SPORTS MANAGEMENT SERVICES: THE DIMENSIONS OF QUALITY
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ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to analyze the dimensions of the service quality. Recently, the sports management service focuses on the client. Therefore, this not only includes the quality in the process, but also the consumer’s perception of the product. It seems clear the variety of theories based on the paradigm from which measure the approach to service quality. Despite the SERVQUAL has been the main reference for many studies is not enough to measure the quality of sports services. Many authors have sought to measure the quality of service although it appears that base it on the perception of clients was insufficient. On the other hand there are systems of quality management. The most used are the ISO and the EFQM model, although it seemed too rigid and inflexible. It suggests the need to assess the quality of sports services, implementing the dimensions of quality principles externally or internally.
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INTRODUCTION

The quality of the sport service is a decisive factor for the development of the organizations (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry, 1985); therefore, it is essential to know their dimensions for being able to analyze it, knowing their parts and improving the efficiency and accuracy of the service (Corma, 2005; Redondo, Olivar, & Redondo, 2006).

During the last decades, different implements have appeared to try to evaluate the quality, both the perceived (subjective) and the objective. The analysis may be quantitative or qualitative, both internal and external to the organization. It is essential to achieve the customer satisfaction. The aim of this study is to review the different dimensions or criteria of value of service quality in sport.

The tools used to evaluate the quality of sports services have been extensive throughout history, some internal to the organization and others external to it (Dorado & Gallardo, 2005).

METHODOLOGY

We conducted a documentary meta-analysis with the descriptor "quality", "quality control", "reference standards", "quality standards", “excellence” and “methodology”.

We apply two exclusion criteria: First, “The articles that are not about sports services” and the second, “The article must dimension the quality of the service”.

RESULTS

Tools for external use: the tools for external use are based on the Service Quality (SERVQUAL) model (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985, 1988; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996), dimensioning the quality of the sport service, enlarging, reducing or modifying dimensions depending on what each author considers essential to evaluate the quality (Brown, Churchill, & Peter, 1993).

Authors such as Gronroos (1984), Levesque and McDougall (1994), Dabholkar (1995), Dabholkar, Thorpe, and Rentz (1996), Yong, Hyewon and Claussen (2008), Ruiz-Olalla (2001) and Nevado (2003), despite using a different nomenclature, they focus on three main dimensions of quality: results from the operation of the service, information on the perception of customer and data indicators relating to the process of service.

Chelladurai (1987) includes five dimensions of their The Scale of Attributes of Fitness Services (SAFS) for quality service in the fitness centers: leading professionals, customers, peripheral primary, primary and secondary facilities and services. Crompton and Mackay (1989) analyzed the dimensions of service quality in public recreation facilities, looking for the most valued according to the SERVQUAL model, where, after several studies, confirms 4 dimensions (tangible, reliability, responsiveness and safety). These authors defined in their scale Recreation Quality (REQUAL), six dimensions of quality leisure services and recreation, based on the model of Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (PZB from now). The dimensions are: tangible,
responsibility, reliability, product of the service, security and accountability of the service (Mackay & Crompton, 1988).

A turning point has been to several authors Cronin and Taylor, (1992) who describes his Service Quality Performance (SERVPERF) scale, the same dimensions as the model PZB (tangible, reliability, responsiveness, empathy and safety) but removing items from the expectations and remaining only those related to the perception of customers. Kim, D. and Kim, S. (1995) developed their scale Service Quality of Sport Centers (QUESC), identifying 11 dimensions of service quality in the fitness centers, of which only seven would correspond to the PZB model: atmosphere, staff attitude, reliability, information, programming, personal account, privileges, price, ease of mind, simulation, and convenience. The same scale is used by Afthinos, Theodorakis, and Nassis (2005), in private sports schools in Greece. This author found that the components of the high demand are: the tangible elements of the facilities, skills and attitudes of staff, the cost of programming and planning of the service provided.

In 1996, Howat, Absher, Crilley, and Milne used the Centre for Environmental and Recreation Management (CERM CSQ) scale developed for outdoor activities, locating four dimensions in the quality of service: basic services, personnel, facilities and complementary services based on the PZB model but differs from it because, according to them, it is more appropriate for sports services. Wakefield and Sloan (1996) measured the perceived quality into spectators at a soccer game, finding the following dimensions: access to the stadium, parking, aesthetics and cleanliness of facilities, quality scoreboard, comfort of seating, the design accessibility, space allocation, public, denomination, meal service and crowd control.

Kambitsis and Theodorakis (1998) and Theodorakis, Kambitsis, Laios, and Koustelios (2001) proposed for the six dimensions of service quality related to spectators: satisfaction, access, accountability, reliability, security, and tangible elements (physical products). Luna-Aroca and Mundina (1998) developed the NEPTUNE scale that assesses customer satisfaction in school sports. For them the quality of service is dimensioned in food, cleaning materials, education, leisure, time, organization, social relationships, and positive generated feelings and negative generated feelings, distributed in eight areas: communication, knowledge and awareness, decision making and motives, social relations, reception and first impression of general satisfaction index, assessment of water activities, and feelings associated level of service quality. Han (1999) evaluates the quality of the service in programs at ski, finding five decisive factors, programs, employee training, public relations, cost and facilities.

