



Scholars research library

Archives of Applied Science Research, 2011, 3 (6):506-512
(<http://scholarsresearchlibrary.com/archive.html>)



Analogy between active ingredient view and customers of Mashhad city in terms of making private in productivity of pools

Azam Pahlavan hashemi¹ Ali Barzegari² nasrin azizian³ Ebrahim Norian⁴

¹Department of Education in Mashhad, MS Sport Management

^{2, 4}Physical Education Department, Payame noor University, 19395-4697 Tehran, I.R. of IRAN

³Physical Education Department, Mohagheghi Ardabili University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was analogy between active ingredient view and customers of Mashhad in terms of making private in productivity of pools. Statistical society of this research was including 11000 of customers. By the means of Morgan list 380 people had been chosen as a sample accidentally. Active ingredient of statistical society also was including 82 people (14 managers, 32 preceptors and 36 saviors.) this sample is equal with society which has been selected. The meter of this research was a questionnaire including 46 questions within two distinct sectors, personal information and questions which were related to research. Thoughts of 13 members of athletic manager congress had been used to choose what the questionnaire must include. Perpetuity of this questioning was 88 percent. This research was two kinds: measurement and descriptive research. Descriptive statistics had been used In order to analyze consequences, and some tables and diagrams had been used to present this research. For analyzing statistics presuppositions nonparametric tests had been used. The results of the research showed that there is a different between active ingredient view and customers of mashhad in terms of making private in productivity of pools and the average of customers toward active ingredient were larger than productivity of making the baths private. ($P \leq 0/05$)

Keywords: privatization, productivity, active ingredient

INTRODUCTION

In the uproar of global free trade and global investments, governments around the world have taken the privatization of state firms to better and competitive pressures due to their stability. Also more resources for social programs should be available [1]. Privatization is a process while

the government at any level checks the transfer functions and facilities from public to private sector and where appropriate will take action against it [2].

Issue of privatization has been stated in 1990 at the first program Policies and policy development (economic, social and cultural) of Iran and the approval letter dated 29/03/1370 and the Executive Council of Ministers and the 3000 list of state and government owned, In order to achieve performance improvement activities and reduce the size of government in economic activities deemed necessary and the balance is provided from use of resources, economic and efficient.

With regard to the resolute affirmation of the Third Development Plan in the assignment and transfer to non-governmental and private sector, government has policies of sports and its prominent position in the eligibility rules have and the rule of position, and to play more effective oversight role [2,3].

In the third program, improve efficiency and increase productivity and efficiency of material and human resources in government policy and cooperative development and empowering the private sector was underlined. With regard to legal positions announced the government is state to implement the privatization policy in all parts of the country's sports [2,3,4].

Privatization as a development tool is able in today sports that are considered an industry has important. In some countries the privatization has 1 to 2 percent of GDP [4] and in Europe in 2001 and 2002, in football industry, the clubs have income over seventh billion pounds [5]. Sport England's, participation in 500 projects with 23 billion pounds worth of private sector led government deficit to be eliminated in the construction of Sport [6]. In the third program, improving efficiency and productivity of human and material resources and effective government policy and development was emphasized in private and cooperative sectors [7]. With regard to its legal position, Government State to implement the privatization policy in all parts of the country's sports. In the current system, and improve its efficiency, one of the major goals of any organization is active and alive [8].

Unfortunately, despite the special status of productivity in organizations, manager's information from productivity is low. As the sink is believed the most productive discussions with the management circles devoted to contemporary unfortunately, anything other than its true meaning is understood [9,10].

Since all activities should be aimed at increasing efficiency and effectiveness of managers that this is both in terms of productivity, Measuring this concepts regarded scholars in different fields of science [8].

Meanwhile, improving efficiency plays a significant role in helping organizations. Productivity is a measure that can help to continually improve existing conditions. Productivity is a concept and phenomenon in criterion for performance evaluation and in fact, spends resources to achieve goals that can be searched. Improving the productivity is the main task of managers; they have the most roles in this regard. Government agencies often suffer from low productivity and many authorities are struggling to find appropriate solutions for this problem [11].

The use of capacity per unit time in organizations increases their productivity. Private sector to follow the proper use of resources with revenue and profit are forced in their division in competition with other sectors and their sustainability is assigned to the efficient use productivity in the industrial, manufacturing and service sectors to increase and the resources and capacity [2]. The pragmatic view of the efficiency criteria includes efficiency, effectiveness, and service quality and customer satisfaction [8].

