

CUSTOMER PERCEPTION ON SERVICE QUALITY IN THE HOSPITALITY SECTOR WITH A FOCUS ON HOTELS IN ABEOKUTA, NIGERIA

Muideen Adejare ISIAKA^{1,3}, Oluyemi Theophilus ADEOSUN², Oladapo Michael SANNI¹ and Rukayat Kikelomo ISIAKA⁴

1. Abeokuta Business School, Crescent University, Abeokuta
Email: dr.isiaka@gmail.com
2. Department of Economics, University of Lagos
Email: oluyemiadeosun@gmail.com
3. Department of Economics and Actuarial Sciences
Email: funkdap@yahoo.com
4. Department of Sociology, Lagos State University, Ojoo, Lagos
Email: rkisiaka@gmail.com

Received: 26/11/2022 **Revised:** 13/3/2023 **Accepted:** 22/3/2023 **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.31559/IJHTS2022.3.2.1>

Abstract: The hotel industry is largely dependent on service quality and customer satisfaction for continuous and efficient growth. The main aim of this research is to determine how perceptions of service quality have influenced hotels' operations in determining customer loyalty and satisfaction. To this end, a sample of 148 customers was drawn from the hotel industry in Abeokuta in south-west Nigeria. The study used a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire that ranges strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Different tests such as demographic analysis, descriptive and reliability test were applied to achieve the objective. The variables employed are tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, confidentiality, communication, sociability/valence, and waiting time. The results clearly show that customers only have a low satisfaction level about the quality of hotel industry services, with an average score of 2.69. The study recommends that the managers and all hospitality service providers provide enough functional and technical quality, which most consumers consider before using such services repeatedly. This is because exclusive customer experiences increase customers' intention to promote firms through Word of Mouth (WOM). The study leverage first-hand data in the hospitality sector of Abeokuta.

Keywords: *Customer Satisfaction, Customer Perception, Service Quality, Hotel Industry.*

1. Introduction

The provision of quality service is a major driver of customer satisfaction in the hospitality industry. The success of any business does not hang on attracting new customers but on strategies and plans to retain the existing ones. Therefore, any enterprise's concentration on retaining loyal existing customers must be implemented through effective customer satisfaction policies and practices. The management's attitude toward focusing on customer satisfaction will promote and improve customer loyalty. And, the hotel's image will be painted positively through the customers' word of mouth (WOM).

In today's market, competitiveness has been the major tool in measuring business sustainability (Atwal and Williams, 2009). Treating customers as kings is a key strategy to a successful business. The strategy of treating customers as kings is to increase demand, create a last long memory of what customers experience, and increase their desire to have it repeatedly. A recent report redefined the concept of going to a hotel; a customer feedback survey revealed that customers perceived it as a place to experience (Sukhu, Choi, Bujisic & Bilgihan, 2019).

Experience shows that customer satisfaction involves all aspects of service delivery, and the hotel management may not be aware of the specific aspect from which the customer is deriving his satisfaction (Grewal, Levy & Kumar, 2009). Therefore, there will always be competition in providing high-quality service to retain existing customers and increase the hotel's customer base. Various elements of service offered will always be constantly assessed by the customers (Meyer and Schwager, 2007). The main aim of the hotel administrators is to know how to keep their existing customers and increase the numerical value of visits and visitors who are checking in and out of the hotel. Understanding empirical knowledge of quality service that will create total customer satisfaction among Abeokuta hotels in the southwest region of Nigeria is the focus of this research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Review

This study relies on the role theory proposed by Ralph Linton and George Herbert Mead. It is a psychological theory that defines every human activity to be psychologically and socially oriented, in which human roles are viewed as norms, expectations, or a particular duty a person has to fulfil (Baskentl et. al, 2019). Every service in the hotel industry is expected to be socially inclined and standard that elucidates both service providers and guest roles in a bid to provide and receive the utmost satisfaction in the industry (Sarkar et.al, 2021). It also specifies that hotel employees often witness stress due to overwhelming workload, which negatively affects their output (Chen, 2018). Also, the occurrence of conflicting or opposite expectations between hotel guests and service providers is another essential factor the role theory duly considered (Shao and Peng, 2022). The desire to satisfy customers optimally and get their uncompromising trust and loyalty drive the quality of service that will be rendered to every guest that patronizes any hotel.

