

Investigating Passengers and Concessionaires Satisfaction on a Bus Terminal

Robert Jay N. Angco

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Cebu Technological University, Philippines

ABSTRACT: *This study was conducted to determine the significant difference between the passengers and concessionaires' level of satisfaction of the Bus Terminal. This also determined the level of satisfaction on the following factors of the terminal in terms of Facility, Management, Security, and Personnel Services. Three hundred samples (one hundred fifty passengers and one hundred fifty concessionaires) were selected using quota sampling method. Data were collected using questionnaires and analyzed using t-test. The results of the study found out that the concessionaires were very satisfied than the passengers in terms of facility, management, security, and personnel services criteria. It was also found out that there is a significant difference between the passengers and concessionaires' level of satisfaction in terms of facility, management, and security criteria. However, there is no significant difference in terms of personnel service criteria.*

Keywords- *Bus Terminal, Concessionaires, Passengers, Public Transportation, Satisfaction*

I. INTRODUCTION

Transportation plays an important role in the economy of the country. The development of the economy depends on the transportation services it offers such as transporting goods from one destination to another. According to Rodrigue and Notteboom (2010), the transport sector is an important component of the economy and a common tool used for development. This is even more so in a global economy since economic opportunities have been increasingly related to the mobility of people, goods and information. Transportation is thus an integral contributor to one's QOL as it is the bridge that enables an individual to visit and patronize local amenities, travel to work and connect with family and friends for example (Noor & Foo, 2014).

Transportation connects people from their origin to their destination, affects land use and shapes our daily lives. Transportation is necessary to access goods, services and activities such as emergency services, health care, adequate food and clothing, education, employment, and social activities (American Hospital Association, 2017).

Public transport should become part of a solution for sustainable transport in the future. To attract more passengers, public transport must set a high service quality to satisfy the passengers (Budiono, 2009). According to Hensher (2007), bus transport is the most patronized of all land-based public passengers' mode. Passenger satisfaction of public transport service refers to a psychological state of satisfaction or disappointment after comparing the expectations of passengers about the services provided by the public transport system (Zhang, 2020).

Metro Cebu, the second international gateway and the second largest urban area in the Philippines, is an example of a metropolitan area with a rapid growing population and increasing urbanization. It is the economic, trading and educational center of the central and southern Philippines, besides developing as a distribution relay hub and a tourist area (Gonzales, 2004). A lot of Cebuanos do not own a private vehicle where they can get around and travel from one place to another. Thus, buses are one of the major public transports preferred by the Cebuanos especially those who travel to some provinces.

Bus systems have the potential of extending transport services to greater proportions of urban residents who do not have private cars and cannot afford frequent taxi fares (Nwachukwu, 2014).

Passengers, however, are important and very essential in improving the services in the bus terminal. They are the ones who purchase the services of the terminal. They're also the ones who will evaluate the

services rendered by the terminal using their satisfaction rating for the improvement of the terminal. Passengers' satisfaction is based on the services rendered by the service provider, on how well the service provider served the passengers.

Therefore, passengers' satisfaction rating is essential. It is the soul and the foundation of improving its services, so it is necessary to undertake a satisfaction survey of passengers' terminal. Concessionaires on the other hand are the businesspeople located inside the terminal that is engaged in selling consumer goods or services to the public under an agreement with the terminal or the owner or lessee of a terminal. Concession products and services are primarily purchased by departing passengers because they typically stay longer in the terminal than those of arriving passengers who have reached the terminal. Since concessionaires are inside the terminal, they also share the services rendered by the terminal. In other words, they can use the facilities inside like the restrooms. Therefore, concessionaires also play an important role in improving the terminal since they generate a much higher proportion of their income from concessions activities than the bus operations. Other than their shared income to the terminal the concessionaire satisfaction together with the passengers' satisfaction rating, it can be very helpful in improving and maintaining the progressiveness of the terminal in the future.

