

# Attitudes and Opinions of Associate and Undergraduate Students Towards Applied Kitchen Courses

Osman Çapan<sup>1</sup>, Füsün Esenkal<sup>2</sup>, Samir Abdüzada<sup>3</sup>, Ercan KARAÇAR<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Assistant Doctor, Atatürk University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Recreation Management, 25240 Erzurum, Türkiye. osman.capan@atauni.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3996-1944

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor Doctor, Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University, Erdek Vocational School, Department of Management and Organization, 10500 Balıkesir, Türkiye. fcozeli@bandirma.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9402-1640

<sup>3</sup>Anadolu University, Department of Tourism Management, 26000 Eskişehir, Türkiye. samirislamoglu@gmail.com

**Corresponding Author Ercan KARAÇAR**

Associate Professor Doctor, Sinop University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Recreation Management, 57000 Sinop, Türkiye. ekaracar@sinop.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1124-9667

---

## ABSTRACT

The field of gastronomy offers important opportunities not only as a cultural and artistic discipline in its multidimensional development process, but also in terms of new employment opportunities, technological innovations and economic returns (Akmanoglu, 2025). Gastronomy and culinary arts and cookery education are known as two concepts that have come to the forefront in tourism education in recent years. This study aims to determine the attitudes and opinions of undergraduate and graduate students of gastronomy and culinary arts, food and beverage management and cookery departments towards applied kitchen courses. A quantitative design was adopted in the study and survey techniques were used. Çemrek & Yılmaz (2010) developed a questionnaire consisting of 25 statements in order to determine students' perceptions of applied kitchen courses and this questionnaire was used in the study. In the study, a questionnaire was administered to associate and undergraduate students taking applied kitchen courses across Türkiye. A total of 392 valid questionnaires were obtained between May-June 2025 and the data obtained were subjected to analysis with the SPSS program. As a result of the t test and one-way analysis of variance, no significant difference was found between the program, department, class and gender of the students. In the study, it was concluded that students showed positive attitudes towards applied kitchen courses. However, it was concluded that kitchen courses are important and will be useful in their daily and professional lives, but there is not enough practical training. It is recommended that the study be more comprehensive and repeated.

**Keywords:** Culinary Education, Applied Culinary Courses, Tourism Education, Vocational Education.

**Jel Codes:** L80, L83, L89

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the elements that enable a country to undergo positive social, cultural, and economic changes and to measure the value of these positive changes. Türkiye's economic development is accelerating, particularly due to the ever-expanding globalization of economic life today. It needs well-educated, technically knowledgeable, and talented individuals to keep pace with the changing world order (Göktürk et al., 2013: 1). Education is not only the basic principle of social development, progress and survival in modern countries, but also ensures the quality of life of individuals (Tayfun & Kara, 2008: 104). Education appears to be the primary path for individuals to achieve a high standard of living, achieve social development and progress, and join the ranks of modern nations. In this respect, education represents the process of developing changes in individual behavior; it qualifies the workforce and increases the productivity of labor factors in production (Ünlüönen & Boylu, 2005:160). In all these aspects, education not only brings about desired positive changes in individual behaviors but also increases the efficiency of labor factors in production by equipping the workforce (Sormaz et al., 2020: 210). Vocational training is particularly important in tourism, as it is a service-oriented and labor-intensive sector. The tourism sector, which is gaining increasing importance for countries every day, has recently begun to diversify. Within this diversified tourism, gastronomy tourism holds a special place. Due to its development, gastronomy has earned a special place in tourism under the name "gastronomy tourism."

Recently, tourists have been considering culinary destinations when deciding on their vacation plans and itineraries. Gastronomic assets are a key factor in the tourism industry, distinguishing a destination from other regions and adding economic value to the region (Tekin & Çiğdem, 2015: 975). The development of gastronomic tourism is driven by individuals experiencing food and beverages from different countries and regions during their travels, and visitors' attitudes toward new and diverse flavors are crucial to the success of this process (Türker & Akmanoğlu, 2022).

