Chapter -III
Service Quality

3.1 Relevance of Quality

“Quality is never an accident; it is always the result of intelligent effort”

John Ruskin (1819-1900)

This quote by Ruskin unambiguously demonstrates us of the significance of quality - in the society in general term and the business place specially. Though purchase intentions are still broadly described by price, quality variables such as consistency and capability as well as reputation and communication are thought to become more and more important. As both end-users and institutional subscribers are no longer satisfied by average quality products and services (Christopher, Payne, & Ballantyne, 1991), quality management philosophy has changed from an extracurricular activity to an essential requirement (Caruana, 2002). As per (Townsend, 2005)

The discussions has diverted away from ‘quality costs money’ towards ‘quality makes money’. While taking into account quality, it is not only essential to realize that quality and profit is not dependant to each other at all, but also that quality has become a key parameter to survive in an ever increasing competitive market scenario. Juran stated Institute “To survive in today’s environment of global competition, never-ending change and complexity, rising customer expectations and continuous cost pressures, focusing on quality is no longer a choice; it is mandatory”.

While quality is considered as essential to corporate accomplishment (Devlin & Dong, 1994), it is required to be able to measure it before being able to suitably manage it
As a result, a clear definition of quality is desirable. On the other hand, sufficient and usually shared definitions of quality are hardly ever found within both academic and commercial areas.

It is famous quote of John Ruskin Fodder supplemented to this famous quote that “Quality is never an accident; it is always the result of high intention, sincere effort, intelligent direction and skilful execution”. While this quote may explain the considerate nature of quality, it is also implicit that quality is indefinable and multifarious – in concept and definition, in production and delivery as well as in measurement and management. This is again complex when analyzing the quality while considering to service operations, particularly in a business-to-business environment.

“It is not enough to do your best; you must know what to do, and then do your best.”

W. Edwards Deming (1900-1993)

Further father of quality system W. Edwards Deming focused on the function of management in targeting quality. Deming noted that around 15% of poor quality was due to workers, and improper management, bad systems and processes were responsible for the rest of 85%. According to Deming, administration should engage employees in solving the problems, not merely to blame them for poor quality. Deming's 14 principles are explained as below:

- Create constancy of purpose (short term actions has to be replaced by long-term planning goals),
- Take on the new philosophy (management should follow this philosophy, instead to expect the employees to do that),
• Stop dependence on examination (it concerns to variation – or we can say, if there is no deviation, no inspection is required because all products shows no defects),

• Shift towards a one supplier for every item

• Get better continually and evermore (it refers to decreasing variation, as a key to better quality),

• Provide institute training on the job (lack of training of workers; train properly them to do a particular job.

• Develop institute leadership (distinction between leadership and supervising),

• Facilitate drive out fear (Get rid of fear at worker's level to get their support for betterments.)

• Try to stop barriers between departments

• Get rid of slogans (usually, it’s not the subordinate who did it incorrect, but it's the organization who authorized that to do so. It is not required to make tension on worker, as long as the system fails to put off problems),

• Get rid of management by objectives (So long as workers had to attain an recognized production level, quality will be a another target),

• Eliminate hurdles to pride of workmanship (bringing problems all the time to worker's ears, will produce a uneasiness for them. Reduced satisfaction levels of workers equals a lower interest for performing good items),

• Facilitate for institute education and self – improvement (Providing education is a benefit. Everybody has to get better )

• Makeover is everyone's job (improvements is possible at every level and always).
The most important book talked about he wrote among other is “Out of the Crisis” in 1987. What is pertinent to this book along these 14 principles is that Deming started the movement toward TQM; even he didn't use this philosophy.

