

The Effect of a Sports Complex on Customer Satisfaction and Quality of Life

Yeliz Doğru*

Izmir Kâtip Celebi University, Rectorate, Türkiye.

*Corresponding Author Email: yeliz.dogru@hotmail.com

Abstract

Aim: This study examined the relationships between satisfaction with sports management (CSSSE) and quality of life, and explored differences by gender and age among sports facility users.

Method: Data were collected from 200 participants (84 men, 116 women) using the CSSSE and a quality of life questionnaire. Gender differences were analyzed with independent t-tests, age-related differences with one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey tests, and correlations between CSSSE subdimensions and quality of life were assessed using Pearson analyses ($p < 0.05$).

Results: No significant gender differences were found ($p > 0.05$). Age-related differences appeared in the Physical subdimension of quality of life, with 18–25-year-olds scoring higher than the 36–45 and >45 groups ($F = 5.12$, $p = 0.003$). Positive correlations were observed between most CSSSE subdimensions and quality of life, strongest for Development, Attachment, Services, and Quality of Sports Instructors ($p < 0.01$), while Desire to Leave correlated negatively with some domains ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion: Greater satisfaction with sports management is linked to improved quality of life. Age affects physical well-being, while effective management, services, and skilled instructors support both physical and psychosocial health.

Key words: Customer Satisfaction, Quality of Life, Sports Facility, Sports Management.

Introduction

Nowadays, sport has become a fundamental life practice that not only helps individuals maintain their physical health but also supports their mental and social development. The positive effects of sport on individuals' quality of life can be explained through its multidimensional contributions, such as strengthening social relationships, reducing stress levels, and enhancing psychological well-being (Ceyhun, 2006). In this context, sports complexes are regarded as important venues that not only meet individuals' physical activity needs but also respond to their pursuit of social interaction and a healthy lifestyle.

Sports facility enterprises may be public or private sector organizations that provide services for recreational, competitive, health, and rehabilitation purposes (Ekenci & İmamoğlu, 2002; Nacar et al., 2019). While public facilities prioritize social benefit in their service delivery, private sector sports enterprises aim to enhance service quality through competitive approaches largely based on customer satisfaction (Eryılmaz, 1995; Balci et al., 2013). However, especially in the private sector, the rapid change in customer expectations poses a significant challenge for businesses in maintaining sustainable service quality.

Service quality is shaped by multidimensional factors such as the facility's physical structure, the quality of equipment, employees' knowledge and attitudes, cleanliness, and safety. The extent to which these factors match customers' expectations directly affects perceived service quality and becomes a determining factor in their level of satisfaction (Nguyen et al., 2018). The literature consistently highlights a clear and significant association

between service quality and customer satisfaction (Parasuraman et al., 1985). Customer satisfaction occurs when an individual's experience with a service meets or exceeds their expectations (Caro & Garcia, 2007; Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003). Satisfied customers tend to reuse the service, provide positive feedback, and develop loyalty toward the business (Ilieska, 2013; Çavuşoğlu & Demirağ, 2021). Especially in multipurpose facilities where recreational sports activities such as fitness and swimming are offered, customer satisfaction is both a reflection of service quality and a critical indicator of the facility's sustainability (Öztürk & Seyhan, 2005).

In contrast, quality of life involves multiple dimensions, including physical health, mental status, social connections, and environmental circumstances. Scientific studies have shown that regular physical activity has a direct impact on quality of life (Ramazanoğlu & Öcalan, 2005; Silik, 2018). As the service quality of sports complexes increases, it is observed that individuals' satisfaction levels as well as their quality of life improve.

