of tourist guidance teaching according to their career preferences. According to the results of the variance analysis in the table, there was a significant difference between career preferences and the dimension of teaching outcomes (p=0.000>0.05) and also in general (p= 0.031<0.05).

According to the TUKEY multiple comparison analysis results, it was determined that the difference between "I want to be a guide" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.47) and "I do not want to be a guide" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.18) is significant (p=0.000). Students who want to do the guidance profession saw the quality of the teaching outcomes at a higher level than the students who do not want to do the guidance profession. Also, in general, it was observed that there was a significant difference between "I want to be a guide" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.41) and "I do not want to be a guide" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.26) (p=0.023). Likewise, students who want to do the guidance profession see the quality of tourism guidance education higher than students who do not want to do the guidance profession. The results show that the career choices of students affect their perceptions of teaching quality.

**Table 10:** Evaluation of the Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Age Groups of Students

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Age Groups | n | $\overline{x}$ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | 19-20 | 239 | 3.15 | 0.83 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.22 | 0.80 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.00 | 0.79 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.09 | 0.83 |
| Academic Staff Quality | 19-20 | 239 | 3.69 | 0.78 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.69 | 0.74 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.51 | 0.78 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.68 | 0.81 |
| Management and Support Services | 19-20 | 239 | 3.25 | 0.80 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.25 | 0.72 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.08 | 0.78 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.29 | 0.71 |
| Teaching Environment | 19-20 | 239 | 3.43 | 0.83 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.42 | 0.80 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.27 | 0.83 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.20 | 0.75 |
| Teaching Outcomes | 19-20 | 239 | 3.39 | 0.86 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.37 | 0.85 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.26 | 0.84 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.18 | 0.93 |
| **Total** | 19-20 | 239 | 3.38 | 0.71 |
| | 21-22 | 429 | 3.39 | 0.67 |
| | 23-24 | 171 | 3.22 | 0.68 |
| | 25 and over | 47 | 3.29 | 0.68 |

According to Table 10, the highest mean of 3.69 was observed in the academic staff quality dimension with students between the ages of 19-20 and 21-22. The lowest average of 3.00 was seen in program and teaching quality with the 23-24 age group. When the data were examined, it was seen that according to the age groups, all students gave answers at the level of moderately agree in the dimensions of program and teaching quality, management and support services, teaching outcomes, and in general. In terms of academic staff, all students answered at strongly agree level. In terms of teaching environment, students in the 19-20 and 21-22 age groups answered at the level of strongly agree, while students aged 23-24 and 25 and over answered at the level of moderately agree.

**Table 11:** Variance Analysis Results by Age Groups

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Between Groups | 6.210 | 3 | 2.070 | 3.138 | **.025** |
| | Within Groups | 581.763 | 882 | .660 | | |
| | Total | 587.973 | 885 | | | |
| Academic Staff Quality | Between Groups | 4.686 | 3 | 1.562 | 2.643 | **.048** |
| | Within Groups | 521.343 | 882 | .591 | | |
| | Total | 526.029 | 885 | | | |
| Management and Support Services | Between Groups | 4.309 | 3 | 1.436 | 2.518 | .057 |
| | Within Groups | 503.163 | 882 | .570 | | |
| | Total | 507.472 | 885 | | | |
| Teaching Environment | Between Groups | 4.851 | 3 | 1.617 | 2.439 | .063 |
| | Within Groups | 584.837 | 882 | .663 | | |
| | Total | 589.688 | 885 | | | |
| Teaching Outcomes | Between Groups | 3.315 | 3 | 1.105 | 1.499 | .213 |
| | Within Groups | 650.100 | 882 | .737 | | |
| | Total | 653.415 | 885 | | | |
| Total | Between Groups | 3.907 | 3 | 1.302 | 2.745 | **.042** |
| | Within Groups | 418.447 | 882 | .474 | | |
| | Total | 422.354 | 885 | | | |

Table 11 shows the results of variance analysis for the comparison of the participants' opinions on the quality of tourist guidance teaching according to their age groups. According to the results of the variance analysis, there was a significant difference between age groups and the dimensions of the program and teaching quality (p=0,025<0.05) and academic staff quality (p=0,048<0.05) and also in general (p=0,042<0.05).