Although, some studies have considered other theories to determine customer satisfaction in the hotel industry. According to Sukhu, Choi, Bujisic and Bilgihan (2019), the major theoretical bases for hotel customer perception of service quality are the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA). Their study suggested hypothesis refers to attitudes and beliefs as predicting factors of consumer behaviour regarding service quality. The beliefs about surroundings and self were found to have an impact on people's emotions and satisfaction. The theory of cognitive emotion (Lazarus, 1991) states that emotions are derivative of beliefs, and therefore, the way people perceive their surroundings through beliefs influences their level of the

emotional state of reasoning. In conclusion, people's beliefs affect their emotional state of mind likewise, their satisfaction in different contexts. In addition, people's attitudes have been proven to be a determinant of satisfaction (Dedeoglu and Demirer, 2015; Giritlioglu, Jones & Avcikurt, 2014; Saari and Judge, 2004).

2.2 Empirical Review

A plethora of previous studies supports the notion that hotel customers pay for an experience and that it is sacrosanct for hotel service providers to pay attention to the sensory experience to inspire positive emotions, moods and feelings among current and potential customers (Andersson, 2010). A package of services that induce positive consumer behaviour includes an appeal to consumer emotions using emotional, physiological, and cognitive responses (Ali, Hussain, Konar & Jeon, 2017; Tamwatin, Trimetsoontorn & Fongsuwan, 2015). Different definitions have been given to service quality. According to (Alshamsi, et al., 2020; Edvardsson, 1998), any service that meets customers' expectations and equally satisfies their utmost requirements is often regarded as service quality. The tangibility, reliability, and responsiveness of any service determine the quality of such services (Shao and Peng, 2022). Customer satisfaction is an important factor that determines guest relationships with providers. Any satisfied customers will undoubtedly come back for the service and equally recommends others to use such services. A dissatisfied guest on the other hand will respond differently. Any dissatisfied guest will complain and discourage others from patronizing such services.

Also, another concerned variable construct of this work is the responsiveness of the hotel service providers to their clients. The willingness and the eagerness to respond to all customer's wants, providing a receptive mechanism to responding to their needs, is known as responsiveness. Mmutle and Shonhe (2017) explained responsiveness in their work on customer perception as the continuous provision of good services to customers and ever willingness to assist customers. Whenever hotel service providers quickly respond to important factors like inquiries and complaints from guests timeously, customer satisfaction is promoted, which directly enhances the hotel's service quality. Another variable construct in this work is tangibility which refers to all the physical and feasible facilities used to portray an organization positively. The physical appearance of a hotel determines how the hotel will grow in the industry as hotel appearance determines achievement. It is an accepted fact that before any visitor or guest visits any hotel, the hotel will first be accessed through its physical appearance and reviewed before considering other factors like its customer satisfaction and the quality of service it provides.

Also, it looks at reliability as the entrusted ability of service providers to provide their services efficiently and effectively. Whenever service providers in the industry provide guests with the precise and concise service they proclaim to provide during their advertisement is often referred to as service reliability which is a core factor that determines both customer satisfaction and service quality.

Another important variable considered is sociability and valence. According to Purnawirawan et al., (2015), valence plays a significant role in customer or guest's satisfaction and even their intention to recommend such service to other potential customers. Also, Hu and Yang (2020) research emphasized that valence rating is significantly connected to a guest's choice of choosing hotel.

Service quality indexes that have been used in previous hotel research include SERVQUAL, LODGSERV, SERVQUALCAL and HOLSERV (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Mei, Dean, and White, 1999). Tangibility and reliability are the only two scopes of SURVAUAL which are generic, while LODGQUAL was developed with the following dimension: (1) tangible, (2)

reliability, (3) contact, (4) empathy, and (5) safety. SERVQUAL has been expanded to include: (1) Communication and transactions, (2) solutions to problems, (3) precision and service speed, and (4) accuracy of hotel reservations in some hotel research. Other dimensions include: (1) presentation and knowledge of the staff, (2) quality products and beverage products, (3) the general value for money, (4) Reserve services, and (5) the structure and the staff atmosphere, was identified to determine the totality of services-scape (Rauch, Collins, Nale & Barr, 2015; Dedeoglu & Demirer, 2015; Ali, Ryu, & Hussain, 2016; Ban, Choi, Choi, Lee and Kim, 2019).

3. Methodology

A questionnaire survey method is employed for this study. The reason for considering this method compared to the face-to-face interview method is that it is a faster, cheaper, and increasingly useful method to obtain information from many interviewees. The second fact for adopting this method is that it allows respondents to answer questions at will without unduly affecting the researcher's existence, which often leads to prejudice. In addition, when using closed questions, investigators can use various statistical software packages to quickly and easily record, quantify, and objectively analyze the data collected in the questionnaire survey. Lastly, hotel customers in Abeokuta of south west Nigeria are majorly presumed to be learned at least at the literate level. Suppose some of the hotel customers willing to participate are not literate. In that case, the researcher will have to present or employ a research assistant to interpret the questionnaire for data collection. Data collected from the completed questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 software.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Table 1 indicates the outcome of the reliability test of the key questions in the study. These questions are critical as they are directly related to research questions.