From this perspective, gastronomy is a phenomenon that enables countries to grow and improve employment opportunities. However, meeting these expectations requires well-educated and qualified personnel (Güdek & Boylu, 2017: 490). Therefore, the importance placed on gastronomy education is increasing daily. To perform good gastronomy and culinary arts, knowledge and training in nutrition, cooking techniques, aesthetics, and culture are essential. To increase the value of Turkish gastronomic culture, educational activities in this field must be of high quality (Öney, 2016: 193). Furthermore, gastronomy education has recently become a topic of interest for young people and educational institutions interested in the field. However, for gastronomy education to be delivered effectively and efficiently, the institutions providing this education must possess the necessary qualifications (Kurnaz et al., 2018a). The purpose of this study is to determine the attitudes and opinions of associate and undergraduate students towards practical culinary courses. For this reason, a study was conducted on associate and undergraduate students of cookery, gastronomy and culinary arts and food and beverage management.

## **2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1. The Concept of Gastronomy**

The word gastronomy is of French origin and is defined by the Turkish Language Association (TDK, 2024) as "an interest in good nutrition" and "a healthy, orderly, pleasant, and delicious cuisine, order, and nutrition system." An examination of the word's etymology reveals that it derives from the Greek words "gastros" (stomach) and "nomas" (relating to knowledge or law). Therefore, gastronomy is defined as the rules and/or norms related to eating and drinking. Furthermore, gastronomy, which deals with the art and science of eating delicious food, is defined in many dictionaries as the art and science of eating delicious food (Santich, 2004: 16).

Gastronomy is a difficult concept to explain and define. Gastronomy encompasses a wide range of interdisciplinary fields, from nutrition science to art, sociology to history. Gastronomy encompasses the preparation, presentation, serving, and consumption of food, and also addresses its nutritional value, cultural, historical, and social dimensions (Özdemir & Altınar, 2019). Gastronomy is defined as the art of selecting, preparing, presenting, and tasting food and beverages, while also being evaluated through its cultural, historical, and social dimensions. This field is not limited solely to cooking skills; rather, it is an area of study associated with various disciplines such as nutrition, health, culture, aesthetics, economics, and tourism (Scarpato, 2002). Gastronomy also plays a significant role in preserving the cultural identities of nations and promoting them on an international level.

The tourism sector is gradually diversifying, and new types of tourism are emerging. Gastronomy tourism is one of the most prominent areas within this diversity. The appeal of local cuisines to tourists highlights gastronomy as both an economic and cultural asset. Today, tourists not only seek natural and historical attractions but also incorporate the gastronomic experiences offered by destinations into their travel plans (Richards, 2012).

### **2.2. Gastronomy Education**

Human beings have an innate connection with food due to their nature and needs. Therefore, research emphasizes the connection between gastronomy and humans (Deveci et al., 2013: 30). Gastronomy is not merely about consuming food and drink for human survival. Gastronomy, a comprehensive subject rooted in human nature and aesthetics, encompasses much more than simply what to eat (Öney, 2016: 193). Despite its broad scope, historical background, and significance, gastronomy is sometimes dismissed as a science. The reason for this is the lack of knowledge in education and the lack of a clear line between practice and theory. However, although it was not previously considered a true field of study, a number of studies have been published in recent years examining the challenges associated with a culinary career. Most of these studies date back to 2000 and later. This demonstrates, as previously mentioned, that gastronomy and related concepts are only just beginning to gain traction in the literature (Md Mubin et al., 2021).

Gastronomy and culinary arts education was just beginning to gain recognition. However, when we look back in time, the first examples of European gastronomic education can be found in palaces. The importance placed on the quality of chefs by rulers like Louis XII and Louis XV ensured the training of those who provided food for the ruling classes of society. Louis XIV, in turn, ensured that schools in the region included a more comprehensive culinary education program. Careme is one of the most important figures in this field. During his lifetime, Careme contributed directly or indirectly to the development of many renowned chefs. In terms of formal education, the gastronomy education diploma awarded by Cornell University in 1922 is one of the first examples of gastronomy education in the world. From the mid-1970s onward, the professions of cooking and culinary arts began to shift away from institutionalism and become increasingly professionally managed. This change brought with it some innovations. The professional takeover of the kitchen paved the way for food technology and necessitated a greater need for professionalism in culinary education. With the strengthening integration of industry and academia, the imperative for students to receive an education that meets market demands is becoming increasingly prominent. In this context, the United States is a leader in modern gastronomy education. Vocational education in Türkiye began with the migration of Turks to Anatolia and the Turkification of the region. During this period, the Ahi organization is known as one of the first educational institutions to provide vocational and technical education (Kılınç, 2012: 63). Secondary school gastronomy education in Türkiye is provided by the Ministry of National Education. The foundations of this level of gastronomy education in Türkiye date back to the 1960s. The establishment of gastronomy education at universities affiliated with the Council of Higher Education dates back to 1997. During these years, Abant İzzet Baysal University was one of the first to offer associate degree gastronomy education. The university began accepting students in the 1998-1999 academic year. Undergraduate courses in gastronomy began to be offered at universities in the 2000s. Yeditepe University's Gastronomy and Culinary Arts program, launched in 2003, represents the first example of undergraduate gastronomy education in Türkiye (Sevim & Görkem, 2016: 975-979).