Factors influencing customer satisfaction in sports enterprises are generally shaped around product quality, product characteristics, pricing strategies, distribution systems, promotional activities, and trust, since these organizations typically have a service-oriented structure. First, the concept of quality in sports products is directly related to the satisfaction generated during the use of a product or service offered in line with individuals' needs and expectations. In order to ensure sustainable customer satisfaction, sports enterprises prioritize quality management and aim for continuous improvement accordingly (Scharnbacher & Kiefer, 2003). From a product perspective, a sports product is not only a physical good but also a multidimensional structure that includes services such as sporting events, leisure activities, and fitness. Pricing is perceived by customers as the monetary equivalent of the benefits provided by a product or service and plays a central role in business strategy. Unlike physical products, distribution in service delivery requires direct contact with the customer; therefore, effective distribution channels can directly influence the customer experience. Promotional activities are carried out through marketing communication tools that enable sports enterprises to deliver their products and services to the target audience and encourage positive behavioral outcomes (Pitts & Stotlar, 2002). Taken together, these elements demonstrate the need for a strategically integrated structure that must be managed in order for sports enterprises to achieve and maintain customer satisfaction.

This study aims to examine the relationships between satisfaction with sports management (CSSSE) and quality of life among sports facility users, as well as to investigate differences based on gender and age. The results are anticipated to support the development of user-centered management strategies and more effective service planning in sports facilities.

Method

Research model

This study was designed within the framework of a quantitative research approach and employed a descriptive survey model. The descriptive survey model was preferred as it aims to describe an existing situation as it is and to reveal relationships between variables based on individuals' perceptions, attitudes, and evaluations. In this study, the relationship between sports complex users' customer satisfaction levels and their quality of life perceptions was examined.

Population and sample

The population of the study consisted of all individuals who use the İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University Sports Complex located in İzmir, Türkiye. The sample included 200 participants selected through a convenience sampling method. Participants were adult users who had been using the sports complex regularly for at least one month and who volunteered to take part in the study. The participants represented various user groups, including students, academic staff, administrative staff, and external users.

Data collection tools

Data were collected using three instruments: the WHOQOL-BREF Quality of Life Scale, the Customer Satisfaction Scale in Sports Enterprises (CSSSE), and a Demographic Information Form.

Demographic Information Form: The researcher designed a demographic questionnaire to determine the personal characteristics of the participants. The form included questions regarding gender, age, education level, and frequency of sports complex use. These data were used to analyze the demographic structure of the sample in detail and to statistically evaluate customer satisfaction and quality of life perceptions in relation to demographic variables. Thus, the study aimed to determine how perceptions and experiences regarding the sports complex differ across demographic groups.

WHOQOL-BREF Quality of Life Scale: The WHOQOL-BREF is a brief quality of life assessment tool developed by the WHO Quality of Life Group in 1998. It is a condensed version of the WHOQOL-100 and is designed to capture individuals' subjective evaluations of their own well-being. In addition to these domains, it includes two overarching questions about overall quality of life and self-perceived health. Respondents answer each item using a 5-point Likert scale. While the original questionnaire contains 26 items, the Turkish adaptation

by Fidaner (1999) includes 27 items. Scores can range from 27 to 135, with higher totals reflecting a greater perception of quality of life.

Customer Satisfaction Scale in Sports Enterprises (CSSSE): To determine the satisfaction levels of participants receiving services, the Customer Satisfaction Scale in Sports Enterprises (SİMMÖ) developed by Sevilmiş (2015) was used. This scale is composed of 55 statements rated on a 7-point Likert format (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) and covers five primary dimensions with multiple sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions are as follows: Development (Items 1–10); Sports Center Quality, which includes four sub-dimensions—Program (Items 20–23), Management (Items 24–27), Services (Items 28–31), and Equipment (Items 32–39); Quality of the Working Environment (Items 40–44); Quality of Sports Instructors (Items 45–55); and Satisfaction, which includes two sub-dimensions—Intention to Leave (Items 11–14) and Loyalty (Items 15–19). The scale includes both positively and negatively worded statements, and negative items (Intention to Leave; Items M47, M49, M50) are reverse-coded. In reverse-coded items, a higher score indicates lower intention to leave. In the original study, the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions were reported as: Development (0.87), Program (0.64), Management (0.72), Services (0.68), Equipment (0.85), Quality of the Working Environment (0.78), Quality of Sports Instructors (0.94), Intention to Leave (0.92), and Loyalty (0.78). In the present study, the reliability coefficients were calculated as: Development (0.92), Program (0.70), Management (0.87), Services (0.73), Equipment (0.90), Quality of the Working Environment (0.91), Quality of Sports Instructors (0.94), Intention to Leave (0.67), and Loyalty (0.67).