3.2 Quality in Service Operations

“Quality is ballet, not hockey” Philip B. Crosby (1926-2001)

This quote by Crosby may assist to distinguish services from products with reference to quality. Alike to hockey game, where one can’t think of measure the final score of a match, product quality can be evaluated against re-determined stipulation. Alike to ballet, where quality is much more in the judgment of the audience, service quality can be rely upon customer perceptions (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry, 1990) (Grönroos, 2000). Consequently, it is not shocking that quality actions for product manufacturing are extensively understood and used, while quality measures precise for service operations have urbanized more slowly (Mills, Chase, & Margulies, 1983). This slower progress has been mainly credited to intangibility (e.g. (Regan, 1963), (Drucker, 1995), (Anantharanthan Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985), labour intensity (Flipo, 1988) and difficulty (Schmenner, 1986). Ignoring these parameters, quality management in the services sector has for too long been controlled by the logic of manufacturing. While comparing quality between service operations and manufacturing, one of the basic claims has been that mainly the complication of service operations demands a additional holistic approach including a customer-orientation to quality (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985), (Grönroos, 2000). The management of quality is again complex when considering quality in a B to B environment - for the plain reason that additional stakeholders are involved in the delivery process.
3.3 Service

Service is considered to be intangible. Compared with substantial products, it is heterogeneous, unable to be kept in stock, produced and consumed at the same time. A broadly accepted definition of service is projected by (Grönroos, 2000) as: “A service is a process consisting of a series of more or less intangible activities that normally, but not necessarily always, takes place in interactions between the customer and service employees and/or physical resources or goods and/or systems of the service provider, which are provided as solutions to customer problems.” This definition showed that service is a process where communications between customer and service provider generally stay alive. Therefore, from a service point of view, there is always an association between customer and service provider; such association can be used as a tool for marketing. Therefore to keep loyal customers associated with the firm, who will bring profit to the firm, the major concern for service provider is to enable this relationship in the way it manages customers by delivering what customers’ want and needs. The quality of a service is instinctively perceived by customers during the communications with a firm.

(Arun Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988) described service quality as the “Consumers’ judgment about a firm’s overall excellence or superiority”. Everything perceived by customers in the communication process will have critical impact on customers’ judgment of service quality (Grönroos, 2000): Because of the special attributes of service, the assessment of service quality is more multifaceted than assessment of product quality. There have been a variety of ways for measurements of service quality proposed by preceding literatures and researches. The well-known
measurement model of service quality is “SERVQUAL” proposed by (Arun Parasuraman et al., 1988), they measured the gap between customer expectations and perceptions based on five determinants: **Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy.**

### 3.3.1 Determinants of Service

As per (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985), earlier definitions of service quality was relied upon the called **“disconfirmation”** model which deals with a perception of service quality which is a result of a assessment between what consumers think that the service should be and their thoughts about the real performance offered by the service provider. Since then, a lot of researches have been carried out on this subject, mainly due to its role as an input to customer satisfaction (Oliver, 1996) and an pointer of organizational performance (Lewis & Mitchell, 1990). The fresh literatures proposes that service quality is the customer’s subjective appraisal of service performance (Cronin Jr & Taylor, 1992).

Service quality is also taken as the customer’s feeling of the relative poor standard or superiority of a service provider and its services (Bitner & Hubbert, 1994)(Tsoukatos & Rand, 2006). A perfect example of a standardized framework for understanding service quality is the SERVQUAL model proposed by (Arun Parasuraman et al., 1988).

This model considers reliability, assurance, responsiveness, empathy, and tangibles. Reliability shows to the ability to perform the committed service accurately.

Responsiveness shows to the willingness to help customer and provide prompt service. Assurance shows to the employees’ acquaintance and courtesy, and their ability to motivate trust and confidence. Tangible characteristics means to look at physical
facilities, equipment, personnel and written materials. Johnson and (Johnson & Sirikit, 2002) proposed the telecommunication industry service quality assessment and the items are as follows (See Table 3.1):

Table 3.1. The Telecommunication Industry Service Quality Assessment and the Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Service Quality</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible</strong></td>
<td>A service provider has modern apparatus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider’s substantial amenities are visually attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider’s CCE (Customer Care Executive) are well clothed and appear neat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The look of the physical amenities of the firm is keeping with the type of telecom service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>When a service provider promises to do something by a assured time, it does so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When someone has problems, a service provider is concerned and comforting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider is reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider delivers its service at the time it commits to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider keeps its account precisely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider does tell customer exactly when service will be performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>I do receive prompt service from CCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCE are not always willing to help customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCE are too busy to respond to customer requests promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td>I can trust customer service staffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel safe in your transactions with customer service staffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer service staffs are polite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td>Customer service staffs get an adequate support from a service provider to do their job well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>A service provider does not give me individual attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCE do not give me personal attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCE do not know what my needs are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A service provider does not have my best interests at heart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 The Relationship between Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction

(Oliver, 1993) first showed that service quality would be priority of customer satisfaction, until now, there are already some other researchers who have established the empirical support for the view point explained above (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993) (Anderson, Fornell, & Lehmann, 1994) ; (Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha, & Bryant, 1996) (Spreng & Mackoy, 1996), and customer satisfaction is a result of service quality. Service quality should be improved by raising expectations and be positively related to consumer satisfaction (Fornell et al., 1996). In the present, various studies also have confirmed that service quality strongly drives satisfaction (Grönroos, 2001)(Kotler & Keller, 2006) (Oliver, 1980) (Wang & Lo, 2002). The Oliver, 1993’s Satisfaction Service Quality Model is shown in Fig 3.1

Figure 3.1 The Oliver’s (1993) Satisfaction Service Quality Model

Source: (Oliver, 1993)
The search for a measurement tool of service quality relies on the backbone of service quality presumption (Grönroos, 1982) & (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985). This research is pillared on the consumer behavior theory developed by Howard and from the (Howard & Sheth, 1969) model, quality is precursor to satisfaction, but quite a few firms do not offer service quality that fulfills customers’ needs which results in customer gaps. The Gap-model given by (Arun Parasuraman et al., 1988) presents the service practitioners quandary as that of not knowing what customers want from the firm. The search for a standard tool of measuring service quality and customer satisfaction has given rise to development of two major models, SERVQUAL model and Service Performance (SERVPEF) model. In spite of the global use of the SERVQUAL model, its dimensionality and using in operation is uncertain. The SERVPERF models thoughts have developed a performance based measure and demonstrate it over the disconfirmation model(Carman, 1990) (Cronin Jr & Taylor, 1992). Inadequate empirical literature is available on the use of performance based models in Indian telecom industry. The SERVQUAL model has five dimensions, (Sureshchandar, Rajendran, & Anantharaman, 2002) further the dimensions of service quality divided into two factors and introduced three additional dimensions; core service, non-human elements and corporate social responsibility.

This study thus projected an assessment of an improved four factor service quality construct as antecedent to customer satisfaction. (Kang & James, 2004) developed image as a moderating variable between functional qualities, technical qualities and perceived service quality. Likewise, driven by a performance based measure,
(Chen & Ting, 2002) combined the dimension of service quality into two attributes; technical qualities and functional qualities and associated them to customer satisfaction. The dimensions of service quality in mobile telecom framework differ from one operator to another, from one nation to another nation and even from one civilization to another, posing a suitable argument. In Indian context, the fast expansion of telecom sector enabled to poor conditions and degraded quality of telecom sector w.r.t. Network quality and call drops, over charging than promised tariff, poor customer care services, activation of unwanted VAS and network coverage problem. Due to such situation, the sustainability of service quality and customer satisfaction in telecommunication sector in India has become doubtful and worse. On the basis of the study background and developing issues on the relationship between service quality, corporate image and customer satisfaction, knowledge gaps were recognized. Major of them was that while previous studies investigated the three variables in separation or in pairs, this study followed an integrated approach and required to establish the influence of service quality on customer’s satisfaction.

The study wanted answers to the research question, ‘what was the nature of relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction amongst telecom operators of India. The always changing nature of service, give rise in service differences between service giving institutions. (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985) developed the gap model that explains why customers experience quality differential. In a successive study, (Arun Parasuraman et al., 1988) gave the definition; “Service quality is the degree of discrepancy between customers’ normative expectations for the service and their perceptions of the service performance”. They used this conceptualization in the
construction of 22 item scale tool (SERVQUAL model). The SERVQUAL tool has since been extensively used as a tool for measuring service quality and customer satisfaction. (Sureshchandar et al., 2002) acknowledges SERVQUAL forms the cornerstone along which all other works have been produced.

