Perception of users about the competitiveness of the service of a passenger motor transport terminal

VELASCO-CEPEDA, Raquel Ivonne*†, CLARK-MENDÍVIL, Yesenia, ESPARZA-GARCÍA, Irma Guadalupe and CARRERA-OLGUÍN Jesús Manuel

Instituto Tecnológico de Sonora, 5 de Febrero 818 Sur, CP85000. Ciudad Obregón, Sonora

Received July 28, 2017; Accepted December 20, 2017

Abstract

The objective of the study was to identify the perception of the service competitiveness by the bus terminal users through a diagnosis for the detection of areas of opportunity or improvement. A non-probabilistic sample of 384 users of the service were selected, who answered an instrument that had the following sections: general information, external aspects related to the service, internal aspects related to the transport and the performance of the personnel and aspects related to the destination route. The procedure consisted in: determine information needs, define objectives and data sources, develop and validate questionnaire, define sample, apply questionnaire, process and analyze information. The results obtained regarding the perception of the users of the service were areas of improvement in the facilities, performance of the personnel, overall performance of the self-service unit, among others. It is concluded that there are areas for improvement in the different services provided to the user. Recommendations include training staff, improving the image of physical infrastructure and complementary services, as well as communication services such as the Internet and telephone access.

Growth regulators, amino acids, algae

Citation: VELASCO-CEPEDA, Raquel Ivonne, CLARK-MENDÍVIL, Yesenia, ESPARZA-GARCÍA, Irma Guadalupe and CARRERA-OLGUÍN Jesús Manuel. Perception of users about the competitiveness of the service of a passenger motor transport terminal. Journal-Urban, rural and regional economy 2017. 1-1:1-13

[†] Researcher contributing first author.

RINOE Journal
December 2017 Vol.1 No.1 1-13

Introduction

Tourism is a factor of expansion in the world that shows a horizon of growth possibilities for the coming years. According to the World Tourism Organization (WTO), from 2000 to 2012 tourism grew at an annual average rate of 3.6% in the world, based on the arrival of international tourists. For Mexico, tourism represents one of the main sources of foreign currency, generates 8.4 percent of GDP and more than 2.2 million jobs. In the last 30 years, Mexico's performance within the main international indicators has been moderate compared to that of other countries (Official Gazette of the Federation, 2013). However, Mexico is now more competitive in tourism, climbing 22 positions from 2013 to 2017, since it occupied position 44. It is currently ranked 22 according to The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report (2017).

The current changes and the growing competition that characterize the tourism markets of today, has forced tourism destinations to make more efforts to increase their competitiveness and may have greater chances of success before the different offers of competing destinations (Acerenza, 2009). To achieve this, more planning and coordination among the elements of the tourism system is needed, which according to Boullón (2006) is made up of: (a) tourism offer, (b) tourism demand, (c) sale process, (d)) tourist product, (e) tourism plant and tourist attractions, (f) infrastructure, (g) tourist superstructure, and (h) tourist heritage. In the case of this study, the focus will be on the infrastructure specifically in transportation and the terminal itself.

Among some of the objectives of the Communications and Transport Sector Program 2013-2018 (National Development Plan 2013-2018) are (a) to develop a multimodal transport and logistics infrastructure that generates competitive costs, improves security and promotes social development and economic development, (b) have timely, efficient and safe transportation logistics services that increase the competitiveness and productivity of economic activities, and (c) generate conditions for an integral, agile, safe, sustainable and inclusive mobility of people, that increases the quality of life. The achievement of the above objectives will favor regional development and tourism, as well as detonate value activities where the diverse actors, such as the government, businessmen, service institutions, community and stakeholders, are involved.

In an investigation carried out by Reyes de Velasco and Gutiérrez (2010) whose main objective was to describe the situation of the tourist transport service in the Paraguaná Peninsula. seen through the competent governmental actors of both the tourist activity and the transport service of said locality. In the study two techniques were used, the observation and the interview which were applied in the scenarios where the informants were located, this is the air, land and nautical terminals of the Paraguaná Peninsula; as well as the tourist and transport offices in each municipality. The interview guide consisted of 15 items and the observation guide transcribed the current state of the transport infrastructure, based on the regulations that govern it. The results obtained were classified into positive aspects and aspects to be improved. In relation to land transport, modern facilities were found in the passenger terminal, permanent training and awareness chats to drivers in tourism and customer service, increase in the number of transport service providers and liaison with other agencies depending on the efficiency and effectiveness of the service.

Tourist attention centers were deployed in private and public transport terminals in the area. Among the aspects to be improved are the service to create a quality image for tourists, transport units in poor condition and neglected, increase tourist signage, motivate the formation of tourist transport associations.