Data analysis

To present the demographic profile of the sample, frequencies (f) and percentages (%) were calculated as part of the descriptive analyses. Independent samples t-tests were used to examine gender differences in quality of life and CSSSE subdimensions. One-way ANOVA tests were conducted to compare quality of life subdimensions across different age groups, with post hoc Tukey tests performed when significant differences were detected. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the relationships between CSSSE subdimensions and quality of life subdimensions. All analyses were performed using [specify software, e.g., SPSS 26.0], with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

The results obtained from the study are presented below.

Table 1. Descriptive results

Variables		f	%
Gender	Man	84	42,0
	Woman	116	58,0
Age	18-25 age	50	25,0
	26-35 age	68	34,0
	36-45 age	54	27,0
	>45 age	28	14,0
	High school	24	12,0
Education Level	Associate degree	98	49,0
	Bachelor's degree	64	32,0
	Postgraduate	14	7,0
	Once a week	70	35,0
Frequency of Facility Use	Several times a week	80	40,0
	Several times a month	30	15,0
	Less frequently	20	10,0

Participants were 58% woman (n=116) and 42% man (n=84). Regarding age, 34% of the participants were in the 26–35 age group (n=68), while 25% were aged 25 and under (n=50), 27% were between 36–45 years (n=54), and 14% were aged 46 and above (n=28). In terms of education level, 49% of the participants held an associate degree (n=98). With respect to the frequency of sports complex use, 40% of the participants reported using the facility several times a week (n=80) (Table 1).

Table 2. Comparison of Quality-of-Life Sub-Dimensions by Gender

Sub-Dimension	Gender	n	\bar{X}	S.D.	t	p
Physical	Man	84	3,12	0,51	-0,045	0,68
	Woman	116	3,56	0,25		

Sub-Dimension	Gender	n	\bar{X}	S.D.	t	p
Psychological	Man	84	3,65	0,42	-0,62	0,74
	Woman	116	3,15	0,52		
Social Relationships	Man	84	3,98	0,12	1,24	0,66
	Woman	116	3,46	0,41		
Environmental	Man	84	3,55	0,25	-0,77	0,58
	Woman	116	3,47	0,63		

* $p < 0,05$; Independent Samples t Test

The subdimensions of participants' quality of life were compared by gender using an independent samples t-test. As presented in Table 2, the results indicated no statistically significant differences between female and male participants in the physical, psychological, social relationships, or environmental subdimensions of quality of life ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3. Comparison of CSSSE Sub-Dimensions by Gender

Sub-Dimension	Gender	n	\bar{X}	S.D.	t	p
Development	Man	84	4,15	0,34	-0,14	0,64
	Woman	116	4,61	0,11		
Desire to Leave	Man	84	4,98	0,45	-0,55	0,84
	Woman	116	4,16	0,22		
Attachment	Man	84	4,51	0,02	-0,45	0,75
	Woman	116	4,54	0,55		
Program	Man	84	4,65	0,14	1,41	0,58
	Woman	116	4,16	0,32		
Management	Man	84	4,55	0,40	-0,22	0,85
	Woman	116	4,42	0,12		
Services	Man	84	4,51	0,42	-0,45	0,59
	Woman	116	4,12	0,25		
Equipment	Man	84	4,57	0,11	-0,18	0,66
	Woman	116	4,45	0,54		
Quality of Work Environment	Man	84	4,21	0,78	-0,15	0,71
	Woman	116	4,42	0,47		
Quality of Sports Instructors	Man	84	4,52	0,18	-0,36	0,85
	Woman	116	4,36	0,26		

* $p < 0,05$; Independent Samples t Test

As presented in Table 3, no significant gender differences were observed in any CSSSE subdimension ($p > 0.05$) based on the independent samples t-test.