Gastronomy and culinary arts education is considered within the scope of vocational education. Vocational education refers to the development of personal, physical, intellectual, emotional, social, and economic abilities, and to equipping people in society with the knowledge, skills, and practical application abilities necessary to perform and complete a specific profession. One of the primary goals of vocational education is to train qualified professionals for the sector to which the profession belongs (Aksu & Bucak, 2012: 9).

Gastronomy and culinary arts education is considered a discipline that requires aesthetic knowledge and skills in food science, food preparation, nutrition, and cooking methods. Because it requires both practical processes and theoretical knowledge, gastronomy and culinary arts courses in the kitchen, designed according to professional requirements and taught by experienced instructors, are considered crucial for students' professional competence. Furthermore, to provide students with training that meets the standards required by the industry, the practice kitchen must have equipment and features appropriate to the technology used in the sector. Providing training in a hands-on kitchen with these qualities will positively impact students' learning motivation and contribute to their easier adaptation to the tools and equipment used in the industrial production phase (Çavuşoğlu, 2021: 138).

Gastronomy and culinary arts education aims to train the qualified workforce required by the food and beverage industry. This educational process includes not only theoretical knowledge but also practical courses. In particular, kitchen practices are of critical importance for the development of students' professional skills. However, many studies have identified various limitations in practical courses, such as infrastructure deficiencies, insufficient practice hours, and problems related to materials (Kurnaz et al., 2018b; Öney, 2016).

A review of the literature reveals few studies addressing student attitudes and opinions regarding practical culinary courses. In this context, a review of the literature reveals that the only relevant study on this topic was conducted by Çemrek & Yılmaz in 2010. In their study, Çemrek & Yılmaz (2010) examined the attitudes and opinions of students receiving associate degrees at Afyon Kocatepe University regarding practical culinary courses. While no significant differences were found between students' genders, the study found that there were differences in students' attitudes and opinions toward practical culinary courses based on their educational background and grade point averages.

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1. Purpose and Significance of the Research

The purpose of this study is to determine the attitudes and opinions of associate and undergraduate students regarding applied culinary courses. In this context, the following questions are addressed:

- What are students' opinions about applied culinary courses?
- Do students' opinions about applied culinary courses show a significant difference based on gender?
- Do students' opinions about applied culinary courses show a significant difference based on departments?

The significance of this research is associated with the rapid development of gastronomy, culinary arts, and cookery education in recent years, as well as the increasing demand for qualified labor in the tourism sector. Applied culinary courses enable students to transform their theoretical knowledge into practical skills and improve their professional competencies. Therefore, identifying students' attitudes and perceptions toward these courses provides important feedback for the development of educational programs. Moreover, this study has the potential to contribute to institutions offering education in gastronomy and culinary arts by encouraging them to review their course content, the intensity of practice, and teaching methods.

### **3.2. The Universe and Sample of the Research**

The population of this study consists of students pursuing associate and undergraduate degrees in gastronomy and culinary arts, cookery, and food and beverage management in Türkiye. To this end, an online survey was conducted and students were contacted through social media. The research sample is composed of 392 students. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), for populations larger than 100,000, a sample size of 384 is considered sufficient; therefore, the sample of 392 students in this study can be regarded as adequate.

