



# **NATIONAL BENCHMARKING SERVICE FOR SPORTS AND LEISURE CENTRES**

## **FACILITY REPORT FOR HADLEY STADIUM**

Prepared by the  
Sport Industry Research Centre, Sheffield Hallam University



December 2009

---



# NATIONAL BENCHMARKING SERVICE FOR SPORTS AND LEISURE CENTRES

## CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE USER SURVEY SAMPLE	2
3. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE FOR HADLEY STADIUM	4
4. MAP OF CATCHMENT AREA AND POPULATION STATISTICS	10
5. RESULTS: CURRENT PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR HADLEY STADIUM	12
• KEY INDICATORS	
• OTHER IMPORTANT INDICATORS	
• SATISFACTION AND IMPORTANCE TABLES	
APPENDIX 1: USER SURVEY FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS	32




# NBS REPORT FOR HADLEY STADIUM

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been produced by Sport England's *National Benchmarking Service for Sports and Leisure Centres* (hereafter referred to as 'NBS') for Hadley Stadium, which is run by Sandwell Leisure Trust on behalf of Sandwell MBC. The report has been compiled by staff from the Sport Industry Research Centre (SIRC) at Sheffield Hallam University.
- 1.2 Before investigating the details of performance for Hadley Stadium in this report, **please read the accompanying *Guidance document to accompany facility reports*.**
- 1.3 The data in this report are based upon a survey of 614 users of the centre between September and October 2009, conducted by Leisure Net Solutions; and a financial return based on the year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009. The user survey and financial return are supplemented by catchment area data provided by the University of Edinburgh. A catchment area map is provided in section 4 of this report.
- 1.4 Hadley Stadium is classified as being a "dry with outdoor" centre which means that it has an indoor sports hall which could accommodate at least 4 badminton courts as well as outdoor provision. The actual floor space of the centre is 2,155m<sup>2</sup> which means that it is benchmarked against comparable centres with a total floor space of 1,500m<sup>2</sup> to less than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> (that is medium sized centres) and it has 1,846m<sup>2</sup> of usable space. The catchment area has a relatively high proportion (21.42%) of residents from NS-SEC 6&7, representing the most disadvantaged people in society. The centre is managed by a trust. In brief the benchmarking 'families' used for Hadley Stadium are:
- dry with outdoor (benchmark family of 11 centres)
  - 20%+ of catchment population in NS-SEC 6 & 7 (benchmark family of 21 centres)
  - 1500 to < 3000 sq.m. (benchmark family of 35 centres)
  - Trust (benchmark family of 42 centres)

## 2. THE USER SURVEY SAMPLE


Figure 1: Hadley Stadium User Survey Characteristics



**Note: The survey instrument groups respondents according to the NS-SEC classification, as used in the 2001 Census and now used as standard in all government surveys.**

- 2.1 The broad nature of the 614 people who took part in the survey is shown in Figure 1. The primary purpose of the data in Figure 1 is for calculating performance indicator scores for comparison against benchmarks, whilst a secondary purpose is to provide important stakeholders with an overview of the user survey sample. Venue managers should reflect on the data and qualify the extent to which they are truly representative of the customer base (221,744 visits in 2008/09). It should be emphasised that any performance indicator scores dependent on the user survey findings are governed by the accuracy of the sampling in this survey.
- 2.2 A further test of representativeness is 'internal representativeness', that is the extent to which the respondents to the user survey truly reflect the balance of the programme and usage of the venue. Some key indicators in this regard are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Hadley Stadium User Survey Balance of Use



2.3 79% of respondents took part in a sport activity during the NBS survey period whilst the rest participated as a spectator or in a non-physical activity. Using fitness equipment was the most frequently stated main activity by survey respondents, accounting for a third of the main activities undertaken during the survey period. Given the distribution of activities undertaken, it is not surprising that the main hall and gym/fitness centre were the most utilised areas of the facility. It is important that managers are able to confirm that the distribution of the users is broadly in line with the centre's overall usage patterns. The majority of activities undertaken were casual (65%) rather than instructor led or club usage. Half of the respondents had some form of leisure card which gave them reduced price admission to the centre. 39% of discounted admissions made via leisure cards were by people with some form of disadvantage.