According to the TUKEY multiple comparison analysis results, it was determined that in terms of the program and teaching quality, the difference between the 21-22 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.22) and the 23-24 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.00) was significant (p=0.014). In terms of academic staff quality, there was also a significant difference between the 21-22 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.69) and the 23-24 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.51) (p=0.041). Students in the 21-22 age group see the quality of the program and teaching and the quality of academic staff at a higher level than students in the 23-24 age group. In addition, in general, a significant difference was found between the 21-22 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.39) and the 23-24 age group ($\bar{X}$ = 3.22) (p=0.035). Likewise, students in the age group 21-22 perceived the quality of tourism guidance teaching at a higher level

than students in the 23-24 age group. The results show that the age of the students affects their perceptions of teaching quality.

**Tablo 12:** Evaluation of the Tourist Guide Teaching Quality According to Academic Success of Students

| Tourist Guiding Teaching Quality Dimensions | Academic Success | n | $\overline{x}$ | Sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program and Teaching Quality | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.17 | 0.92 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.17 | 0.80 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.10 | 0.85 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.12 | 0.79 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.33 | 0.80 |
| Academic Staff Quality | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.60 | 0.86 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.64 | 0.75 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.67 | 0.76 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.62 | 0.77 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.89 | 0.83 |
| Management and Support Services | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.23 | 0.70 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.23 | 0.77 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.22 | 0.75 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.14 | 0.75 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.20 | 0.64 |
| Teaching Environment | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.40 | 0.79 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.39 | 0.79 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.41 | 0.85 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.33 | 0.82 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.45 | 0.71 |
| Teaching Outcomes | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.45 | 0.89 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.39 | 0.83 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.29 | 0.91 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.25 | 0.87 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.68 | 0.73 |
| **General** | Conditional Pass (1.5-1.9) | 46 | 3.37 | 0.74 |
| | Pass (2.0-2.4) | 287 | 3.36 | 0.67 |
| | Average (2.5-3.0) | 239 | 3.34 | 0.72 |
| | Good (3.0-3.4) | 181 | 3.29 | 0.68 |
| | Excellent (3.5-4.0) | 34 | 3.51 | 0.61 |

According to the answers given in Table 12, the highest mean is 3.67 in terms of academic staff quality. The lowest mean of 3.10 is in the program and teaching quality dimension. When the data were examined, it was seen that all students gave answers at the level of moderately agree in the dimensions of program and teaching quality and management and support services. In terms of academic staff, all students answered at strongly agree level. Students with average and excellent academic success answered at strongly agree level in the teaching environment dimension, while other students answered at moderately agree level. At the teaching outcomes, dimension students with conditional pass and excellent academic success answered at strongly agree level while other students responded at the level of moderately agree level. In general, students with excellent academic success responded at the strongly agree level, while the other students answered at moderately agree level.

According to the results of variance analysis, no significant difference was found between the participants' academic success and the dimensions of tourist guidance teaching (p> 0.05). The results show that the academic success of students does not affect their teaching quality perceptions.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When the findings were evaluated in general, it was determined that the tourist guide candidates assessed the quality of tourism guidance teaching at moderately agree level. While the dimensions of program and teaching quality, management and support services quality, teaching environment and learning outcomes were evaluated at moderately agree level, academic staff quality was rated as strongly agree level. In the study conducted by Tayyar and Dilşeker (2012) on state and foundation universities, it was determined that students gave a partially sufficient response in terms of non-academic staff and academic staff. It was concluded that they have a "partially sufficient" and "sufficient" perception in terms of support services. However, students did not report the quality very well in any dimension or statement.

Similarly, in the studies of Güzel (2006), Tayyar and Dilşeker (2012), and Chopra, Chawla and Sharma (2014), it was stated that tourism institutions providing education at higher education level could not meet the expectations of students in terms of service quality. Yousapronpaiboon (2014) found a similar result in his study on undergraduate students and stated that higher education institutions in Thailand could not meet students' service quality expectations, and the service quality could be increased, especially with the applications to be made by the administration. In addition, in the study conducted by Bayrak (2007) to measure students' perceived service quality level in higher education institutions, it was concluded that students expect the service quality of the university where they study to be 60.75% better.

1812

Students perceived the lowest quality in English education. They stated that English education is inadequate in institutions. Similarly, in the studies of Hussein, Temizkan and Temizkan (2008), Gökçe and Batman (2015), Ayaz, Yalı, and Aydın (2017), they stated that foreign language proficiency is one of the most important issues in the sector and the foreign language education received is insufficient for an international career or an academic career.

The other expressions with the lowest quality perceptions were the items related to the curriculum used, the inclusion of practical lessons on the field of tourism guidance, the support of the institution in technical trips, and the adequacy and quality of the food and beverage areas. The low level of opinions on these items shows that students' perceptions about the practice aspect of education are not very positive.

