SERVICE QUALITY AND VALUE IN THE 2014 FIFA WORLD CUP IN BRAZIL: THE MODERATOR ROLE OF CONSUMERS’ OPINION ABOUT HOSTING THE EVENT
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Synopsis:
This study examines the relationships between service quality and value among consumers who agree with the fact Brazil was hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup and those against this event.

Abstract:
Hosting a FIFA World Cup is seen as an achievement to governments and hosting cities. However, there are concerns on whether the investment to host a major event truly generates benefits to the citizens (Conchas, 2014). The recent 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil has raised the question of whether the host population perceives its importance, with protests before and during the event about the costs of the infrastructures and the added value to the country. Complementarily, researchers suggest that providing superior service quality at the events is paramount for hosts (Biscaia, Correia, Yoshida, Rosado, & Marôco, 2013) due to positive impacts on value creation for consumers (Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013). Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between service quality and value among consumers who agree with the fact Brazil was hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup and those against this event.

Data were collected during 29 games of 2014 FIFA World Cup. A team of six surveyors and a supervisor were assigned to five hosting cities. Each surveyor was assigned to an area surrounding the arena, approaching the potential respondents, explaining the project, and asking for their participation. Only native Brazilians and individuals with visible domain of the Portuguese Language were selected. A total of 3466 surveys were collected. After data screening, 3042 responses were deemed usable. The scale proposed by Biscaia et al. (2013) was adapted to assess service quality, and included 18 items to measure Teams, Referees, Frontline Employees, Accessibilities, Event Atmosphere, and Crowd Experience. Additionally, six items were
adapted to assess from Yoshida et al. (2013) to assess Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value. All items were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree). A structural equation model (SEM) was performed using AMOS 22.0 to examine the relationships between service quality and value for each group (groupA: agree with hosting the World Cup; groupB: against the event). Additionally, a multi-group SEM was conducted to examine how these relationships vary across groups.

The measurement and structural models for both groups showed an acceptable fit to the data (CFI>.90, GFI>.90, RMSEA<.06). Internal consistency of all constructs were above .60, while the AVE values were close to or greater than the .50 standard for convergent validity. Discriminant validity was accepted given that AVE for each construct was greater than the squared correlation between that construct and any other. Path coefficients for groupA indicate that Teams have positive effects on Hedonic Value ($\beta=.15$, $p<.01$) and Utilitarian Value ($\beta=.16$, $p<.01$). Referees have a positive effect on Hedonic Value ($\beta=.08$, $p<.05$). Accessibilities impacts positively Hedonic Value ($\beta=.15$, $p<.01$) and Utilitarian Value ($\beta=.16$, $p<.01$), with the same for Event Atmosphere (Hedonic Value: $\beta=.56$, $p<.01$; Utilitarian Value: $\beta=.34$, $p<.01$). In turn, Crowd Experience impacts negatively Hedonic Value ($\beta=-.21$, $p<.01$) and Utilitarian Value ($\beta=-.47$, $p<.01$). Regarding groupB, Teams have a positive effect on Hedonic Value ($\beta=.28$, $p<.01$) and Utilitarian Value ($\beta=.27$, $p<.01$), with the same for Accessibilities (Hedonic Value: $\beta=.25$, $p<.01$; Utilitarian Value: $\beta=.25$, $p<.01$) and Event Atmosphere (Hedonic Value: $\beta=.30$, $p<.01$; Utilitarian Value: $\beta=.16$, $p<.01$). In turn, Crowd Experience impacts negatively Hedonic Value ($\beta=-.22$, $p<.01$) and Utilitarian Value ($\beta=-.37$, $p<.01$). The multi-group SEM analysis revealed that both the unconstrained and the constrained model (CFI>.90, GFI>.90, RMSEA<.06) showed an acceptable fit to the data. The $\chi^2$ statistic revealed these models were significantly different [$\chi^2_{\text{dif}}(27)=76.12$, $p<.001$]. The Z tests for structural differences indicated that three paths differ significantly among the two groups (Event Atmosphere and Utilitarian Value: $Z=3.11$, $p<.01$; Event Atmosphere and Utilitarian Value: $Z=4.79$, $p<.01$; Crowd Experience and Utilitarian Value: $Z=2.82$, $p<.01$).

Examining how the relationships between service quality and value differ among consumers who agreed and those against hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil is paramount to understand the impact of this event on the hosting community. Findings indicate that the impact of event atmosphere on hedonic value is stronger for consumers agreeing with the event. It suggests that event managers should create a unique atmosphere in the stadium (e.g. memorabilia, interactive experiences) and its surroundings (e.g. fan zones, mega-screens) (Yoshida et al., 2013). Additionally, the path between Crowd Experience and Utilitarian Value was negative for both groups, with this effect being stronger for consumers agreeing with the event. This suggests that consumers may fear the consequences of crowd noise/energy to the hosting community. Thus, event managers should have a role on fan activities in order to increase consumption value. These findings should be considered by hosts when planning future events.
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