
A Study on the Service Quality Perceptions of Students Using Sports Facilities and Businesses in the Student Life Center as A Recreational Area

¹Yakup Dinç, ²Hülya Eraslan

¹Associate Professor Doctor, Balıkesir University, Ayvalık Vocational School, Hotel-Restaurant and Catering Services Department, 10400 Balıkesir, Türkiye. yakdin@yahoo.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6533-3987

²Corresponding Author

Assistant Professor Doctor, Harran University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Tourism Management, 63250 Şanlıurfa, Türkiye. hulyaeraslan@harran.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1440-6736

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the service quality perceptions of students who use sports facilities and student life centers as recreational areas. In this context, an attempt was made to reach higher education students who continue active, face-to-face education across Türkiye. Data were collected from 400 students using online and face-to-face surveys between April 1, 2025, and June 1, 2025. The data were subjected to frequency, reliability, confirmatory factor, and difference tests using SPSS 24.0 statistical data analysis program. As a result of the analyses, it was determined that the service quality perceptions of students who use sports facilities and student life centers consisted of the dimensions of physical equipment, reliability, willingness, trust, empathy and satisfaction. Furthermore, significant differences were identified between these dimensions and the demographic variables of the participants' gender, age, marital status and monthly income.

KEYWORDS

Tourism, Recreation, Sports Facilities, Service Quality, Perception, Türkiye.

1. INTRODUCTION

Businesses located in university sports facilities and student life centers are among the most important elements students experience in campus life. These facilities meet students' social and physical needs, bringing them together and providing opportunities for interaction and socialization (Eren, 2014; Abdullah & Mohamad, 2016). Considering the fact that university sports facilities and student life centers are generally located in remote areas, transportation is challenging and the limited breaks or open hours, students spend all their remaining time there and feel compelled to use these spaces. Therefore, the quality of the services provided to students is known to have a direct impact on students' satisfaction and perceptions (Eren, 2014). When considered as a concept, the concept of service appears in various aspects in our daily lives. Generally speaking, it is a concept composed of various social elements that aim to meet the expectations of societies and individuals. These elements fundamentally provide benefits and satisfaction to individuals, but they do not have any property status or price. In this context, the quality and nature of the services provided to individuals play a significant role in shaping the experiences of students, especially those in these fields.

Today, service quality is not only a determining factor in student satisfaction but also a strategic element for higher education (Tehci, 2022). In this context, universities are constantly improving the service quality of their food and beverage and sports facilities to retain, attract and meet the needs of students (Nadiri et al., 2009: 523). Consequently, academic studies are increasingly emphasizing the importance of understanding the nature of service quality (Yılmaz & Temizkan, 2022). The SERVQUAL model, widely accepted in the literature, is used to understand service quality. This model, developed by Parasuraman and colleagues, aims to examine service performance across five basic categories (Parasuraman et al., 1985). These dimensions are defined as empathy, assurance, sensitivity, reliability and physical characteristics (Eleren et al., 2007: 78). This model is an important tool that aims to contribute to a company's quality improvement plans by revealing the differences between perceptions and service expectations (Özgül & Devebakan, 2005). A review of the relevant literature reveals limited studies on the service quality of businesses located in the student life center and sports facilities on campus. Existing studies, however, conclude that improving the service quality of these areas on campus will also increase student satisfaction (Abdullah & Mohamad, 2016). Therefore, student evaluation of the service quality of these areas is crucial for ensuring their development and providing guidance. This study aims to analyze the perceived service quality of businesses located in the sports facilities and student life centers on campus by students using the SERVQUAL model.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Concept of Service

The concept of service is seen as the most important factor determining the success of a business or service location (Ustasüleyman, 2009). While there are numerous definitions of service, it can be defined as various benefits, activities and products that do not possess any tangible element and are included in sales processes. It can also be defined as opportunities that provide psychological, form, location and time benefits and yield economic returns (Parasuraman et al., 1985). Another definition defines service as all intangible activities that can be wasted, cannot be smelled, cannot be touched and cannot be standardized to meet the needs of groups of people or individuals offered for sale at a specific price (Sevimli, 2006). In another definition, Kotler & Armstrong (2012) define service as a variety of products consisting of activities, satisfactions and benefits that do not create any ownership for the buyer and are essentially intangible. Service is also generally defined as performance, process and action (Zeithaml et al., 2003). Similarly, İslamoğlu et al. (2006: 16) define service as a set of non-physical benefits, activities and actions that facilitate or provide solutions to non-physical problems arising from consumers' lives. Mucuk (2006: 76) on the other hand, focuses on its characteristics rather than its definition, defining it as various marketing elements that we cannot perceive with our senses but can be noticed and felt during consumption.