Students perceived the highest level of quality in academic staff. The students stated that the lecturers helped the students. The lecturers who attended the courses were experts in their subjects, had sufficient knowledge and equipment, and effectively communicated. It has been concluded that the quality of academic staff is higher than other dimensions. Tayyar and Dilşeker (2012) stated in their study that the variable that affects satisfaction the most is the quality of academic staff, and they reported that they found this dimension at a partially sufficient level. In Yousapronpaiboon's (2014) study, the lecturers had sufficient knowledge and the highest quality perception.

Considering the gender of the students, no significant difference was found regarding the quality of tourist guidance teaching. The result that gender does not affect the quality of higher education was also seen in the studies conducted by Güzel (2006) and Bayrak (2007). In the study of Maksüdünov, Çavuş and Eleren (2016), it was revealed that there was a difference in favour of female students in terms of service quality. In the study conducted by

Karahan and Kuzu (2014), it was concluded that female students were more satisfied with food and library services than males. In the study conducted by Min and Khoon (2013) in Singapore, it was concluded that female students' perceptions of service quality were lower than male students.

Similarly, no statistically significant difference was found between the participants' grades and the dimensions of tourist guidance teaching. However, even if there was no statistically significant difference at this point, the quality perceptions of the last year students showed a decrease compared to the other grades. The reason for this can be explained by the anxiety of graduating and finding a job. According to the study of Maksüdünov, Çavuş and Eleren (2016), the grade of the students did not affect their service quality perceptions. In the study of Sakarya (2006), a difference was found between the grade of the students and their quality perceptions, and it was found that the satisfaction levels of the second-grade students were higher than the fourth-grade students. A similar result was found in the study of Karahan and Kuzu (2014); second-grade students stated that they were more satisfied with the cafeteria services. On the other hand, in the study conducted by Bayrak (2007), it was revealed that as the grades of students increased, their service quality perception levels also increased.

When the data about students' accommodation choices were examined, it was seen that the students staying at home had the same level of quality perception as the students staying at the dormitory and with their families. However, even if there was no statistically significant difference, the students staying with their families perceived the program and teaching as less quality than the students living in the dormitory. This difference can be explained by the fact that the students staying in the dormitory interact more with other departments' students and thus exchange information with each other on academic issues.

The quality perceptions of the students who want to be a tourist guide were found to be higher than the students who do not want to do the guidance profession in the teaching outcomes dimension and in general. This result is normal, as it is expected that the awareness and responsibility levels of the candidates who want to do the guidance profession are high. After graduation, issues related to finding a job, future goals, and personal development are not interesting for students who do not want to work as a tourist guide. However, the fact that there is no difference in other factors indicates that students have similar thoughts in the teaching process, although their expectations are high after graduation.

When examining the answers of the tourist guide candidates regarding their ages and the quality of tourism guidance teaching, no significant difference was found in the dimensions of management and support services, teaching environment, and teaching outcomes. However, a significant difference was found between the 21-22 age group and the 23-24 age group in terms of program and teaching quality, academic staff quality, and in general. Students in the 21-22 age group stated that they perceive quality higher than those in the 23-24 age group. In the study of Min and Khoon (2013), it was found that the age factor did not affect the perception of service quality in higher education. In Güzel's (2006) study, it was concluded that there was a significant difference only in the assurance dimension from the service quality dimensions, but it did not make a significant difference in other dimensions. In the study by Yousapronpaiboon (2014), it was reported that there was a significant difference between students' ages and service quality dimensions. In the study conducted by Bayrak (2007), it was found that as the age of the students increased, the level of service quality perceptions also increased.

When examining the tourist guide candidates' answers regarding their academic success and the quality of teaching, no significant difference was found. While it was expected that students' perceptions of the quality of teaching differ significantly according to

1813

the academic success variable, not encountering such a difference is an important finding. On the other hand, when the dimensions of the scale were examined, it was noteworthy that the students with excellent academic success perceived the quality of management and support services lower than students with conditional pass, pass and average academic success. Again, the perception average of the students with excellent academic success was higher than the other students. This may be due to the higher meta-cognitive levels of these students. However, it should be kept in mind that this difference was not significant. A similar result was seen in the study by Yousapronpaiboon (2014). According to the study, no significant difference was found between students' academic success and their perception of service quality.

This study has a practical significance, apart from the value it provides to the literature conceptually. This study aimed to determine the quality of the institutions that provide tourism guidance education at the undergraduate level with the students' opinions. Thus, it has been tried to ensure that the relevant institutions are able to identify their deficiencies in terms of quality and make improvements in this regard. Seeing the shortcomings and making improvements can help to increase the quality of the teaching provided. In addition to the scale, more information can be obtained with the use of qualitative research methods together. Moreover, service users in higher education institutions cannot be limited to students only. For this reason, the inclusion of other segments other than students in future researches can provide important information in terms of quality management within the institution.