II. RELATED LITERATURE

This study anchors on Richard L. Oliver's (1977) Disconfirmation Theory. This theory argues that satisfaction is related to the size and direction of the disconfirmation experience that occurs as a result of comparing service performance against expectations.

On one hand, satisfaction is defined as customer fulfillment (Oliver 1997). It is a judgment that a product or service feature or the product or service itself provides a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under- or over-fulfillment (Budiono, 2009).

Customer satisfaction and service quality are considered as a crucial aspect in business, for the development of a company highly depends on how good they maintain their customer through service. Indeed, good service quality is expected to result in customer satisfaction, therefore will increase customers retention and loyalty (Suciptawati et.al, 2019).

The quality of service has become an aspect of customer satisfaction. It has been proven by some researchers that service quality is related to customer satisfaction. Others used service quality dimensions to evaluate service quality (Agbor, 2011).

In the research of Singh (2006), satisfaction is defined as: "a person's feelings of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing a product's perceived performance (or outcome) in relation to his or her expectations". Additionally, customer satisfaction is important because many researches have shown that customer satisfaction has a positive effect on an organization's profitability (Singh 2006).

There are many factors that affect customer satisfaction. According to Hokanson (1995) as cited by Singh (2006), these factors include friendly employees, courteous employees, knowledgeable employees, helpful employees, accuracy of billing, billing timeliness, competitive pricing, service quality, good value, and the like.

Ekinici (2004) supported that satisfaction is the guest's fulfillment response. It is a judgment that a service feature, or the service itself, provided or is providing a pleasurable level of fulfillment. Basically, satisfaction is the result of direct experiences with services and it occurs by comparing perceptions against expectations. Research also indicates that how the service was delivered is more important than the outcome of the service process.

Eboli and Mazulla (2011), stated that the quality of services provided can be evaluated by the perceptions and expectations of customers. According to Schiefelbusch and Dienel (2009) as cited by Rizvi (2014), that a customer is satisfied whenever his or her needs and expectations are met or exceeded. In other words, it should be customer-oriented and meet the customers' needs and desires.

Satisfied customers are most likely to share their experiences with other people to the order of perhaps five or six people. Equally well, dissatisfied customers are more likely to tell another ten people of their unfortunate experience (Zairi, 2000).

According to Hansemark and Albinsson (2004), satisfaction is an overall customer attitude towards a service provider, or an emotional reaction to the difference between what customers anticipate and what they receive, regarding the fulfilment of some need, goal or desire.

To keep and attract more bus passengers, public bus transport must have high service quality to satisfy and fulfill a wider range of different passenger needs. Increases in passenger satisfaction are translated into retained markets, increased use of the system, new customers, and more positive public image ((Nwachukwu, 2014).

III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study mainly analyzes the difference between the passengers and concessionaires' level of satisfaction of Cebu South Bus Terminal services on some factors that affect their satisfaction level. It answered the following: 1.) passengers' level of satisfaction, 2.) concessionaires' level of satisfaction, and 3.) significant difference between passengers and concessionaires' level of satisfaction.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study used the descriptive method of research. The collection of data was done through a survey. The respondents of the study were the passengers and concessionaires in one of the Bus Terminals in Cebu City. There were 300 respondents in the survey wherein 150 were classified as passengers and 150 as concessionaires. Survey questionnaire was utilized as an instrument to gather the desired data. The instrument consisted of four (4) different criteria, namely: facility with 12 questions, management with 3 questions, security with 6 questions and personnel services with 5 questions. Respondents rated a five-point likert scale rating was used with "Outstanding 5", "Very Satisfied 4", "Satisfied 3", "Fair 2", "Dissatisfied 1".

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the results and analysis of the data.

Passengers' and Concessionaires' Level of Satisfaction of the Bus Terminal

The table 1 shows the passengers' and concessionaires' level of satisfaction in the facility criteria of the Bus Terminal.