On the other hand, the positive results found in the air transport were constant improvements in the internal facilities and in the air terminal, incorporation of tourist attention modules, and an increase in national air transport. Among the aspects to be improved are: the image, since it is deteriorated and unpleasant to the visitors because of the absence of green areas and deterioration in the main façade, to improve the technical and operational conditions of the aircraft, insufficient infrastructure to provide support to tourist activity, support services and complementary to tourism, such as improvements in the infrastructure of food and beverage establishments. As far as water transport is concerned, it was found to have an excellent and strategic geographical location to develop tourist routes and circuits, personnel trained in tourism awareness and attention to visitors, has the minimum conditions necessary to be a tourist port that allows the access to cruises. As areas for improvement, the following were found: to promote greater maintenance in the facilities, based on a better image for the user; increase the arrival of cruise ships during the year, extend transportation services that allow connections to the airport, create a cruise tourism school where human talent is prepared.

The Mexican Institute for Competitiveness A.C. (2016), analyzes through 120 variables the urban competitiveness index of the 74 most important cities in the country, which are made up of 367 municipalities. The objective of the urban competitiveness index is to measure the capacity of Mexican cities to attract and retain talent and investment.

The study carried out in 2016 showed that the municipality of Cajeme, specifically its municipal capital, Ciudad Obregón, was ranked 47th in the overall competitiveness index among the 74 cities that make up the sample. Regarding the subindex of law that evaluates public and legal security, it occupies the 70th place; in relation to the environment, this is the capacity of cities to relate sustainably and responsibly with natural resources and their environment, was in place 52. In relation to society, this is the quality of life of its inhabitants: education, health and inclusion, occupies the 14th place. The political subindex that measures the potential of political systems to be stable and functional, Ciudad Obregon was in place 33. Regarding the government subindex, it ranked 32nd. The economy is ranked number 30.

Regarding the sub-index of efficient factor markets, which measures the efficiency of the production factor markets, mainly the labor and energy markets, it remained in the position 31. In the world-class precursor sectors, which measure financial sectors, telecommunications and transport was in place 60. Finally, in taking advantage of international relations with which the cities capitalize their ties with the outside to raise their competitiveness was in place 48.

As can be seen, the place occupied by Ciudad Obregón in the ranking of urban competitiveness, which in some cases is not satisfactory at all, according to the Mexican Institute for Competitiveness (2016), the city climbed 20 places in the ranking of the sub-index between 2012 and 2014 (from position 50 to 30), this due to the decrease in unemployment from 9 to 6%, the debt was reduced from 0.75 to 0.40% of GDP, among others. The gap found implies a great challenge for the region and for the parties involved, however there is the capacity and willingness of the same to improve performance and competitiveness.

Problem

Globally, there has been a growing interest in researching and specifying the necessary requirements to increase the competitiveness of countries, regions and localities in general, and of organizations and individuals in particular (Berumen and Palacios, 2009). Combined with competitiveness, there is a close relationship with the quality of the service provided by a grantor of the same be it public or private.

Among the most common complaints of users of the transport service in the terminals, there are the following: total or partial loss of luggage, overbooking of tickets, setbacks at the destination, unexpected cancellations, and setbacks in the departure time.

In the case of the Ciudad Obregón bus terminal, there are no specific studies on the opinion or perception of the users of the transport terminal service. Therefore, the following statement arises: What is the perception of users about the competitiveness of the service of a motor transport terminal?

Objective

Identify the perception of the competitiveness of the service by the users of a motor transport terminal through a diagnosis for the detection of areas of opportunity or improvement.

Justification

The present investigation will allow us to know what is the perception of the service of transport users, in relation to the service, the performance of the personnel, the facilities, among other services. The results will serve as a framework for action to address the areas of opportunity detected and propose strategies to provide a better service and to be more competitive. The findings will contribute to the state of the art of the subject under study, since in the region there are no known studies related to the motor transport terminal.

Theoretical framework

To establish a frame of reference that supports the research carried out, it is necessary to present some contributions made by different authors about tourism, competitiveness, service, motor transport and terminal.

Tourism. Ascanio (2010) refers to tourism as the set of all those processes, mainly of an economic nature, that set in motion the arrivals, stays and departures of tourists to and from a specific community, region or state that are directly related to them. . On the other hand, De San Eugenio (2012) takes up the concept of tourism of the World Tourism Organization (WTO), which was translated from English to Spanish by Governs and Go (2009) as: "the set of activities of the people who travel and stay in places other than their usual environment for a period of time not exceeding one year, for reasons of leisure, business and other tasks not related to the exercise of a paid professional activity in the place visited. Both concepts are complementary and allow a new concept of tourism, considering this as a set of processes, activities in which tourists stay, transfers and provision of services by various actors and allow an economic benefit in communities, regions and states.

Competitiveness. Veliyath and Zahra, 2000 (cited by Damareski, dos Anjos and Garotti, 2013) mention that competitiveness is a concept directly linked to globalization, since it is evaluated both for companies and for nations, having been established as a solution for various social problems ranging from unemployment and control of inflation, to the development of localities. For Buendía (2013) after conducting a study on competitiveness and the terms related to it, he mentions that competitiveness consists of participating adequately in the market, through price or quality, and at the same time is the ability to obtain a comparative advantage.