2.4 Assuming that the surveys were conducted randomly and that the user profile accurately reflects the centre's customer base, we now consider the centre's performance against a series of performance indicators and family specific benchmarks.

### 3. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE FOR HADLEY STADIUM

3.1 The centre's performance is reported in two main parts. First, for key indicators and other access, finance and utilisation indicators, the centre's performance is reported relative to their 2009 national benchmarks. Second, for satisfaction and importance scores from customers, the centre's performance is analysed by gap analysis and grid analysis. We conclude the summary with our perception of the main strengths, weaknesses and factors to watch out for at this centre.

#### Performance relative to national benchmarks

3.2 The reference points for the performance for each indicator are the four quartiles and three benchmarks identified in the General Guidance Document (page 8) which accompanies this report. This positioning has been judged by the NBS analysts by examining 'average' performance across the four family comparisons. The four comparisons for each indicator are in the detailed performance results in Section 5 of this centre report.

3.3 The seven facility performance indicators which were proposed for the CPA in 2007 have been retained as key indicators for NBS reporting. This is because they are a good indication of national government priorities for sports facilities.

#### Key indicators

<i>Key indicators</i>	<i>Bottom quartile</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>Top quartile</i>
11-19 years							
NS-SEC 6&7							
Ethnic minorities							
60+ years							
Disabled <60 years							
Subsidy per visit							
Visits per m <sup>2</sup>							

3.4 One of these key indicators, visits per square metre, is calculated differently to its equivalent in the utilisation indicators below. For the key indicator, the square metres of indoor space used in the calculation excludes corridors and offices. In the utilisation indicators part of Section 5 of this report, and in the utilisation summary below, the visits per square metre indicator includes corridors and offices in the square metres. Furthermore, the centre had actual central establishment charges which were zero and in the financial return you estimated what they would have been if they had been charged - the key indicator subsidy per visit calculation includes these estimated central establishment charges in the total costs. In the

financial indicators part of Section 5 of this report, and in the financial summary below, the subsidy per visit indicator is measured by using actual costs, including zero central establishment charges for your centre.

- 3.5 Two of the key indicator scores, two access indicators and one efficiency indicator, are at or above the 75% benchmark level. One, however, for disabled under 60 years, is at its bottom quartile level. This is the result of under-representation of visits to the centre by the disabled under 60 years (3%), when compared with their proportion in the catchment area (11%).

*Access*

<i>Access indicators</i>	<i>Bottom quartile</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>Top quartile</i>
Females							
11-19 years							
20-59 years							
60+ years							
NS-SEC 6&7							
Ethnic minorities							
Disabled <60 years							
Disabled 60+							
Unemployed							
Discount card holders							
Disadvantaged card holders							
First visits							

- 3.6 When considering the wider set of access indicators, rather than just the five in the key indicators, the picture is of mixed access performance with some clear strengths. It is important to stress that not all the access groups identified are likely to be important to a social inclusion agenda. Four of the groups which might be seen as important to social inclusion are located at the 50% benchmark level or above (11-19 years, NS-SEC 6&7, the unemployed, and disadvantaged card holders), but four which are relevant to social inclusion are below their 50% benchmark performance levels (60+ years, ethnic minorities, disabled under 60, and disabled 60+). The relative position of females, in the bottom quartile, would not normally be a cause for concern, but for Hadley Stadium, they comprise only 27% of the total visitors - which is well below the industry norm. Two other indicators are at or above the 75% benchmark, but these groups are not normally considered relevant to social inclusion, because people in these groups are not necessarily disadvantaged (first visits and discount card holders).