2.2. Concept of Quality

The concept of quality has various definitions. According to the definition provided in ISO 9000, quality is defined as the acceptance of process operations into the process of improving customer satisfaction through the operation and development of a specific system, the fulfillment of customer requirements and the development and implementation of activities (ISO Quality Certificate, n.d.). According to the Turkish Language Association Current Grand Dictionary (TDK, 2025) the concept of quality is defined as "*the conformity of a thing, a product, to desired qualities; its value.*" Regarding definitions in the literature, Juran (1995) defined quality as the fitness of a service or product for expectations and purpose, with an emphasis on suitability for use. Finally, Kotler & Armstrong (2012) defined quality as the ability of services or products to meet customer expectations while exceeding them when necessary.

Furthermore, from a marketing perspective, they emphasized it as the foundation of brand loyalty and customer satisfaction.

2.3. Concept of Service Quality

Service quality can be broadly defined as the difference between a customer's perceived service performance and their internal expectations after purchasing a product or service (Parasuraman et al., 1985). This concept is characterized as an element that expresses customers' perceptions of service or product quality. Service quality can be defined as an abstract phenomenon encompassing tangible features such as design and environment, as well as elements such as empathy, attitude and behavior (Silik & Ünlüönen, 2018). In other words, service quality is defined as the customer's perception of service quality as a result of comparing how well a product or service meets their expectations before and after experiencing it (Tosun et al., 2015). For businesses that consider this concept, it not only shapes their position among target customers in that sector but also determines their competitiveness. Evaluating and considering service quality is crucial for identifying a business's strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, businesses can maintain their strengths while also identifying and correcting their weaknesses (Khan, 2010). Finally, service quality can be said to be a factor that directly influences consumer repeat behavior and satisfaction in almost every setting, particularly in public social spaces and educational institutions. In this regard, it is crucial for institutions serving various sectors, such as universities, to ensure that their service units and physical facilities provide the maximum experience for all consumers, especially students, in terms of service quality (Hill et al., 2003).

2.4. Perceived Service Quality

When considering the perception of service quality, this concept encompasses both context-specific and subjective assessments. It encompasses various elements such as employee attention, operational style, physical environment and service reliability (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003). Another definition defines perceived service quality as a customer's judgment of the excellence or superiority of a requested product (Zeithaml, 1988). Regarding this issue, Rowley (1998) argues that perceived service quality is an attitude and emerges from the perception of performance and the satisfactory fulfillment of customer expectations. According to Czepiel (1990) the high performance of service provider interactions determines a company's success because he emphasized that while the results of this performance may not be evident in the short term, they will have long-term consequences. Finally, perceived service quality, as a perception that emerges after a certain period of time between the service provider and the customer, can influence customer behavior. Therefore, it is believed that compensating for errors experienced during product or service delivery will lead to positive outcomes in these relationships, especially in the long term (Koç et al., 2014). To summarize these definitions, we can define service quality as perceived by customers as a significant element that results from the fit between their expectations and the service's performance and that influences consumer behavior over long periods of time.

2.5. As A Service Quality Perception Measurement Model: SERVQUAL

The inherent intangibility of the services consumers experience creates significant challenges in measuring their quality. In response to this challenge, we can see various models aimed at measuring service quality. Some of these include the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1988), the SERVPERF model (Cronin & Taylor, 1992), Grönroos's Service Quality Model (Grönroos, 1984), the Gap Model (Parasuraman et al., 1985) and the Haywood-Farmer model (Haywood-Farmer, 1988). The most popular among these is the SERVQUAL model. Developed by Parasuraman and colleagues (1985) this model provides a valid and reliable measurement of customer perceptions and expectations for service quality.

Based on this model, businesses can measure their perceptions of service quality and take the necessary measures. The SERVQUAL model, which is also used in our study, helps us perceive service quality based on five dimensions (Parasuraman et al., 1988: 37);

- *Reliability*: The extent to which the service provided is consistently, accurately, and reliably performed as promised.
- *Physical Indicators*: The extent to which the cleanliness of the service location, equipment status, physical structure, and staff appearance are measured.
- *Responsiveness*: The extent to which the willingness to provide prompt service and assistance to service recipients is assessed.
- *Assurance*: The extent to which employees' trust-inspiring abilities, courtesy, and knowledge levels are assessed.
- *Empathy*: The extent to which the needs of service recipients are understood and more personalized support is provided.

2.6. Related Research

The impact of service quality perception on consumer behavior has been the subject of numerous studies in the literature and has been explored from various perspectives. Dean et al. (2002) focused on travel services and concluded that customers are willing to pay more when their perceived service quality is high. Kayaman & Araslı (2007) examined perceived service quality from a hotel brand equity perspective, concluding that service quality has a direct impact on brand loyalty and an indirect impact on brand image. Hu et al. (2009) evaluated service quality in a selected hotel in terms of corporate image, perceived value, and customer satisfaction. They concluded that the perception of service quality has a positive relationship with these factors. Timur (2018) conducted a similar study and investigated the effects of destination image and service quality on the decision to revisit thermal hotels. In this study, they concluded that destination image plays a mediating role between these factors. Aksaray & Ateş (2019) examined destination image in terms of the service quality of tour guides and concluded that tour guides have a significant impact on the perceived service quality of users.