Velasco, Peñúñuri, Serrano and Gil (2011), make reference to competitiveness involves analyzing several concepts related to it as they are: attitude, quality, value chain, skills, costs, performance, differentiation, indicators, innovation, productivity, added value and competitive advantage. Regarding the attitude, this is defined as the mental disposition of an individual that influences his behavior, towards a situation, person or objective; which manifests itself in a relatively stable manner over time; being able to be favorable or unfavorable. With regard to quality, they mention that if a product has the characteristics that meet the customer's expectations or exceeds them, then it is of quality.

Article

The value chain is an instrument and theoretical model that allows describing the development of the activities of a business organization to generate value to the final customer (Verglú, 2013). Porter mentions five generic categories of primary activities to compete in an industrial sector: entry logistics, operations, exit logistics, marketing and sales, and service. In the category activities support are: acquisition, technological development, human resource management and organizational infrastructure.

With respect to the competences Velasco, Peñúñuri, Serrano and Gil (2011), they mention that one must bear in mind the capacity and disposition that an individual has for performance and for interpretation in a given situation. At the same time it is said that a person is competent if he has the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that allow him to act under certain standards in a certain situation and have a favorable effect in the environment in which it develops.

In relation to costs, this is the monetary value of the resources used in the production of goods and / or provision of services, thereby obtaining a future benefit, which means income for profit-oriented companies.

Performance is defined by Guerra-López (2007) as the achievements arising from behavior, rather than the behavior itself. You can also define performance as the result of an activity or activities of individuals within an organization, which impact their achievements, those of an area, as well as the company in general.

Differentiation is defined by Kerin, Hartley and Rudelius (2014) as a marketing strategy that implies that a company uses different activities of the marketing mix to help consumers perceive that the product is different and better than those of the competition.

The term indicator is defined by Münch and Paredes (2015) as a measure of compliance with the standard in a given period that allows evaluating activities, as well as knowing the current status of processes. For García (2010) the indicators are not isolated figures, but they are interrelated with each other, and to obtain a better understanding of the information they provide they must be grouped and constituted in what is known as indicator systems.

For Alburquerque, 2008 (cited by Ponce, innovation is a key factor 2011) competitiveness, and this goes beyond just introducing technological advances, it can also be applied to procedures and methods of enterprise organization, to the differentiation of products (whether goods and services), the organization of work and the valorization of human resources. the anticipation of technologies and techniques or the observation of needs and markets.

Productivity, a key element of competitiveness, is defined by Münch (2010) as the relationship between the quantity of inputs needed to produce a specific good or service and the results obtained.

Leppard and Molyneux, 2000 (cited by García, 2016) mention that the added value of a service is an effort to stand out, by which companies provide something beyond their transactions to customers. Therefore, it can be said that the service provider wants to fulfill beyond the expectations of the client; therefore, it strives to make the customer feel how important it is for the company.

For Kotler and Armstrong (2012) the competitive advantage is an advantage over the competitors which is gained by offering great value to the client, either because they offer low prices or providing more benefits that justify high prices.

For everything described above, we must emphasize that nowadays competitiveness is a constant of great value and that it will last over time; perhaps with new approaches, theories and models that adapt to what nations, organizations, as well as interested parties demand.

Service. Services are defined by Kerin, Harley and Rudelius (2014) as the intangible activities or benefits that an organization or company provides to consumers, in exchange for money or something more of value. The same authors refer to the term customer service as the logistics management capacity to satisfy users in terms of time, seriousness, communication and convenience. For Lamb, Hair and McDaniel (2011) the service is the result of applying human or mechanical efforts to people or objects. These include an action, performance or effort that cannot be physically possessed. For the above described, it can be said that the service is a performance that one party offers to the other in exchange for money or something of value.

Autotransport. Regarding this term, the Ministry of Communications and Transportation (2015) refers to the term of federal passenger motor carriers, such as the service for the transportation of people that is regularly provided on federal roads, with itineraries and fixed routes, subject to schedules for the arrival and departure of vehicles in authorized places for the ascent, as well as for the descent of passengers in terminals registered by the Secretary. This type of service is classified as luxury and executive, first class, economic and mixed.

Terminals The Ministry of Communications and Transportation (2015) refers to these as auxiliary facilities for the passenger motor transport service, in which the departure and arrival of buses for the ascent and descent of travelers are carried out. Added to this term are the passenger terminals in which permit holders must have terminals of origin and destination in accordance with the respective regulations, for the ascent and descent of passengers, prior authorization of land use by state and municipal authorities.

Methodology

The research carried out is of a descriptive, cross-sectional type, the non-experimental design with a quantitative approach.

Subjects of study. The study subjects are the users of the service of the different passenger motor transport lines of the Bus Station (Bus Terminal) of Ciudad Obregón, Sonora. A total of 384 informants participated.

Instruments. To know the perception of the users of the service, a questionnaire was used in which some of its sections were taken from the study of Economic Indicators for the Federal Passenger Autotransport of the Mexican Institute of Transportation, by the authors Moreno, De la Torre and Bustos (2012) and adapted to the conditions of the motor transport of Ciudad Obregón.