### Financial

<i>Financial indicators</i>	<i>Bottom quartile</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>Top quartile</i>
Subsidy per visit							
Cost recovery							
Subsidy per m <sup>2</sup>							
Subsidy per resident							
Operating cost per visit							
Operating cost per m <sup>2</sup>							
Maintenance & repair cost per m <sup>2</sup>							
Energy cost per m <sup>2</sup>							
Income per visit							
Income per m <sup>2</sup>							
Direct income per visit							
Secondary income per visit							

3.7 Financial performance is rather weak relative to the benchmarks, with cost recovery and two subsidy indicators in their second quartiles. All the subsidy scores in this summary table and in the other indicators figures in Section 5 are calculated using the actual costs, rather than including any estimated central establishment costs. The main factor which constrains this financial performance is very low income per visit, despite the fact that operating cost per square metre and visits per square metre are reasonably good, in their third quartiles. It is relevant to note that satisfaction with entrance charges and value for money of activities are tenth and eighth in the satisfaction rankings, with average customer scores of 4.09 and 4.10 out of 5 respectively. Value for money of activities is also among the largest importance-satisfaction gap and 8% of respondents were dissatisfied with it - see below. Together these considerations suggest that the activity prices are not near to the limit of acceptability for customers.

### Utilisation

<i>Utilisation indicators</i>	<i>Bottom quartile</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> quartile</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>Top quartile</i>
Visits per m <sup>2</sup>							
% of visits that are casual							
Weekly number of people visiting							

3.8 The main throughput indicator, visits per square metre, is measured in the utilisation summary table and in the other indicators' figures in Section 5 by using the total indoor floor space of the centre. This indicator performs at the third quartile level, the simple product of a reasonably high number of annual visits for a centre of this size. Meanwhile, the weekly number of people visiting performs at

the top quartile, suggesting an excellent market penetration in the local catchment population. The percentage of visits which are casual (65%) is relatively low by industry standards but whether or not this level of casual use is appropriate depends on the targeting and programming policies of the centre.

## Satisfaction with and importance of attributes

### *Gap analysis*

- 3.9 The tables below identify five attributes with the largest gaps between importance and satisfaction, by mean scores or by ranks. These gaps signal the attributes with the most potential to represent problems, although it should be emphasised that no attribute has a satisfaction score of less than three, the neutral score (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), so there are no absolute problems among the attributes scored in the user survey.

#### Mean score gaps

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Importance</i>	<i>Satisfaction</i>	<i>Gap</i>
Quality of equipment	4.71	4.01	0.70
Quality of lighting in the sports hall	4.50	3.82	0.68
Cleanliness of changing areas	4.64	3.99	0.65
Value for money of activities	4.67	4.10	0.57
Cleanliness of activity spaces	4.62	4.09	0.53


#### Rank gaps

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Importance</i>	<i>Satisfaction</i>	<i>Gap</i>
Quality of equipment	1	12	-11
Cleanliness of changing areas	4	13	-9
Value for money of activities	2	8	-6
Cleanliness of activity spaces	6	9	-3
Quality of lighting in the sports hall	12	15	-3

- 3.10 The same attributes feature in both the tables above. The second table demonstrates that four of the attributes are among the most important to customers. However, most of the gaps featured are small compared with other NBS centres, except for the top two rank gaps. Quality of equipment shows the largest gaps whether measured by mean scores or rankings - one in ten respondents were dissatisfied with this attribute (See Appendix, Q12g). The appearance of cleanliness of the changing areas among the largest gap scores is not unusual for sports facilities. From the frequency distributions in the appendix, it is apparent that 8% of respondents were dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the changing areas, whilst 4% were dissatisfied with the cleanliness of activity spaces (Appendix Q12m and n) - these are low levels of dissatisfaction compared with other NBS centres. Other higher levels of dissatisfaction include 14% for quality of lighting in the hall (Q12f),

8% for value for money of activities (Q12r) and 10% for value for money of food and drink (Q12s). So any problems are not absolute, but relative - the satisfaction scores falling short of the importance scores - and minorities of customers are dissatisfied.

*Grid analysis*



3.11 The grid analysis reveals five attributes which are in the quadrant for high importance and low satisfaction: the two cleanliness attributes, the equipment quality, value for money of activities and the activity charge - these are normally the attributes most immediately deserving of managerial attention. Low satisfaction relative to other attributes is also evident for the food and drink attributes, car parking on site, and the quality of lighting in the sports hall, but these are relatively low in importance too. They may, however, have commercial implications - i.e. constraining income to a greater or lesser extent.