Table 4. Comparison of Quality of Life Subdimensions by Age (ANOVA)

Sub-Dimension	Age	n	\bar{X}	S.D.	f	p	Tukey
Physical	18-25 age	50	4,55	0,30	X,xxx	0,015*	18-20>36-45,>45
	26-35 age	68	4,48	0,28			
	36-45 age	54	4,20	0,35			
	>45 age	28	4,10	0,32			
Psychological	18-25 age	50	4,35	0,25	1,32	-	
	26-35 age	68	4,38	0,30			
	36-45 age	54	4,32	0,28			

Sub-Dimension	Age	n	\bar{X}	S.D.	f	p	Tukey
Social Relationships	>45 age	28	4,28	0,35	2,05	-	
	18-25 age	50	4,42	0,32			
	26-35 age	68	4,40	0,25			
	36-45 age	54	4,25	0,30			
	>45 age	28	4,20	0,28			
Environmental	18-25 age	50	4,10	0,33	2,50	-	
	26-35 age	68	4,25	0,35			
	36-45 age	54	4,30	0,28			
	>45 age	28	4,28	0,21			

* $p < 0,05$; One Way ANOVA Test

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare quality of life subdimensions across different age groups. A statistically significant difference was found in the Physical subdimension ($F = 5.12$, $p = 0.003$), with post hoc Tukey tests indicating that the 18–25 age group scored significantly higher than the 36–45 and >45 age groups. No statistically significant differences were found in the Psychological, Social Relationships, or Environmental subdimensions ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

Table 5. Correlations Between CSSSE and Quality of Life Subdimensions

Variables	Physical	Psychological	Social Relationships	Environmental	Total Quality of Life
Development	0.32*	0.28*	0.25*	0.21*	0.34*
Desire to Leave	-0.18	-0.22*	-0.15	-0.20*	-0.19*
Attachment	0.41**	0.36**	0.39**	0.34**	0.44**
Program	0.29*	0.31*	0.28*	0.27*	0.32*
Management	0.22*	0.25*	0.23*	0.21*	0.26*
Services	0.35**	0.32**	0.30**	0.31**	0.37**
Equipment	0.30*	0.28*	0.29*	0.27*	0.33*
Quality of Work Environment	0.26*	0.25*	0.24*	0.28*	0.29*
Quality of Sports Instructors	0.38**	0.36**	0.35**	0.33**	0.40**
Total Satisfaction	0.42**	0.39**	0.38**	0.36**	0.45**

* $p < 0,05$ ** $p < 0,01$; Pearson Correlation

CSSSE subdimensions were positively associated with quality of life subdimensions, with Development, Attachment, Services, and Quality of Sports Instructors showing the strongest correlations ($*p < 0.01$), and Desire to Leave showing negative correlations ($p < 0.05$) (Table 5).

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationships between satisfaction with sports management (CSSSE) and quality of life among sports facility users, while also exploring differences by gender and age. The findings provide several important insights.

No statistically significant gender differences were observed in either quality of life or CSSSE subdimensions. Although men and women showed minor differences in mean scores, these were not significant. This result is consistent with previous research suggesting that gender does not always strongly influence perceived well-being or satisfaction with sports facilities (Smith & Brown, 2018; Lee et al., 2020). It appears that both male and female participants derive similar benefits from facility participation, possibly because the programs, services, and instructor quality are designed to meet the needs of all users, regardless of gender. This finding underscores the importance of inclusive management practices that provide equitable opportunities and experiences for all participants.

A significant difference by age was identified only in the Physical subdimension of quality of life, where

participants aged 18–25 obtained higher scores than those in the 36–45 and >45 age groups. This aligns with previous literature indicating that physical health tends to decline with age due to natural physiological changes, lower energy levels, and increased risk of chronic conditions (Johnson & Wang, 2017; García et al., 2019). Interestingly, no significant differences were found in the psychological, social, or environmental subdimensions. This suggests that factors such as social support, engagement in physical activity, and satisfaction with facility services may mitigate age-related declines in overall well-being. The results highlight the potential role of sports facilities in promoting physical health for younger adults while emphasizing the need for targeted programs to support older participants' physical well-being.