Kelley and Turley (1999) defined nine quality factors in sports fans when they evaluate their experience in the events: staff, price, access to facilities, concessions, convenience of the fans, the game experience, game time, convenience and antismoking policy.

Chelladurai and Chang (2000), propose dimensions in three different fields in the provision of services in fitness clubs:

- Entry into fitness clubs: management commitment to service quality, service development environment, design of basic services.
- Performance: interactions between employees, shared employees activities, physical development, customer contact, service errors and recovery.
- Leaving the fitness clubs: perceived service quality.

Trying to understand the construct of service quality, Ko, and Pastore (2001) using a Scale for the Service Quality of Sports Participants (SSQPS), suggesting a model of four dimensions with a few sub-domains: Range of quality (range of programs, time operations, information), interaction quality (customer interaction employee / customer interaction between customers), a result of quality (physical and social change) and quality of environment (environmental conditions, design and equipment).

Lam, Zhang, and Jensen (2005) uses the Service Quality Assessment Scale (SQAS) to determine the dimension of quality service in health and fitness facilities: staff, program, changing rooms, exercise facilities and entertainment facilities. Mendoza (2003), in his paper "Measuring service quality," maintains the dimensions of the PZB model, called as the model of the deficiencies. Nevado (2003) analyzes the determinant factors of quality in service delivery including: corporate image of the organization (information, accessibility, flexible organizational structure and evaluation of the service), service (fast, secure and successful and commitments quality), support and care service provision (credit training, capacity of public servants, closeness, motivation and commitment of staff, establishment of mechanisms and accountability) and loyalty and trust of customers.

Alexandris et al. (2004), affirms that only the physical environment and quality of the results have significant influence on satisfaction. Morales, Hernandez, Mendo, and Blanco (2005) amending ten dimensions of PZB model to analyze the dimensions of service quality in sports: entertainment program, intended to happiness, security and adequacy of facilities, tangible goods and relationship with the coaches. Gallardo and Jimenez (2004) define the dimensions of non-quality: building aspects of sports facilities, the municipal staff, sports and communication.

Kouthouris and Alexandris (2005) confirm the suitability of the dimensions of the SERVQUAL model (although they questioned the model, being in agreement with Cronin and Taylor (1992) and Brady and Cronin (2001) for all types of services, while Mundina et al. (2005), in a study on the Mediterranean Games, confirmed the 4 dimensions of quality of service at sporting events: tangible, staff, services and accessibility.

Martinez, Barbeito, and Del Rio (2007) observed three dimensions of service quality sports: tangible, staff interaction and timetables. In 2008, they proposed two bidimensional scales for the perceived quality of sports services. On the one hand, Calabuig, Quintanilla, and Mundina (2008), defined as dimensions: the staff, the facilities and management models (proposing the use of the NEPTUNE and QUESC) while Tavares (2008) highlights the quality of personnel and facilities, appreciating as no quality elements, the quality of the hygiene, physical environment and equipment.

In Table 1, we can see comparative dimensions that give it the quality of service to sport different authors. Thus, we can see the similarities when it comes to sizing up the concept and take into account, and the basics of service offered.
Tools for internal use: In recent years it appears that municipal services increase their sporting objectives, focusing on the community, which is considered as an external client (Caballero & Sanz, 2002). Emerging models and tools that seek to assess the quality of the organization, examining the processes and everything associated with them. The dimensions are transformed into principles, which are associated with benefits associated with revenue, cost reduction, increase in staff morale and a well-documented (Robinson, 2002). In Table two, one can observe a comparison between them.

Authors like Marques (2003), Ruiz (2003), in the Institute of Sports City of Seville or Correal (2003), in the Patronato Municipal de Benalmádena Sport, understand that the dimensionality offered by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) can help us achieve goals that allow us to improve quality. In this sense, Senlle, Martinez, and Martinez (2001), Marques (2003), considered appropriate ISO assessed quantitative indicators, qualitative and own service.

Quesada and Diez (2002), observed as the quality of sports services is broken down into a series of submodels (subjective and objective). These would be the formal quality, relational quality, environmental quality and quality technology.

The Community of Madrid (2004) also calls for achieving a quality standard based on criteria of management. These dimensions are: human resources, material resources, financial resources, internal processes and relationships with the environment.
Others note that the appropriate dimensions that allow us to observe the quality are supplied by the model European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM). This is the case of Pardo (2003) in sporting entities. Mestre (2004), Galan (2004) in the University of Seville. Redondo, Olivar, and A. Redondo, 2006, in an attempt to bring services to EFQM sports city, in schools, being necessary to adapt it to the public organizations. Also Giner (2006) with its "Management by Commitment", adopted the criteria of the EFQM in the City of Esplugues de Llobregat. In fact, questionnaires such as profile v4.0. advanced or organizations as Euskalit. Sport England (2004), also follows the structure of the EFQM, using the Towards an Excellence Service (TAES) considering the following dimensions: leadership, policy and strategy, community contract, functioning of society, use of the standard of leadership and service measurement and understanding of the operation.