3.12 Comparison of the centre's satisfaction scores with industry averages, provided by the final satisfaction table in Section 5 of this report, shows that the centre is marginally above the industry average overall satisfaction for dry centres, at 4.27 out of 5, and exceeds industry average scores for six of the 16 individual attributes. The main exception is the hall lighting, where the centre's score lags significantly behind the industry average. However, it should be noted that different satisfaction scores in different locations will be caused not only by real differences in satisfaction but also by differences between locations in their generosity of scoring.

*Weaknesses in service attributes, as perceived by customers*

3.13 Putting together the results of the gap analysis and grid analysis, the weakest attributes are shown in the following table.

	<i>Relatively weak attributes</i>	<i>Evidence</i>
<i>Primary weaknesses</i>	Equipment quality Cleanliness of changing areas	Relatively large gaps and relatively high in importance
<i>Secondary weaknesses</i>	Quality of lighting in the sports hall Quality of food & drink Value for money of food & drink	Absolutely low satisfaction but relatively low in importance

*Strengths in service attributes, as perceived by customers*

3.14 Combining the results of the grid analysis and the satisfaction scores, the table below summarises the strongest attributes. A mixture of attributes are in the top five satisfaction rankings and two are also in the top five for importance rankings - a desirable correlation.

	<i>Relatively strong attributes</i>	<i>Evidence</i>
<i>Primary strengths</i>	Activity available at convenient times Helpfulness of reception staff Helpfulness of other staff	In top five satisfaction scores; relatively high in importance
<i>Secondary strengths</i>	Quality of car parking on site Ease of booking	In top five satisfaction scores but not high in importance


**Main strengths and weaknesses**

3.15 As a result of the analysis above, we conclude that the main strengths, weaknesses and factors to watch for at this centre are as shown in the following table.

<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Three access indicators; operating cost per visit; weekly number of people visiting; staff; car park attribute; availability of activity</b>
<b>Ones to watch</b>	<b>Cost recovery; cleanliness; equipment quality; hall lighting</b>
<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>One access indicator; income per visit</b>

#### 4. MAP OF CATCHMENT AREA AND POPULATION STATISTICS

4.1 The catchment area shown in this map is defined as the area within which Hadley Stadium attracts more visitors than any other centre, i.e. the area within which Hadley Stadium is the dominant supplier. On the next page are key population statistics for the catchment area.




## Hadley Stadium

### confirmation of catchment data used

---


<b>% population 11 - 19</b>	<b>14.91</b>
<b>% population 20 - 59</b>	<b>64.54</b>
<b>% population 60+</b>	<b>20.54</b>
<b>% population non-white</b>	<b>42.72</b>
<b>% population groups NS-SEC 67</b>	<b>21.42</b>
<b>% population &lt;60 disabled</b>	<b>10.76</b>
<b>% population 60+ disabled</b>	<b>10.61</b>
<b>total residents competing</b>	<b>14748</b>
<b>total residents non-competing</b>	<b>19809</b>
<b>difference</b>	<b>5061</b>

## 5. RESULTS: CURRENT PERFORMANCE SCORES FOR HADLEY STADIUM


- 5.1 The results in this section are structured in the following order:
- first, for the seven key performance indicators;
  - second, for 22 other important performance indicators for access, finance and utilisation;
  - third, satisfaction and importance scores for 16 service attributes;
- 5.2 In each of the figures for the access, finance and utilisation indicators, the centre score is compared with the national benchmarks and lowest and highest scores for each of the four family categories to which Hadley Stadium belongs. The scores and benchmarks are presented to the most appropriate number of decimal places.
- 5.3 For all the performance indicators compared with national benchmarks, it is the 75% national benchmarks which represent 'better' performance. For performance indicators involving visits and income, these will be higher scores. For performance indicators involving subsidy and costs, they will be the lower scores.
- 5.4 For the satisfaction and importance service attributes, four tables are presented:
- first with all the mean scores and ranks for both satisfaction and importance;
  - second in rank order according to the gaps between the importance and satisfaction mean scores;
  - third, in rank order according to the gaps between the importance and satisfaction ranks.
  - fourth, a comparison of the centre's satisfaction scores with industry averages.
- The two 'gap' tables have the highest gap between importance and satisfaction first, because these are the attributes which may require management consideration and action. For some attributes there may be only an importance score (e.g. 'overall satisfaction with the visit' does not have an importance score). Such attributes are not included in the rankings and therefore they are not in the 'gap' tables.
- 5.5 Please remember to read the accompanying *Guidance document to accompany facility reports* to help you understand your results. As you become more familiar with the data you should find it increasingly valuable as a tool in your management decision making.
- 

