

SERVICE QUALITY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AT LEISURE AND CULTURAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT’S SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr LEUNG Chun Fai, BSocSc (Hons) in Sports and Recreation Management,
Department of Sport and Recreation
Supervisor: Dr Peggy CHOI, Associate Professor

BACKGROUND

- Growing Popularity of Sports:
- Supported by government initiatives.
- Enhancing community participation (Frey & Gullo, 2021).
- Facility Development:
- Examples include Kai Tak Sports Park.
- Essential for improving customer satisfaction.
- Enhances overall experiences in sports facilities (Bitner, 1990).

PURPOSE OF STUDY

- Investigate how service quality dimensions relate to customer satisfaction in LCSD-managed sports and recreation facilities.
- Identify the key factors that drive user satisfaction.
- Examine potential differences in service quality perceptions among diverse user demographics (e.g., age, gender, employment status, usage frequency).

METHODOLOGY

- Data collection (using Google Form)
- SERVQUAL dimensions: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy.
- Statistical analyses (Spearman correlations, Mann-Whitney U tests, Kruskal-Wallis H tests) to evaluate relationships and group differences.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the relationships between the expectations of service quality and satisfaction of the sports and recreations facility users of LCSD?
2. Which aspects of service quality have a major impact on customer satisfaction?
3. Are there any disparities in views of service quality and satisfaction across distinct user groups?

RESULTS

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for Service Quality Dimensions and Overall Satisfaction

Service Quality Dimension	Maximum Score	M	%	SD
TotalT	20	12.36	61.8	2.97
TotalRel	30	13.24	44.1	3.68
TotalRes	15	9.90	66	2.30
TotalA	20	13.23	66.15	2.89
TotalE	25	15.96	63.84	3.51
OverallSatisf	5	3.40	68	0.98

Mean Ratings for Service Quality Aspects

- Total Assurance: Mean: 13.23, Percentage: 66.15%
- Total Responsiveness: Mean: 9.90 ,Percentage: 66%
- Standard Deviation Values:
- Total Reliability: SD: 3.68, Total Empathy: SD: 3.51

Table 4. 4

Mean Ranks and Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics for Service Quality Dimensions by Gender

Service Quality Dimension	Female (N = 57)	Male (N = 34)	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig.
Total Tangible	46.25	45.57	954.500	-0.120	.904
Total Reliability	46.16	45.74	960.000	-0.074	.941
Total Responsiveness	50.25	38.87	726.500	-2.021	.043
Total Assurance	45.39	47.01	934.500	-0.287	.774
Total Empathy	47.06	44.22	908.500	-0.499	.618
Overall Satisfaction	44.89	47.85	906.000	-0.559	.576

Gender Differences in Service Quality Ratings

- Total Responsiveness:
- Statistically significant difference: U = 726.50, p = 0.043
- Suggests gender may influence this aspect.

Table 4.12

Spearman's rho Correlations Among Service Quality Dimensions (N = 91)

Service Quality Dimension	Total Tangible	Total Reliability	Total Responsiveness	Total Assurance	Total Empathy	Overall Satisfaction
TotalT	1.000	.023 (p = .831)	.099 (p = .348)	.113 (p = .285)	.113 (p = .286)	.068 (p = .524)
TotalRel	.023 (p = .831)	1.000	.700 (p < .001)	.658 (p < .001)	.643 (p < .001)	.603 (p < .001)
TotalRes	.099 (p = .348)	.700 (p < .001)	1.000	.732 (p < .001)	.718 (p < .001)	.541 (p < .001)
TotalA	.113 (p = .285)	.658 (p < .001)	.732 (p < .001)	1.000	.765 (p < .001)	.563 (p < .001)
TotalE	.113 (p = .286)	.643 (p < .001)	.718 (p < .001)	.765 (p < .001)	1.000	.586 (p < .001)

Correlation Analysis Summary Overall Satisfaction:

- It shows large correlations with Total Reliability, Total Responsiveness, Total Assurance, and Total Empathy, with all of them ranging from 0.5 to 0.7
- Total Tangible:
- Correlations are trivial (<0.1) , indicating they have little impact on perceptions of quality and satisfaction.
- Total Responsiveness:
- Shows very large correlations with all dimensions, and all of them are greater than 0.7 except for Total Tangible.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

- Maintain constant pricing to increase client confidence and expectations.
- Proactive Customer Support: Assist clients, especially women, with their individual requirements.
- Create a comprehensive feedback system to demonstrate dedication to addressing customers complaints.
- Establish more transparent standards for response times for the public, as they significantly impact customer satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. Journal of Marketing, 56(2), 57–71.
- Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (1993). Gender, emotion, and the family. CambridgeUniversity Press.
- Frey, B. S., & Gullo, A. (2021). Does sports make people happier, or do happy people more sports? Journal of Sports Economics, 22(4), 432-458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527002520985667>
- García-Pérez, M. A., Serrano-Del-Rosal, R., & Topa-Cantisano, G. (2011).Patient satisfaction in healthcare systems: An analysis of the relationshipbetween social and clinical factors. Social Science & Medicine, 72(6), 1116–1124.
- Gneezy, Ayelet & Gneezy, Uri & Lauga, Dominique. (2014). A Reference-Dependent Model of the Price–Quality Heuristic. Journal of Marketing Research. 51. 153-164. 10.1509/jmr.12.0407.
- Mattila, A. S., Grandey, A. A., & Fisk, G. M. (2003). The interplay of gender and affective tone in service encounter satisfaction. Journal of Service Research,6(2), 136–143.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2002). Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm. McGraw-Hill.