

The Effect of Service Quality in Sports Businesses on Customer Satisfaction*

Ali Gürel GÖKSEL^{1†}, Mürüvvet ÇOBAN², Aygün AKGÜL³

¹Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Mugla, Türkiye

²Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University, Institute of Social Sciences, Mugla, Türkiye

³Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University, Institute of Health Sciences, Mugla, Türkiye

Original Article

Received: 19.07.2024

Accepted: 27.08.2024

DOI: 10.47778/ejsse.1518961

Online Published: 30.09.2024

Abstract

Sports businesses need to improve their service quality to achieve their goals continuously. Enterprises that can achieve this will have a positive effect on customer satisfaction and will be able to sustain their existence and allow their businesses to grow. The problem statement of the research is "Is there a relationship between perceived service quality and customer satisfaction in sports businesses?". In this direction, the research aims to examine the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in enterprises in terms of different demographic variables. The population of the study consisted of 885 members who receive active service in Mugla Culture Art Sports Center and Trade LLC sports enterprises. The sample consisted of 375 people over the age of 18, 123 of whom were female and 252 of whom were male. To collect the data needed for the research, the personal information form prepared by the researchers, the Sports Facilities Customer Satisfaction Scale (SFCSS) developed by Yıldırım (2017), and the Fitness Centers Service Quality Scale (FCSQS) developed by Sevilmiş (2019) was used. The data were collected a face-to-face questionnaire technique. SPSS 26.0 package program was used to analyze the collected data. Frequency and percentage analyses were used to determine the demographic structure of the data. A T-test was used to investigate the relationship between two independent variables and a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the relationship between three or more variables. Statistical analyses were interpreted based on a $p < 0.05$ significance level. The results of the analyses showed that the Cronbach Alpha values of the scales and sub-dimensions were highly reliable. The findings revealed a strong and positive relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction ($r=0.613$, $p < 0.01$). This means that customer satisfaction increases with the increase in service quality in sports facilities.

Keywords: Sports businesses, Service quality, Customer satisfaction

Spor İşletmelerindeki Hizmet Kalitesinin Müşteri Memnuniyetine Etkisi

Öz

Spor işletmelerinin hedeflerine ulaşabilmeleri için hizmet kalitelerini sürekli geliştirmeleri gerekmektedir. Bunu başarabilen işletmeler müşteri memnuniyetine olumlu yönde etki ederek hem varlıklarını sürdürebilecek hem de işletmelerinin büyümesine olanak tanıyacaktır. Araştırmanın problem cümlesi "spor işletmelerinde algılanan hizmet kalitesi ile müşteri memnuniyeti arasında bir ilişki var mıdır?" şeklindedir. Bu doğrultuda araştırmanın amacı, işletmelerdeki hizmet kalitesi ile müşteri memnuniyeti arasındaki ilişkinin farklı demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesidir. Araştırmanın evrenini Muğla Kültür Sanat Spor Merkezi ve Ticaret LTD. ŞTİ spor işletmesinde aktif hizmet alan 885 üye oluşturmuştur. Örneklemi ise 18 yaşından büyük 123'ü kadın ve 252'si erkek toplamda 375 kişi oluşturmuştur. Araştırmanın ihtiyaç duyduğu verileri toplayabilmek için araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan kişisel bilgi formu, Yıldırım (2017) tarafından geliştirilen Spor Tesisleri Müşteri Memnuniyeti Ölçeği (STMMÖ) ve Sevilmiş (2019) tarafından geliştirilen Fitness Merkezleri Hizmet Kalitesi Ölçeği (FMKHÖ) kullanılmıştır. Veriler yüz yüze anket tekniğiyle toplanmıştır. Toplanan verilerin analizlerini gerçekleştirebilmek için SPSS 26.0 paket programı kullanılmıştır. Verilerin demografik yapısını tespit etmek için frekans ve yüzde analizleri kullanılmıştır. İki bağımsız değişken arasındaki ilişkiyi analiz etmek için t-testi, üç veya daha fazla değişkenin ilişkilerini incelemek için ise tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) yapılmıştır. İstatistiksel değerlendirmelerde $p < 0.05$ anlamlılık düzeyi temel alınarak yorumlar yapılmıştır. Analiz sonuçları, ölçeklerin ve alt boyutlarının Cronbach Alpha değerlerinin yüksek güvenilirlikte olduğunu göstermiştir. Bulgular, hizmet kalitesi ile müşteri memnuniyeti arasında güçlü ve olumlu bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koymuştur ($r=0,613$, $p < 0,01$). Bu sonuçlar, spor tesislerindeki hizmet kalitesinin artmasıyla müşteri memnuniyetinin de arttığını ifade etmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Spor işletmeleri, Hizmet kalitesi, Müşteri memnuniyeti

* This study was supported by the TÜBİTAK 2209/A University Students Research Projects Support Program with the project application number 1919B012204451.

† **Corresponding Author:** Ali Gürel GÖKSEL, **E-mail:** aligoksel@mu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Sports and health facilities operate as customer-oriented institutions (Howat et al., 2013; McDonald & Howland, 1998). In this environment of intense competition, great importance should be given to service quality to attract customers and ensure loyalty (Cristea & Mocuta, 2018). Proper evaluation of service quality in sports enterprises plays a vital role in fully meeting customer expectations and ensuring the business's long-term success (Grönroos, 1984). In the global competitive age, organizations must focus on improving service quality to enhance their performance. Additionally, providing a sustainable competitive advantage and meeting customer needs effectively should be the primary goals for the survival of the organization (Cristea & Mocuta, 2018; Demirbag et al., 2006; Imran et al., 2018; Jong et al., 2019; Sinha et al., 2016).

The interaction between customers' expectations and the provided service is critical in determining service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1985). Service quality is defined as an attitude resulting from comparing customers' expectations with the business's actual performance, which is associated with satisfaction but not entirely equivalent to it (Bolton & Drew, 1991; Parasuraman et al., 1988). According to Kasiri et al. (2017), service quality is defined as the difference between customers' expectations and the service received, and it is considered one of the main determinants of customer satisfaction. The concept of service quality is closely linked to customer satisfaction and is seen as a precursor to it (Grönroos, 1982; Parasuraman et al., 1985). Service quality is one of the main elements that shape customers' interactions with the business and determine their overall satisfaction levels (Alnawas & Hemsley-Brown, 2019; Deng et al., 2013; Hao et al., 2015; Nunkoo et al., 2017; Oh & Kim, 2017; Ren et al., 2015).

Satisfaction is defined as a positive state that arises when consumers' expectations are met (Peter & Olson, 2010). According to Oliver (1980), customer satisfaction measures the consistency or inconsistency between expectations before purchasing a service or product and evaluations after purchasing it. Another definition describes customer satisfaction as the feeling of contentment consumers have with the products they purchase (Gülbaşı, 2022). In this context, the relationship between the quality of services provided in sports enterprises and customer satisfaction is a significant area of research in both theoretical models and applied studies (Alexandris et al., 2004; Chelladurai & Chang, 2000; Deng et al., 2013; Francesco & Roberta, 2019; Göksel & Ekici, 2013; Mathe et al., 2016; Rahimi & Kozak, 2017).

The concept of service quality is closely related to customer satisfaction (Grönroos, 1982; Parasuraman et al., 1985). Funk et al., (2022) stated that these two concepts are interdependent and emphasized that quality is a precursor to customer satisfaction. Therefore, customers cognitively evaluate service performance in the short term and this ultimately affects their overall service experience (Torres, 2014). Research shows that each of the dimensions of service quality in sports organizations such as physical facilities, staff attitude and competence, reliability, and timeliness have different effects on customer satisfaction (Álvarez-García et al., 2019; Tufantoz & Yıldız,

2022; Yoshida & James, 2011). In addition, it should not be forgotten that communication is an important tool for solving problems that may arise (Akgül & Mutlu, 2021). Therefore, it is extremely important to pay attention to, control and improve the quality of these dimensions, opportunities and tools.