## REFERENCES

Abdullah, F. (2005). HEdPERF versus SERVPERF: The Quest For Ideal Measuring Instrument Of Service Quality İn Higher Education Sector. *Quality Assurance in Education,* C: 13, No: 4, ss. 305-328.

Abdullah, F. (2006). The Development of HEdPERF: a New Measuring Instrument of Service Quality for the Higher Education Sector. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, C: 30, No: 6, ss. 569-581.

Artuner, G., Uzun, F. and Ilbars, Z. (2012). Works Carried out by Higher Education Institutions for Academic Evaluations and Quality Improvement Studies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* C: 62, ss. 1255-1259.

Avcıkurt, C., Alper, B. and Geyik S. (2009). Education and Training of Tourist Guides in Turkey. *Management and Education*, No: 5, ss. 57-63.

Ayaz, N. and Arakaya, A. (2017). Eğitim Sektöründe Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesi: Öğrenci İşleri Birimi Örneği. *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* C: 7, No: 1, ss. 336-350.

Ayaz, N., Yalı, S. and Aydın, A. (2017). Lisans Düzeyinde Turizm Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin İngilizce Öğrenmedeki Başarısızlık Nedenleri. *Turizm ve Araştırma Dergisi,* C: 6, No: 1, ss. 59-72.

Bayrak, B. (2007). Yükseköğretim Kurumlarından Beklenen Hizmet Kalitesi ve Hizmet Kalitesinin Algılanmasına Yönelik Bir Araştırma. Marmara University, Institute Of Social Sciences. Unpublished Phd Thesis.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. and Demirel F. (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri,* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

1814

Chopra, R., Chawla, M., Sharma, T. (2014). Service Quality in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Management and Education Institutions. Journal of NMIMS Management Review, XXIV, 59-72.

Cronin, J. J. and Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing,* C: 56, No: 3, ss. 55-68.

Çolakoğlu, O. E., Efendi, E. and Epik, F. (2010). *Seyahat İşletmeciliği ve Turizm Rehberliği,* Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Dahles, H. (2002). The Politics of Tour Guiding Image Management in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research,* C: 29, No: 3, ss. 783-800.

Değirmencioğlu, A.Ö. (2001). Türkiye'de Turizm Rehberliği Üzerine bir Araştırma. *Anatolia Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi,* No: 12, ss. 189-196.

Eker, N. and Zengin, B. (2016). Turist Rehberliği Eğitiminin Değerlendirilmesi: Profesyonel Turist Rehberliği Üzerine Bir Uygulama. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* C: 5, No: 4, ss. 65-74.

Eraqi, M. I., (2006). Tourism Services Quality (TourServQual) in Egypt: The Viewpoints of External and Internal Customers. *Benchmarking: An International Journal,* C: 13, No: 4, ss. 469-492.

Gökçe, A. and Batman, O. (2015). Turizm Ön Lisans Programlarında Meslek Amaçlı İnbilizce (EOP) Öğretiminin Öğrenci Görüşlerine Dayalı İhtiyaç Değerlendirmesi. *Paradoks Ekonomi, Sosyoloji ve Politika Dergisi,* C: 11, No: 1, ss. 211-264.

Güzel, N. G.(2006). Yüksek Öğretimde Turizm Eğitimi ve Hizmet Kalitesi. Gazi University, Institute Of Educational Sciences, Unpublished Phd Thesis.

Hu, Wei. (2007). Tour Guides and Sustainable Development: the Case of Hainan, China. University of Waterloo, Unpublished Phd Thesis.

Huang, Y. (2011). Chinese Tour Guides' Strategies in Intercultural Communication—Implications for Language Teaching and Tourism Education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* C: 2, No: 1, ss. 146-150.

Hussein, A. T., Temzikan, S. P. and Temizkan, R. (2008). Turizm Alanında Öğretmenlik Eğitimi Veren Lisans Programlarında Yabancı Dil Eğitimi: Akademisyen ve Öğrencilerin Değerlendirmeleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* No: 1, ss. 102-119.

Karahan, M. and Kuzu, Ö. H. (2014). Yükseköğretimde Kalite Yönetim Sistemi Uygulamalarının Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesi: Meslek Yüksekokulları Örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi,* C: 28, No: 3, ss. 23-41.