In this research, the purposive sampling method was adopted, as it enabled the selection of participants most relevant to the aim of the study (Patton, 2015). Moreover, since data were collected through an online survey and students who were most easily accessible were reached, the study also incorporated the convenience sampling. This dual approach allowed the researcher to obtain data efficiently while ensuring that the target population was adequately represented. Purposive sampling is a method in which the researcher selects information-rich units or individuals in line with the purpose of the study. In this approach, the participants included in the sample consist of those who possess the most appropriate characteristics to the research questions and can provide the most information (Patton, 2015). It is particularly preferred in qualitative research. Convenience sampling, on the other hand, is a method in which the researcher includes the individuals who are the easiest and most accessible to reach in the sample. This approach is advantageous in terms of time, cost, and accessibility; however, its power to fully represent the population may be limited (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). It is mostly preferred in quantitative research.

### **3.3. Limitations of the Research**

This study is subject to several limitations. Although the target population comprised students enrolled in practical culinary courses across Türkiye, the sample was restricted to 392 participants, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the data were collected within a specific time frame, between May and June 2025; thus, students' attitudes and perceptions may differ in studies conducted at other periods. The study relied exclusively on the questionnaire developed by Çemrek and Yılmaz (2010), meaning that students' perspectives were assessed solely within the boundaries of the instrument. In addition, the research employed a purely quantitative approach, without the inclusion of qualitative techniques such as interviews or focus groups. This constitutes a further limitation, as it may have constrained the ability to capture students' more nuanced and in-depth views regarding practical culinary courses.

### **3.4. Data Collection Process of the Research**

The study adopted a quantitative design and employed survey techniques. Çemrek & Yılmaz (2010) developed a 25-item survey to determine students' perceptions of practical culinary courses, and this survey was used in this study. This survey form was chosen because it was designed considering vocational tourism education in Türkiye. The form also included demographic variables regarding students' gender, educational status, and the programs and classes they were studying in. A 5-point Likert scale (1=Completely disagree; 5=Completely agree) was used in the survey. A total of 405 surveys were returned. Thirteen of the surveys were deemed invalid and excluded from the analysis. The relevant surveys were administered between May and June 2025. 392 surveys obtained from students were evaluated using the SPSS statistical program. The ethics committee permit required for the

collection of the data used in this study was obtained from the Sinop University Ethics Committee dated 09.05.2025 and numbered 209-310.

#### 4. FINDINGS

This section includes the analysis results of the students' responses to the survey questions regarding the practical kitchen courses.

**Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Scale to Determine Students' Opinions on the Practical Kitchen Course**

Expressions	Factors*			
	1	2	3	4
1. The instructors are supportive and encouraging.	0,652			
2. I can transfer what I learn in the practical culinary courses to my professional life.	0,749			
3. The instructors are experienced in the kitchen.	0,782			
4. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I can understand the kitchen work stages and kitchen operations in the tourism sector.	0,757			
5. I believe that the practical culinary courses have improved some of my life skills.	0,807			
6. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I can/will be able to overcome my anxiety in the kitchen in front of my chefs.	0,728			
7. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I believe I have improved my skills in quality, hygiene, and cost.	0,734			
8. I can apply what I learned in practical kitchen courses to my daily life.	0,796			
9. The attitudes and behaviors of kitchen workers in the industry diminish my interest in my profession.	0,743			
10. Practical kitchen courses are unnecessary.	0,816			
11. The information I learned in practical kitchen courses will not be useful to me in the industry (or in business).		0,733		
12. The time allocated for practical kitchen courses is insufficient.		0,717		
13. The time allocated for practical kitchen courses is too long.		0,753		
14. I think I will be able to adapt easily when I start working in the kitchen department in the industry.		0,737		
15. Practical kitchen courses have alienated me from my profession.			0,771	
16. I'm looking for ways to avoid practical culinary classes.			0,582	
17. What I learn in practical culinary classes differs from industry culinary practices.			0,587	
18. I'm bored with the observations I make in practical culinary classes (or my instructors' observations).			0,794	
19. I'm looking for ways to avoid practical culinary classes.			0,653	
20. I've grown to love my profession thanks to practical culinary classes.			0,675	
21. Some of my culinary skills are also improving thanks to practical culinary classes.				0,587
22. I think practical culinary classes are necessary.				0,698
23. I believe I've gained work experience in the kitchen thanks to practical culinary classes.				0,815
24. I think I've improved thanks to practical culinary classes.				0,731
25. I like the way our instructors approach us in practical culinary classes.				0,638
<b>Eigenvalue</b>	4,635	4,055	2,673	1,482