## Key Indicators


**% visits 11-19 years ÷ % catchment population 11-19 years**




**% visits from social classes 6 & 7 ÷ % catchment population in social classes 6 & 7**




**% visits from black, Asian & other ethnic groups ÷ % catchment population in same ethnic groups**




**% visits 60+ years ÷ % catchment population 60+ years**




**% visits <60 years disabled ÷ % catchment population <60 years disabled**




--- Centre score = 0.25



**Subsidy per visit (£) - 1**




--- Centre score = 1.03




(a) To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest subsidy) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest subsidy) is on the right of each cluster. Also, note that the best scores/lowest subsidy and some of the 75% benchmarks are 'negative subsidies' - i.e. surpluses.

(b) Subsidy for this proposed CPA indicator includes consideration of estimated central establishment charges where the actual charges are zero

### Annual visits per sq. m. (excluding offices)




--- Centre score = 120




For this performance indicator, square metres of indoor space excludes offices and corridors

## Other important Indicators


% visits 20-59 years ÷ % catchment population 20-59 years




% visits which were first visits




### % visits with discount card




--- Centre score = 50.81




### % visits with discount card for 'disadvantage'




--- Centre score = 19.54




**% visits female**




**% visits 60+ years disabled ÷ % catchment population 60+ years disabled**




### % visits unemployed




--- Centre score = 4.15




### % cost recovery



--- Centre score = 71



### Subsidy per visit (£) - 2




--- Centre score = 0.59

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

(a) To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest subsidy) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest subsidy) is on the right of each cluster. Also, note that the best scores/lowest subsidy and some of the 75% benchmarks are 'negative subsidies' - i.e. surpluses.

(b) Subsidy for this indicator includes consideration of actual central establishment charges whether they are zero or positive

### Subsidy per sq. m. (£)




--- Centre score = 61

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest subsidy) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest subsidy) is on the right of each cluster. Also, note that the best scores/lowest subsidy and some of the 75% benchmarks are 'negative subsidies' - i.e. surpluses.

### Subsidy per resident (£)




--- Centre score = 8.89

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

The catchment population used for this indicator allows for competing facilities nearby. This is different from previous NBS reports.

### Total operating cost per visit (£)




--- Centre score = 2.03

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest cost) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest cost) is on the right.

### Total operating cost per sq. m. (£)




--- Centre score = 209

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest cost) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest cost) is on the right.

### Maintenance and repair costs per sq. m. (£)




--- Centre score = 12

lowest score 25% 50% 75% highest score

To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest cost) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest cost) is on the right.

### Energy costs per sq. m. (£)




--- Centre score = 19

■ lowest score  
 ■ 25%  
 ■ 50%  
 ■ 75%  
 ■ highest score

To be consistent with the other diagrams, the worst score (= highest cost) is on the left of each cluster, and the best score (= lowest cost) is on the right.