In the general information section, age, gender, if you had a car for your personal use and current occupation was requested. Regarding the basic consultation section, it was essential to know the bus line he traveled to, the place of origin (where he started his trip), the number of people accompanying him. In the section on external aspects, the conditions of the bus terminal were qualified, such as the sanitary service, waiting room conditions, cafeteria service, parking service, taxi service, sale of souvenirs and gifts, service pharmacy, service of magazines and newspapers, luggage storage service, dispatch calls, access to bank tellers, internet access, baggage handling, access to telephone service, complaints and suggestions mailbox, access for the disabled, ease of arrival to the terminal and the security inside the terminal. In this section, each of the aspects described above was evaluated on a scale of very good, good, fair, bad and very bad.

Regarding the internal aspects, the section had reagents on the same scale as the previous section and whose objective was to evaluate the infrastructure of the line and the performance of the counter staff. In the last section, the performance of the unit during the journey was evaluated, as well as the driver's.

Procedure. To carry out this study, the steps proposed by Lamb, Hair and McDaniel (2011) were analyzed, as well as the process proposed by Kinnear and Taylor (1998), to finally be as follows:

- 1. Determine the information needs. In order to carry out the research, it was necessary to analyze the type of information required related to indicators that would allow evaluating through them the perception of the service provided by the company under study.
- 2. Determine the objectives of the investigation. In order to initiate the investigation, it was necessary to determine the objectives and with this to comply with the research in development.
- 3. Define the primary and secondary data sources. In order to obtain data in this investigation, the user of the service provided by the bus station in the region had to be considered, as well as a bibliography that supported this study.
- 4. Prepare the questionnaire. For the elaboration of the instrument, a consultation was first made to research conducted on the subject, as well as the analysis of questionnaires already used by researchers, to finally take as reference the Moreno, De la Torre and Bustos (2012) and make the relevant adjustments for the project under study.
- 5. Validate instrument. Once the instrument was designed, it was validated by experts in the subject.
- 6. Define the sample. The type of sampling that was carried out was non-probabilistic and of convenience, where the collaboration of the informants was requested considering their availability to participate in the application of the questionnaire.
- 7. Apply the questionnaires. The questionnaires were applied to the selected sample.
- 8. Review each of the questionnaires applied to verify that the information provided is complete and consistent.

- 9. Capture and process information in the SPSS statistical package. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used
- 10. Analyze data. Once the data was processed, tables and graphs were generated that allowed the understanding of the data in SPSS.
- 11. Identify the perception of service users.

Results

Below are the results that allow meeting the objective set:

(a) General information about service users

Of the total of people surveyed, 55.5% belong to the male sex, and 44.5% to the female sex. Regarding whether they had their own car for personal use, 78.6% do not have a car and 21.4% do not have a car.

In terms of occupation, 54.7% corresponds to students, followed by professionals and technicians with 16.4%, housewives with 9.9%, retirees and pensioners represented by 6.8%, government employees correspond to 6.5 %, business owners 3.1%, employee of the private initiative 1.6% and others, represented by 1%.

(b) Basic Information

This section describes basic aspects regarding the bus line used, who you travel with and the number of people who accompany you. Table 1 shows the findings regarding the bus line used.

Bus line	Users
Tufesa	23.7%
Тар	17.4%
Norte de Sinaloa	12.2%
Mayitos	15.1%
Estrella Blanca	7.3%
Albatros	4.2%
Тар	3.9%
Élite	4.4%
Estrellas del Pacífico	5.5%
Turi Star	3.1%
Other	2.3 %
No answer	0.9 %

Total 100.0%

Own elaboration

Table 1 Bus line used

Regarding the number of people accompanying the user and with whom they travel, it was found that 48.4% of the informants travel alone, 16.7% with their partner, 24% are accompanied by their family, 3% with coworkers, 7.3% with friends, in group 0.3%, and in the others category 0.3%.

(c) External aspects related to the service

This section describes the external aspects related to the services offered at the bus station such as the toilets, waiting room, cafeteria, taxi services, luggage, and parking, among others. Table 2 shows the research findings in this regard.