The quality of services offered in sports organizations directly affects customer satisfaction and thus plays a decisive role in the sustainability and competitiveness of the organizations (Huang & Kim, 2023). Many studies in the literature have concluded that perceived service quality has a significant positive effect on customer satisfaction (Ali & Raza, 2017; Brady et al., 2001; Cronin et al., 2000; Nunkoo et al., 2017; Wu, 2014). Abror et al., (2019) emphasize that the extent to which service quality is in line with customer needs and expectations is a determining factor in customer satisfaction. This study shows that customer satisfaction increases with the increase in the harmony provided in service delivery. In addition, Bakar et al., (2012) states that customer satisfaction passes through service quality. In addition to these studies, some studies conclude that the perception of service quality in customers makes a significant difference in customer satisfaction levels (Álvarez-García et al, 2019; Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Kyle et al., 2010; Lentell, 2000; Murray & Howat, 2002; Parasuraman et al., 1988; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2009; Swan & Bowers, 1998; Taylor & Baker, 1994; Theodorakis et al., 2001).

While sports organizations aim to increase customer satisfaction with the quality of the services they offer, they also endeavor to survive in a competitive market. Service quality is a critical factor that directly affects customers' loyalty to the business and the rate of repeat preference and is supported by the literature (Anderson & Mittal, 2000; Brocato et al., 2012; Heinonen & Strandvik, 2015; Novokreshchenova et al., 2016; Schneider et al., 2005). In this context, examining whether the service quality to be provided affects customer satisfaction is of great importance both in the academic field and in practical applications. Determining the factors affecting customer satisfaction and improving these factors play a key role in ensuring the long-term success and sustainability of sports enterprises. Considering this information, the problem statement of the research is “Is there a relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction levels offered in sports enterprises?”. The study aims to examine the relationship between the quality of services offered in sports enterprises and customer satisfaction through different variables.

METHOD

Research Model

In the study titled "The Effect of Service Quality in Sports Enterprises on Customer Satisfaction", a survey technique was used. In addition, a relational survey model was used in the study. In the research carried out according to this model, the existing situations are tried to be defined as they are, without any intervention to the person, situation, case, event, or object being examined (Karasar, 2016). In the research, it is aimed to "examine the relationship between service quality perceptions and customer satisfaction" of consumers who purchase services from sports enterprises.

Participants

This study preferred the convenience sampling method. This choice was made to simply reach the mass needed in the study and to provide flexibility in the sample selection process (Baştürk & Taştepe, 2013). Muğla Culture Art Sports Center and Trade LLC, which operates in the center of Muğla province, has 885 members who actively receive service in the sports enterprises. While determining the sample of the study, it was aimed to reach 268 people with a 95% confidence level and 5% sampling error. This sample size was found acceptable in terms of statistical reliability. Individuals who participated voluntarily were over the age of 18. The total number of participants was 375. Of these, 123 were female and 252 were male. The voluntary participation of the participants contributed to the study being more resistant and reliable against external influences. As a result, the voluntary participants selected with the easily accessible sampling method represent the general findings of the study. The results obtained are limited to the member population of the relevant sports organization.

Table 1. Information on the demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables		N	%
Gender	Male	252	67,2
	Female	123	32,8
Marital Status	Married	90	24,0
	Single	285	76,0
Age	18-24 Years	165	44,0
	25-34 Years	114	30,4
	35-44 Years	66	17,6
	45 Years and Over	30	8,0
Educational Background	Primary and Secondary	18	4,8
	High School	174	46,4
	Associate Degree	78	20,8
	Bachelor's Degree	87	23,2
Duration of Regular Sports Practising	Graduate Degree	18	4,8
	Less than 1 Year	186	49,6
	1-3 Years	75	20,0
Frequency of Coming to the Sports Center	More than 3 Years	114	30,4
	1-2 per week	36	9,6
	3-4 per week	198	52,8
Total	5-6 per week	141	37,6
		375	100

Table 1 presents information on the demographic characteristics of the participants such as gender, marital status, age, educational status, duration of regular sports practice, and frequency of visiting

the sports center. It was determined that 67.2% of the participants were male (n=252) and 32.8% were female (n=123). When the marital status of the participants was analysed, it was found that 90 of them were married (24.0%) and 285 of them were single (76.0%). It was found that 44% of the participants were 18-24 years old (n=165), 30.4% were 25-34 years old (n=114), 17.6% were 35-44 years old (n=66) and 8.0% were 45 years old and above. According to the answers given to the educational status question, it is seen that the group with the highest average is high school graduates (n=174) with an average of 46.4%. In addition, 18 (4,8%) primary and secondary school graduates, 78 (20,8%) associate degree graduates, 87 (23,2%) undergraduate graduates, and 18 (4,8%) postgraduate graduates were found. In terms of the duration of doing sports regularly, it is understood that most of the participants (49.6%) have been doing sports for less than 1 year and those who have been doing sports for more than 3 years have a rate of 30.4%. Regarding the frequency of weekly visits to the sports center, it is observed that most of the participants come to the sports center 3-4 times a week (52.8%), followed by 5-6 times a week (37.6%).

Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire used in this study consists of three parts. In the first part, there are six questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants: gender, marital status, age, education level, duration of regular exercise, and frequency of visiting the fitness center. In the second part, the Fitness Centers Service Quality Scale (FCSQS) developed by Sevilmış (2019) was used to measure the service quality perceptions of the participants. This scale is a five-level Likert-type scale consisting of 30 items and has five different dimensions: contract, trainer interest, physical evidence, cleaning, and interaction. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the FCSQS was calculated as 0.70. In the third part, the Sports Facilities Customer Satisfaction Scale (SFCSS) developed by Yıldırım (2017) was used to evaluate customer satisfaction levels. This scale consists of 32 items and has eight different dimensions: coach approach, support staff approach, personal and social development, hygiene, canteen services, program support, atmosphere, and suitability/comfort. The reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions ranged from 0.63 to 0.90 and the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the total scale was determined as 0.90.

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval of the study was obtained from Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee on 09.12.2022 with protocol number 220196 and decision number 171.

Data Collection

Both the ethics committee permission required for the study and the necessary permissions were obtained from the researchers who developed the scales to be used. In the data collection process, a face-to-face questionnaire form was applied to 375 members who received services at Mugla Culture, Arts and Sports Center and voluntarily participated in the study. These survey data were evaluated, and the results obtained were analyzed.

Analysis of Data

Since the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the data were between -2 and +2, it was determined that the data exhibited a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). Based on this result, parametric tests were applied. In the data analysis performed using SPSS 26.0 software, frequency and percentage analyses were performed to determine the demographic characteristics of the data collected by face-to-face questionnaires, t-test to evaluate the relationship between two independent variables, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the relationship between three or more variables. According to the ANOVA results, Tukey HSD multiple comparison test was used to determine between which groups there were statistically significant differences. Pearson correlation test was performed to evaluate the relationship between service quality, the independent variable of the study, and customer satisfaction, the dependent variable. Statistical analyses and interpretations of the data were based on $p < 0.05$ significance level. As a result of the analyses, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the scales and sub-dimensions were found to be robust.

FINDINGS

Statistical analyses of the data collected in line with the determined methods and objectives of this study were made and the results obtained were given in tables.

Table 2. Mean values of SFCSS and FSQS

	N	Min.	Max.	\bar{X}	S	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
SFCSS	375	1,50	3,00	2,696	0,249	-1,568	1,234	0,896
Coach Approach	375	1,00	3,00	2,836	0,316	-1,781	1,710	0,879
Support Staff Approach	375	1,00	3,00	2,872	0,339	-1,623	1,861	0,918
Personal and Social Development	375	1,75	3,00	2,718	0,331	-,753	-,759	0,700
Hygiene	375	1,00	3,00	2,452	0,472	-,380	-,690	0,759
Canteen Services	375	1,00	3,00	2,612	0,407	-1,175	1,193	0,643
Programme Support	375	1,00	3,00	2,741	0,463	-1,276	1,812	0,827
Atmosphere	375	1,25	3,00	2,532	0,400	-,572	-,196	0,559
Suitability/Comfort	375	1,50	3,00	2,736	0,389	-1,365	1,089	0,312
FCSQS	375	2,07	5,00	4,122	0,617	-,811	,853	0,936
Contract	375	1,00	5,00	3,949	1,018	-,726	-,310	0,912
Trainer Interest	375	1,00	5,00	4,012	0,900	-1,192	1,605	0,917
Physical Evidence	375	1,57	5,00	4,097	0,795	-,911	,373	0,880
Cleaning	375	1,17	5,00	4,089	0,724	-,819	1,384	0,840
Interaction	375	3,00	5,00	4,668	0,517	-1,728	1,559	0,787