Now, according to the necessity of privatization and productivity in today's society, the researcher intended to study analogy between active ingredient view and customers of Mashhad in terms of making private in productivity of pools. So the researchers sought to answer the following questions: there are differences between the executive and the views of customers about the role of privatization in Mashhad in pools productivity?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this study, the pragmatic view of the four indicators of efficiency, effectiveness, improves service quality and customer satisfaction were measured. Research method was descriptive and field methods and to collect necessary information the questionnaire is used. To determine the validity of the questionnaire, 13 physical education teacher's feedback from the Iranian universities were used and numerous amendments were considered.

The study population was the sports pools customers' of Mashhad city which are 11000 persons, According to Morgan table equal to 374 people as a sample were selected. 380 persons have responded to the questionnaire. The sample was selected randomly among the customers, the statistical community for implementation was 82 persons (14 Head, 32 instructors and 36 Nagy) that the sample is considered equal in society.

For data analysis descriptive statistics in graphs and to display data in table format also for hypothesis analysis nonparametric statistical tests (binomial distribution, U Mann Whitney) were used.

RESULTS

Table1. Test results for privatization role on studied factors based on customer's opinion

Variables	Group	N	Ratio	Tested ratio	Sig
Efficacy	3>	333	0.88	0.50	0.001
	≤3	46	0.12		
Efficiency	3>	341	0.90	0.50	0.001
	≤3	36	0.10		
quality of customer services	3>	341	0.90	0.50	0.001
	≤3	36	0.10		
Consumers satisfaction	3>	355	0.94	0.50	0.001
	≤3	24	0.06		

Table2. Test results for privatization role on studied factors based on executive agent's opinion

Variables	Group	N	Ratio	Tested ratio	Sig
Efficacy	3>	68	83	0.50	0.001
	≤3	14	17		
Efficiency	3>	65	79	0.50	0.001
	≤3	17	21		
quality of customer services	3>	72	88	0.50	0.001
	≤3	10	12		
Consumers satisfaction	3>	71	87	0.50	0.001
	≤3	11	13		

Table3. U Mann Whitney test results for study the differences between customers and Executive agent's opinion in all studied factures

Variables	Indexes groups	N	Rate Mean	U Mann Whitney	Wilcoxon	Z	Sig
Productivity	customers	372	235.40	12313	15716	-2.73	0.006
	Executive agents	82	191.66				
Efficacy	customers	379	237.31	13147.000	16550.000	-2.192	0.028
	Executive agents	82	201.83				
Efficiency	customers	377	236.30	13083.000	16486.000	-2.184	0.029
	Executive agents	82	201.05				
quality of customer services	customers	377	235.64	13331.000	16734.000	-1.955	0.052
	Executive agents	82	204.07				
Consumers satisfaction	customers	379	238.48	12703.500	16106.500	-2.59	0.009
	Executive agents	82	196.42				

In the present study, 462 people have responded to the questionnaire. As can be seen from the tables (1) to (8) for examining the hypothesis the binomial distribution test is used. It was considered the Likert range whether the respondents said their overall opinion of the average Likert range (ie, number three) has announced. If yes research hypothesis and the target variable (privatization) is acceptable.

As Table 1 is considered Privatization is effective factor on the performance of the indoor pools in executive agents view. As Table 2 is shown the Privatization is affecting Factors the performance of the indoor pools in customers view.

As in Table 3 is considered the Privatization is factors affecting the effectiveness of private enforcement in indoor pools in executive agents view. As in Table 4 is considered the Privatization is factors affecting the effectiveness of privatization on customers in the indoor pools in customers view.

As in Table 5 is considered the Privatization is factors affecting the quality of services from the perspective of indoor pools in customers view. As in Table 6 is considered the Privatization is factors affecting the quality of indoor pools in the privatization of services in executive agents view.

As in Table 7 is considered the Privatization is factors affecting customer satisfaction from the perspective of indoor pools in customers view. As per table (8) is considered the Privatization is factors affecting customer satisfaction in terms of indoor pools in executive agents view.

As shown in Table (4-9), given the extent and significance level of Z, significant differences were observed between executive factor view and customers in the role of privatization on customer satisfaction in swimming pools. In other words, customers have higher average satisfaction affected by the privatization of the pools were closed to the Administrator. As can be seen in Figure 1, indicator of service quality and customer perspective and the overall performance of subjects have the highest average. The lowest averages in the customers view related to customer satisfaction index and from the perspective of executive indicators relating to administrative factors.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Detailed findings analysis indicates that from the perspective of the executive and customers, privatization is a affecting factor on the efficiency of indoor pools (Tables 1 and 2). The cause of such effect is the ability to place sport at the efficient manpower, efficient use of funds and facilities, the programs associated with innovation, solidarity.