### Total income per visit (£)




--- Centre score = 1.44

■ lowest score  
 ■ 25%  
 ■ 50%  
 ■ 75%  
 ■ highest score


### Total income per sq. m. (£)




### Direct income per visit (£)



### Secondary income per visit (£)




### Annual visits per sq. m. (including offices)




For this indicator, total indoor floor space is used

**% visits casual, instead of organised**



**Weekly number of people visiting the facility, as % of catchment population 11+**



<b>Satisfaction and importance scores: by attribute</b>
---

	IMPORTANCE			SATISFACTION			GAPS ( Importance minus Satisfaction )	
	Rank	Mean	no	Rank	Mean	no	Rank	Mean
<b>Accessibility</b>								
a.	Activity available at convenient times	7	4.62	588	1	4.38	570	6 0.24
b.	Ease of booking	11	4.56	560	5	4.32	494	6 0.24
c.	The activity charge/fee	9	4.58	572	10	4.09	539	-1 0.49
d.	The range of activities available	10	4.57	559	7	4.19	542	3 0.38
<b>Quality of facilities/services</b>								
e.	Quality of flooring in the sports hall	13	4.47	460	11	4.07	156	2 0.40
f.	Quality of lighting in the sports hall	12	4.50	457	15	3.82	155	-3 0.68
g.	Quality of equipment	1	4.71	475	12	4.01	425	-11 0.70
k.	Quality of car parking on site	14	4.38	526	2	4.36	389	12 0.02
l.	Quality of food and drink	16	4.14	496	14	3.83	412	2 0.31
<b>Cleanliness</b>								
m.	Cleanliness of changing areas	4	4.64	537	13	3.99	448	-9 0.65
n.	Cleanliness of activity spaces	6	4.62	586	9	4.09	529	-3 0.53
<b>Staff</b>								
o.	Helpfulness of reception staff	3	4.65	596	3	4.35	568	0 0.30
p.	Helpfulness of other staff	5	4.64	590	4	4.33	533	1 0.31
q.	Standard of coaching/instruction	8	4.61	487	6	4.24	162	2 0.37
<b>Value for money</b>								
r.	Value for money of activities	2	4.67	596	8	4.10	549	-6 0.57
s.	Value for money of food/drink	15	4.30	536	16	3.81	435	-1 0.49
<b>Other attributes *</b>								
h.	Water quality in the swimming pool	N/A			N/A			
i.	Water temperature in the swimming pool	N/A			N/A			
j.	Number of people in the pool	N/A			N/A			
t.	Overall satisfaction with visit	N/A			4.27	594		

\* The other attribute(s) listed at the end of the table have either the satisfaction or importance scores but not both. This is for logical reasons - e.g. Overall satisfaction with visit does not have an importance score; no satisfaction score for pool attributes if there is no pool at the centre. Therefore such attributes do not appear in the subsequent tables of 'gaps'.

<b>Satisfaction and importance scores: by mean gaps</b>
---

	IMPORTANCE		SATISFACTION		GAPS ( Importance minus Satisfaction )	
	Rank	Mean no	Rank	Mean no	Rank	Mean
	g. Quality of equipment	1	4.71 475	12	4.01 425	-11
f. Quality of lighting in the sports hall	12	4.50 457	15	3.82 155	-3	0.68
m. Cleanliness of changing areas	4	4.64 537	13	3.99 448	-9	0.65
r. Value for money of activities	2	4.67 596	8	4.10 549	-6	0.57
n. Cleanliness of activity spaces	6	4.62 586	9	4.09 529	-3	0.53
c. The activity charge/fee	9	4.58 572	10	4.09 539	-1	0.49
s. Value for money of food/drink	15	4.30 536	16	3.81 435	-1	0.49
e. Quality of flooring in the sports hall	13	4.47 460	11	4.07 156	2	0.40
d. The range of activities available	10	4.57 559	7	4.19 542	3	0.38
q. Standard of coaching/instruction	8	4.61 487	6	4.24 162	2	0.37
l. Quality of food and drink	16	4.14 496	14	3.83 412	2	0.31
p. Helpfulness of other staff	5	4.64 590	4	4.33 533	1	0.31
o. Helpfulness of reception staff	3	4.65 596	3	4.35 568	0	0.30
a. Activity available at convenient times	7	4.62 588	1	4.38 570	6	0.24
b. Ease of booking	11	4.56 560	5	4.32 494	6	0.24
k. Quality of car parking on site	14	4.38 526	2	4.36 389	12	0.02