Table 1 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Key Items in the Questionnaire	Cronbach Alpha	D.G. rho (PCA)
Customers Satisfaction	0.779	0.851
Tangibility	0.654	0.764
Responsiveness	0.737	0.828
Sociability & Valence	0.844	0.885
Waiting Time	0.734	0.814
Communication	0.682	0.720
Confidence	0.712	0.863
Reliability	0.660	0.798

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

The value of the alpha for each question as well as the rho value, is greater than 0.6, with a lot of rho values above 0.8. These measures are reliable.

4.2 Demographics Analysis

The demographics analysis presents information about the respondents, including working experience and year of operation. This is important for any research that sources data through questionnaire, the experience about customer service differ across the respondents.

Table 2, row 1 shows the gender distribution of the surveyed respondents. About 39% are male, while the remaining 61% are females. For the age distribution, about 37% of the respondents are within 20-30 age range, 20% are of 31-40 years, 21% are of age 41-50, 19% belong to age 51-60, and 3% of the respondents belonged to age group 61-70 years.

Concerning experience, about 74% have 1-5 years of experience, 18% have 6-10 years of experience, the respondents with 11-20 years' experience stood at 5%, and 3% have 21 years and above. For qualification, 20% of the respondents had bachelor's degrees, 16% were interns, 32% of the respondents were with NCE/OND, and 31% of the respondents were O-level holders.

Table 2: Demographics of the Respondents

Variable\Statistic	NoB	Mode	Mode freq	Categories	Freq	(%)
Gender	147	Female	88	Female	88.000	60.690
				Male	57.000	39.310
Age	147	20-30	54	20-30	54.000	36.735
				31-40	30.000	20.408
				41-50	31.000	21.088
				51-60	28.000	19.048
				61-70	4.000	2.721
Experience	147	1-5	109	1-5	109.000	74.150
				6-10	26.000	17.687
				11-20	8.000	5.442
				21years Above	4.000	2.721
Highest Qualification	147	NCE/ND	47	Bachelor/Degree	30.000	20.408
				Internship	24.000	16.327
				NCE/ND	47.000	31.973
				O-Level	46.000	31.293
What level are you in the organization structure?	147	Managerial	73	Managerial	73.000	52.143
				Operational	55.000	39.286
				Strategic	12.000	8.571
What is your monthly income	147	₦100000-499999	44	1-99999	40.000	33.058
				100000-499999	44.000	36.364
				1000000-1499999	9.000	7.438
				500000-999999	11.000	9.091
				Over 1500000	17.000	14.050

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

For the career level of respondents, 52% are at the managerial level, 39% are operational, while the remaining 9% are at a strategic level in the organization. For income of the respondent, 33% of the

respondents have ₦1-99999 income monthly, 36% generate ₦100000-499999 monthly, 7% of the respondents generate ₦1000000-1499999 monthly, 9% of the respondents generate ₦500000-999999 while over ₦1500000 are generated by 14% of the respondents.

4.3 Level of Customer Satisfaction

Table 3 presents the response of the respondents regarding customer satisfaction. The result of item 1 shows almost 60% (59.2) of the respondents either mildly disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that they are satisfied with the decision to use the resort as a service provider and less than 30% agree while 14% of the respondents were undecided. Item 2 of Table 3 reveals that 47% of the respondents disagree with the statement of their choice of choosing the resort as a service provider was a wise one, 44.9% of the respondents agree the choice they made was a wise one and 8.2% were not sure if their choice was a wise one or not. The result of the question in row 3 of table 3 reveals that almost 45%(44.9%) of these respondents chose between strongly disagree or mildly disagree with the statement stating whether they have done the right thing or not when choosing the hotel, 34.7% of these participating respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while 20.4% were undecided.

Table 3: Summary of Overall Customer Satisfaction Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. Satisfied with the choice to this particular hotel.	48 32.7%	39 26.5%	21 14.3%	36 24.5%	3 2.0%	147 100%	2.37
2. Choosing this hotel as a service provider was a wise decision.	21 14.3%	48 32.7%	12 8.2%	48 32.7%	18 12.2%	147 100%	2.96
3. I did the right thing for choosing this destination.	24 16.3%	42 28.6%	30 20.4%	42 28.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.80
4. I enjoyed my experience with this hotel.	66 44.9%	36 24.5%	12 8.2%	27 18.4%	6 4.1%	147 100%	2.12
5. I have a satisfactory experience in this hotel.	27 18.4%	21 14.3%	3 2.0%	84 57.1%	12 8.2%	147 100%	3.22
Total	186 25.3%	186 25.3%	78 10.6%	237 32.2%	48 6.5%	735 100%	2.69