SFCSS=Sports Facilities Customer Satisfaction Scale; FSQS=Fitness Centers Service Quality Scale; \bar{X} =Average; S=Standard Deviation; α =Cronbach Alpha

Table 2 presents the mean values and other statistical measures for the Sports Facility Customer Satisfaction Scale (SFCSS) and Fitness Center Service Quality Scale (FCSQS). In the study in which the SFCSS scale was evaluated with a total of 375 participants, the mean SFCSS score was found to be 2.696, with a standard deviation of 0.249. Similarly, the mean score of the FCSQS was 4.122, with a standard deviation of 0.617. Cronbach Alpha coefficients show that both scales have adequate internal consistency ($\alpha=0.896$ for SFCSS and $\alpha=0.936$ for FCSQS). The mean scores for the Coach Approach, Support Personnel Approach, and Programme Support sub-dimensions were

found to be 2.836, 2.872, and 2.741, respectively. The internal consistency for each of these sub-dimensions is at a sufficient level ($\alpha=0.879$, $\alpha=0.918$, and $\alpha=0.827$, respectively). On the other hand, the mean scores for Personal and Social Development, Hygiene, Canteen Services, Atmosphere, and Appropriateness/Comfort are 2.718, 2.452, 2.612, 2.532 and 2.736, respectively. The internal consistency level varies among these sub-dimensions ($\alpha=0.700$, $\alpha=0.759$, $\alpha=0.643$, $\alpha=0.559$ and $\alpha=0.312$, respectively). Finally, the mean scores for the sub-dimensions of Contract, Coach Interest, Physical Evidence, Cleanliness, and Interaction were determined as 3.949, 4.012, 4.097, 4.089 and 4.668, respectively. The internal consistency level for these sub-dimensions was also high ($\alpha=0.912$, $\alpha=0.917$, $\alpha=0.880$, $\alpha=0.840$ and $\alpha=0.787$, respectively). These findings presented in Table 2 show that customer satisfaction and service quality in sports facilities are at different levels in different sub-dimensions and the internal consistency of these measures is generally acceptable.

Table 3. T-test result for gender variable

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	t	p
SFCSS	Male	252	2,691	0,260	-,353	,725
	Female	123	2,708	0,229		
Coach Approach	Male	252	2,841	0,335	,265	,791
	Female	123	2,825	0,275		
Support Staff Approach	Male	252	2,842	0,381	-1,667	,098
	Female	123	2,932	0,223		
Personal and Social Development	Male	252	2,750	0,329	1,554	,123
	Female	123	2,652	0,330		
Hygiene	Male	252	2,452	0,488	,013	,990
	Female	123	2,451	0,444		
Canteen Services	Male	252	2,610	0,416	-,074	,941
	Female	123	2,615	0,391		
Programme Support	Male	252	2,742	0,486	,025	,980
	Female	123	2,739	0,418		
Atmosphere	Male	252	2,503	0,390	-1,162	,248
	Female	123	2,591	0,417		
Suitability/Comfort	Male	252	2,684	0,401	-2,266	,026*
	Female	123	2,841	0,343		
FCSQS	Male	252	4,107	0,635	-,374	,709
	Female	123	4,152	0,583		
Contract	Male	252	3,865	1,087	-1,445	,152
	Female	123	4,122	0,847		
Trainer Interest	Male	252	4,025	0,928	,229	,819
	Female	123	3,986	0,850		
Physical Evidence	Male	252	4,039	0,820	-1,169	,245
	Female	123	4,216	0,737		
Cleaning	Male	252	4,142	0,721	1,184	,239
	Female	123	3,979	0,728		
Interaction	Male	252	4,684	0,480	,509	,611
	Female	123	4,634	0,591		

*p<,05

When the results of the t-test conducted according to the gender variable in Table 3 were analyzed, a statistically significant difference was found in the Appropriateness/Comfortability sub-dimension of the SFCSS ($p=0.026$). According to this finding, it was determined that women (mean=2.841) obtained higher scores than men (mean=2.684). No statistically significant

difference was found in the overall and other sub-dimensions of the SFCSS. Similarly, no statistically significant difference was observed in the overall and sub-dimensions of the FCSQS.

Table 4. T-test result for marital status variable

	Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	S	t	p
SFCSS	Married	90	2,677	0,235	-,493	,623
	Single	285	2,703	0,254		
Coach Approach	Married	90	2,828	0,325	-,158	,874
	Single	285	2,839	0,314		
Support Staff Approach	Married	90	2,900	0,305	,516	,607
	Single	285	2,863	0,351		
Personal and Social Development	Married	90	2,641	0,369	-1,341	,187
	Single	285	2,742	0,316		
Hygiene	Married	90	2,316	0,414	-1,966	,054
	Single	285	2,494	0,483		
Canteen Services	Married	90	2,608	0,386	-,056	,955
	Single	285	2,613	0,415		
Programme Support	Married	90	2,777	0,422	,493	,623
	Single	285	2,729	0,477		
Atmosphere	Married	90	2,500	0,307	-,591	,556
	Single	285	2,542	0,426		
Suitability/Comfort	Married	90	2,833	0,330	1,580	,117
	Single	285	2,705	0,402		
FCSQS	Married	90	4,114	0,609	-,081	,936
	Single	285	4,124	0,622		
Contract	Married	90	4,011	0,903	,380	,705
	Single	285	3,929	1,056		
Trainer Interest	Married	90	3,900	0,862	-,784	,434
	Single	285	4,048	0,913		
Physical Evidence	Married	90	4,300	0,644	1,613	,109
	Single	285	4,033	0,829		
Cleaning	Married	90	3,855	0,819	-2,053	,042*
	Single	285	4,163	0,680		
Interaction	Married	90	4,708	0,561	,488	,626
	Single	285	4,655	0,505		

*p<,05

Table 4 shows the t-test results for the marital status variable. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall and sub-dimensions of SFCSS. In addition, while there was no significant difference in the overall FCSQS, a significant difference was observed in the Cleanliness sub-dimension (p=0,042). According to this finding, it was determined that married individuals (\bar{x} =3,855) had a lower satisfaction level than single individuals (\bar{x} =4,163) in the Cleanliness dimension.

Table 5. ANOVA results according to age variable

	Age	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p	Post-Hoc
SFCSS	18-24	165	2,744	0,240	1,426	,239	
	25-34	114	2,666	0,292			
	35-44	66	2,670	0,175			
	45 and +	30	2,603	0,243			
Coach Approach	18-24	165	2,851	0,259	,373	,773	
	25-34	114	2,827	0,387			
	35-44	66	2,857	0,271			
	45 and +	30	2,742	0,414			
Support Staff Approach	18-24	165	2,877	0,254	,727	,538	
	25-34	114	2,835	0,476			
	35-44	66	2,954	0,166			
	45 and +	30	2,800	0,421			
Personal and Social Development	18-24	165	2,822	0,257	4,001	,009*	18-24 > 45 and +
	25-34	114	2,644	0,375			
	35-44	66	2,670	0,356			
	45 and +	30	2,525	0,321			
Hygiene	18-24	165	2,609	0,490	3,896	,011*	18-24 > 45 and +
	25-34	114	2,342	0,504			
	35-44	66	2,318	0,337			
	45 and +	30	2,300	0,229			
Canteen Services	18-24	165	2,627	0,443	,604	,614	
	25-34	114	2,638	0,417			
	35-44	66	2,602	0,342			
	45 and +	30	2,450	0,283			
Programme Support	18-24	165	2,793	0,408	1,422	,240	
	25-34	114	2,771	0,395			
	35-44	66	2,560	0,669			
	45 and +	30	2,733	0,409			
Atmosphere	18-24	165	2,590	0,433	,712	,547	
	25-34	114	2,486	0,414			
	35-44	66	2,477	0,317			
	45 and +	30	2,500	0,311			
Suitability/Comfort	18-24	165	2,690	0,402	,879	,454	
	25-34	114	2,723	0,414			
	35-44	66	2,840	0,323			
	45 and +	30	2,800	0,349			
FCSQS	18-24	165	4,155	0,685	,172	,915	
	25-34	114	4,106	0,588			
	35-44	66	4,050	0,601			
	45 and +	30	4,163	0,368			
Contract	18-24	165	3,945	0,977	,406	,749	
	25-34	114	3,903	1,107			
	35-44	66	3,886	1,029			
	45 and +	30	4,283	0,955			
Trainer Interest	18-24	165	4,135	0,969	,753	,523	
	25-34	114	3,973	0,768			
	35-44	66	3,811	1,009			
	45 and +	30	3,928	0,716			
Physical Evidence	18-24	165	4,085	0,886	,099	,960	
	25-34	114	4,078	0,704			
	35-44	66	4,097	0,829			
	45 and +	30	4,228	0,572			
Cleaning	18-24	165	4,160	0,776	1,184	,319	
	25-34	114	4,157	0,745			
	35-44	66	3,916	0,652			
	45 and +	30	3,816	0,372			
Interaction	18-24	165	4,618	0,566	1,258	,292	
	25-34	114	4,611	0,562			
	35-44	66	4,829	0,321			
	45 and +	30	4,800	0,329			

*p<,05

Table 5 presents the ANOVA analyses for the age variable. No significant difference was found in the overall SFCSS and FCSQS. However, when the sub-dimensions of SFCSS were analyzed, statistically significant differences were found in Personal and Social Development ($p=0.009$) and Hygiene ($p=0.011$) sub-dimensions. The findings show that participants aged between 18-24 years show a higher level of satisfaction in both sub-dimensions than participants aged 45 years and over.