Table 1. Respondents' Level of Satisfaction as to Facility

I. Facility	Passengers			Concessionaires		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category
1. Clarity of terminal signages and symbols	3.47	0.96	Very Satisfied	3.75	1.03	Very Satisfied
2. TV and entertainment equipment	2.95	1.06	Satisfied	3.71	1.01	Very Satisfied
3. Clarity of bus information screen and displays	3.27	1.09	Satisfied	3.39	1.07	Satisfied
4. Power charging facilities	2.66	1.11	Satisfied	3.04	0.98	Satisfied
5. Payphone location	2.53	1.08	Fair	3.33	1.07	Satisfied
6. Sufficient benches available	3.41	1.1	Very Satisfied	3.72	1.03	Very Satisfied
7. Comfort of seats in the terminal and waiting area	3.41	1.07	Very Satisfied	3.73	1.04	Very Satisfied
8. Cleanliness inside the terminal	2.95	1.19	Satisfied	3.56	0.97	Very Satisfied
9. Availability of trash bins	3.02	1.04	Satisfied	3.55	0.98	Very Satisfied
10. Terminal comfort, ambiance, and design	2.84	1.03	Satisfied	3.43	1	Very Satisfied
11. Smoking policy and smoking lounges	2.98	1.3	Satisfied	3.44	1.08	Very Satisfied
12. Overall satisfaction of the facilities	2.97	1.04	Satisfied	3.57	0.96	Very Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.04	1.09	Satisfied	3.52	1.02	Very Satisfied

The passengers were satisfied in the clarity of terminal signage and symbols with a mean of 3.47 while the concessionaires were very satisfied with a mean of 3.75. The passengers were also satisfied in the sufficient benches available in the waiting area with a mean of 3.41 while the concessionaires were very satisfied with a mean of 3.72. The passengers were also satisfied with the comfort of seats in the waiting area with a mean of 3.41 while the concessionaires were very satisfied with a mean of 3.73. As can be gleaned in the table, passengers were not satisfied on the "payphone location" with a mean of 2.53 which falls under the category of Fair. The overall rating of the respondents is satisfied.

In table 2, the passengers were satisfied on the affordability of fare with a mean of 3.01. The concessionaires were very satisfied of the smooth transition of passengers for departure and arrival with a mean of 3.59 while the passengers were satisfied with a mean of 2.69. The concessionaires were satisfied of the availability of medical assistance with a mean of 3.33 while the passengers were rated fair with a mean of 2.07.

Table 2. Respondents' Level of Satisfaction as to Management

II. Management	Passengers			Concessionaires		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category
1. Smooth transition of passengers for departure and arrival	2.69	1.04	Satisfied	3.59	1.03	Very Satisfied
2. Availability of medical assistance	2.07	1.03	Fair	3.33	1.01	Satisfied
3. Affordable fare	3.01	1.04	Satisfied	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Overall satisfaction of terminal management	2.94	1.02	Satisfied	3.33	1.00	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.04	1.09	Satisfied	3.42	1.02	Very Satisfied

This implies that the terminal was able to manage the passengers. However, there are some areas which need to be improved. According to Anderson (2007), which affects the passengers' satisfaction is the operation failures of the services such as delay of transportation. Iseki (2007), revealed that accessibility and reliability are the top two key factors in evaluating the effectiveness of the services at the bus terminal. Additionally, the satisfaction levels of the passengers depend on numerous factors such as fare, comfort, reliability of service, facilities provided inside the bus and at the bus terminals and bus stops, safety, etc. (Nagadevara, 2007).