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

Row 4 of Table 3 depicts that almost 70% of the participating respondents' opinions were in between disagree or strongly disagree on whether their experience with the resort has been enjoyable, 22.5 of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while the remaining percentage was not sure of the statement. The result of item 5 reveals high percentage (65.3%) of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement they were satisfied with their decision to use the

resort as a service provider, 32.7% of the respondents were either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and the remaining 2.0% were not sure of their decision. The average score reveals that items 2, 3 and 5 have a score greater than 2.5, indicating more of the respondent agree. The overall average is 2.69 indicating that the respondents are mildly satisfied.

4.4 Analysis of Tangibility Measures

Tangibility analysis was carried out among selected hotels in Abeokuta. Table 4 reveals the results of respondents regarding their experience in the hotels. Row 1 of Table 4 depicts 63.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement that "the front desk was visually appealing", 32.7% of the respondents disagree with the statement, while only 4.1% are undecided.

Table 4: Summary of Tangibility of Service Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. The front desk was visually appealing	21 14.3%	27 18.4%	6 4.1%	81 55.1%	12 8.2%	147 100%	3.24
2. The employees had clean, neat uniforms	18 12.2%	21 14.3%	18 12.2%	84 57.1%	6 4.1%	147 100%	3.27
3. The hotel's atmosphere was inviting	6 4.1%	12 8.1%	60 40.5%	52 35.1%	18 12.2%	148 100%	3.43
4. The hotel's interior was pleasant and attractive.	15 10.2%	16 10.9%	18 12.2%	71 48.3%	27 18.4%	147 100%	3.54
5. The outdoor surroundings were visually attractive	30 20.4%	47 32.0%	15 10.2%	52 35.4%	3 2.0%	147 100%	2.67
6. The hotel was bright and well-lighted	27 18.4%	12 8.2%	12 8.2%	69 46.9%	27 18.4%	147 100%	3.39
7. The hotel's interior and exterior were well maintained	42 28.6%	52 35.4%	18 12.2%	29 19.7%	6 4.1%	147 100%	2.35
8. The hotel was clean	42 28.6%	59 40.1%	15 10.2%	22 15.0%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.30
9. The front desk was visually appealing	18 12.3%	18 12.3%	21 14.4%	74 50.7%	15 10.3%	146 100%	3.34
Total	219 16.6%	264 20.0%	183 13.8%	534 40.4%	123 9.3%	1323 100%	3.06

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

About 61.2% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement in row 2 of the table, 26.5% of them either disagree or strongly agree with the statement and the remaining 12.2% of the respondents neither agree/strongly nor disagree/strongly disagree. Row 3 reveals 47.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly disagree with the statement in the row, less than 15%(12.2%) of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while 40.5% of the respondents are not sure.

The result of the statement "the hotel's interior was pleasant and active" reveals 66.7% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statements, 21.1% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree, while 12.2% are undecided. Row 5 of table 4 result shows 37.4% either agree or strongly agree, 50.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and 10.2% are not sure whether to agree or disagree with the statement. The result to the statement "the hotel was bright and well-lighted" reveals that 65.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly disagree with the statement, 26.6% are either disagree or strongly agree with the statement and the remaining 8.2% are undecided.

Row 7 of the tangibility cross-tabulation analysis reveals 23.8% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement in it, 64% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while 12.2% of the respondents remain undecided. The result of the statement "the hotel was clean" reveals 21.1% of the respondents agree and strongly agree with the statement, 68.7% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while 10.2% are undecided. The result of the last statement on the tangibility cross-tabulation analysis depicts 70% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement, 24.6% either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while 14.4% are undecided.

Out of the nine items under tangibility measures, seven have a mean score that is greater than 2.5. The overall mean score is 3.06 indicating customers are somewhat satisfied with the tangibility of hotel services in Abeokuta.

4.5 Analysis of Reliability of Services

Cross-tabulation analysis was carried out on reliability among hotels' guests in Abeokuta. The result is row 1 of table 5 reveals 71.4% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement, 16.3% either disagree or strongly disagree, while 14.3% of the respondents remain undecided about the statement. The result of cross-tabulation analysis on reliability in row 2 of table 5 shows 38.8% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement, 24.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with the statement while high percent (36.7%) of the respondents are not sure if their room was ready as promised.