Table 6. ANOVA results according to education level variable

	Education	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p
SFCSS	Primary and Secondary	18	2,645	0,286	,127	,972
	High School	174	2,694	0,273		
	Associate Degree	78	2,721	0,233		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,690	0,224		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,697	0,224		
Coach Approach	Primary and Secondary	18	2,666	0,466	1,048	,386
	High School	174	2,805	0,361		
	Associate Degree	78	2,873	0,262		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,871	0,245		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,976	0,058		
Support Staff Approach	Primary and Secondary	18	2,833	0,408	,122	,974
	High School	174	2,887	0,328		
	Associate Degree	78	2,865	0,293		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,844	0,424		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,916	0,129		
Personal and Social Development	Primary and Secondary	18	2,583	0,376	,585	,674
	High School	174	2,711	0,337		
	Associate Degree	78	2,778	0,318		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,724	0,308		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,625	0,440		
Hygiene	Primary and Secondary	18	2,583	0,341	,367	,831
	High School	174	2,478	0,452		
	Associate Degree	78	2,461	0,541		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,379	0,470		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,375	0,564		
Canteen Services	Primary and Secondary	18	2,541	0,332	,929	,450
	High School	174	2,650	0,405		
	Associate Degree	78	2,673	0,322		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,534	0,466		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,416	0,516		
Programme Support	Primary and Secondary	18	2,333	0,666	1,492	,209
	High School	174	2,747	0,455		
	Associate Degree	78	2,717	0,601		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,804	0,274		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,888	0,172		
Atmosphere	Primary and Secondary	18	2,833	0,204	,976	,423
	High School	174	2,517	0,396		
	Associate Degree	78	2,548	0,412		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,500	0,383		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,458	0,579		
Suitability/Comfort	Primary and Secondary	18	2,750	0,418	,889	,473
	High School	174	2,672	0,444		
	Associate Degree	78	2,750	0,324		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	2,827	0,306		
	Graduate Degree	18	2,833	0,408		

Table 6 (Continue). ANOVA results according to education level variable

	Education	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p
FCSQS	Primary and Secondary	18	3,961	0,512	,397	,811
	High School	174	4,135	0,632		
	Associate Degree	78	4,210	0,647		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	4,035	0,633		
	Graduate Degree	18	4,194	0,400		
Contract	Primary and Secondary	18	4,138	1,351	,616	,652
	High School	174	4,054	0,849		
	Associate Degree	78	3,929	1,065		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	3,706	1,224		
	Graduate Degree	18	4,000	1,032		
Trainer Interest	Primary and Secondary	18	3,428	1,495	,808	,522
	High School	174	4,000	0,895		
	Associate Degree	78	4,126	0,906		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	4,014	0,840		
	Graduate Degree	18	4,214	0,358		
Physical Evidence	Primary and Secondary	18	4,166	0,602	,382	,821
	High School	174	4,078	0,802		
	Associate Degree	78	4,241	0,826		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	4,034	0,840		
	Graduate Degree	18	3,881	0,641		
Cleaning	Primary and Secondary	18	3,611	1,009	1,210	,310
	High School	174	4,126	0,729		
	Associate Degree	78	4,205	0,631		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	3,965	0,733		
	Graduate Degree	18	4,305	0,661		
Interaction	Primary and Secondary	18	4,791	0,332	,523	,719
	High School	174	4,607	0,607		
	Associate Degree	78	4,730	0,380		
	Bachelor's Degree	87	4,672	0,486		
	Graduate Degree	18	4,833	0,408		

p>,05

In Table 6, the results of the ANOVA test conducted in line with the answers given by the participants to the education status variable are presented. According to the findings obtained, no statistically significant difference was found both in the overall and sub-dimensions of the SFCSS and in the overall and sub-dimensions of the FCSQS.

Table 7. ANOVA results according to the variable of doing regular sports

	Duration	N	X̄	S	F	p	Post-Hoc
SFCSS	Less than 1 Year	186	2,571	0,214	4,161	,018*	3 Years + > Less than 1 Year
	1-3 Years	75	2,722	0,314			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,731	0,236			
Coach Approach	Less than 1 Year	186	2,794	0,256	,278	,758	
	1-3 Years	75	2,845	0,455			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,849	0,300			
Support Staff Approach	Less than 1 Year	186	2,770	0,228	1,420	,246	
	1-3 Years	75	2,895	0,572			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,901	0,282			
Personal and Social Development	Less than 1 Year	186	2,570	0,296	3,328	,039*	3 Years + > Less than 1 Year
	1-3 Years	75	2,736	0,364			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,766	0,343			
Hygiene	Less than 1 Year	186	2,160	0,427	7,333	,001*	3 Yıl + ve 1-3 Years > Less than 1 Year
	1-3 Years	75	2,453	0,438			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,568	0,492			
Canteen Services	Less than 1 Year	186	2,490	0,401	1,780	,173	
	1-3 Years	75	2,598	0,349			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,669	0,440			
Programme Support	Less than 1 Year	186	2,600	0,434	1,690	,189	
	1-3 Years	75	2,752	0,638			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,815	0,352			
Atmosphere	Less than 1 Year	186	2,410	0,422	1,481	,231	
	1-3 Years	75	2,568	0,352			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,552	0,386			
Suitability/Comfort	Less than 1 Year	186	2,660	0,444	4,023	,020*	3 Years + > Less than 1 Year
	1-3 Years	75	2,677	0,374			
	More than 3 Years	114	2,881	0,244			
FCSQS	Less than 1 Year	186	4,002	0,651	1,760	,176	
	1-3 Years	75	4,079	0,529			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,271	0,599			
Contract	Less than 1 Year	186	3,801	1,037	1,650	,196	
	1-3 Years	75	3,966	1,068			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,179	0,932			
Trainer Interest	Less than 1 Year	186	3,840	0,910	1,095	,338	
	1-3 Years	75	3,983	0,923			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,172	0,864			
Physical Evidence	Less than 1 Year	186	3,988	0,882	1,129	,327	
	1-3 Years	75	4,043	0,648			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,255	0,724			
Cleaning	Less than 1 Year	186	3,766	0,668	3,224	,043*	3 Years + > Less than 1 Year
	1-3 Years	75	4,180	0,581			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,153	0,846			
Interaction	Less than 1 Year	186	4,572	0,556	2,272	,107	
	1-3 Years	75	4,720	0,397			
	More than 3 Years	114	4,789	0,501			

*p<,05

The results of ANOVA analyses according to the duration of regular sport practice are presented in Table 7. As a result of the analyses, a significant difference (p=0,018) was found in the overall SFCSS scale. Significant differences were also found in the sub-dimensions of Personal and Social Development (p=0,039), hygiene (p=0,001), and Fitness/Relaxation (p=0,020). According to the results, it was found that participants who have been doing sports regularly for 3 years or more have higher satisfaction levels in the overall scale and these sub-dimensions compared to those who have been doing sports for less than 1 year. When the data belonging to FCSQS were analyzed, no significant difference was found in the overall scale, while it was concluded that those who have been doing sports for 3 years or more ($\bar{x}=4,153$) have higher scores at the level of significance than

those who have been doing sports for less than 1 year ($\bar{x}=3,766$) in the Cleanliness sub-dimension ($p=0,043$).