Services	Findings
WC	15.9% Very bad 53.6% Bad
	20.6% Regular
	5.2% Good
	1.6 % Very good 3.1% No answer
	3.170 110 answer
Waiting	13.0 % Very bad
room	57.3% Bad 19.3% Regular
	2.3% Good
	0.3% Very good
Cafeteria	7.8% No answer 2.9% Very bad
Calcieria	4.7% Bad
	15.9% Regular
	3.1% Good 1.3% Very good
	72.1% No answer
Parking	0.5% Very bad
	4.2% Bad 14.6 % Regular
	13.3% Good
	3.1% Very good
T	64.3% No answer
Taxis	4.7 % Very bad 10.2% Bad
	11.2 % Regular
	2.1 % Good
	0.8 % Very good 71.0 % No answer
Souvenirs	2.6% Very bad
and gifts	6.3% Bad
store	21.9% Regular 3.4 % Good
	1.6% Very good
	64.2 % No answer
Pharmacy	2.6% Very bad 3.1% Bad
	12.0 % Regular
	6.5 % Good
	0.3% Very good 75.5% No answer
Luggage	5.2% Very bad
storage	36.5% Bad
	25.3% Regular 9.4% Good
	1.6% Very good
	22.0% No answer
Paging service	6.5% Very bad 46.1% Bad
SCIVICC	21.4% Regular
	10.4% Good
	2.1% Very good 13.5% No answer
Internet	2.1% Very bad
	3.9% Bad
	13.0% Regular
	10.4% Good 2.9 % Very good
	67.7 % No answer
Luggage	3.1% Very bad 7.0% Bad
Carrying	7.0% Bad 14.6% Regular
	9.4% Good
	0.8% Very good
Telephone	65.1% No answer 3.9% Very bad
	5.2% Bad
	18.0 % Regular
	7.3% Good 0.8% Very good
	64.8% No answer
Access for	3.6% Very bad
the disabled	8.6% Bad 14.1% Regular
	3.4 % Good
	0.5% Very good
Eggy gagge	69.8% No answer 8.1% Very bad
Easy access to the bus	8.1% Very bad 10.9% Bad
station	18.0% Regular
	1.8% Good
	0.5 % Very good 60.7% No answer

Own elaboration

Table 2 External aspects related to the service

(d) Internal aspects related to transportation and staff performance

Table 3 shows the results on the evaluation by the user on the aspects of modernity and maintenance of the unit. Table 4 shows the evaluation of staff performance

Criteria	Findings
Modernity	4.4% Very bad
-	21.6% Bad
	10.2% Regular
	0.3% Good
	1.8% Very good
	61.7% No answer
Maintenance	3.4% Very bad
	10.4% Bad
	11.7% Regular
	2.1% Good
	0.3% Very good
	72.1% No answer
Performance	18.8% Very bad
	61.2% Bad
	15.9% Regular
	1.8% Good
	0.3% Very good
	2.0% No answer

Own elaboration

Table 3 Evaluation on internal aspects of modernity and maintenance of the unit.

Criteria	Findings
Performance of the	16.1% Very bad
counter staff when buying	57.0% Bad
the ticket.	22.9% Regular
	2.1% Good
	0.0% Very good
	1.8% No answer
Attitude of the counter	5.5% Very bad
staff	13.0% Bad
	18.0% Regular
	0.8% Good
	0.0% Very good
	62.7% No answer
Schedules	3.9% Very bad
	10.4% Bad
	12.8% Regular
	6.3% Good
	0.0% Very good
	66.6% No answer
Information about the	5.7% Very bad
route	7.3% Bad
	20.3% Regular
	2.6% Good
	0.5% Very Good
	63.6% No answer
Information about extra	5.7% Very bad
costs for excess baggage	37.0% Bad
	26.3% Regular
	6.3% Good
	1.6% Very Good
	23.1% No answer
Speed of attention	4.9% Very bad
received	14.1% Bad
1	14.6% Regular
	2.6% Good
	0.0% Very Good
1	63.8% No answer

Own elaboration

Table 4 Evaluation of staff performance

VELASCO-CEPEDA, Raquel Ivonne, CLARK-MENDÍVIL, Yesenia, ESPARZA-GARCÍA, Irma Guadalupe and CARRERA-OLGUÍN Jesús Manuel. Perception of users about the competitiveness of the service of a passenger motor transport terminal. Journal-Urban, rural and regional economy 2017

(e) Aspects related to the route to the destination

In this section the results presented are related to the evaluation made by the user, regarding the performance of both the bus and its staff during their journey to the destination. The results are presented in the Table 5.