Table 3. Respondents' Level of Satisfaction as to Security

III. Security	Passengers			Concessionaires		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category
1. Thoroughness of screening or inspection	2.91	1.05	Satisfied	3.47	0.94	Very Satisfied
2. The overall insights of security and safety standards	3.01	1.04	Satisfied	3.47	0.97	Very Satisfied
3. Visibility of security in the terminal	3.27	1.07	Satisfied	3.04	1.07	Satisfied
4. Sufficient CCTVs throughout the terminal	3.11	1.17	Satisfied	3.36	1.10	Satisfied
5. The safety of the passengers inside and outside of the terminal	3.18	1.06	Satisfied	3.47	0.98	Very Satisfied

6. Overall satisfaction of security checkpoint in the terminal	3.18	1.08	Satisfied	3.34	0.92	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.11	1.08	Satisfied	3.36	1.00	Satisfied

As can be gleaned in table 3, the passengers were satisfied of the visibility of security in the terminal with a mean of 3.27 while the concessionaires were also satisfied with a mean of 3.04. The passengers were satisfied of the safety inside and outside the terminal with a mean of 3.18 while the concessionaires were very satisfied with a mean of 3.47. The sufficiency of CCTV's throughout the terminal was satisfied by the passengers with a mean of 3.11 while the concessionaires were also satisfied with a mean of 3.36. The overall rating of the respondents was satisfied. This implies that the terminal was able to provide good security and order; this makes the passengers and the concessionaires' safe inside and outside the terminal.

Table 4. Respondents' Level of Satisfaction as to Personnel Services

III. Personnel Services	Passengers			Concessionaires		
	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category	Weighted Mean	Standard Dev.	Category
1. Courtesy and helpfulness of the terminal staff	3.14	1.14	Satisfied	3.41	1.06	Very Satisfied
2. Communication skills of the terminal staff	3.16	1.03	Satisfied	3.38	1.01	Satisfied
3. Grooming appearance of the terminal staff	3.01	0.95	Satisfied	3.23	1.02	Satisfied
4. Professional attitude of the terminal staff	3.09	0.97	Satisfied	3.19	1.06	Satisfied
5. Overall satisfaction of personnel services	3.19	1.01	Satisfied	3.17	1.06	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.14	1.02	Satisfied	3.28	1.04	Satisfied

The passengers were satisfied of the communication skills of terminal staff with a mean of 3.16 while the concessionaires were also satisfied with a mean of 3.38. The passengers were also satisfied of the courtesy and helpfulness of terminal staff with a mean of 3.14 while the concessionaires were very satisfied with a mean of 3.41. The passengers were satisfied of the professionalism of the terminal staff with a mean of 3.09 while the concessionaires were also satisfied with a mean of 3.19. The overall ratings of the respondents were satisfied.

Table 5. Significant Difference Between Passengers and Concessionaires' Level of Satisfaction

Factors	Passengers vs Concessionaires		
	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
1. Facility	0.0000**	Reject Ho	Significant
2. Management	0.0000**	Reject Ho	Significant
3. Security	0.0020**	Reject Ho	Significant
4. Personnel Services	0.2000	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant when $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

In terms of Facility, Management, and Security the null hypothesis was rejected since p-value is 0.000. This means that passengers and concessionaires vary significantly in their level of satisfaction with regards to the above-mentioned factors. While in terms of Personnel Services, there is no significant difference since p-value is 0.200 (Do not reject H_0). This means that the respondents are similarly satisfied with the personnel services of the said bus terminal. This implies that Cebu South Bus Terminal is actively responding to the passengers as well as the concessionaires' needs. Maintaining the needs of the passengers and concessionaires can gain more satisfaction and trust. First class service and quality create a satisfied customer so it is important not only achieve satisfaction but also maintain and improve it which concludes that quality and good service creates satisfaction and retention. According to Deng et.al (2009), the ability of a service provider to create high degree of satisfaction is crucial for product differentiation and developing strong relationship with customers. This indicates that the terminal is able to provide good services to the passengers as well as to the concessionaires.