Table 8. ANOVA results according to the frequency of coming to the sports center

	Duration	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p	Post-Hoc
SFCSS	1-2 per week	36	2,645	0,353	3,055	,051	
	3-4 per week	198	2,656	0,263			
	5-6 per week	141	2,766	0,178			
Coach Approach	1-2 per week	36	2,774	0,386	3,490	,034*	5-6 per week > 1-2 per week
	3-4 per week	198	2,809	0,371			
	5-6 per week	141	2,930	0,154			
Support Staff Approach	1-2 per week	36	2,729	0,405	1,182	,310	
	3-4 per week	198	2,890	0,325			
	5-6 per week	141	2,883	0,341			
Personal and Social Development	1-2 per week	36	2,604	0,376	5,145	,007*	5-6 per week > 1-2 per week
	3-4 per week	198	2,655	0,333			
	5-6 per week	141	2,835	0,286			
Hygiene	1-2 per week	36	2,390	0,616	1,262	,287	
	3-4 per week	198	2,479	0,447			
	5-6 per week	141	2,531	0,465			
Canteen Services	1-2 per week	36	2,604	0,548	,657	,520	
	3-4 per week	198	2,575	0,415			
	5-6 per week	141	2,664	0,354			
Programme Support	1-2 per week	36	2,651	0,445	3,240	,043*	5-6 per week > 1-2 per week
	3-4 per week	198	2,722	0,549			
	5-6 per week	141	2,872	0,274			
Atmosphere	1-2 per week	36	2,437	0,453	,550	,578	
	3-4 per week	198	2,522	0,408			
	5-6 per week	141	2,569	0,378			
Suitability/Comfort	1-2 per week	36	2,708	0,541	,039	,961	
	3-4 per week	198	2,742	0,374			
	5-6 per week	141	2,734	0,373			
FCSQS	1-2 per week	36	4,050	0,891	1,731	,181	
	3-4 per week	198	4,041	0,616			
	5-6 per week	141	4,253	0,521			
Contract	1-2 per week	36	3,805	1,145	,169	,844	
	3-4 per week	198	3,941	1,084			
	5-6 per week	141	3,996	0,901			
Trainer Interest	1-2 per week	36	3,833	0,927	3,313	,040*	5-6 per week > 1-2 per week
	3-4 per week	198	4,000	0,991			
	5-6 per week	141	4,267	0,691			
Physical Evidence	1-2 per week	36	4,142	0,957	,467	,628	
	3-4 per week	198	4,032	0,795			
	5-6 per week	141	4,176	0,761			
Cleaning	1-2 per week	36	4,055	1,196	2,163	,119	
	3-4 per week	198	3,974	0,666			
	5-6 per week	141	4,258	0,631			
Interaction	1-2 per week	36	4,333	0,725	3,133	,047*	5-6 per week > 1-2 per week
	3-4 per week	198	4,674	0,472			
	5-6 per week	141	4,744	0,495			

* $p<,05$

When the answers given to the variable of weekly attendance to the sports center were examined, no significant difference was found in the overall scales of SFCSS and FCSQS, but significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions (Table 8). In the sub-dimensions of Coaching Approach ($p=0,034$), Personal and Social Development ($p=0,007$), and Programme Support ($p=0,043$) of the SFCSS, it was found that those who do sports 5-6 times a week have significantly higher scores than those who do sports 1-2 times a week. When the sub-dimensions belonging to FCSQS were examined, it was determined that those who played sports 5-6 times a week had higher scores than those who played sports 1-2 times a week in the sub-dimensions of Coach interest ($p=0,040$) and Interaction ($p=0,047$).

Table 9. Correlation Analysis of SFCSS and FCSQS

		N	\bar{X}	σ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	SFCSS	375	2,696	0,249	-	,736**	,573**	,620**	,715**	,648**	,578**	,714**	,524**	,613**	,383**	,567**	,459**	,507**	,330**
2	Coach Approach	375	2,836	0,316	,736**	-	,498**	,321**	,277**	,273**	,658**	,281**	,302**	,474**	,251**	,586**	,226**	,361**	,345**
3	Support Staff Approach	375	2,872	0,339	,573**	,498**	-	,183*	,219**	,312**	,253**	,238**	,283**	,272**	,239**	,149*	,233**	,161*	,304**
4	Personal and Social Development	375	2,718	0,331	,620**	,321**	,183*	-	,498**	,352**	,278**	,395**	,176*	,287**	,107	,250**	,238**	,293**	,231**
5	Hygiene	375	2,452	0,472	,715**	,277**	,219**	,498**	-	,424**	,176*	,693**	,270**	,518**	,338**	,395**	,449**	,551**	,068
6	Canteen Services	375	2,612	0,407	,648**	,273**	,312**	,352**	,424**	-	,162*	,454**	,385**	,403**	,344**	,232**	,361**	,339**	,204*
7	Programme Support	375	2,741	0,463	,578**	,658**	,253**	,278**	,176*	,162*	-	,183*	,222**	,408**	,104	,623**	,244**	,268**	,227**
8	Atmosphere	375	2,532	0,400	,714**	,281**	,238**	,395**	,693**	,454**	,183*	-	,423**	,421**	,337**	,337**	,348**	,332**	,110
9	Suitability/Comfort	375	2,736	0,389	,524**	,302**	,283**	,176*	,270**	,385**	,222**	,423**	-	,290**	,196*	,217**	,264**	,187*	,252**
10	FCSQS	375	4,122	0,617	,613**	,474**	,272**	,287**	,518**	,403**	,408**	,421**	,290**	-	,740**	,821**	,780**	,764**	,555**
11	Contract	375	3,949	1,018	,383**	,251**	,239**	,107	,338**	,344**	,104	,337**	,196*	,740**	-	,460**	,454**	,378**	,250**
12	Trainer Interest	375	4,012	0,900	,567**	,586**	,149*	,250**	,395**	,232**	,623**	,337**	,217**	,821**	,460**	-	,492**	,572**	,419**
13	Physical Evidence	375	4,097	0,795	,459**	,226**	,233**	,238**	,449**	,361**	,244**	,348**	,264**	,780**	,454**	,492**	-	,521**	,358**
14	Cleaning	375	4,089	0,724	,507**	,361**	,161*	,293**	,551**	,339**	,268**	,332**	,187*	,764**	,378**	,572**	,521**	-	,472**
15	Interaction	375	4,668	0,517	,330**	,345**	,304**	,231**	,068	,204*	,227**	,110	,252**	,555**	,250**	,419**	,358**	,472**	-

**p<.01; *p<.05

Table 9 presents the results of Pearson correlation analysis between the Sports Facility Customer Satisfaction Scale (SFCSS) and the Fitness Centers Service Quality Scale (FCSQS). When the results are analyzed, it is seen that there is a strong and positive correlation between SFCSS and FCSQS ($r=0.613$, $p<0.01$). This shows that customer satisfaction increases with the increase in service quality in sports facilities. In addition, relationships at various levels were also determined between the sub-dimensions of SFCSS and FCSQS. For example, a strong relationship ($r=0.736$, $p<0.01$) was found between SFCSS and Coach Approach, and a strong relationship ($r=0.715$, $p<0.01$) was found between SFCSS and Hygiene. In addition, moderate positive correlations were found between SFCSS and Atmosphere ($r=0.714$, $p<0.01$), Appropriateness/Comfort ($r=0.524$, $p<0.01$), and Contract ($r=0.383$, $p<0.01$). However, weaker relationships were found between SFCSS and other sub-dimensions. For example, a moderate relationship ($r=0.459$, $p<0.01$) was found between SFCSS and Cleanliness. The present findings show that customer satisfaction increases with the increase in service quality in sports facilities and these two factors support each other.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the study, various methods were used by focusing on a specific topic, and the data obtained were analyzed. The results obtained were compared with the information in the existing literature and supported by studies with both similar and different results. When the analyses of the scales used to collect data were examined, it was found that Cronbach's Alpha value of the overall SFCSS was 0.896 and the Cronbach's Alpha value of the overall FCSQS was 0.936 (Table 2). These results show that the scales are sufficient and reliable for our study.