The previous researches on customers’ satisfaction in traditional areas, (Oliver, 1980) projected the theory of “expectation inconformity”, that is the customers will feel satisfied when the services actual performances are ahead of their anticipation. Alternatively, when the services actual performances are beneath their anticipation, customers will feel displeased. During the last decade, satisfaction has been taken as one of the most significant theoretical as well as sensible issues for most service organizations and customer researchers. (Kotler & Keller, 2006) projected that, “Satisfaction is a personal feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction resulting from comparing service performances in relation to his or her expectation.”

3.5 Service Quality Measurement Models

The foremost objective of this argument is to critically analyze and assess the value of important service quality models and to recognize the relationship between them on the basis of an in depth analysis of literature.

3.5.1 Grönroos Model

In a row with the disconfirmation paradigm, (Grönroos, 1984) gave a model in which he argued that consumers evaluate the service as experienced with the service as predictable in evaluating service quality. The model given by Grönroos pursuits to understand, how the quality of a given service is perceived by customers. In addition, it separates the customer's experience of any service into two horizons: technical quality
(what the consumer gets or the technical result of the service delivery process) and functional quality (how the consumer gets that technical outcome). Grönroos proposed that, in the framework of services, functional quality is usually perceived to be more significant than technical quality, considering that the service is provided at a technically acceptable level. The relevant diagram is shown in Fig 3.2

![Service Quality Model](Grönroos, 1984)

Later on exploratory research by (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985) exposed several insights and propositions concerning consumers’ perceptions of service quality. They suggest a more detailed service quality model including different service quality pillars based on an explanation of qualitative data achieved through a number of in-depth executive interviews and focus group discussions in four dissimilar service areas
eral banking, securities, credit card, brokerage and product repair and maintenance). The detailed executive interviews exposed four ‘gaps’ on the service provider’s side that are likely to affect service quality as perceived by subscribers. A fifth gap, depending on the description of the first four gaps, was recognized on the consumer’s side. The main insights achieved through the interviews suggest a theoretical ‘SQ Model’; also known as the Gap-Model.

3.5.2 SERVQUAL Model

At the outset, by (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985) recognized a need to investigate the role of service quality in areas not generally for researchers to think broadly about discoverable issues and to be willing classified as operations, finance or marketing. They stated that “a need exists for research in the area of services to enter a new phase of empirical work that integrates various disciplines and various service industries” (p. 44).

Parasuraman et. al, proposed a theoretical model of service quality where they discovered five gaps that could affect the consumer’s assessment of service quality in four dissimilar industries (retail banking, securities brokerage, credit card, securities brokerage and product repair and maintenance). These gaps were identified as;

**Gap-1:** Consumer expectation - Management perception gap;

**Gap-2:** Management perception - Service quality specification gap;

**Gap-3:** Service quality specifications – Service delivery gap;

**Gap-4:** Service delivery – External communications gap;

**Gap-5:** Expected Service – Perceived service gap;
Since the degree and direction of the fifth ‘gap’ influences the service quality in straight way as noticed by the consumer, it is taken as the most important gap. Pillared by the focus group discussions, (Anantharanthan Parasuraman et al., 1985) have idea of high service quality to the extent that their prospect are lower than the perceived service performance. If the opposite were true, customers would take the concept that the solution to ensuring good service quality is meeting or exceeding consumers’ expectations.
The focus group discussions also discovered that, in spite of the type of service, customers use similar benchmark in developing expectations about and perceptions of services. These benchmarks seem to fall into ten classes, labelled as ‘service quality determinants’: reliability, responsiveness, competence, security, access, communication, understanding, courtesy, credibility, and tangibles. For each element, examples of service specific criteria were given.