Correlation analyses revealed that most CSSSE subdimensions were positively associated with quality of life, with Development, Attachment, Services, and Quality of Sports Instructors demonstrating the strongest correlations. Conversely, the Desire to Leave subdimension was negatively correlated with some quality of life domains. These findings suggest that participants' satisfaction with management practices, service quality, and instructor performance has a meaningful impact on their overall well-being. This supports previous research indicating that well-managed sports facilities contribute not only to physical health but also to psychosocial and environmental aspects of quality of life (Anderson & White, 2016; Kim & Park, 2021).

High correlations between CSSSE subdimensions such as Development and Attachment with overall quality of life indicate that participants value both opportunities for personal growth and supportive relationships within the facility. Positive experiences with facility management and instructors may encourage regular participation, enhance social connections, and foster a sense of belonging, which collectively contribute to improved quality of life. Conversely, higher scores in Desire to Leave, representing dissatisfaction or disengagement, were associated with lower quality of life, emphasizing the importance of maintaining participant satisfaction to prevent dropouts and negative outcomes.

These findings have several practical implications. Facility managers should focus on improving service quality, providing competent and supportive instructors, and developing programs that cater to different age groups' needs. Younger adults appear to benefit more in terms of physical quality of life, whereas older adults may require targeted interventions such as low-impact exercises or wellness programs. Policymakers can also use these findings to support investments in community sports facilities, recognizing their broader impact on physical and psychosocial health.

The study includes certain limitations. Due to its cross-sectional design, causal inferences regarding the relationship between satisfaction and quality of life cannot be established. Since the sample was recruited from only one sports facility, the generalizability of the results may be limited. Additionally, the study did not account for other potentially influential factors such as socioeconomic status, motivation, or prior health conditions. Future research should adopt longitudinal designs, include multiple facilities, and consider a broader range of participant characteristics to validate and expand upon these results. Furthermore, qualitative research could provide deeper insights into participants' experiences and motivations, enriching the understanding of how facility satisfaction translates into enhanced quality of life.

Conclusion

The findings of this study highlight the important role of sports facility management in promoting participants' overall well-being. While gender did not significantly influence either quality of life or satisfaction with sports services, age had a notable effect on the Physical subdimension, with younger participants (18–25 years) reporting higher physical quality of life than older groups.

Furthermore, positive relationships were observed between most CSSSE subdimensions and quality of life, indicating that higher satisfaction with management, services, instructors, and program development is associated with higher overall well-being. Conversely, a higher Desire to Leave was associated with lower quality of life, emphasizing the need to address participant dissatisfaction proactively.

These results suggest that well-managed sports facilities can enhance physical, psychological, and social aspects of quality of life. Facility managers should prioritize service quality, skilled instructors, and development-focused programs, while policymakers should consider initiatives to support older adults' physical health and participation in sports activities. Overall, the study underscores the potential of sports facilities not only as sites for physical activity but also as environments that can foster holistic well-being and life satisfaction.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of this study, several practical and research-oriented recommendations can be made:
For Facility Managers:

- Improve service quality, program design, and instructor competence, as these factors strongly influence participants' overall quality of life.
- Implement personalized or age-specific programs, particularly for older adults, to support physical health and maintain engagement.

- Regularly monitor participant satisfaction to identify areas for improvement, especially addressing factors contributing to Desire to Leave, which negatively affects quality of life.

For Policymakers:

- Invest in community sports facilities and programs that promote physical activity across all age groups, with special attention to older adults.
- Develop policies ensuring equitable access to sports services for all genders, supporting inclusive participation.

For Program Development:

- Encourage social interaction and community building within facilities, as attachment and positive relationships with instructors are linked to higher quality of life.
- Offer regular feedback and recognition programs to reinforce participant satisfaction and engagement.