Kozak, M. (2015). Bilimsel Araştırma: Tasarım, Yazım ve Yayım Teknikleri. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Küçük, F., Arslan, B. and Nur, E. (2018). Hizmet Kalitesi Algısı ile Memnuniyet Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki: Harran Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Uygulama. *Econharran Harran Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi,* C: 2, No: 2, ss. 40-56.

Li, R. Y., and 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,* C: 4, No: 2, ss. 103-113.

1815

Maksüdünov, A., Çavuş, Ş. and Eleren, A. (2016). Yüksek Öğretimde Öğrencilerin Hizmet Kalitesine Yönelik Algılamaları. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi,* C: 5, No: 4, ss. 65-76.

Min, S. and Khoon, C. C. (2013). Demographic Factors in the Evaluation of Service Quality in Higher Education: International Students' Perspective. *International Review of Management and Business Research,* C: 2, No: 4, ss. 994-1010.

Okumuş, A. and Duygun, A. (2008). Eğitim Hizmetlerinin Pazarlanmasında Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçümü ve Algılanan Hizmet Kalitesi ile Öğrenci Memnuniyeti Arasındaki İlişki. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* C: 8, No: 2, ss. 17-38.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. and Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing,* No: 64, ss. 12-37.

Punch, K. 2011. Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Rabotic, B. (2010). Professional Tourist Guiding: The Importance of Interpretation For Tourist Experiences. *20th Biennial International Congress: New Trends in Tourism and Hotel Management,* Opatija (Croatia).

Rahman, S. (2012). Flourishing Service and Quality in Tourism Education. Centria University of Applied Science, Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Ramsden, P. (1991). A Performance Indicator of Teaching Quality in Higher Education: The Course Experience Questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education,* C: 16, *No:* 2, ss. 129-150.

Resmi Gazete, 2012. *Turist Rehberliği Meslek Kanunu,* (Çevrimiçi) http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2012/06/20120622-2.htm, 30 Mart 2018.

Sakarya, M. C. (2006). Yükseköğretimde Öğrenciye Yönelik Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesi. Akdeniz University, Institute Of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Senthilkumar, N. and Arulraj, A. (2011). SQM-HEI – Determination of Service Quality Measurement of Higher Education in India. *Journal of Modelling in Management, C:* 6, No: 1, ss. 60-78.

Şenol, F. and Aliyev, İ. (2015). Türkiye'de Rus Turist Pazarına Hakim Tur Acentalarında İstihdam Edilen Turist Rehberleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi,* No: 8, ss. 167-181.

Taşkın, E. and Büyük, K. (2002). Hizmet Pazarlaması Açısından Eğitim Hizmetlerinde Kalite (Kütahya'daki Özel Dershane Öğrencileri ile İlgili Bir Saha Araştırması). *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* No: 7, ss. 203-224.

Tayyar, N. and Dilşeker, F. (2012). Devlet Üniversitelerinde Hizmet Kalitesi ve İmajın Öğrenci Memnuniyetine Etkisi. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* No: 28, ss. 194-203.

Temizkan, R. (2005). Turist Rehberlerinin Türkiye İmajını Algılamaları. Mustafa Kemal University, Institute Of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Temizkan, S. P. (2010). Profesyonel Turist Rehberlerinin Turizm Pazarlamasındaki Rolüne Etkisi Açısından Hizmet İçi Eğitim Seminerleri. Gazi University, Institute Of Educaitonal Sciences, Unpublished Phd Thesis.

Temizkan, S. P. and Ergün, B. (2020). Turist Rehberliği Öğretimi Kalite Ölçeği Geliştirilmesi, *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(4): 3720-3739.

Tetik, N. (2006), Türkiye'de Profesyonel Turist Rehberliği ve Müşterilerin Turist Rehberlerinden Beklentilerinin Analizi (Kuşadası Örneği). Balıkesir University, Institute Of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Türkiye Rehberler Birliği (2017). Nasıl Rehber Olunur, (Çevrimiçi) http://www.tureb.org.tr/tr/Page/Detail/75, 13 Kasım 2017.

Welsh, J. F. and Dey, S. (2002). Quality Measurement and Quality Assurance in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* C: 10, No: 1, ss. 17-25.

Yenipınar, U. and Zorkirişci, A. (2013). Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde Turist Rehberliği Eğitimi. *Cag University Journal of Social Sciences,* C: 10, No: 2, ss. 111-136.

Yousapronpaiboon, K. (2014). SERVQUAL: Measuring Higher Education Service Quality in Thailand. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* No: 116, ss. 1088-1095.

Zhang, H. Q. and Chow, I. (2004). Application of Importance-Performance Model in Tour Guides' Performance: Evidence from Mainland Chinese Outbound Visitors in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management,* No: 25, ss. 81-91.