Table 5: Summary of Reliability of Service Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. My reservation was handled efficiently	18 12.2%	6 4.1%	21 14.3%	84 57.1%	18 12.2%	147 100%	3.53
2. My room was ready as promised	18 12.2%	18 12.2%	54 36.7%	42 28.6%	15 10.2%	147 100%	3.12
3. All the equipment in the room was working properly	27 18.4%	39 26.5%	21 14.3%	51 34.7%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.84
4. I got what I paid for	33 22.4%	33 22.4%	27 18.4%	45 30.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.76
Total	96 16.3%	96 16.3%	123 20.9%	222 37.8%	51 8.7%	588 100%	3.06

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

The result in row three of the analysis table shows that 40.8% of the respondents agree that all equipment in the hotel room was working properly, while 44.9% of the respondents disagree with the statement and 14.3% of the respondents did not decide on the statement. The result is row 4 of the analysis table depicts 36.7% of the respondents agree they got what they paid for while 44.8% of the respondents disagree with the statement and the remaining 18.4% of the respondents are not sure if they got what they paid for or not. All the four reliability measures have a mean score that is more than 2.5, indicating that respondents have mild satisfaction with the reliability of hotel services in Abeokuta, leading to the overall mean value of 3.06.

4.6 Analysis of Responsiveness Measures

A cross-tabulation analysis was carried out on responsiveness through the response of hotels' guests in Abeokuta. The result is row 1 of table 6 reveals 61.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement in the row while 24.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statements and 14.3% of them are undecided. Row 2 of the analysis table depicts 69.1% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statements while 16.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and 14.4% are undecided.

Table 6: Summary of Responsiveness of Service

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. Employees responded promptly to my requests	18 12.2%	18 12.2%	21 14.3%	75 51.0%	15 10.2%	147 100%	3.35
2. Informative literature about the hotel was provided	18 12.3%	6 4.1%	21 14.4%	83 56.8%	18 12.3%	146 100%	3.53
3. Employees were willing to answer my questions	18 12.2%	18 12.2%	54 36.7%	42 28.6%	15 10.2%	147 100%	3.12
4. Employees responded quickly to solve my problems	27 18.4%	39 26.5%	21 14.3%	51 34.7%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.84
5. Room service was prompt	33 22.4%	33 22.4%	27 18.4%	45 30.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.76
Total	114 15.5%	114 15.5%	144 19.6%	296 40.3%	66 9.0%	734 100%	3.12

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

The result in row 3 of table 6 reveals that 38.8% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement, the result also reveals that 24.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with the statement while a large percent (36.7%) of the respondents are undecided. Row 4 result reveals that 40.8% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree that employees responded quickly to solve their problems while 44.9% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and 14.3% of the respondents remain undecided about the statement. The last test result on the analysis table reveals 36.7% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the fact that the room service was prompt, while 44.8% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. All the five measures of responsiveness have a mean score that is above 2.5, with the overall mean score of 3.12. This suggests that respondents have mild satisfaction with the responsiveness of hotel services in Abeokuta.

4.7 Analysis of Confidentiality Measures

Table 7 reveals the results of the confidentiality cross-tabulation analysis carried out in some selected quests in hotels in Abeokuta. The response from respondents to the statement in row 1 of table 7 reveals 69.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement, 16.3% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while 14.3% of the respondents are undecided. Row 2 result reveals that 38.8% either agree or strongly agree that the employees treated them with respect, 24.4% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while a large percentage of 36.7% of the respondents are not sure whether they are treated with respect or not.

Table 7: Summary of Confidentiality of Staff

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. Employees knew about the local places of interest	18 12.2%	6 4.1%	21 14.3%	84 57.1%	18 12.2%	147 100%	3.53
2. Employees treated me with respect	18 12.2%	18 12.2%	54 36.7%	42 28.6%	15 10.2%	147 100%	3.12
3. Employees were polite when answering my questions	27 18.4%	39 26.5%	21 14.3%	51 34.7%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.84
4. The hotel provided a safe environment	33 22.4%	33 22.4%	27 18.4%	45 30.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.76
5. The facilities were conveniently located	18 12.2%	18 12.2%	21 14.3%	75 51.0%	15 10.2%	147 100%	3.35
Total	114 15.5%	114 15.5%	144 19.6%	297 40.4%	66 9.0%	735 100%	3.12

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

Row 3 reveals 40.8% either agree or strongly agree that the employees were polite when answering their questions, 44.9% of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with this statement while 14.3% of the respondents are undecided on the statement. The result in row 4 depicts 36.7% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree the hotel provided a safe environment, 44.8% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while 18.4% of them are undecided. The outcome in row 5 of table 7 reveals 60.3% of the respondents agree the facilities were conveniently located, 24.4% of the respondents disagree with this statement while 14.3% of the respondents are not sure whether the facilities in the hotel premises were conveniently located or not. All the five measure of confidentiality have a mean score that is more than 2.5. Item 1 has the highest mean score of 3.53. The overall mean score is 3.12, indicating mild satisfaction with the level of confidentiality of hotel staff in Abeokuta.