Uslu & Karabulut (2019) examined the impact of service quality on loyalty, trust and brand image in slow-food restaurants. They concluded that restaurants with high service quality have a significant impact on customer loyalty and brand perception. Kocagöz & Eytmiş (2020) concluded that perceived service quality in coffee chains has a positive impact on consumer loyalty and satisfaction and that satisfaction significantly influences loyalty among customers. Setyawan et al. (2020) examined the impact of perceived quality and brand awareness on a business's quality image, concluding that brand image has a positive impact on brand loyalty. Solunoğlu (2020) concluded that the quality of the food customers experience has a positive impact on their satisfaction and perception of the business's image. Davras & Özperçin (2021) concluded that the quality of the services provided by festivals has a significant impact on the image of the destinations where they are located. Finally, Eren et al. (2023) examined green restaurants and concluded that the quality of the service offered there has a significant impact on revisit intention and restaurant image.

Following the general studies on service quality, relevant studies on the social living spaces located on university campuses and sports facilities, which form the basis of this study, are included. Sports facilities and living spaces within universities are known to significantly impact the physical, social and psychological development of individuals who use them. These spaces on campus not only make the

time spent there more productive, but also significantly enhance the sense of belonging they feel to their campus. The service quality of these facilities is known to have a significant impact on students' repurchase intentions and overall satisfaction (Tinto, 1993). Studies conducted in this direction have revealed different findings regarding the service quality reflected on individuals by sporting and social areas on campuses. For example, in a study conducted by Yıldız & Atalay in 2017, they determined that the factors that most affect the perceptions of individuals using these areas on campus are reliability and physical adequacy. Similarly, Kara et al. (2015) concluded in their study that the behavior of employees and the physical facilities encountered by individuals using the same areas have a significant impact on the service quality they perceive in these areas. Finally, a 2020 study by Özdemir & Polat concluded that the attitudes and behaviors of staff in the use of campus areas have a significant impact on the service quality perceived by individuals.

On the other hand, there are studies examining the relationship between the satisfaction of individuals using the food, beverage and sports facilities on campus and their service quality. These studies in the literature have concluded that service quality has a significant impact on students' perceived satisfaction (Bekar & Kılıç, 2015; Pepe & Algün Doğu, 2024). Similarly, factors such as hygiene, friendly service, security and cleanliness are also seen as important sub-dimensions of service quality (Eser, 2015; Unur & Kanca, 2016; Szkudlarek & Maślanka, 2019; Chand, 2025). Studies focusing on sports and fitness areas have found that service quality does not fully meet individuals' expectations, but the level of dissatisfaction is not particularly high (Aslan, 2006; Çelik & Akyol, 2015; Yıldırım, 2018). Furthermore, a study conducted during the pandemic concluded that individuals perceived high service quality in areas such as food and beverage presentation, operational services and security (Pa et al., 2022). As a result of this research, it is believed that improving the service quality of social and sporting establishments operating on university campuses will have a significant and positive impact on the perceived service quality and satisfaction levels of individuals who choose these establishments.

3. METHOD

3.1. Universe and Sample of the Research

The research population consists of all students receiving active, face-to-face education at higher education institutions across Türkiye as of the spring semester of the 2024-2025 academic year. As of April 1, 2025, the beginning of the data collection period, the research population was determined to be 3.248.672 people (YÖK, 2025). The research sample consists of students receiving active, face-to-face education across Türkiye that could be reached during the data collection period (April 1, 2025 - June 1, 2025). However, it could not be determined exactly how many students in Türkiye were continuing active, face-to-face education during the data collection period. In this context, in cases where the exact sample size cannot be determined, various sources indicate that a sample size of 384 will represent the population in terms of quality and quantity (Altunışık et al., 2007). To ensure an acceptable sample size for the population, the survey prepared was administered to a total of 400 students receiving education across Türkiye via face-to-face and online methods.

3.2. Data Collection Process and Scales of the Research

The data collection process utilized a survey technique. This study utilized a two-part survey consisting of 27 items. The first part of the survey consisted of eight items to identify the participants and their demographic characteristics, along with multiple-choice options. The second part of the survey consisted of 19 items to determine the participants' perceived service quality from the sports facilities and student life centers they utilized, using a five-point Likert scale (5 - Strongly Agree and 1 - Strongly

Disagree). The demographic and Likert-type items in the survey were developed using the work of Babakus & Glynn (1992); Yapraklı & Sağlık (2010).

3.3. Data Analysis of the Research

For the purpose of the research, descriptive statistical tests were first conducted on the collected data. Confirmatory factor analysis was then conducted in this study to determine the reliability and validity of the scale used in Babakus & Glynn (1992); Yapraklı & Sağlık (2010) study to determine the perceived service quality levels of students in the sports facilities and student life centers they utilize. Furthermore, analyses were conducted to identify the differences between each dimension of the scale (physical equipment, reliability, willingness, trust, empathy and satisfaction) and demographic variables, and hypotheses were tested in light of the relevant literature.

3.4. Hypotheses of the Research

This study, prepared in line with the research purpose, is a descriptive and explanatory research using quantitative methods and the assumed research hypotheses are given below.