Neatness of the bus	Criteria	Findings
the bus		
14.1% Regular 3.1% Good 0.5% Very good 1.6% No answer		
3.1% Good 0.5% Very good 1.6% No answer Access to the bus 23.4% Bad 14.8% Regular 1.0 % Good 0.0 % Very good 53% No answer WC 13.3% Very bad 49.2% Bad 15.1% Regular 9.1% Good 2.6 % Very good 10.7% No answer Access to coffee and / or water on board the bus 2.3% Very bad 4.7 % Bad or water on board the bus 2.3% Very good 2.3% Very good 7.2.9% No answer Box lunch 2.9 % Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer Driving 11.2 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer Criteria Attitude of the driver Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 8.4% Very bad 11.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 8.4% Very bad 11.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 8.4% Very bad 11.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 8.4% Very bad 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good	the out	
0.5% Very good		
1.6% No answer		0.5% Very good
Access to the bus 23.4% Bad 14.8% Regular 1.0 % Good 0.0 % Very good 53% No answer WC 13.3% Very bad 49.2% Bad 15.1% Regular 9.1% Good 2.6 % Very good 10.7% No answer Access to 2.1% Very bad 47.7% Bad of 72.9% No answer Box lunch 2.9% Very good 72.9% No answer Box lunch 2.9% Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer Driving 11.2 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer Criteria Findings Attitude of the driver 37.2% Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 13.5% No answer Air 28.4 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 13.5 % No answer Air 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer Air 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer Air 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer Air 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer Air 24.0 % Very bad 8.4 % Very bad 8.4 % Very bad 1.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good		1.6% No answer
bus	Access to the	7.8% Very bad
1.0 % Good	bus	
0.0 % Very good 53% No answer		14.8% Regular
S3% No answer		
S3% No answer		0.0 % Very good
49.2% Bad 15.1% Regular 9.1% Good 2.6 % Very good 10.7% No answer 2.1% Very bad 4.7 % Good 2.3% Very good 72.9% No answer 2.9 % Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.3 % Very Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 13.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 37.2% Bad 3.9 % Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 3.9 % Good 3.6% No answer 3.9% Good 3.6% No answer		53% No answer
15.1% Regular 9.1% Good 2.6 % Very good 10.7% No answer 2.1% Very bad 4.7 % Bad 9.4 % Good 2.3% Very good 72.9% No answer 2.9 % Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 9.4% Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 18.9 % Good 1.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good	WC	
9.1% Good		49.2% Bad
2.6 % Very good		15.1% Regular
10.7% No answer		9.1% Good
Access to coffee and /		2.6 % Very good
Coffee and / or water on board the bus		10.7% No answer
or water on board the bus 8.6 % Regular 9.4 % Good 2.3% Very good 72.9% No answer 2.9 % Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 73.2% Bad 73.4% No answer 73.4% No answer 73.4% Regular 73.4% Good 73.4% No answer 73.4% Regular 73.4% Regular 73.4% Sad 73.4% No answer 73.4% No answer 73.4% No answer 73.4% Regular 73.4% No answer 7		
Doard the bus 9.4 % Good 2.3% Very good 72.9% No answer 2.9 % Very bad 6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 2.9 % Good 0.6 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 28.4 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 2.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 3.9% Good 3.9% Good 3.5% No answer 24.0 % Very good 3.6% No answer 24.0 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 3.9% Good 3.6% No answer		
2.3% Very good 72.9% No answer 70.9% Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 74.4% No answer 74.4% No answer 74.4% No answer 74.4% No answer 75.2% Bad 75.2% Bad 75.2% Bad 75.2% Bad 75.2% Good 75.2% No answer 75.2% No		
72.9% No answer	board the bus	
Box lunch		
6.8 % Bad 9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 11.2 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 28.4 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 3.9 % Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 3.9 % Good 3.9 % Good 3.9 % Good 3.6 % No answer 3.9 % Good 3.6 % No answe		
9.6 % Regular 7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer Driving 11.5 % Bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer Criteria Findings Attitude of the driver 37.2% Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good	Box lunch	
7.0 % Good 0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 11.2 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 28.4 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 3.9 % Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 9.4% Regular 24.0 % Very bad 3.9% Good 3.6% No answer 3.9		
0.3 % Very good 73.4% No answer 11.2 % Very bad 11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very bad 58.3 % No answer 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 24.0 % Very bad 25.8 % Bad 9.4% Regular 24.0 % Very bad 25.8 % Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 25.8 % Bad 3.9 % Good 15.3 % Very good 3.6 % No answer 24.0 % Segular 25.0 % Se		
73.4% No answer		7.0 % Good
Driving		0.3 % Very good
11.5 % Bad 16.1 % Regular 2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer		
16.1 % Regular	Driving	
2.9 % Good 0.0 % Very good 58.3 % No answer		
Criteria Findings Attitude of the driver Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit Baggage handling Baggage handling Batting of the unit Baggage handling Batting of the unit Baggage handling Batting of the unit Baggage handling Baggage handling Batting of the unit Batting of the unit the		
58.3 % No answer		0.0 % Voru good
Criteria Findings		58.3 % No answer
Attitude of the driver 28.4 % Very bad 37.2% Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 9.4% Regular 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 3.6 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good	Cuitonio	
the driver 37.2% Bad 13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 9.4% Regular 4.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good		
13.0 % Regular 2.6 % Good 0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer		•
Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit Baggage handling Baggage handling Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit Baggage handling Baggage handling Aware Baggage handling Baggage B	the driver	
0.3 % Very Good 18.5 % No answer 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad 3.9% Good 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good		13.0 % Regular
Air 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad and / or 9.4% Regular heating of the unit 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good		2.6 % Good
Air 24.0 % Very bad 57.8 % Bad and / or 9.4% Regular heating of the unit 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good		0.3 % Very Good
Air conditioning and / or heating of the unit 1.3% Very bad 3.9% Good 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good		
conditioning and / or 9.4% Regular 9.4% Regular 3.9% Good 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good	Air	
and / or heating of the unit 3.9% Good 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good 0.5 % Very good		
heating of the unit		
the unit 1.3% Very good 3.6% No answer Baggage handling 8.4% Very bad 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good		
3.6% No answer		
3.6% No answer	the unit	1.3% Very good
Baggage 8.4% Very bad 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good		
handling 18.0 % Bad 14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good	Raggage	
14.3 % Regular 1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good		
1.8 % Good 0.5 % Very good	nanunng	
0.5 % Very good		
57.0% No answer		
		57.0% No answer

Own elaboration

Table 5 Evaluation of bus and staff performance during the trip to the destination

When performing an analysis of the findings described above, it can be observed that four are the most commonly used lines of motor transport in the region by the service users: Tufesa, Tap, Mayitos and Norte de Sinaloa.