Variance Explanation Rate (%)	23,149	20,352	12,857	7,376
Total Variance Explanation Rate (%)	62,719			
Factor-Related Reliability Level	0,879	0,895	0,861	0,852
Overall Reliability Level	0,871			

According to Table 1, the first 10 items constitute the efficiency dimension, items 11-14 constitute the contribution to development, items 15-20 constitute the adaptation dimension, and items 21-25 constitute the necessity dimension. When the reliabilities of the four factors constituting the scale are evaluated, it is seen that the efficiency factor is 0,879, the contribution to development factor is 0,895, the adaptation factor is 0,861, and the necessity factor is 0,852. The ranges within which the reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) coefficient can be found and the reliability status of the scale are as follows; if " $0,61 < \alpha < 0,80$ ", the scale is considered highly reliable, and if " $0,81 < \alpha < 1,00$ ", the scale is considered highly reliable (İslamoğlu, 2014: 283). In this context, it can be said that the scale is highly reliable.

**Table 2. Information on Demographic and Other Individual Characteristics of Participants**

Variable	Category	f	%
Gender	Male	168	42.9
	Female	224	57.1
Educational Status	Associate's Degree	127	32.4
	Undergraduate	265	67.6
Department	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	161	41
	Cookery Department	149	38
	Food and Beverage Management	82	21
Grade	1st Grade	35	8.7
	2nd Grade	145	37.1
	3rd Grade	134	34.3
	4th Grade	78	20

Table 2 shows that %42,9 (f=168) of the participants were male and %57,1 (f=224) were female. When the distribution of the participants by educational background was examined, it was seen that %32,4 (f=127) had an associate degree, and %67,6 (f=265) were undergraduate students. When the distribution of the research group by department was examined, it was seen that 41% (f=161) were studying in Gastronomy and culinary arts, 38% (f=149) in Cookery, and 21% (f=82) in Food and Beverage Processing. When the distribution of the participants by grade was examined, it was seen that %8,7 (f=35) were in their first year, %37,1 (f=145) were in their second year, %34,3 (f=134) were in their third year, and %20 (f=78) were in their fourth year.

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the answers given to the research questions in the survey given to the participants are given in Table 3.

**Table 3. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Responses to Questions**

Expressions	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. The instructors are supportive and encouraging.	3,49	1,07
2. I can transfer what I learn in the practical culinary courses to my professional life.	3,12	1,21
3. The instructors are experienced in the kitchen.	3,85	1,16
4. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I can understand the kitchen work stages and kitchen operations in the tourism sector.	3,75	1,14
5. I believe that the practical culinary courses have improved some of my life skills.	3,91	1,13
6. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I can/will be able to overcome my anxiety in the kitchen in front of my chefs.	3,96	1,04
7. Thanks to the practical culinary courses, I believe I have improved my skills in quality, hygiene, and cost.	3,98	1,07
8. I can apply what I learned in practical kitchen courses to my daily life.	3,32	1,20

9. The attitudes and behaviors of kitchen workers in the industry diminish my interest in my profession.	2,15	1,01
10. Practical kitchen courses are unnecessary.	1,98	1,11
11. The information I learned in practical kitchen courses will not be useful to me in the industry (or in business).	2,01	1,25
12. The time allocated for practical kitchen courses is insufficient.	3,36	1,17
13. The time allocated for practical kitchen courses is too long.	2,96	1,03
14. I think I will be able to adapt easily when I start working in the kitchen department in the industry.	3,29	1,18
15. Practical kitchen courses have alienated me from my profession.	2,49	1,23
16. I'm looking for ways to avoid practical culinary classes.	2,17	1,07
17. What I learn in practical culinary classes differs from industry culinary practices.	3,15	1,26
18. I'm bored with the observations I make in practical culinary classes (or my instructors' observations).	2,73	1,47
19. I'm looking for ways to avoid practical culinary classes.	2,17	1,07
20. I've grown to love my profession thanks to practical culinary classes.	3,99	0,94
21. Some of my culinary skills are also improving thanks to practical culinary classes.	3,49	1,01
22. I think practical culinary classes are necessary.	3,85	0,99
23. I believe I've gained work experience in the kitchen thanks to practical culinary classes.	3,55	1,11
24. I think I've improved thanks to practical culinary classes.	4,13	0,89
25. I like the way our instructors approach us in practical culinary classes.	4,29	0,85

An examination of Table 3 reveals that participants' opinions about practical culinary courses are positive. The study concludes that students are satisfied with the practical culinary courses, consider them necessary, and benefit from them in their daily lives and in their future lives. The study also concludes that students consider the hours in practical culinary courses insufficient.