H₁: The service quality perceived by students from businesses in sports facilities and student life centers they use varies significantly by gender.

H₂: The service quality perceived by students from businesses in sports facilities and student life centers they use varies significantly by age.

H₃: The service quality perceived by students from businesses in sports facilities and student life centers they use varies significantly by marital status.

H₄: The service quality perceived by students from businesses in sports facilities and student life centers they use varies significantly by monthly income levels.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Demographic Findings Regarding Participants

Of the students who participated in the study, 52.5% were female, 92.5% were 19 years old and over, 93.5% were single, 64.5% had a good monthly income, 57.5% had been using social facilities and businesses in student life centers for 1-3 years, 55% used social facilities and businesses in student life centers several times a week, 72.8% used minibuses/public transportation to social facilities and businesses in student life centers, and 34.5% preferred social facilities and businesses in student life centers due to their proximity (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (n=400)

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	
Gender	Female	210	52.5
	Male	190	47.5
Age	Ages 18 and Under	30	7.5
	Ages 19 and Over	370	92.5
Marital Status	Married	26	6.5
	Single	374	93.5

Monthly Income	Bad	30	7.5
	Medium	258	64.5
	Good	112	28.0
Facility Usage Duration	Less than 1 Year	164	41.0
	1-3 Years	230	57.5
	4 Years and Above	6	1.5
Facility Usage Frequency	Once a Week	144	36.0
	Several Times a Week	220	55.0
	Every Day	36	9.0
Transportation to Facilities	Minibuses/Public Transportation	291	72.8
	Taxi	13	3.3
	Private Vehicle	29	7.2
	Motorcycle/Bicycle	67	16.8
Reason for Choosing Facilities	Proximity	138	34.5
	Affordability	60	15.0
	Cleanliness	12	3.0
	Security	14	3.5
	Amenities	176	44.0
Total		400	100

4.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the Scale to Determine the Service Quality Perceptions of Students Using Businesses in Sports Facilities and Student Life Centers

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was applied to the data collected within the scope of the "Scale to Determine the Service Quality Perceptions of Students Utilizing Businesses in Sports Facilities and Student Life Centers" for which reliability and validity tests were conducted by Babakus & Glynn (1992) and Yapraklı & Sağlık (2010) to determine the structural validity of the scale. The secondary level CFA fit indices obtained as a result of the analysis conducted within this scope are presented in Table 2. Model fit indices were checked with CFA analysis, and since the model fit indices showed a "good fit" it was concluded that the model created within the scope of the research was "compatible and acceptable" with the collected data.

Table 2. Secondary Level CFA Fit Indices of the Scale for Determining the Service Quality Perceptions of Students Using Businesses in Sports Facilities and Student Life Centers

Fit Statistics	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	Values	Results
CFI	≥ 0,95	0,94-0,90	0,92	Good Fit
IFI	≥ 0,95	0,94-0,90	0,92	Good Fit

RMSEA	≤ 0,05	0,06-0,08	0,06	Acceptable Compliance
NFI	≥ 0,95	0,94-0,90	0,95	Acceptable Compliance
NNFI (TLI)	≥ 0,95	0,94-0,90	0,95	Acceptable Compliance
(x2/df)	≤3	≤4-5	3,86	Good Fit
AGFI	≥ 0,90	0,89-0,80	0,89	Acceptable Compliance
GFI	≥ 0,90	0,89-0,85	0,84	Good Fit

The factor loadings, CR, AVE and reliability values for the scale to determine the service quality perceptions of students who use businesses in sports facilities and student life centers are shown in Table 3. Hair et al. (2017) stated that factor loadings should be above 0.70. When the values in Table 3 are examined, it is seen that all the expressions included in the analysis are above this value. In addition, when the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the dimensions that make up the scale to determine the service quality perceptions of students who use businesses in sports facilities and student life centers are examined, it is found that the "physical equipment" dimension is .888; "reliability" dimension is .896; "willingness" dimension is .865; "trust" dimension is .848; "empathy" dimension is .820 and "satisfaction" dimension is .866 and according to Hair et al. (2017) internal consistency validity was achieved within the scope of the determination of the CR coefficients between 0.830 and 0.888. In addition, factor loadings between 0.720 and 0.888 and AVE coefficients between 0.580 and 0.798 indicate that convergent validity is achieved.