4.8 Analysis of Communication Measures

A communication cross-tabulation analysis was conducted. Below in Table 8 are the results of the analysis. Row 1 of Table 8 reveals that 44.9% of the respondents either agree or strongly disagree with the statement, 47% of the respondent either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, while 8.2% of the respondents are not sure if the charges on their account were clearly explained.

Table 8: Summary of Communication of Service Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. Charges on my account were clearly explained	21 14.3%	48 32.7%	12 8.2%	48 32.7%	18 12.2%	147 100%	2.96
2. I received undivided attention at the front desk	24 16.3%	42 28.6%	30 20.4%	42 28.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.80
3. Staff tried to find out my particular needs	66 44.9%	36 24.5%	12 8.2%	27 18.4%	6 4.1%	147 100%	2.12
4. Employees anticipated my needs	27 18.4%	21 14.3%	3 2.0%	84 57.1%	12 8.2%	147 100%	3.22
Total	138 23.5%	147 25.0%	57 9.7%	201 34.2%	45 7.7%	588 100%	2.78

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

Results from row 2 reveal that 34.7% of the respondents agree to the fact they received undivided attention at the front desk of the hotel, the result reveals 44.9% of the respondents either disagree or disagree with the statement while 20.4% are undecided. The outcome of row 3 analysis reveals 22.5% either agree or strongly agree staff tried to find out their particular needs, almost 70% (69.4%) of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with the statement while 8.2% of them are undecided about the statement. Row 4 of the communication cross-tabulation analysis reveals a large percentage of 65.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the fact that employees anticipated their needs, 32.7% of the respondents are against this statement while a low percent of 2.0% of the respondents are undecided. Out of the four measure of communication, item 3 has a mean score of less than 2.5, indicating that customers do not agree that hotel staff tried to find out about their particular need. The overall mean score of 2.78 however indicated mild satisfaction with the level of communication of hotel staff with customers in Abeokuta.

4.9 Analysis of Sociability and Valence Measures

Sociality and valence cross-tabulation analysis was carried out among guests in the hotels in Abeokuta. Row 1 of Table 9 reveals 36.7% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement "I was provided with opportunity for social interaction, 44.8% of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with the statement while 18.4% are not sure about the statement.

Table 9: Summary of Sociability & Valence of Service Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Undecided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. I was provided with	33	33	27	45	9	147	2.76

opportunities for social interaction.	22.4%	22.4%	18.4%	30.6%	6.1%	100%	
2. I felt a sense of belonging with other customers.	18	18	21	75	15	147	3.35
	12.2%	12.2%	14.3%	51.0%	10.2%	100%	
3. I made social contacts	21	48	12	48	18	147	2.96
	14.3%	32.7%	8.2%	32.7%	12.2%	100%	
4. At the end of my stay, I felt that I had a good experience.	24	42	30	42	9	147	2.80
	16.3%	28.6%	20.4%	28.6%	6.1%	100%	
5. I would evaluate the outcome of the services favorably	27	21	3	84	12	147	3.22
	18.4%	14.3%	2.0%	57.1%	8.2%	100%	
Total	189	198	105	321	69	882	2.87
	21.4%	22.4%	11.9%	36.4%	7.8%	100%	

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

Row 2 of table 9 reveals 61.2% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree they felt a sense of belonging with other customers, 24.4% of the respondents felt differently with the statement while a percentage of 14.3% are undecided. The analysis also reveals that 44.9% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree they make social contact, 47% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with making social contact in the hotel while 8.2% are undecided. Row 4 of Table 9 reveals 34.7% of the respondents felt they have a good experience at the end of their stay in the hotels in Abeokuta, 44.9% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while 20.4% of the respondent are undecided. Row 4 of Table 9 reveals 65.3% of the respondents either agree or disagree with the statement, 32.7% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while 2.0% of the respondent are undecided. All the mean score are above 2.5, and the overall mean score of 2.87 indicates that customers have mild satisfaction with the sociability and valence of hotel services in Abeokuta.

4.10 Analysis of Waiting Time Measures

Waiting time cross-tabulation reveals the response of quests in the hotels in Abeokuta. Row 1 of table 10 reveals that 34.7% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the fact that the waiting time service in the hotel was responsible, 44.9% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement while 20.4% are undecided.