Based on this researchers opinion, the reasons for the positive impact of privatization to costs reduction was using a set of capacities, the optimal combination of production and reduce costs and increase profits, improve labor quality, technology development, increase the share of increased investment, the reforms and Sports optimize resources, increase the rate of investment banking and subsequently, the new technology, reducing the number of workers, proper use of resources, reducing the number of workers, they know [12,13,14].

The performed tests show that from the perspective of both administrative and customer service, privatized factor affecting the quality of the indoor pools (Tables 5 and 6).

This increasing is due to customer expectations, increase customer loyalty and trust, at different hours of access, satisfaction and environmental features.

Conducted tests show that from the perspective of the executive and the customer, privatization is affecting factors is the customer satisfaction in indoor swimming pools (Tables 7 and 8).

The cause of this effect is improvement of environmental health, to the surveys of customers, immediate action in respect of employees and customer's comments, match fees and services.

Research findings show that was significantly differences between the executive and the customer perspective of the role of privatization in productivity pools. In other words, customers have higher average of productivity performance of the indoor pools were affected by privatization [15].

Also were significant differences between the perspectives of executives and consumers about the role of pools performance. In other words, customers have higher average efficiency affected by privatization indoor pools affected by the executive agents and also significant differences were observed between the perspectives of executives and consumers about the role of pools efficacy.

In other words, customers have higher average of efficiency affected by the privatization of the executive agents. Also, there was no significant difference between the executive and customer of privatization in improving the quality of pools customer services.

In the other word, there was no significant difference between improve quality index affected by privatization in two costumers and executive agents and both groups equally believe the impact of privatization on the quality of services. Significant differences were observed between executive and customer of privatization in improving the quality of pools customer services. In other words, customers have a higher average of customer's satisfaction affected by the privatization of the pools rather than executive agents.

Based on the materials listed this difference is caused by a customer places why keep an old customer than to attract a new customer is much less expensive. Therefore, managers are seeking solutions so that increase customer loyalty to your collection [16].

The customers for various reasons, including filling leisure time, physical health and ETC following the conditions for increasing participation in sport facilities. They focus on points such as change of ownership or transfer has been more subtle and the opinion of their private pools is getting increasing productivity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tavakoli S, **2007**. Comparison the opinion of managers in privatization of the Ghom province sport. Shomal University.
- [2] Razavi MH, **2004**. Surveying privatization diplomacy in Iran sport based on championship. Tehran University.
- [3] Maghdoonie privatization organization, **2003**. Privatization in the maghdoonie, Iranian privatization organization.
- [4] Cagla Okten & k.Peren Arin, **2006**. *World Development* Vol.34, No.9, PP.1537-1556.
- [5] Cagla okten, **2003**. How Does Privatization Affect Efficiency, Productivity and Technology Choice?: Evidence from Turkey
- [6] Chao-Chung Kang, **2009**. Privatization and production efficiency in Taiwan's telecommunications industry, Science Direct
- [7] John S. Earle, **2002**. Privatization Methods and Productivity Effects in Romanian Industrial Enterprises, Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper, 2-81
- [8] Marcio I. Nakane, **2003**. Bank Privatization and Productivity: Evidance for Brazil.
- [9] David Brown, **2004**. Does Privatization Hurt Works? Lessons from Comprehensive Manufacturing Firm Panel Data in Hungary, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine, Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper, 5-125.
- [10] Scott E. Atkinson, **2005**. *J. productivity Analysis*, 23: 245-73.
- [11] IKE Mathur, **2007**. *Emerging Markets Review* 8, 134-46

- [12] Kofi Fred Asiedu, (2007) *World Dev* vol.35(10): 1779-95.
- [13] Elena Fumagalli, 2007. Service quality in the electricity industry: The role of privatization and managerial behavior, *Energy Policy*, 35
- [14] Kevin Amess, 2007. The productivity effects of privatization : The case of polish cooperatives, *IRFA international Review of Financial Analysis*16: 354-66
- [15] James A Schmitz Jr, 2008. Privatization s impact on private productivity : The case of Brazilian iron ore ,*Review of Economic Dynamics*, 111:745
- [16] Chong-En Bai, 2008. How does privatization work in China? *Association for Comparative Economic Studies*.