Independent samples t-tests were used for bivariate groups (gender, education level) to compare the scale based on demographic and other individual characteristics. The results of the t-test used to measure differences in the scale by gender are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. Comparison of Scales by Gender**

Scale Dimensions	Gender	n	X̄	s.d.	t	p
Efficiency	Male	168	2,94	0,93	0,907	0,365
	Female	224	2,85	0,82		
Contribution to Development	Male	168	3,71	0,72	0,575	0,566
	Female	224	3,76	0,81		
Adaptation	Male	168	4,18	0,66	1,003	0,317
	Female	224	4,10	0,76		
Necessity	Male	168	3,37	0,84	2,343	0,217
	Female	224	3,84	1,11		

\*\*\*p<0,001 \*\*p<0,01 \*p<0,05

Table 4 presents the results of a t-test to compare the scale dimensions by gender. The table reveals that the responses for the dimensions of efficiency, contribution to development, adaptation, and necessity are identical and close to each other. Because the responses given by the participants were similar, the analysis results were not significantly different (p>0,05). In short, it can be concluded that gender did not have a significant impact on any of the scale dimensions.

The results of the t-test used to measure differences in the scale according to educational status are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Comparison of Scales by Educational Status**

Dimensions	Age Groups	n	X̄	s.d.	F	p
------------	------------	---	----	------	---	---

Efficiency	Associate's Degree	168	2,74	0,84	0,822	0,297
	Undergraduate	224	2,24	0,89		
Contribution to Development	Associate's Degree	168	3,58	0,81	2,905	0,325
	Undergraduate	224	3,48	0,72		
Adaptation	Associate's Degree	168	3,79	0,79	3,556	0,214
	Undergraduate	224	4,21	0,66		
Necessity	Associate's Degree	168	3,14	0,97	3,568	0,343
	Undergraduate	224	3,96	0,92		

\*\*\*p<0,001 \*\*p<0,01 \*p<0,05

Table 5 presents the results of a t-test to compare the scale dimensions by educational background. The table reveals that the responses for the dimensions of efficiency, contribution to development, adaptation, and necessity are identical and close to each other. Because the responses given by the participants were similar, the analysis results were not significantly different ( $p>0,05$ ). In short, it can be concluded that educational background has no significant impact on any of the scale dimensions.

The results of one-way analysis of variance used to measure differences among students according to their departments on the scale are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6. Comparison of Scales According to Education Departments**

Dimensions	Groups	n	X̄	s.d.	F	p
Efficiency	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	161	2,98	0,71	2,45	0,051
	Cookery Department	149	2,65	0,87		
	Food and Beverage Management	82	2,63	0,95		
Contribution to Development	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	161	3,76	0,72	2,702	0,281
	Cookery Department	149	3,66	0,79		
	Food and Beverage Management	82	3,98	0,94		
Adaptation	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	161	4,08	0,67	2,873	0,682
	Cookery Department	149	4,04	0,66		
	Food and Beverage Management	82	4,24	0,65		
Necessity	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	161	3,85	0,81	2,640	0,545
	Cookery Department	149	3,24	0,96		
	Food and Beverage Management	82	3,65	0,92		

\*\*\*p<0,001 \*\*p<0,01 \*p<0,05

Table 6 presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance to compare the scale dimensions according to students' departments. The table reveals that the responses for the dimensions of efficiency, contribution to development, adaptation, and necessity are identical and close to each other. Because the responses given by the participants were close to each other, the analysis results were not significantly different ( $p>0,05$ ). In short, it can be concluded that the students' departments did not have a significant impact on any of the scale dimensions.

The results of one-way analysis of variance used to measure differences among students according to their departments on the scale are shown in Table 7.