In the external aspects related to the service offered at the bus station, a critical point that requires attention is the health services since as shown in the table, 56.3% said they were bad and 20.6% said they considered it regular and only 15.9% that was very bad, compared to the waiting room, 57.3% said that the conditions were bad, in addition to the luggage storage, as well as the paging service.

In the internal aspects was found the need to pay attention to the general performance of the motor transport unit, since 61.2% considered it bad, as well as modernizing some units. Regarding the evaluation made by the users of the performance of the counter staff, 57% said that their performance was bad, so they also found attitude problems. Another aspect in which attention should be paid is in the information provided regarding the route, of the extra costs on excess baggage.

The results of the evaluation of the users regarding the performance of the bus and the personnel during the journey, it can be seen that 56% considered the cleaning of the unit bad, 49.2% mentioned that the conditions of the WC were bad. Regarding the driver's driving performance, he was in the regular category with 16.1%, 11.5% mentioned that he was bad and 11.2% very bad.

In relation to the attitude of the driver 37.2% said it was bad, 28.4% very bad and 13% that was regular. Another aspect that must be mentioned is the air conditioning and / or heating of the unit since 57.8% said it was bad and 24% very bad.

In other aspects such as the speed of the attention received, the cafeteria, parking, taxi service, ease of access to the terminal, souvenirs, Internet, telephone access, were evaluated by the user in the regular category.

Comparing the results of this study with the research carried out by Reyes de Velasco and Gutiérrez (2010), in both cases the service provided to the user is important since it may affect the image perceived by the tourist who visits the city for the first time. Another aspect that was found of similarity is the maintenance and performance of the unit.

By performing an analysis of the theory described with the results obtained in the present investigation, it can be corroborated that for a service provider organization to obtain customer satisfaction and at a given moment its preference for products and / or services, it must be seen as an integral system the performance of the personnel in the position according to their competences, as well as the attitude shown; the competitive advantage, the value chain of its activities, the added value to its services, as well as the tangible and intangible aspects thereof.

Conclusions

Below are a series of conclusions based on the results presented, which allow to comply with the stated objective:

The perception about the competitiveness of the service by users of the bus terminal in some aspects evaluated, was not entirely satisfactory; particularly in the health services of both the bus station and the motor transport unit; as well as the conditions of the waiting room and the exit paging service.

- Users considered the performance of the counter staff to be deficient in relation to the information provided on the route and the excess baggage costs, among others; as well as the attitude and attention of the same.
- The general conditions of the motor transport unit were considered inadequate in relation to cleaning, air conditioning and / or heating, modernity.
- The attitude of the driver of the unit was considered inadequate by the users of the service.

Among the limitations of the study are the following:

The presented results cannot be generalized, since on the one hand the sample is not probabilistic, on the other, in some of the reagents the informants did not respond, either because they did not use the service, or they were not presented with any type of situation or need of them.

Among the proposed recommendations are the following:

- Train the personnel of the motor transport terminal, as well as the operators of the unit in aspects related to the quality in the service to the client, as well as in areas that allow to improve their performance and be more competitive in their jobs.
- Improve the image of the power plant, in relation to the physical infrastructure.
- Give general maintenance to the motor transport units.

- Improve the conditions of the sanitary service, waiting room, exit paging service and luggage storage of the bus station.
- Address flaws in Internet service, as well as dial-up.
- Be more efficient in providing a faster service.

References

Acerenza, M.A. (2009). Competitividad de los destinos turísticos. México: Editorial Trillas, S.A.de S.V.

Alburquerque, F. (2008).Innovación, transferencia de conocimientos y desarrollo económico territorial: una política pendiente. *Arbur:ciencia, pensamiento,cultura*.Nº732, pp.687-700.

Ascanio, A. (2010). El objeto del turismo ¿Una posible ciencia de los viajes? PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural. Vol 8, pp 633-641.

Berumen, S. y Palacios O. (2009). *Competitividad, clusters e innovación*. México: Editorial Trillas, S.A. de C.V.

Boullón, R. (2006). Planificación del espacio turístico.4a edición. México: Editorial Trillas, S.A. de C.V.

Buendía, E.A. (2013). El papel de la ventaja competitiva en el desarrollo económico de los países. *Análisis Económico*, XXVIII Septiembre-Diciembre, 55-78

Damaraski, T.C., dosAnjos, F.A.,&Gadotti, S.J.

Competitividad de destinos turísticos. Estudio de Casos De Foz Do Iguacu. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, num31, pp 83-103.