Table 10: Summary of Waiting Time of Service Measures

	CUS Response					Total	Mean
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Mildly	Unde- cided	Agree Mildly	Agree Strongly		
1. The waiting time for service was reasonable.	24 16.3%	42 28.6%	30 20.4%	42 28.6%	9 6.1%	147 100%	2.80
2. The employees tried to minimize my waiting time.	66 44.9%	36 24.5%	12 8.2%	27 18.4%	6 4.1%	147 100%	2.12
3. The employees understood that waiting time is important to me.	27 18.4%	21 14.3%	3 2.0%	84 57.1%	12 8.2%	147 100%	3.22
4. The employees provided service for me punctually.	21 14.3%	27 18.4%	6 4.1%	81 55.1%	12 8.2%	147 100%	3.24
5. The employees were able to answer my questions quickly.	21 14.3%	19 12.9%	8 5.4%	15 10.2%	84 57.1%	147 100%	3.83
Total	159 21.6%	145 19.7%	59 8.0%	249 33.9%	123 16.7%	735 100%	3.04

Source: Authors' Computation (2022)

Row 2 of Table 10 reveals 22.5% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement in the row, almost 70%(69.4%) of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with statement while 8.2% of the respondents are not sure with the statement. Row 3 of Table 10 reveals 57.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree that the employees understood that waiting time is important to them, 32.7% disagree with this statement while the remaining 2.0% are not sure if the employees understood how waiting time is important to them. Row 4 of the waiting time cross-tabulation reveals 63.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement in the row, 32.7% of the respondents either disagree or strongly agree with the statement and the remaining of respondents with an estimated 4.1% are not sure if the employees provided them with punctual service. Row 5 of Table 10 reveals 67.3% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree that employees were able to answer their questions quickly, 27.2% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while 5.4% of the respondents can't tell if the employee were able to answer their questions quickly or not. The mean score of item 2 indicated that customers are not happy with the staff effort at minimizing waiting time. The overall mean score of 3.04 indicated that customers have a mild satisfaction level with their waiting time in hotels. Out of the five measures of waiting time, only item 2 has a mean score that is below 2.5. The overall mean score is 3.04, indicating that customers have mild satisfaction waiting time of hotel services.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This paper is based on the relationship between the hotels in Abeokuta in south-west region of Nigeria, quality service and customer satisfaction. The empirical results of this study reveal that service quality is positively related to customer satisfaction, and it is consistent with the previous studies like Kasiri, Teoh, Sambasivan, & Sidin (2017), Izogo and Ogba (2015) and Lymperopoulos, Chaniotakis & Soureli (2013). It also shows that customer satisfaction breeds customer loyalty which

is in agreement with the study of Ali, Dey & Fileiri (2015), Gorondutse and Hilman (2014), Wilkins, Merrilees, & Herington (2009), Narteh, Agbemabiese, Kodua, & Braimah (2013) and Kaura, Prasad & Sharma (2015).

From all implications, it is evident that both functional quality and technical quality play significant roles in overall service quality, which directly determines the level of customer satisfaction that can be gotten in such hotels. It is also crystal clear that there is a need for all hotels to provide a unit known as customer care, just like other reputable service organizations have, where guests can freely state any inconveniences or grievances in order to provide specific areas of improvement needed to be worked upon. Consistency in the delivery of quality service is another important recommendation that will enhance customers' confidence apart from satisfaction and customer loyalty. Although this study only considered the impact of service quality on customer satisfaction, it will be very good if future research can consider the roles employee satisfaction play in customer satisfaction in the same industry. This is to adequately allow owners of these hotels to treat their employees very well.