<b>Satisfaction and importance scores: by rank gaps</b>
---


	<b>IMPORTANCE</b>			<b>SATISFACTION</b>			<b>GAPS</b> ( Importance minus Satisfaction )	
	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>g. Quality of equipment</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>0.70</b>
<b>m. Cleanliness of changing areas</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>-9</b>	<b>0.65</b>
<b>r. Value for money of activities</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>0.57</b>
<b>n. Cleanliness of activity spaces</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>0.53</b>
<b>f. Quality of lighting in the sports hall</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>0.68</b>
<b>c. The activity charge/fee</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4.09</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>0.49</b>
<b>s. Value for money of food/drink</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>0.49</b>
<b>o. Helpfulness of reception staff</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.30</b>
<b>p. Helpfulness of other staff</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.31</b>
<b>e. Quality of flooring in the sports hall</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.40</b>
<b>l. Quality of food and drink</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.31</b>
<b>q. Standard of coaching/instruction</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.37</b>
<b>d. The range of activities available</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4.57</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.38</b>
<b>a. Activity available at convenient times</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.24</b>
<b>b. Ease of booking</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.24</b>
<b>k. Quality of car parking on site</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.02</b>

## Centre satisfaction scores compared with industry average scores


	centre score	centre rank	industry mean	industry rank
Activity available at convenient times	4.38	1	4.42	2
Ease of booking	4.32	5	4.35	5
The activity charge/fee	4.09	10	4.14	8
The range of activities available	4.19	7	4.18	6
Quality of flooring in the sports hall	4.07	11	4.11	9
Quality of lighting in the sports hall	3.82	15	4.10	10
Quality of equipment	4.01	12	4.08	11
Quality of car parking on site	4.36	2	3.93	13
Quality of food and drink	3.83	14	3.58	16
Cleanliness of changing areas	3.99	13	3.88	14
Cleanliness of activity spaces	4.09	9	4.05	12
Helpfulness of reception staff	4.35	3	4.41	3
Helpfulness of other staff	4.33	4	4.36	4
Standard of coaching/instruction	4.24	6	4.43	1
Value for money of activities	4.10	8	4.17	7
Value for money of food/drink	3.81	16	3.68	15
Overall satisfaction with visit	4.27		4.25	

**APPENDIX 1:**  
**USER SURVEY FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS**


### Q1 Main activity today?




### Q2 Where did you do your main activity today?




### Q3 How you are taking part in your main activity today?




**Q4 Is today your first ever visit to this facility?**




**Q5a Number of times visited in past 7 days.**



**Q5b Number of times visited in past 4 weeks.**




**Q7 Do you have a leisure card?**




**Q8 Basis of eligibility for card/scheme.**




**Q9 From where did you come here today?**




**Q10 Main method of transport.**




**Q11 Journey time.**




**Q12a Satisfaction - availability of activities at convenient times.**




**Q12b Satisfaction - ease of booking.**




**Q12c Satisfaction - activity charges/fees.**




**Q12d Satisfaction - range of activities available.**




**Q12e Satisfaction - quality of flooring in sports hall.**




**Q12f Satisfaction - quality of lighting in sports hall.**



**Q12g Satisfaction - quality of equipment.**



**Q12h Satisfaction - water quality in pool.**



**Q12i Satisfaction - water temperature in pool.**

Very satisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Fairly satisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Fairly dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Very dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Missing/Not applicable		614


**Q12j Satisfaction - number of people in pool.**

Very satisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Fairly satisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Fairly dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Very dissatisfied	0 ( 0.0% )	
Missing/Not applicable		614


**Q12k Satisfaction - quality of car parking on site.**

Very satisfied	188 ( 48.3% )	
Fairly satisfied	161 ( 41.4% )	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	35 ( 9.0% )	
Fairly dissatisfied	3 ( 0.8% )	
Very dissatisfied	2 ( 0.5% )	
Missing/Not applicable		225