Table 3. Factor Loadings, CR, AVE and Reliability Values of the Scale for Determining the Service Quality Perceptions of Students Using Businesses in Sports Facilities and Student Life Centers

Dimensions*	Statements	Factor Loadings	t-value	CR	AVE	Cronbach's Alpha
PE	PE1	.888	10.88	0.830	0.740	0.888
	PE2	.878	10.40			
	PE3	.871	9.89			
REL	REL4	.806	10.11	0.847	0.580	0.896
	REL5	.804	8.65			
	REL6	.778	9.23			
WIL	WIL 7	.836	11.01	0.860	0.666	0.865
	WIL 8	.830	8.68			
	WIL 9	.808	7.86			
TRU	TRU 10	.798	8.36	0.820	0.798	0.848
	TRU 11	.776	11.10			
	TRU 12	.764	10.45			
	TRU 13	.720	10.27			
EMP	EMP 14	.802	9.36	0.832	0.605	0.820

	EMP 15	.786	6.58			
	SAT 16	.780	9.44			
SAT	SAT 17	.766	6.98	0.888	0.743	0.866
	SAT 18	.757	7.90			
	SAT 19	.723	8.80			

* PE: Physical Equipment, REL: Reliability, WIL: Willingness, TRU: Trust, EMP: Empathy, SAT: Satisfaction

4.3. Hypothesis Test Results

In this study, before proceeding with hypothesis testing, the data were examined for normal distribution. According to the results of the normality test applied in this context, the skewness value was found to be between -0.560 and 0.987, and the kurtosis value was found to be between 0.887 and -0.688. The determination of the relevant values between -1.5 and +1.5 indicates that the research scale has a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Following the normality test, T-tests and ANOVA analyses were applied to the dimensions and relevant hypotheses for difference tests of the study.

An independent samples T-test was applied to determine whether the dimensions included in the research differed according to the gender variables of the students. According to the test results, a significant difference was found between the PE dimension (.010; $p < 0.05$), REL dimension (.002; $p < 0.05$), WIL dimension (.018; $p < 0.05$), TRU (.025; $p < 0.05$), EMP (.044; $p < 0.05$) and SAT (.046; $p < 0.05$) dimensions and the gender variables of the participants. In the PE dimension; female participants ($x=4.56$) had higher scores than male participants ($x=4.40$), in the REL dimension; female participants ($x=4.58$) had higher scores than male participants ($x=4.20$), in the WIL dimension; female participants ($x=4.60$) had higher scores than male participants ($x=4.42$), in the TRU dimension; it was found that the perceptions of the quality of services used in social facilities and student life centers differed between female participants ($x=4.54$) and male participants ($x=4.46$) in the EMP dimension; female participants ($x=4.25$) and male participants ($x=4.11$) and female participants ($x=4.48$) and male participants ($x=4.28$) in the SAT dimension (Table 4). Within the framework of these results, H_1 was **accepted**.

Table 4. T-test Analysis Results in Terms of Participants' Gender Status

		Test of Equality of Variances				
Factor	Groups	\bar{x}	Levene	p	t	P
PE	Female	4.56	.660	.358	3.302	.010
	Male	4.40				
REL	Female	4.58	.598	.344	2.360	.002
	Male	4.20				
WIL	Female	4.60	.440	.303	4.102	.018
	Male	4.42				
TRU	Female	4.54	.612	.405	2.698	.025
	Male	4.46				

EMP	Female	4.25	.665	.558	3.358	.044
	Male	4.11				
SAT	Female	4.48	.502	.605	4.025	.046
	Male	4.28				

An independent samples T-test was applied to determine whether the dimensions included in the research differed according to the age variables of the students. According to the test results, a significant difference was found between the PE dimension (.036; $p < 0.05$), REL dimension (.028; $p < 0.05$), WIL dimension (.018; $p < 0.05$), TRU (.014; $p < 0.05$), EMP (.032; $p < 0.05$) and SAT (.024; $p < 0.05$) dimensions and the age variables of the participants. In the PE dimension; participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.45$) had higher scores than participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.20$), in the REL dimension; participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.56$) had higher scores than participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.38$), in the WIL dimension; it was found that the perceptions of the quality of services used in social facilities and student life centers differed between participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.38$) compared to participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.18$), in the TRU dimension; between participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.52$) compared to participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.21$), in the EMP dimension; between participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.28$) compared to participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.10$) and between participants aged 19 and over ($x=4.62$) compared to participants aged 18 and over ($x=4.21$) in the SAT dimension (Table 5). Within the framework of these results, H_2 was accepted.

Table 5. T-test Analysis Results in Terms of Participants' Ages Status

		Test of Equality of Variances				
Factor	Groups	\bar{x}	Levene	p	t	P
PE	Ages 18 and Under	4.20	.655	.606	3.689	.036
	Ages 19 and Over	4.45				
REL	Ages 18 and Under	4.38	.256	.365	5.201	.028
	Ages 19 and Over	4.56				
WIL	Ages 18 and Under	4.18	.421	.744	2.369	.018
	Ages 19 and Over	4.38				
TRU	Ages 18 and Under	4.21	.166	.289	3.458	.014
	Ages 19 and Over	4.52				
EMP	Ages 18 and Under	4.10	.428	.404	2.158	.032
	Ages 19 and Over	4.28				
SAT	Ages 18 and Under	4.21	.545	.369	4.008	.024
	Ages 19 and Over	4.62				