(H1) The hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports enterprises according to gender variable was not supported by the general averages of the scales (Table 3). However, when the appropriateness (comfort) sub-dimension of the SFCSS scale was analyzed, it was concluded that women ($\bar{x}=2.841$) had a higher mean than men ($\bar{x}=2.684$) ($p=0.026$). This shows that women feel more comfortable in the gym where they receive service. In the study conducted by Ergün (2018), no significant difference was found between individuals' service quality and gender variable, and it was found to be like our study. In addition, Jiang and Zhang (2016) concluded that gender variable had no effect on satisfaction level in their study and showed similarities with our study. Duman (2022) reached a difference between gender variables and service quality perceptions in his study conducted with individuals benefiting from sports facilities. According to the result, it was found that the service quality perception of women was higher than that of men. When the studies conducted in the literature are examined, Afthinos et al. (2005), Türksoy and Aycan (2020) and Yıldız et al., (2021) also found a significant difference between gender variables and service quality.

(H2) The results show that the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports organizations according to the marital status variable is not confirmed (Table 4). When the cleanliness sub-dimension of the FCSQS was analyzed, it was found that single participants ($\bar{x}=4.163$) had a higher mean ($p=0.042$) than married participants ($\bar{x}=3.855$). There may be many reasons for this result. However, this result may be due to the higher hygiene and cleanliness standards of married individuals, especially those who have children. Another reason may be that since married individuals are more sensitive about family health, they expect such an expectation from the enterprises they receive service from and act more sensitively in this regard than singles. As a result of the literature review, it was found that in some studies, significant differences were found when individuals' perceptions of service quality and customer satisfaction were evaluated in terms of marital status variable (Aksoylu, 2019; Baş et al., 2017; Demirel, 2013; Ergin et al., 2011), while in some studies, no significant difference was found (Ergün, 2018; Theodorakis et al., 2004).

(H3) There is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports enterprises according to age variable was not supported by the results (Table 5). When the sub-dimensions of the scales were examined, it was determined that there were statistical differences

between age groups in the personal and social development sub-dimension ($p=0.009$) and hygiene sub-dimension ($p=0.011$) in the SFCSS. When the results obtained in the personal and social development sub-dimension were analyzed, it was found that the 18-24 age group ($\bar{x}=2.822$) had higher scores than individuals aged 45 and over ($\bar{x}=2.525$). When the hygiene sub-dimension was analyzed, it was determined that the 18-24 age group ($\bar{x}=2.609$) had higher averages than individuals aged 45 and over ($\bar{x}=2.300$). The results show that the 18-24 age group is more satisfied with personal and social development and hygiene issues than the 45 and over age group. It is thought that this may be because individuals in the higher age group are more sensitive to hygiene personal development and socialization issues compared to younger individuals. When the literature was examined, studies that did not reach a significant difference between age variable and service quality and were like our study were found (Duman, 2022; Güzel & Taşçı, 2020). In the study conducted by Çolak et al. (2022) to determine the satisfaction levels of individuals receiving sports services, significant differences were found in terms of age variable and differed from our study. In the study conducted by Türksoy and Aycan (2020), a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of the scale used. According to the result, it was observed that quality perception increased as age decreased.

(H4) When the results are analyzed, it is determined that the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship in terms of service quality and customer satisfaction in sports enterprises according to the education level variable is not supported (Table 6). When the result is evaluated, it can be said that the education level of individuals receiving services from sports enterprises is not a factor affecting service quality and customer satisfaction. However, a different conclusion can be reached in studies to be conducted in different enterprises or in different sample groups. In the study conducted by Güzel and Taşçı (2020) and Yıldız et al., (2021) with individuals receiving service from fitness centers, significant differences were found between the educational status of the participants and their perceptions of service quality, and a different conclusion was reached from our study. Jiang and Zhang (2016) also concluded that the level of education did not affect customer satisfaction in their study and showed similarities with our study.

(H5) When the results are evaluated, the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship in terms of service quality and customer satisfaction in sports enterprises according to the variable of doing regular sports is confirmed (Table 7). According to the results, statistically significant differences were found in the general ($p=0.018$) and personal and social development ($p=0.039$), hygiene ($p=0.001$), and suitability/comfort ($p=0.020$) sub-dimensions of the SFCSS. The results of the analysis show that participants who have been practicing sports regularly for 3 years or more have higher satisfaction levels than those who have been practicing sports for less than 1 year. The fact that individuals who do sports for a long time have experienced the services offered by the business in depth may have affected this result. This experience may positively affect both service quality and customer satisfaction. When the FCSQS was analyzed, it was found that there was no significant difference in the overall scale, but in the cleaning sub-dimension, participants who have been doing sports for less than 1 year ($\bar{x}=3.766$) have a lower satisfaction level than individuals

who have been doing sports for more than 3 years ($\bar{x}=4.153$) ($p=0.043$). In the study conducted by Güzel and Taşçı (2020), no significant difference was found between the year of doing sports and service quality, and a different result was reached from our study.

(H6) The hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports enterprises according to the frequency of visiting the sports center was not confirmed (Table 8). However, when the sub-dimensions of the scales were examined, statistically significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of coach approach ($p=0.034$), personal and social development ($p=0.007$), and program support ($p=0.043$) of the SFCSS. Regarding the sub-dimensions of the FCSQS, significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of coach interest ($p=0,040$) and interaction ($p=0,047$). In all sub-dimensions, it was found that those who do sports 5-6 times a week have higher averages compared to those who do sports 1-2 times a week. In other words, it has been determined that individuals who come to sports more frequently have more positive feedback in terms of customer satisfaction sub-dimensions and service quality sub-dimensions. When other studies in the literature and the results we have reached in the sub-dimensions are related, Pradeep et al., (2020) with Çiftçi and Çakmak (2018) concluded that weekly frequency of use affects the perception of service quality in their study conducted in a fitness center. In other words, the service quality perception of those who use the gym more frequently was found to be at a higher level.

(H7) The findings confirmed the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports organizations. When the results obtained were analyzed, it was found that there was a strong and positive relationship between SFCSS and FCSQS ($r=0,613$, $p<0,01$) (Table 9). In addition, significant differences were also found between the sub-dimensions of SFCSS and FCSQS. In addition to a strong relationship between the sub-dimensions of Coaching Approach ($r=0,736$, $p<0,01$) and Hygiene ($r=0,715$, $p<0,01$), there was a moderate positive relationship between the sub-dimensions of Atmosphere ($r=0,714$, $p<0,01$), Appropriateness/Comfort ($r=0,524$, $p<0,01$), and Contract ($r=0,383$, $p<0,01$). These results show that businesses that increase the perception of service quality in their customers increase customer satisfaction in parallel. When the literature is analyzed, a positive relationship has been found between service quality and customer satisfaction in sports businesses in many studies, which is in parallel with the results of our research. Berber and Mollaoğulları (2020) and Günel and Duyan (2020) found that service quality has a significant and positive effect on customer satisfaction in sports programs and facilities. Yıldız and Duyan (2019) and Tufantoz and Yıldız (2022) found that customer satisfaction partially mediates the relationship between service quality and customer loyalty in a sports and physical activity center. It can be said that the businesses that provide this are paving the way for their continued existence and have a higher potential to increase their market share. In addition, it is possible to find many studies supporting that there is a relationship between the services provided by organizations and customer satisfaction (Anderson & Mittal, 2000; Álvarez-García et al., 2019; Brocato et al., 2012; Heinonen & Strandvik, 2015; Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Lentell, 2000; Novokreshchenova et al., 2016; Schneider et al., 2005;

Theodorakis et al., 2001). In addition to these, Ali and Raza (2017), Aşık (2016), Brady et al. (2001), Cronin et al. (2000), Duman (2022), Murray and Howat (2002), Nunkoo et al. (2017), Shonk and Chelladurai (2008), Shonk and Chelladurai (2009), Şahin and Şen (2017), Taşlıyan et al. (2017), Thamnopoulos et al. (2012), Theodorakis et al. (2001), Wu (2014), Barbosa et al. (2019), Pradeep et al., (2020) also found that there is a relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction.

Customers expect the service they receive from sports businesses to be of high quality. The fact that sports businesses provide a quality service by acting with the awareness of this leads customers to feel valuable. Individuals who feel that they receive a quality service increase their satisfaction levels. Both the results we have reached from the literature and the findings of our study support this. According to the result obtained from our study, there is a strong and positive relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction ($r=0,613$, $p<0,01$). This shows that customer satisfaction increases with the increase in service quality in sports facilities.