**Q12l Satisfaction - quality of food/drink.**




**Q12m Satisfaction - cleanliness of changing area.**




**Q12n Satisfaction - cleanliness of activity spaces.**




**Q12o Satisfaction - helpfulness of reception staff.**




**Q12p Satisfaction - helpfulness of other staff.**




**Q12q Satisfaction - standard of coaching/instruction.**




**Q12r Satisfaction - value for money of activities.**




**Q12s Satisfaction - value for money of food/drink.**




**Q12t Satisfaction - overall satisfaction of visit.**




**Q13a Importance - availability of activities at convenient times.**




**Q13b Importance - ease of booking.**




**Q13c Importance - activity charges/fees.**




**Q13d Importance - the range of activities available.**




**Q13e Importance - quality of flooring in sports hall.**




**Q13f Importance - quality of lighting in sports hall.**




**Q13g Importance - quality of equipment.**




**Q13h Importance - water quality in pool.**




**Q13i Importance - water temperature in pool.**




**Q13j Importance - number of people in pool.**




**Q13k Importance - quality of car parking on site.**




**Q13l Importance - quality of food/drink.**




**Q13m Importance - cleanliness of changing area.**




**Q13n Importance - cleanliness of activity spaces.**




**Q13o Importance - helpfulness of reception staff.**




**Q13p Importance - helpfulness of other staff.**




**Q13q Importance - standard of coaching/instruction**




**Q13r Importance - value for money of activities.**




**Q13s Importance - value for money of food/drink.**




**Q14 Gender.**




**Q15 Ethnic origin of respondent.**




**Q16 Long term illness, health problem or disability.**




**Q17 Age.**



**Q18 Current employment status.**



**Socio-economic group.**



**Q23 Postcode.**

first part of postcode	number of questionnaires		cumulative percent
B67	170	( 29.0% )	29.0
B66	159	( 27.1% )	56.0
B68	39	( 6.6% )	62.7
B17	31	( 5.3% )	68.0
B16	26	( 4.4% )	72.4
B69	23	( 3.9% )	76.3
B70	16	( 2.7% )	79.0
B63	9	( 1.5% )	80.6
B71	9	( 1.5% )	82.1
B32	8	( 1.4% )	83.5
B62	7	( 1.2% )	84.7
B44	6	( 1.0% )	85.7
B20	5	( 0.9% )	86.5
B42	4	( 0.7% )	87.2
B65	4	( 0.7% )	87.9
DY1	4	( 0.7% )	88.6
B14	3	( 0.5% )	89.1
B15	3	( 0.5% )	89.6
B29	3	( 0.5% )	90.1
B43	3	( 0.5% )	90.6
B76	3	( 0.5% )	91.1
DY2	3	( 0.5% )	91.7
B18	2	( 0.3% )	92.0
B23	2	( 0.3% )	92.3
B30	2	( 0.3% )	92.7
B45	2	( 0.3% )	93.0

B74	2	( 0.3% )	93.4
B8	2	( 0.3% )	93.7
DY10	2	( 0.3% )	94.0
DY4	2	( 0.3% )	94.4
WS10	2	( 0.3% )	94.7
WS6	2	( 0.3% )	95.1
WV10	2	( 0.3% )	95.4
B11	1	( 0.2% )	95.6
B12	1	( 0.2% )	95.7
B13	1	( 0.2% )	95.9
B19	1	( 0.2% )	96.1
B20	1	( 0.2% )	96.3
B34	1	( 0.2% )	96.4
B5	1	( 0.2% )	96.6
B60	1	( 0.2% )	96.8
B64	1	( 0.2% )	96.9
B78	1	( 0.2% )	97.1
B90	1	( 0.2% )	97.3
B92	1	( 0.2% )	97.4
BB66	1	( 0.2% )	97.6
CV3	1	( 0.2% )	97.8
DV1	1	( 0.2% )	98.0
DY3	1	( 0.2% )	98.1
DY5	1	( 0.2% )	98.3
DY9	1	( 0.2% )	98.5
LE12	1	( 0.2% )	98.6
N53	1	( 0.2% )	98.8
PY2	1	( 0.2% )	99.0
SY13	1	( 0.2% )	99.1
SY4	1	( 0.2% )	99.3
WN36	1	( 0.2% )	99.5
WR2	1	( 0.2% )	99.7
WS14	1	( 0.2% )	99.8
WS8	1	( 0.2% )	100.0
Missing/Not applicable	27		