An independent samples T-test was applied to determine whether the dimensions included in the research differed according to the marital status variables of the students. According to the test results, a significant difference was found between the PE dimension (.008; $p < 0.05$), REL dimension (.012; $p < 0.05$), WIL dimension (.034; $p < 0.05$), TRU (.004; $p < 0.05$), EMP (.018; $p < 0.05$) and SAT (.036; $p < 0.05$)

dimensions and the marital status variables of the participants. In the PE dimension; single participants ($x=4.36$) had higher scores than married participants ($x=4.16$), in the REL dimension; single participants ($x=4.48$) had higher scores than married participants ($x=4.21$), in the WIL dimension; single participants ($x=4.40$) had higher scores than married participants ($x=4.10$), in the TRU dimension; it was found that the perceptions of the quality of services used in social facilities and student life centers differed between single participants ($x=4.52$) and married participants ($x=4.16$) in the EMP dimension; between single participants ($x=4.45$) and married participants ($x=4.28$) in the SAT dimension; and between single participants ($x=4.48$) and married participants ($x=4.22$) in the SAT dimension (Table 6). Within the framework of these results, H_3 was accepted.

Table 6. T-test Analysis Results in Terms of Participants' Marital Status

		Test of Equality of Variances				
Factor	Groups	\bar{x}	Levene	p	t	P
PE	Married	4.16	.588	.565	2.987	.008
	Single	4.36				
REL	Married	4.21	.445	.622	3.102	.012
	Single	4.48				
WIL	Married	4.10	.358	.448	2.156	.034
	Single	4.40				
TRU	Married	4.16	.208	.511	3.089	.004
	Single	4.52				
EMP	Married	4.28	.601	.446	4.238	.018
	Single	4.45				
SAT	Married	4.22	.478	.389	2.362	.036
	Single	4.48				

One-way analysis of variance was applied to determine whether the dimensions included in the research differ in terms of the monthly income variables of the students. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there was a significant difference in terms of the monthly income variable of the students in the PE dimension (.030; $p<0.05$), REL dimension (.005; $p<0.05$), WIL dimension (.028; $p<0.05$) and SAT dimension (.009; $p<0.05$). In the PE dimension; the participants with good monthly incomes ($x=4.36$) were more significant than the participants with poor monthly incomes ($x=4.16$); in the REL dimension; the participants with good monthly incomes ($x=4.36$) were more significant than the participants with poor monthly incomes ($x=4.16$); in the WIL dimension; the participants with good monthly incomes ($x=4.36$) were more significant than the participants with poor monthly incomes ($x=4.16$) and in the SAT dimension; it was determined that the perception of the quality of services they receive from social facilities and student life centers differed among participants with good monthly incomes ($x=4.36$) compared to participants with poor monthly incomes ($x=4.16$) (Table 7). Within the framework of these results, H_4 was accepted.

Table 7. ANOVA Analysis Results According to Participants' Monthly Income Status

Test of Equality of Variances						
Factor	Groups	\bar{x}	Levene	p	t	P
PE	Bad	4.18	.663	.648	3.897	.030
	Medium	4.25				
	Good	4.35				
REL	Bad	4.10	.589	.587	3.656	.005
	Medium	4.28				
	Good	4.56				
WIL	Bad	4.02	.456	.689	4.208	.028
	Medium	4.18				
	Good	4.46				
TRU	Bad	4.20	.560	.656	3.978	.009
	Medium	4.32				
	Good	4.50				
EMP	Bad	4.06	.480	.580	4.892	.068
	Medium	4.15				
	Good	4.38				
SAT	Bad	4.20	.209	.458	3.115	.083
	Medium	4.28				
	Good	4.32				

5. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This study determined university students' perceptions of service quality regarding their use of sports facilities and student life centers as recreational areas. The findings indicated that students evaluated the service quality of these areas in terms of physical equipment, reliability, willingness, trust, empathy and satisfaction. Analyses revealed that female students had higher perceptions of all service quality dimensions compared to male students. Similarly, students aged 19 and over, unmarried individuals and students with higher monthly incomes also had more positive perceptions of service quality. These findings suggest that the perception of service quality varies not only depending on physical conditions but also on demographic factors. The research findings support some studies in the literature. For example, studies by Yıldız & Atalay (2017) and Kara et al. (2015) revealed that physical competence and employee behavior are the most important factors affecting service quality on university campuses.

Similarly, Özdemir & Polat (2020) emphasized that employee attitudes and behaviors influence perceived service quality. In this context, the high scores on trust, empathy and reliability obtained in our study are consistent with these results. High scores on service quality dimensions indicate that university students are generally satisfied with their on-campus social spaces. However, the relatively lower perceptions in some demographic groups (e.g., low-income or married students) suggest that these groups' expectations or experiences differ. This suggests that service providers need to develop policies more responsive to the needs of different student profiles. Consequently, the perception of service quality in sports facilities and student life centers on university campuses plays a significant role in students' frequency of use of these spaces, their level of satisfaction and their sense of belonging to the institution. Therefore, it is recommended that university administrations continuously measure the quality of services offered in these areas and implement improvements based on student expectations. Furthermore, a comparative examination of service quality perceptions across universities in future studies could contribute to more comprehensive conclusions.