Recommendations

- When the results obtained are evaluated, it is necessary for sports enterprises to increase service quality to positively affect customer satisfaction. While doing this, it is important to consider all elements and act.
- It is important for enterprises to endeavour to increase the satisfaction levels of all participants by evaluating the significant differences that emerged because of the research findings.
- Conducting the study with larger sample groups, in different regions and sectors, and bringing the results to the literature will contribute to the subject.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Authors' Contribution: Study Design AGG and MÇ, Data Collection MÇ and AA, Statistical Analysis AGG, Manuscript Preparation AGG and AA. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding: This study was supported by the TÜBİTAK 2209/A University Students Research Projects Support Program, 1st Term 2022, with the project application number 1919B012204451. We would like to thank TÜBİTAK for their support.

Ethical Approval: Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Date: 09 December 2022

Protocol Number: 220196/171

REFERENCES

- Abror, A., Patrisia, D., Engriani, Y., Evanita, S., Yasri, Y., & Dastgir, S. (2019). Service quality, religiosity, customer satisfaction, customer engagement and Islamic bank's customer loyalty. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 11(6), 1691–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-03-2019-0044>
- Afthinos, Y., Theodorakis, N. D., & Nassis, P. (2005). Customers' expectations of service in Greek fitness centers: Gender, age, type of sport center, and motivation differences. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 15(3), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520510597809>
- Akgül, A., & Mutlu, T. O. (2021). Basketbol klasman hakemlerinin iletişim becerilerinin problem çözme süreçleri üzerine etkisinin incelenmesi. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19(3), 81-95. <https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.866843>
- Aksoylu, M. E. (2019). *Spor merkezi üyelerinin hizmet kalitesi ile müşteri memnuniyetine yönelik beklenti ve algularının değerlendirilmesi: KOZAWOS the club örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Antrenörlük Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Spor Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Alexandris, K., Zahariadis, P., Tsorbatzoudis, C., & Grouios, G. (2004). An empirical investigation of the relationships among service quality, customer satisfaction and psychological commitment in a health club context. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4(1), 36-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740408737466>
- Ali, M., & Raza, S. A. (2017). Service quality perception and customer satisfaction in Islamic banks of Pakistan: the modified SERVQUAL model. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 28(5-6), 559-577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2015.1100517>
- Alnawas, I., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2019). Examining the key dimensions of customer experience quality in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(7), 833-861. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2019.1568339>
- Álvarez-García, J., González-Vázquez, E., Río-Rama, M., & Durán-Sánchez, A. (2019). Quality in customer service and its relationship with satisfaction: An Innovation and competitiveness tool in sport and health centers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(20), Article, 3942. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16203942>.
- Anderson, E. W., & Mittal, V. (2000). Strengthening the satisfaction-profit chain. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(2), 107–120. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050032001>
- Aşık, N. A. (2016). Algılanan hizmet kalitesinin müşteri memnuniyeti üzerine etkisi: Termal otellerde bir araştırma. *Journal of International Social Research*, 9(47), 1161-1168.
- Bakar, A. H. A., Tabassi, A. A., Razak, A. A., & Yusof, M. N. (2012). Key factors contributing to growth of construction companies: A Malaysian experience. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(9), 1295–1304. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.09.1454>
- Barbosa, H. I., Loureiro, V., & Alves, A. (2019). Quality and satisfaction in gymnasiums & health clubs. *Materiales para la Historia del Deporte*, (18), 115-121.
- Baş, M., Çelik, A., & Solak, N. (2017). Spor işletmelerinde algılanan hizmet kalitesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(4), 1-11.

Göksel, A. G., Çoban, M., Akgül, A. (2024). The Effect of service quality in sports businesses on customer satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, 6(2), 200-223.

Baştürk, S., & Taştepe, M. (2013). *Evren ve örneklem*. Vize Yayıncılık.

Berber, U., & Mollaogulları, H. (2020). The effect of service quality on satisfaction of athletes participating in sport programmes. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 6(1), 1-11.

Bolton, R. N., & Drew, J. H. (1991). A multistage model of customers' assessments of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 375-384. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208564>

Brady, M. K., Robertson, C. J., & Cronin, J. J. (2001). Managing behavioral intentions in diverse cultural environments: An investigation of service quality, service value, and satisfaction for American and Ecuadorian fast-food customers. *Journal of International Management*, 7(2), 129-149. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-4253\(00\)00041-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-4253(00)00041-7)

Brocato, E. D., Voorhees, C. M., & Baker, J. (2012). Understanding the influence of Cues from other customers in the service experience: A scale development and validation. *Journal of Retailing*, 88(3), 384–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2012.01.006>

Chelladurai, P., & Chang, K. (2000). Targets and standards of quality in sport services. *Sport management Review*, 3(1), 1-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(00\)70077-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(00)70077-5)

Çiftçi, S., ve Çakmak, G. (2018). Fitness merkezleri müşterilerinin hizmet kalitesi ile ilgili beklenti ve algı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 23-31. <https://doi.org/10.25307/jssr.368522>

Çolak, S., Yılmaz, S., & Çakıl, H. (2022). Özel ve kamuya ait spor tesislerini kullanan bireylerin memnuniyet düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi (Kocaeli örneği). *Journal of Social Research & Behavioral Sciences*, 8(16), 308-321.

Cristea, I. G., & Mocuta, D. (2018). Customer relationship management. Proceedings of the 31st International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA 2018: Innovation management and education excellence through vision 2020. Milan, Italy. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/51/21>

Cronin Jr, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 193-218. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(00\)00028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00028-2)

Demirbag, M., Koh, S. C. L., Tatoglu, E., & Zaim, S. (2006). TQM and market orientation's impact on SMEs' performance. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 106(8), 1206–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570610710836>

Demirel, H. (2013). *Rekreasyonel spor/fitness programı sunan işletmelerde hizmet kalitesi*. Doktora Tezi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Deng, W. J., Yeh, M. L., & Sung, M. L. (2013). A customer satisfaction index model for international tourist hotels: Integrating consumption emotions into the American Customer Satisfaction Index. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35, 133-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.05.010>

Göksel, A. G., Çoban, M., Akgül, A. (2024). The Effect of service quality in sports businesses on customer satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, 6(2), 200-223.

Duman, F. K. (2022). Spor tesislerinde algılanan hizmet kalitesinin müşteri memnuniyeti ile ilişkisi. *Journal of ROL Sport Sciences*, 3(3), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7059995>

Ergin, B. M., İmamoğlu, A. F., Tunç, T., Akpınar, S., & Çon, M. (2011). Üniversite spor merkezlerindeki hizmet kalitesi boyutlarının algı ve önem düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 41-49.

Ergün, İ. (2018). *Hizmet sektöründe halkla ilişkiler faaliyetlerinin hizmet kalitesi ve müşteri memnuniyetine etkileri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Halkla İlişkiler Bilim Dalı, Avrasya Üniversitesi, Trabzon.

Francesco, G., & Roberta, G. (2019). Cross-country analysis of perception and emphasis of hotel attributes. *Tourism Management*, 74, 24-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.02.011>

Funk, D. C., Alexandris, K., & McDonald, H. (2022). *Perceptions of service quality and customer satisfaction. In Sport Consumer Behaviour*. Routledge.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Routledge.

Grönroos, C. (1982). An applied service marketing theory. *European Journal of Marketing*, 16(7), 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004859>

Göksel, A. G., & Ekici, S. (2013). Research on customer satisfaction in enterprises providing water sports service. *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport*, 2(4), 29-41.

Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of marketing*, 18(4), 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004784>

Gülbaşı, A. (2022). E-ticaret kullanıcılarına ait e-hizmet kalitesinin müşteri memnuniyeti üzerine etkisi. *Toplum Ekonomi ve Yönetim Dergisi*, 3(1), 22-39.

Günel, İ., & Duyan, M. (2020). The effect of service quality on athlete satisfaction: an empirical result from sports facilities of public organizations. *European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies*, 5(3), 51-65.

Güzel, D., & Taşcı, M. F. (2022). Spor merkezlerinde algılanan hizmet kalitesi düzeyinin belirlenmesi: Erzurum ili örneği. *Bucak İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 66-88. <https://doi.org/10.38057/bifd.1094752>

Hao, J. X., Yu, Y., Law, R., & Fong, D. K. C. (2015). A genetic algorithm-based learning approach to understand customer satisfaction with OTA websites. *Tourism Management*, 48, 231-241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.11.009>

Heinonen, K., & Strandvik, T. (2015). Customer-dominant logic: Foundations and implications. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(6/7), 472-484. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2015-0096>

Howat, G., Crilley, G., & McGrath, R. (2013). A focused service quality, benefits, overall satisfaction, and loyalty model for public aquatic centres. *Performance measurement and leisure Management* (5-27). Routledge.