De San Eugenio, J. (2012). Aproximaciones teóricas y conceptuales para una definición del estado del arte de la comunicación de los destinos turísticos. *Andamios. Revista de investigación social*, vol.9 septiembrediciembre, pp 211-236

Diario Oficial de la Federación (2013). Secretaría de Gobernación. Recuperado de: http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codig o=5326572&fecha=13/12/2013

García.A.(2016). Cultura de servicios en la optimización del servicio al cliente. *TELOS*. *Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Ciencias Sociales*. Vol. 18, pp. 381-398.

García, B. (2010). Modelos teóricos e indicadores de evaluación educativa. Sinéctica, *Revista Electrónica de Educación*, núm. 35, pp. 1-21

Govers R. y Go.F.M. (2009). Place branding. Glocal, virtual and physical identities, constructed, imagined and experienced. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guerra-López, I. (2007). Evaluación y mejora continua: conceptos y herramientas para la medición y mejora del desempeño. Estados Unidos de América: Author House.

Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad (IMCO). Índice de competitividad urbana 2016. Reelección Municipal y rendición de cuentas: ¿Cómo lograr el círculo virtuoso?, 2016. Recuperado de:

http://imco.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/2016-Indice_Competitividad_Urbana-Documento.pdf

Kerin, R. & Hartley,S.& Rudelius,W.(2014).Marketing.11aediciónMéxic o: McGraw-Hill/Interamericana Editores, S.A. de C.V.

economy 2017

RINOE Journal

Kinnear, T. & Taylor, J. (1998). *Investigación de mercados*.5ª edición. México: McGraw-Hill Interamericana, S.A.

Kotler, P. y Armstrong, G.(2012). *Marketing*. 14ª edición. México: Pearson Educación de México, S.A. de C.V.

Lamb, C., Hair, J. & McDaniel, C. (2011) Marketing 11 aedición. México: Cengage Learning Editores, S. A.

Leppard, J. y Molyneux, L. (2000). *Cómo mejorar su servicio al cliente*. España: Gestión 2000.

Moreno, E. & De la Torre, E. & Bustos, A. (2012). Indicadores económicos para el autotransporte federal de pasajeros. Instituto Mexicano del Transporte. Recuperado de: http://imt.mx/archivos/Publicaciones/PublicacionTecnica/pt357.pdf

Münch,L.(2010). Administración. Gestión organizacional, enfoques y proceso administrativo. México: Pearson Educación de México,S.A. de C.V.

Münch, L. y Paredes, R.(2015). *Consultoría administrativa. Las ocho claves para el éxito del consultor*. México: Editorial Trillas, S.A.de C.V.

Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2013-2018. Programa Sectorial de Comunicaciones y Transportes. Recuperado de:

http://www.sct.gob.mx/fileadmin/banners/Progr ama_Sectorial_de_Comunicaciones_y_Transpo rtes.pdf

Ponce,M.D.(2011). Competitividad e innovación en el producto turístico rural de la región de Murcia. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, num. 27, pp.743-758.

Porter, M.(2010). *Ventaja competitiva. Creación* y sostenimiento de un desempeño superior. Edición revisada. México: Grupo Editorial Patria.

Reyes de Velasco, G. y Gutiérrez, J. (2010). Situación actual del servicio de transporte turístico en la península de Paraguaná. Multiciencias. Vol.10. pp 301-309

Robbins, S.y Coulter,M. (2014). *Administración*. 12^a edición. México: Pearson Educación de México,S.A. de C.V.

Secretaría de comunicaciones y transportes. Subsecretaría de Transportes. Estadística básica del autotransportes federal 2015. Recuperado de:

http://www.sct.gob.mx/fileadmin/DireccionesG rales/DGAF/EST_BASICA/EST_BASICA_20 15/Estadistica_Basica_del_Autotransporte_Fed eral_2015.pdf

The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2017. Paving the way for a more sustainable and inclusive future. World Economic Forum. Committed to Improving the State of the World. Recuperado de:http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TTCR_2017_web_0401.pdf

Velasco, R.I., Peñúñuri, A.R., Serrano, L.& Gil, M. (2011). Herramientas administrativas de apoyo a la competitividad en las organizaciones. México: Instituto Tecnológico de Sonora.

Veliyath,R.,Zahara,S.A.(2000).Competitiveness in the 21st Century: Reflections on the Growing Debate about Globalization. Advances in Competitiveness Research, 8(1), pp.14-33

Verglú, J.(2013). La cadena de valor como herramienta de gestión para una empresa de servicios. *Industrial Data, Revista de investigación*, vol.16, num. 1, pp.17-28

VELASCO-CEPEDA, Raquel Ivonne, CLARK-MENDÍVIL, Yesenia, ESPARZA-GARCÍA, Irma Guadalupe and CARRERA-OLGUÍN Jesús Manuel. Perception of users about the competitiveness of the service of a passenger motor transport terminal. Journal-Urban, rural and regional economy 2017