VI. CONCLUSION

Generally, this study found out that the passengers were only satisfied of the services rendered by the bus terminal. This implies that there are more room for improvement to obtain a much higher level of satisfaction of the passengers. On the other hand, the concessionaires were very satisfied of the services rendered by the bus terminal. Recommendations Based on the result of this study the following are suggested: 1.) that the Bus Terminal could be able to improve their services to obtain a higher level of satisfaction of the passengers, 2.) that the terminal ensures the services they offered for the concessionaires in order to maintain the high level of satisfaction, 3.) that the passengers and concessionaires need to be involved in answering the level of satisfaction survey sheet to help improve the Bus Terminal, and 4.) the terminal keep developing new strategies in serving the passengers and concessionaires and ensures their needs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zhang, X., Liu, H., Xu, M., Mao, C., Shi, J., Meng, G., & Wu, J. (2020). Evaluation of passenger satisfaction of urban multi-mode public transport. *PLoS one*, 15(10), e0241004.
- [2] Suciptawati, N. L. P., Paramita, N. L. P. S. P., & Aristayasa, I. P. (2019, October). Customer satisfaction analysis based on service quality: case of local credit provider in Bali. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1321, No. 2, p. 022055). IOP Publishing.
- [3] American Hospital Association. (2017). Social Determinants of Health Series: Transportation and the Role of Hospitals.
- [4] Noor, H. M., & Foo, J. (2014). Determinants of customer satisfaction of service quality: City bus service in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 153, 595-605.
- [5] Nwachukwu, A. A. (2014). Assessment of passenger satisfaction with intra-city public bus transport services in Abuja, Nigeria. *Journal of Public Transportation*, 17(1), 5.
- [6] Rizvi, A. (2014). *How planning process impacts bus rapid transit outcomes: a comparison of experiences in Delhi and Ahmedabad, India*. Columbia University.
- [7] Rodrigue, J. P., & Notteboom, T. (2013). 3.1–Transportation and Economic Development.
- [8] Agbor, J. M. (2011). The Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality: a study of three Service sectors in Umeå.
- [9] Eboli, L., & Mazzulla, G. (2011). A methodology for evaluating transit service quality based on subjective and objective measures from the passenger's point of view. *Transport Policy*, 18(1), 172-181.
- [10] Budiono, O. (2009). *Customer Satisfaction in Public Bus Transport: A study of travelers' perception in Indonesia*.
- [11] Deng, Z., Lu, Y, Wei, K. K., Zhang, J. (2009), "Understanding customer satisfaction and loyalty: An empirical study of mobile instant messages in China", *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 30, pages 289–300
- [12] Hensher, D. A. (2007). *Bus transport: Economics, policy and planning*. Elsevier.
- [13] Nagadevara, V., & Ramanayya, T. V. (2007, August). Factors affecting passenger satisfaction levels: a case study of Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation (India). In *INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COMPETITION AND OWNERSHIP IN LAND PASSENGER TRANSPORT, 10TH, 2007, HAMILTON ISLAND, QUEENSLAND, AUSTRALIA*.
- [14] Singh, H. (2006). The importance of customer satisfaction in relation to customer loyalty and retention. *Academy of Marketing Science*, 60(193-225), 46.
- [15] Ekinci, Y., & Sirakaya, E. (2004). An examination of the antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction. *Crouch GI, Perdue RR, Timmermans HJP, & Uysal M. Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*. Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing, 189-202.

- [16] Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Mazvancheryl, S. K. (2004). Customer satisfaction and shareholder value. *Journal of marketing*, 68(4), 172-185.
- [17] Gonzales, G. R. (2004). *Metro Cebu: A metropolitan area in need of coordinative body* (No. 2004-49). PIDS Discussion Paper Series.
- [18] Hansemark, O. C. & Albinson, M., 2004, Customer Satisfaction and Retention: The Experiences of Individual Employees, *Managing Service Quality*, 14 (1), pp. 40- 57
- [19] Zairi, M., 2000, Managing Customer Dissatisfaction Through Effective Complaint Management Systems, *The TQM Magazine*, 12 (5), pp. 331-335.
- [20] Oliver, R. L. 1997. *Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- [21] Hokanson, S., January 2, 1995, The Deeper You Analyse, The More You Satisfy Customers, *Marketing News*, p. 16.

**Corresponding author: Robert Jay N. Angco
(Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Cebu Technological University, Philippines)*