**Table 7. Comparison of Scales According to the Classes They Received Education**

Dimensions	Groups	n	X̄	s.d.	F	p
<b>Efficiency</b>	1st Grade	30	35	1,11	2,143	0,071
	2nd Grade	128	145	1,03		
	3rd Grade	83	134	1,02		
	4th Grade	46	78	0,86		
<b>Contribution to Development</b>	1st Grade	30	35	1,08	2,501	0,069
	2nd Grade	128	145	0,99		
	3rd Grade	83	134	0,95		
	4th Grade	46	78	0,83		
<b>Adaptation</b>	1st Grade	30	35	1,07	2,873	0,079
	2nd Grade	128	145	1,22		
	3rd Grade	83	134	1,07		
	4th Grade	46	78	0,94		
<b>Necessity</b>	1st Grade	30	35	1,04	2,651	0,123
	2nd Grade	128	145	1,23		
	3rd Grade	83	134	1,15		
	4th Grade	46	78	1,03		

\*\*\*p<0,001 \*\*p<0,01 \*p<0,05

Table 7 presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance to compare the scale dimensions across grades. The table reveals that the responses for the dimensions of efficiency, contribution to development, adaptation, and necessity are identical and close to each other. Because the responses given by the participants were close to each other, the analysis results were not significantly different ( $p>0,05$ ). In short, it can be concluded that the students' grades did not have a significant impact on any of the scale dimensions.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Gastronomy is fundamentally defined as an interdisciplinary field that examines the scientific and artistic aspects of quality food and beverage culture. In recent years, reflecting global developments in this field, interest in gastronomy has been significantly increasing in Türkiye. This momentum has paved the way for the institutionalization of gastronomy education and the establishment of new programs at the higher education level. The increase in the number of gastronomy departments has led to a parallel rise in student demand. Today, gastronomy is emerging not only as a professional orientation but also as an academic specialization. In this context, many students prioritize gastronomy in their career planning and participate in various training and certification programs to enhance their competencies in this field. Consequently, gastronomy is becoming a field of study that attracts attention and students' attention with its interdisciplinary nature in the contemporary higher education system (Kurnaz et al., 2018a).

This study aims to determine the attitudes and opinions of associate and undergraduate students taking practical culinary courses across Türkiye. A nationwide survey was conducted, and a sample survey developed by Çemrek and Yılmaz (2010) was administered to students. A sample online survey was sent to students who did not use a sampling method. A total of 405 surveys were returned. Thirteen of the surveys were deemed invalid and excluded from the analysis. The remaining 392 surveys were analyzed using the SPSS statistical program.

According to the results of a t-test conducted on male and female students in practical culinary courses, no significant difference was found between male and female students. Another t-test revealed no significant difference between undergraduate and associate degree students based on their educational background. According to the results of a one-way analysis of variance conducted as part of the study, no significant difference was found in terms of the students' programs and grades.

Furthermore, students' responses to the scale indicate that they value practical culinary courses, believe them to be valuable, and believe they will be beneficial in their daily lives and future careers. Students also believe that the number of hours in practical culinary courses is insufficient. Therefore, it is recommended that both associate and undergraduate curricula be expanded or updated to include more practical courses. It is also recommended that the number of practical courses added to the curriculum be both numerous and sufficient.

The research suggests that practical culinary courses can be improved by considering student feedback during curriculum development. It is recommended that a training and education committee be established, including other institutions (universities) offering training in this field, to develop a corresponding curriculum. Furthermore, developing a different and more comprehensive scale could yield more diverse results. It is important to replicate this study with different student groups in the future. It is hoped that the results of this study will be shared with public institutions and organizations, contributing to the development of curricula.

## 6. DECLARATION

All authors contributed equally to the manuscript. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. The research permission required for data collection was obtained by the Sinop University Human Research Ethics Committee with the decision dated 09/05/2025 and meeting numbered 2025/299.