6. REFERENCE

- [1] Abdullah, N. & Mohamad, N. (2016). University recreational facilities service quality and students' physical activity level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224, 207-212.
- [2] Aksaray, M. & Ateş, A. (2019). Turist rehberlerinin hizmet kalitesinin destinasyon imajına etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 22(1), 112-132.
- [3] Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. & Yıldırım, E. (2007). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: SPSS uygulamalı. (geliştirilmiş 5. baskı)*. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- [4] Aslan, M. (2006). Determination of the service quality among sport and fitness centers of the selected universities. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Middle East Technical University.
- [5] Babakus, E. & Glynn, M. (1992). Adapting the servqual scale to hospital services: an empirical investigation. *Health Service Research*, 26(6), 767-786.
- [6] Bekar, A. & Kılıç, B. (2015). Hizmet kalitesi memnuniyet ilişkisi: üniversite kampüsünde faaliyet gösteren yiyecek içecek işletmelerinde karşılaştırmalı bir uygulama. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 34, 1-16.
- [7] Chand, D. (2025). Canteen service quality and student satisfaction: a case study of a private college in kathmandu. *Nepalese Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 6(1), 129-143.
- [8] Cronin, J. J. & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68.
- [9] Czepiel, J. A. (1990). Service encounters and service relationships: implications for research. *Journal of Business Research*, 20, 13-21.
- [10] Çelik, A. K. & Akyol, K. (2015). Predicting student satisfaction with an emphasis on campus recreational sports and cultural facilities in a Turkish university. *International Education Studies*, 8(4), 7-18.
- [11] Davras, Ö. & Özperçin, İ. (2021). The relationships of motivation, service quality, and behavioral intentions for gastronomy festival: the mediating role of destination image. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 15(4), 451-464.
- [12] Dean, A., Morgan, D. & Tan, T. E. (2002). Service quality and customers' willingness to pay more for travel services. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(2-3), 95-110.
- [13] Eleren, A., Bektaş, Ç. & Görmüş, A.Ş. (2007). Hizmet sektöründe hizmet kalitesinin servqual yöntemi ile ölçülmesi ve hazır yemek işletmesinde bir uygulama, *Finans Politik&Ekonomik Yorumlar Dergisi*, 44/514, 75-88.

- [14] Eren, R., Uslu, A. & Aydın, A. (2023). The effect of service quality of green restaurants on green restaurant image and revisit intention: the case of istanbul. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5798.
- [15] Eren, S. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okul içi kantin hizmetleri ile ilgili beklenti ve hizmet kalitesine yönelik genel tatmin düzeylerinin belirlenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(25), 211-219.
- [16] Eser, F. D. (2015). Üniversite spor hizmetlerinin karşılıklı memnuniyet düzeyleri: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Spor Merkezi örneği. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Pamukkale Üniversitesi.
- [17] Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- [18] Hair J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M. & Thiele, K. O. (2017). Mirror, mirror on the wall: a comparative evaluation of composite-based structural equation modeling methods. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(5), 616-632.
- [19] Haywood-Farmer, J. (1988). A conceptual model of service quality. *International Journal of Operations&Production Management*, 8(6), 19-29.
- [20] Hill, F., Lomas, L. & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1), 15-20.
- [21] Hu, H. H. (Sunny), Kandampully, J. & Juwaheer, T. D. (2009). Relationships and impacts of service quality, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and image: an empirical study. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(2), 111-125.
- [22] ISO Quality Certificate. (n.d.). ISO 9000 belgesi nedir? ISO 9001 belgesi nedir? ISO 9004 belgesi nedir? <https://www.isokalitebelgesi.com/iso-9000-belgesi-nedir-iso-9001-belgesi-nedir-iso-9004-belgesi-nedir> (Retrieved: 13 April 2025).
- [23] İslamoğlu, A. H., Candan, B., Hacıefendioğlu, Ş. & Aydın, K. (2006). *Hizmet pazarlaması*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
- [24] Juran, J. M. (1995). *A history of managing for quality*. ASQC Quality Press.
- [25] Kara, A., Demirtaş, H. & Şahin, F. (2015). Üniversite kampüslerinde sosyal alanların hizmet kalitesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 40(181), 233-246.
- [26] Kayaman, R. & Araslı, H. (2007). Customer based brand equity: evidence from the hotel industry. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 17(1), 92-109.
- [27] Khan, M. A. (2010). An empirical assessment of service quality of cellular mobile telephone operators in Pakistan. *Asian Social Science*, 6(10), 164-177.
- [28] Kocagöz, E. & Eyitmiş, A. M. (2020). The effects of perceived service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty: a quantitative research in the food and beverage industry. *Business and Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(5), 4575-4610.
- [29] Koç, F., Şahin, N. K. & Özbek, V. (2014). Hizmet hataları ve algılanan kalite arasındaki ilişki üzerinde değiştirme maliyetinin düzenleyici etkisi: küçük işletmeler ve hizmet satın aldıkları muhasebecilere yönelik bir uygulama. *Pazarlama ve Pazarlama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14, 21-46.
- [30] Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (2012). *The Principles of marketing. (14. edition)*. UK: Pearson Education.
- [31] Mucuk, İ. (2006). *Pazarlama ilkeleri*. Bursa: Türkmen Kitabevi.
- [32] Nadiri, H., Kandampully, J. & Hussain, K. (2009). Students' perceptions of service quality in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 20(5), 523-535.
- [33] Özdemir, M. & Polat, S. (2020). Üniversite yemekhanelerinde hizmet kalitesi algısı ve öğrenci memnuniyeti. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 10(1), 45-54.
- [34] Özgül, E. & Devebakan, N. (2005). Üniversitelerde SERVQUAL tekniği ile algılanan hizmet kalitesinin ölçülmesine yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 93-116.