References

- Ali, F., Dey, B.L. & Fileiri, R. (2015). An assessment of service quality and resulting customer satisfaction in Pakistan International Airlines, *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 32(5), 486-502.
- Ali, F., Hussain, K., Konar, R. & Jeon, H. (2017). The effect of technical and functional quality on guests' perceived hotel service quality and satisfaction: A SEM-PLS analysis, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 18:3, 354-378, DOI: 10.1080/1528008X.2016.1230037
- Ali, F., Ryu, K., & Hussain, K. (2016). Creative tourists' experience, memories, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 33(1), 85-100. doi:10.1080/10548408.2015.1038418
- Alshamsi, A., Alshurideh, M., Kurdi, B. A., & Salloum, S. A. (2020). The influence of service quality on customer retention: A systematic review in the higher education. In *International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Systems and Informatics* (pp. 404-416). Springer, Cham.
- Andersson, D.E. (2010). Hotel attributes and hedonic prices: an analysis of internet-based transactions in Singapore's market for hotel rooms. *Ann. Reg. Sci.* 44 (2), 229-240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00168-008-0265-4>.
- Atwal, G. & Williams, A. (2009). Luxury brand marketing-The experience is everything! *J. Brand Manage.* 16 (5), 338-346.
- Ban, H., Choi, H., Choi, E., Lee, S. & Kim, H. (2019). Investigating key attributes in experience and satisfaction of hotel customer using online review data. *Sustainability*, 11, 1-13. doi:10.3390/su11236570
- Baskentli, S., Sen, S., Du, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2019). Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility: The role of CSR domains. *Journal of Business Research*, 95, 502-513.
- Chen, X. (2018). Multidimensional study of hospitality and the host-guest paradigm in China, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 495-513.
- Dedeoglu, B. B. & Demirel, H. (2015). Differences in service quality perceptions of stakeholders in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 130-146. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-08-2013-0350 doi:10.1108/IJCHM-03-2012-0049
- Edvardsson, B. (1998). Service quality improvement, *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 8(2), 142-149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604529810206972>
- Giritlioglu, I., Jones, E., & Avcikurt, C. (2014). Measuring food and beverage service quality in spa hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(2), 183- 204.
- Gorondutse, A.H. & Hilman, H. (2014). Mediation effect of customer satisfaction on the relationships between service quality and customer loyalty in the Nigerian foods and beverages industry: Sobel test approach, *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management*, 9(1), 1-8.
- Grewal, D., Levy, M. & Kumar, V. (2009). Customer experience management in retailing: an organizing framework. *J. Retail.* 85(1), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2009.01.001>.

- Hu, X. S., & Yang, Y. (2020). Determinants of consumers' choices in hotel online searches: A comparison of consideration and booking stages. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 86, 102370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102370>
- Izogo, E. E. & Ogba, I. (2015). Service quality, customer satisfaction and loyalty in automobile repair services sector, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 32(3), 250 – 269
- Kasiri, L., Teoh, K., Sambasivan, M. & Sidin, S. (2017). Integration of standardization and customization: Impact on service quality, customer satisfaction, and loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 35, 91-97.
- Kaura, V., Prasad, Ch. & Sharma, S. (2015). Service quality, service convenience, price and fairness, customer loyalty, and mediating role of customer satisfaction, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 11(6), 8–10.
- Lazarus, R. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American psychologist*, 46(4), 487- 352.
- Lymperopoulos, C., Chaniotakis, I. E. & Soureli, M. (2013) The role of price satisfaction in managing customer relationships: The case of financial services. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 31(3), 216-228.
- Mei, A.W.O., Dean, A.M. & White, C.J. (1999). Analyzing service quality in the hospitality industry, *Managing Service Quality*, 9(2), 136–143.
- Meyer, C. & Schwager, A. (2007). Understanding customer experience. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 85(2), 116-121.
- Mmutle, T., & Shonhe, L. (2017). Customers' perception of service quality and its impact on reputation in the hospitality industry. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(3), 1-10.
- Narteh, B., Agbemabiese, G.C., Kodua, P. & Braimah, M. (2013). Relationship marketing and customer loyalty: evidence from the Ghanaian luxury hotel industry, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 22(4), 407–436
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1988). SERQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Purnawirawan, N., Eisend, M., De Pelsmacker, P., & Dens, N. (2015). A meta-analytic investigation of the role of valence in online reviews. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 31, 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2015.05.001>
- Rauch, D. A., Collins, M. D., Nale, R. D. & Barr, P. B. (2015). Measuring service quality in mid-scale hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 87–106. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-06-2013-0254
- Saari, L.M. & Judge, T.A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Hum. Resource Manage.* 43 (4), 395–407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20032>.
- Sarkar, A., Sarkar, J. G., & Sreejesh, S. (2021). Managing customers' undesirable responses towards hospitality service brands during service failure: The moderating role of other customer perception. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102873.
- Shao, D. & Peng, Y. (2022). Impact of socially responsible human resource management (SRHRM) on hotel employee outcomes using the role theory, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJHTI-08-2021-0224>
- Sukhu, A., Choi, H., Bujisic, M. & Bilgihan, A. (2019). Satisfaction and positive emotions: a comparison of the influence of hotel guests' beliefs and attitudes on their satisfaction and emotions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.06.013>
- Tamwatin, U., Trimetsoontorn, J., & Fongsuwan, W. (2015). Ensuring customer satisfaction through service quality and image management in the hospitality industry: A conceptual perspective. *Journal for Global Business Advancement*, 8(1), 59–83. doi:10.1504/JGBA.2015.067270
- Wilkins, H., Merrilees, B. & Herington, C. (2009). The determinants of loyalty in hotels, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 19(1), 1–21.