## 7. REFERENCE

1. Akmanoğlu, E. (2025). Gastronomide Dijital Pazarlamanın Rolü: Müşteri Deneyimini Şekillendiren Yeni Trendler. *Dijital Pazarlama Çalışmaları*, Gaziantep: Özgür Yayınları.
2. Aksu, M., & Bucak, T. (2012). Mesleki Turizm Eğitimi. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 7-18.
3. Çavuşoğlu, F. (2021). Lisans Düzeyinde Gastronomi ve Mutfak Sanatları Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin Akademik Motivasyonlarını Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Çağdaş Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 136-150.
4. Çemrek, F., & Yılmaz, H. (2010). Turizm ve Otel İşletmeciliği ile Aşçılık Programı Öğrencilerinin "Uygulamalı Mutfak Dersleri" Hakkında Tutum ve Düşüncelerini Ölçmeye Yönelik Bir Uygulama. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 203-220.
5. Deveci, B., Türkmen, S., & Avcıkurt, C. (2013). Kırsal Turizm ile Gastronomi Turizmi İlişkisi: Bigadiç Örneği. *Uluslararası Sosyal ve Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(2), 29-34.
6. Erikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
7. Göktürk, İ. E., Aktaş, M. A., & Göktürk, Ü. (2013). Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokullarının Eğitim Sürecinde; Uygulama Açısından Karşılaşılan Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri. *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, 3(4), 1-8.
8. Güdek, M., & Boylu, Y. (2017). Türkiye'de Yükseköğretim Düzeyinde Gastronomi Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin Beklenti ve Değerlendirmelerine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Tourism & Gastronomy Studies*, 5(4), 489-503.
9. Kılınç, P. (2012). Gençlik Hizmetleri ve Spor İl Müdürlüğünde Çalışan Antrenörlerin İş Doyumunun Belirlenmesi (İç Anadolu Bölgesi Örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Karaman.
10. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
11. Kurnaz, A., Babür, T. E., & Kurnaz, H. A. (2018a). Gastronomi Eğitiminde Bir Sosyal Sorumluluk Projesi: Mengen Ulusal Aşçılık Kampı. *Opus International Journal of Society Researches*, 8(1), 504-520.
12. Kurnaz, A., Şengül, S., & Özdemir, M. (2018b). Gastronomi eğitimi ve uygulamalı derslerde karşılaşılan sorunlar. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 5(2), 35-50.
13. Md Mubin, S. I. I., Hemdi, M. A., & Isjkarim, S. (2021). Factors Affecting Career Advancement of Female Chefs. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 13(3), 99-109.
14. Öney, H. (2016). Gastronomi Eğitimi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 35, 193-203.
15. Özdemir, G., & Altın, D. D. (2019). Gastronomi Kavramları ve Gastronomi Turizmi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(1), 1-14.
16. Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. (4. Edition). CA: Sage Publications.
17. Richards, G. (2012). An Overview of Food and Tourism Trends and Policies. *OECD Studies on Tourism*.
18. Santich, B. (2004). *Hospitality and Gastronomy: Natural Allies*. (Edt.: Lashley, C.). *Hospitality A Social Lens*. pp.47-59. London: Elsevier.
19. Scarpato, R. (2002). Gastronomy Studies in Search of Hospitality. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(2), 1-12.
20. Sevim, B., & Gökem, O. (2016). Gastronomi Eğitiminde Geç Mi Kalındı Acele Mi Ediliyor? *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(58), 977-988.
21. Sormaz, Ü., Özata, E., & Büşra, A. (2020). Tüketicilerin Yöresel Ürün, Yemek ve Restoranları Tercih Etme Nedenleri: Trakya Yöresi Mutfağı Örneği. *Journal of Tourism & Gastronomy Studies*, 8(1), 538-551.
22. Tayfun, A., & Kara, D. (2008). Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesinde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Okul Deneyimi Derslerine Yönelik Tutumları. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2, 103-116.
23. Tekin, Ö. A., & Çiğdem, G. (2015). Turizm Öğrencilerinin Mutfak Departmanına Yönelik Tutumları Ölçeği: Bir Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(39), 975-986.
24. Türk Dil Kurumu. (2024). <http://www.tdk.gov.tr/>, Available: 10.04.2025.
25. Türker, N., & Akmanoğlu, E. (2022). Yeni Yiyecek Fobisi ve Gastronomi Turizminin Gelişmesine Etkisi: Kalitatif Bir Çalışma. *Gastro: Journal of Gastronomy and Travel Research*, 6(1), 177-198.
26. Ünlüönen, K., & Boylu, Y. (2005). Anadolu Otelcilik ve Turizm Meslek Liselerinde Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Beklenti ve Algılamalarındaki Değişimin Karşılaştırılması (2000-2001 ve 2003-2004 Öğretim Yılları). *Milli Eğitim Üç Aylık Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33(166), 159-174.