Huang, Y., & Kim, D. (2023). How does service quality improve consumer loyalty in sports fitness centers? The moderating role of sport involvement. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712840>.

Göksel, A. G., Çoban, M., Akgül, A. (2024). The Effect of service quality in sports businesses on customer satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, 6(2), 200-223.

Imran, M., Abdul Hamid, S. N. B., & Aziz, A. B. (2018). The influence of TQM on export performance of SMEs: Empirical evidence from manufacturing sector in Pakistan using PLS-SEM. *Management Science Letters*, 1(1), 483–496. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2018.3.003>

Jiang, H., & Zhang, Y. (2016). An investigation of service quality, customer satisfaction and loyalty in China's airline market. *Journal of air transport management*, 57, 80-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2016.07.008>

Jong, C. Y., Sim, A. K. S., Lew, T. Y., & Nonino, F. (2019). The relationship between TQM and project performance: Empirical evidence from Malaysian construction industry. *Cogent Business and Management*, 6(1), 1568655. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1568655>

Karasar, N. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar ilkeler teknikler*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Sevilmiş, A. (2019). Almanya'da fitness merkezleri için oluşturulan standartların (DIN-33961) Türkiye için uygulanabilirliğinin incelenmesi ve DIN normlarında fitness merkezi kalite ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. Doktora Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Spor Yöneticiliği Anabilim Dalı, Konya.

Kasiri, L. A., Cheng, K. T. G., Sambasivan, M., & Sidin, S. M. (2017). Integration of standardization and customization: Impact on service quality, customer satisfaction, and loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 35, 91-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.11.007>

Kouthouris, C., & Alexandris, K. (2005). Can service quality predict customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the sport tourism industry? An application of the SERVQUAL model in an outdoors setting. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 10(2), 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080500223165>

Kyle, G. T., Theodorakis, N. D., Karageorgiou, A., & Lafazani, M. (2010). The effect of service quality on customer loyalty within the context of ski resorts. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 28(1), 1-15.

Lentell, R. (2000). Untangling the tangibles: 'physical evidence' and customer satisfaction in local authority leisure centres. *Managing Leisure*, 5(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136067100375704>

Mathe, K., Scott-Halsell, S., & Roseman, M. (2016). The role of customer orientation in the relationship between manager communications and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(2), 198-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480134962>

McDonald, M. A., & Howland, W. (1998). Health and fitness industry. In L. Masteralexis, C. A. Barr, & M. A. Hums (Eds.), *Principles and practice of sport management (pp. 431-451)*. Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Murray, D., & Howat, G. (2002). The relationships among service quality, value, satisfaction, and future intentions of customers at an Australian sports and leisure centre. *Sport Management Review*, 5(1), 25-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(02\)70060-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(02)70060-0)

Novokreshchenova, O. A., Novokreshchenova, N. A., & Terehin, S. E. (2016). Improving bank's customer service on the basis of quality management tools. *European Research Studies Journal*, XIX(3B), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/562>

Nunkoo, R., Teeroovengadum, V., Thomas, P., & Leonard, L. (2017). Integrating service quality as a second-order factor in a customer satisfaction and loyalty model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 2978-3005. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2016-0610>

Göksel, A. G., Çoban, M., Akgül, A. (2024). The Effect of service quality in sports businesses on customer satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, 6(2), 200-223.

Oh, H., & Kim, K. (2017). Customer satisfaction, service quality, and customer value: years 2000-2015. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 2-29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2015-0594>

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of marketing research*, 17(4), 460-469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378001700405>

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of marketing*, 49(4), 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298504900403>

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.

Peter, J. P., & Olson, J. C. (2010). *Consumer behavior & marketing strategy*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Pradeep, D. S., Vadakepat, D. V., & Rajasenan, D. (2020). The effect of service quality on customer satisfaction in fitness firms. *Management Science Letters*, 10(9), 2011-2020. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.2.011>

Rahimi, R., & Kozak, M. (2017). Impact of customer relationship management on customer satisfaction: The case of a budget hotel chain. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(1), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2015.1130108>

Ren, L., Zhang, H. Q., & Ye, B. H. (2015). Understanding customer satisfaction with budget hotels through online comments: Evidence from home inns in China. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 16(1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2015.966299>

Şahin, A., & Şen, S. (2017). Hizmet kalitesinin müşteri memnuniyeti üzerine etkisi. *Journal of International Social Research*, 10(52), 1176-1184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2017.1971>

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., Mayer, D. M., Saltz, J. L., & Niles-Jolly, K. (2005). Understanding organization-customer links in service settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 1017-1032. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.19573107>

Shonk, D. J., & Chelladurai, P. (2008). Service quality, satisfaction, and intent to return in event sport tourism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(5), 587-602. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.22.5.587>

Shonk, D. J., & Chelladurai, P. (2009). Model of service quality in event sport tourism: Development of a scale. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 6(3), 292-307. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSMM.2009.02909>

Sinha, N., Garg, A. K., & Dhall, N. (2016). Effect of TQM principles on performance of Indian SMEs: The case of automotive supply chain. *The TQM Journal*, 28(3), 338-359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2014->

Swan, J. E., & Bowers, M. R. (1998). Services quality and satisfaction. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 12(1), 59-72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876049810202375>

Taşlıyan, M., Hırlak, B., Güler, B., & Ceyhan, Y. (2017). Algılanan hizmet kalitesi, müşteri memnuniyeti, müşteri sadakati ve bazı sosyo-demografik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiler. *Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 3(5), 119-131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sss.j.20>

Göksel, A. G., Çoban, M., Akgül, A. (2024). The Effect of service quality in sports businesses on customer satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, 6(2), 200-223.

Taylor, S. A., & Baker, T. L. (1994). An assessment of the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in the formation of consumers' purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing*, 70(2), 163-178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4359\(94\)90013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4359(94)90013-2)

Thamnopoulos, Y., Tzetzis, G., & Laios, S. (2012). The impact of service quality and satisfaction on customers' future intentions, in the sport spectators' context. *The Sport Journal*, 15(1), 1-14.

Theodorakis, N., Alexandris, K., Rodrigues, P. M., & Sarmiento, P. J. (2004). Measuring customer satisfaction in the context of health clubs in Portugal. *International Sports Journal*, 8, 44-53.

Theodorakis, N., Kambitsis, C., & Laios, A. (2001). Relationship between measures of service quality and satisfaction of spectators in professional sports. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 11(6), 431-438. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520110410638>

Torres, E. N. (2014). Deconstructing service quality and customer satisfaction: Challenges and directions for future research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 23(6), 652-677. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.846839>

Tufantoz, S., & Yıldız, S. (2022). The Mediating Role of Customer Satisfaction Between Service Quality and Customer Loyalty: A Study in Commercial Sport Organizations. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(2), 419-431. <https://doi.org/10.33459/cbubesbd.1175918>.

Türksoy, B., & Aycan, A. (2020). Spor merkezlerinde sunulan hizmetlere yönelik kalite algisinin değerlendirilmesi. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(2), 489-508. <https://doi.org/10.11616/basbed.vi.687862>

Wu, H. C. (2014). The effects of customer satisfaction, perceived value, corporate image and service quality on behavioral intentions in gaming establishments. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 26(4), 540-565. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-03-2014-0049>

Yıldırım, M. (2017). Spor tesisleri müşteri memnuniyeti ölçeği geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum*, 6(16), 157-176.

Yıldız, S. M., & Duyan, M. (2019). The Relationship among service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty: An empirical investigation of sports and physical activity sector. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2019(1), 17-30.

Yıldız, K., Yumuk, E. D., Ekim, N., & García-Fernández, J. (2021). "Because i choose to": reasons for women to choose boutique fitness centers. *PODIUM Sport, Leisure and Tourism Review*, 10(1), 141-162. <https://doi.org/10.5585/podium.v10i1.17616>.

Yoshida, M., & James, J. (2011). Service quality at sporting events: Is aesthetic quality a missing dimension? *Sport Management Review*, 14, 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SMR.2009.06.002>.



Except where otherwise noted, this paper is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license**.