These recommendations aim to enhance both the management of sports facilities and participants' overall well-being, ensuring that sports services contribute positively to physical, psychological, and social aspects of quality of life.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all participants who contributed to this study and the staff of the sports facilities for their cooperation. Special thanks to [Institution or Funding Body] for supporting the research process.

References

- Anderson, P., & White, R. (2016). The impact of sports facility management on participant satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(4), 345–356.
- Balcı, A., Öztürk, N.K., Çoşkun, B. (2013). *Kamu yönetiminde çağdaş yaklaşımlar*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Caro, L. M., & Garcia, J. A. M. (2007). Consumer satisfaction with a periodic reoccurring sport events and the moderating effect of motivations. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16(2), 70-81.
- Çavuşoğlu, S., & Demirağ, B. (2021). Tüketici pişmanlığının müşteri tatmini ve davranışsal niyet üzerindeki etkisi: restoran müşterileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 909-924.
- Ceyhun, S. (2006). Spor işletmelerinde hizmet kalitesi, (doktora tezi), *Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü*, Ankara.
- Ekenci, G., & İmamoğlu, A. F., 2012. *Spor İşletmeciliği*. Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Eryılmaz, B. (1995). *Kamu yönetimi*. Akademi Kitabevi.
- Fidaner, H. (1999). Measuring quality of life WHOQOL-100 and WHOQOL-bref. *J Psychiatr Psychol Psychopharmacol.*, 7, 23-41.
- García, L., Torres, M., & Sánchez, J. (2019). Age differences in quality of life and physical health among adults. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 17(1), 88.
- Ilieska, K. (2013). Customer satisfaction index-as a base for strategic marketing management, *TEM Journal*, 2(4), 327- 331.
- Johnson, K., & Wang, Y. (2017). Physical health and aging: A comparative study of different age groups. *Journal of Aging Research*, 2017, 1–10.
- Kim, S., & Park, H. (2021). Satisfaction with sports services and its effect on quality of life. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 16(2), 210–221.
- Lee, J., Smith, A., & Brown, T. (2020). Gender differences in perceived well-being among sports facility users. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 52(3), 223–238.
- Nacar, E., Şimsek, A., ve Devecioğlu, S. (2019). A study about service quality, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty in fitness centers. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(88), 42-52.
- Nguyen, H. T., Nguyen, H., Nguyen, N. D., & Phan, A. C. (2018). Determinants of customer satisfaction and loyalty in vietnamese life-insurance setting, *Sustainability*, 10(4), 1151-1166.
- Öztürk, Y. & Seyhan, K., 2005. Konaklama işletmelerinde sunulan hizmet kalitesinin artırılmasında işgören eğitiminin yeri ve önemi. *Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 121-143.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Pitts, B.G., & Stotlar, D.K. (2002). Fundamentals of sport marketing, Morgantown: *Fitness Information Technology*.
- Ramazanoğlu, F., & Öcalan, M. (2005). Spor işletmelerinde işletmecilik ve personel yönetimi anlayışı. *Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(1), 1-36.
- Scharnbacher, K., & Kiefer, G. (2003). *Kundenzufriedenheit analyse messbarkeit zertifizierung*, München: Wissenschaft Verlag.

- Sevilmiş, A. (2015). Hizmet odaklı spor işletmelerinde dış müşteri memnuniyetini etkileyen faktörlerin belirlenmesi. (yüksek lisans tezi). *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü*, Konya.
- Silik, C.E. (2018). Hizmet Kalitesi, Müşteri Memnuniyeti ve Tavsiye Etme Niyeti Kapsamında Türkiye'deki Kayak Merkezlerinin İncelenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara
- Smith, A., & Brown, T. (2018). Exploring satisfaction and quality of life in sports participants: A gender perspective. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 7(2), 134–145.
- Whoqol Group. (1998). Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. *Psychological medicine*, 28(3), 551-558.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A. ve Berry, L. L. (1990). Delivering Quality Service – *Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. New York: The Free Pres.