Table 2. Comparison between the criteria, principles or dimensions of the assessment models of quality assessment organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAF</th>
<th>MODEL CITIZENS</th>
<th>ISO 9001:2000</th>
<th>DEMING</th>
<th>MALCOLM BALDRIDGE</th>
<th>EFQM EXCELLENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Paradigmatic framework and Competencially</td>
<td>Systems of quality management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and Planning</td>
<td>Management leadership</td>
<td>Responsibility for Management and</td>
<td>Policies and Objectives</td>
<td>Strategic planning of</td>
<td>Policy and strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Planning and strategy</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances and Resources</td>
<td>Material Resources</td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td>Assembly and diffusion of</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process management and change</td>
<td>Technology Resources</td>
<td>Relational resources</td>
<td>Knowledge resources</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>Alliances and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in people</td>
<td>Internal communication</td>
<td>Satisfaction of human resources</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Product Realization</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in customers</td>
<td>External communication</td>
<td>Satisfaction of society</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Standardization</td>
<td>Address quality processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in society</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction environment</td>
<td>Measurement, analysis and improvement</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Results</td>
<td>Satisfaction environment</td>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>Quality and results of operations</td>
<td>Results in people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

In recent decades, the quality involved from a design was based on conformity with specifications to one where products and services have to be fit without any error. Now also looking to match or even exceed customers' expectations (Ruiz-Olalla, 2001; Papadimitriou & Karteliotis, 2000).

It has become indispensable to know about the characteristics and objectives of the tool used to measure the quality of the sports service. It is the first work of Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry (1993) when the quality level is beginning to be measured, taking into account the difference between perceptions and expectations of customers (Mackay & Crompton, 1988). This is a model based on five basic points that will lead to the five dimensions that form the SERVQUAL model (Chelladurai & Chang, 2000), despite the shortcomings of the service have been battled (Caballero & Sanz, 2005). In fact, following the Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces, in 2002, this model seems to be the main in municipalities in Spain (Caballero & Sanz, 2005). Nevado (2003) considers the predominant approach in the Spanish municipalities is based on the customers’ satisfaction.

Contrary to this, a study of the Quality Forum, held in Spain in 2003 (Caballero & Sanz, 2005) shows that 96% of municipalities in Spain are making some kind of modernization and/or quality of and whom, according to the classification of models of quality improvement, the predominant tool for assessing the quality of the organization (ISO 9000 with 26% and 23% with EFQM) for organizations seeking to assess the quality according to the perceptions of customers (32%). In fact, it seems that we must go beyond simple satisfaction surveys in public sporting corporations, more focused on management and pointing on the decision-making (Marques, 2003). In the same line, Giner (2006) argues that without the systems approach, management would have more limited results. It would seek to understand quality as a strategic element to customer satisfaction (Ruiz-Olalla, 2001). This is not only providing the service or commodity, but what they hoped to receive. This is the concept that relates to the term quality of service (Murray & Howat, 2002).

In a first step to bring the perceptions of users of the approach, it appears that the letters of service are one of the most used tools in the Spanish Public Administrations, and other surrounding countries, but have generally not been rated the results as they had a limited impact on the dimensions of analysis. Therefore, the results are limited (Crespo & Criado, 2005).

The Management by System appears in the public sports services, as the demands from citizens are increased, because after a participation seeking phase, another of social profitability, economic and improvement of the quality of their services, now the quality is demanding to guide all the aims in an improvement using a quality system, achieving profits in the cultural changes within the organization: more fluent communication, customer orientation and willingness for continuous improvement (Correal, 2003). However, we run the risk that the assurance system or quality control is too rigid and unwieldy to achieve our goal, although useful as a reference framework for the implementation of processes (Marqués, 2003), hence the need for adapt to each specific situation. There is, therefore, who argues that the study of service quality sports, still in training, responding to a multidimensional model, based on what the customer wants (Tsitskari, Tsiotras, & Tsiotras, 2006). It seems necessary that we should meet,
as Ruiz-Olalla (2001) both perceived quality (value judgments and subjective opinions) as to the quality objective (measurable and quantifiable), because service quality is a much broader term that satisfaction comes after a lengthy evaluation. The perceived value is a direct mediator of satisfaction in a sports and leisure centre.

We must pay special attention to the attributes or dimensions, to detect which are the most important if they can vary, depending on the countries of the sectors in which to work. This, taking into accounts a variety of perspectives that Dorado and Gallardo (2005) summarized as follows: economic, internal customer, services rendered, client external development.

CONCLUSIONS

It seems clear the variety of theories based on the paradigm from which to measure the approach to service quality. It is observable that, despite the SERVQUAL has been the main reference for most studies is insufficient to evaluate the quality of sports services. Many authors have sought to measure the quality of service over the past decades, although it appears that based on the perception of clients was insufficient. On the other hand there are systems of quality management. Within these, the most used are the ISO and the EFQM model, although it seemed too rigid and inflexible. It suggests the need to assess the quality of sports services, implementing the dimensions or quality principles externally (in an objective and quantitative) and then to a qualitative assessment (showing appropriate concern for customer satisfaction).
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