- [35] Pa, W. A. M. W., Hassan, M. F. & Redde, S. (2022). Quality of sports facilities services and student satisfaction during covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 11(2), 115-127.
- [36] 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.
- [37] 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.
- [38] Pepe, B. & Algün Doğu, G. (2024). Üniversitelerin fitness merkezlerinin hizmet kalitesi ve müşteri memnuniyet ilişkisinin spor bilimleri fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğrenciler açısından incelenmesi (burdur mehmet akif ersoy üniversitesi örneği). *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(3), 414-425.
- [39] Rowley, J. (1998). Quality measurement in the public sector: some perspectives from the service quality literature. *Total Quality Management*, 9(2/3), 321-335.
- [40] Setyawan, K. F., Mugiono. & Hussein, A. S. (2020). The effect between brand awareness, perceived quality, and brand loyalty through a brand image. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 23(1), 216-224.
- [41] Sevimli, S. (2006). Hizmet sektöründe kalite ve hizmet kalitesi ölçümü üzerine bir uygulama. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
- [42] Silik, C. E. & Ünlüöner, K. (2018). Hizmet kalitesi, müşteri memnuniyeti ve tavsiye etme niyeti arasındaki ilişki: kayak merkezlerine yönelik bir inceleme. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(4), 333-357.
- [43] Solunoğlu, M. (2020). Perceived food quality, satisfaction, brand image in restaurants and recommendation intention relation. *Journal of Yasar University*, 15(60), 833-849.
- [44] Szkudlarek, M. & Maślanka, T. (2019). Assessment of service quality in university canteens: a case study of warsaw universities. *PMC*, 6801505.
- [45] Tehci, A. (2022). Yükseköğretimde hizmet kalitesi ve öğrenci memnuniyeti: görsel haritalama tekniği ile bibliyometrik analiz. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(2), 808-821.
- [46] Timur, B. (2018). Service quality, destination image and revisit intention relationships at thermal tourism businesses. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel*, 1(1), 38-48.
- [47] Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. (2. edition). USA: University of Chicago Press.
- [48] Tosun, C., Dedeoğlu, B. B. & Fyall, A. (2015). Destination service quality, affective image and revisit intention: the moderating role of past experience. *Journal of Destination Marketing&Management*, 4(4), 222-234.
- [49] Türk Dil Kurumu. (2025). Kalite. *Güncel Türkçe Sözlük*. <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>, (Retrieved: 13 April 2025).
- [50] Unur, K. & Kanca, B. (2016). Mersin üniversitesi merkezi kafeteryadaki yiyecek içecek hizmetlerinin öğrenciler tarafından algılanan kalite, memnuniyet ve algılanan risk açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-36.
- [51] Uslu, A. & Karabulut, A. N. (2019). Slow food konseptine uygun restoranlarda algılanan hizmet kalitesinin, markaya yönelik imaj, güven ve sadakate etkisi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(72), 2166-2181.
- [52] Ustasüleyman, T. (2009). Bankacılık sektöründe hizmet kalitesinin değerlendirilmesi: AHS-TOPSIS yöntemi. *Bankacılar Dergisi*, 69, 33-44.
- [53] Yapraklı, Ş. & Sağlık, E. (2010). Hizmet işletmelerinde rekabet aracı olarak hizmet kalitesi ve ilişki kalitesi: konaklama işletmelerinde bir uygulama. *Öneri Dergisi*, 9(34), 71-85.
- [54] Yıldırım, M. (2018). Spor tesislerinden yararlanan kişilerin tesislerden memnuniyet düzeylerinin belirlenmesi (eskışehir osmangazi üniversitesi örneği). *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(25), 342-360.

- [55] Yıldız, M. & Atalay, E. (2017). Üniversite spor tesislerinde hizmet kalitesi ve kullanıcı memnuniyeti: bir uygulama. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 28(1), 35-50.
- [56] Yılmaz, K. & Temizkan, V. (2022). The effects of educational service quality and socio-cultural adaptation difficulties on international students' higher education satisfaction. *SAGE Open*, 12(1), 1-18.
- [57] YÖK. (2025). Student Statistics. <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>, (Retrieved: 01 April 2025).
- [58] Zeithaml, V. A. & Bitner, M. J. (2003). *Services marketing: integrating customer focus across the firm*. (3. Edition). USA: McGraw-Hill.
- [59] Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2-22.