3.5.3 SERVPREF Model

Cronin and Taylor (1992) do not support the framework of Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985, 1988) in their empirical work, with respect to conceptualization and measurement of service quality, and developed a performance-based measure of service quality called ‘SERVPERF’ exhibiting that service quality is a form of consumer attitude (Fig 3.4). They contended that SERVPERF was an improved means of measuring the service quality construct. Their framework was afterwards mirrored and results suggested that there is little theoretical evidence supports the relevance of the E-P= quality gap; as the basis for measuring service quality. Again utmost criticism found against SERVQUAL scale, Cronin and Taylor (1992) gave theoretical evidences across four sectors viz. fast food, dry cleaning, pest control and banking to support the superiority of their ‘performance only’ scale over SERVQUAL scale keeping the same items as had been projected by the Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988). In equation form, SERVPERF service quality can be expressed as

\[ KQ_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{ij} \]
SQ = Perceived Service Quality

k = Number of Attributes/Items

p = Perception of individual “i” with respect to performance of a service firm on attribute “j”

![Performance Only Model (SERVPERF)](image)

**Figure 3.4 : Performance Only Model (SERVPERF)**

Source: (Martinez & Martinez, 2010)

### 3.5.4 Inside about SERVQUAL and SERVPERF

The SERVQUAL versus SERVPERF argue is continuing as both groups of researchers have presented additional arguments to support their respective perspectives (Arun Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1994), (Shemwell, Cronin, & Bullard, 1994).

The main arguments in favour of SERVQUAL by Parasuraman et al. (1994) are:

- There is important theoretical and empirical research to sustain their perception-expectation gap theory.
- The SERVQUAL tool is developed to measure perceived service quality at a given point in time (i.e. the attitude level), in spite of the development by which it was formed.
- SERVQUAL’s concurrent and discriminate validity is as good as SERVPERF’s validity.
The major arguments in favour of SERVPERF by Cronin and Taylor (1994) are:

The SERFPERF theory shows just one of a number of current challenges to the SERVQUAL conceptualization of service quality (Carman 1990, (Babakus & Boller, 1992), (Rust & Oliver, 1993)

- SERVQUAL tool based on disconfirmation- is not evaluating service quality, but it appears at best an operational form of only one of the many forms of expectancy-disconfirmation (Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml, 1993), (Rust & Oliver, 1993).

- Better construct validity has been observed with SERFPERF, when measured side by side to SERVQUAL based on a review of the accessible literature and the detail that SERFPERF evaluates also show convergent and it discriminate validity.

To conclude, Cronin and Taylor (1994) argued that since perceptions-minus-expectations evaluations seem to have small theoretical and experiential support, the genuine question that should be asked is whether or not perceptions only evaluates can effectively measure service quality. Based the literature and their own observed findings; they persist that the SERVPERF tool can supply a reliable and valid tool for measuring levels of service quality.
3.6 Construct of Service Quality

A service indicates to any activity that one party offers to another which is basically intangible and through some form of exchange satisfies an known need (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2006). Service quality is measured by (Zeithaml, 1987) as consumer’s evaluation about an products overall excellence performance. (Kariuki & Kibera, 1996) postulate that service quality is the agreement of a service to customer specification and expectation, while (Kimonye, 1998) enlightens that service quality is the extent of match between predictable and real service given by the service provider and that the higher the fit, the higher the level of customer satisfaction. On the contrary, (Kang & James, 2004) found that the construct of service quality relies upon the perceived quality, a position backed by (Sultan & Wong, 2010),

who explained service quality as a form of approach showing a long run overall assessment. This study followed the afterward position and examines service quality ‘as a form of attitude showing customers long run overall assessment of a service after a service encounter.’

The quality management in institutions, includes: Joseph Juran (1950’s), Edward Deming (1950’s) and Philip Crosby (1980’s) whose works conclude in the spread of the concept of TQM. The discussion on the connection between service quality and satisfaction has been arouse by researchers including; (Spreng & Singh, 1993) who recognized that the more the level of service quality the more the level of customer satisfaction, Stafford et al., (1998) developed that service quality and customer satisfaction are different but associated, while (Shekarchizadeh, Rasli, & Hon-Tat, 2011) argued that customer satisfaction is antecedent to service quality. Satisfaction is usually related with one
particular transaction at a specific time and has been explained by (Spreng & Mackoy, 1996) as an emotional feedback to a product/service experience. Service quality conversely is further similar with a long term attitude. Generally, satisfaction is more analyzable, temporary and transaction-specific, while service quality is supposed to be long lasting.

3.7 **Problem Area and Research Focus:**

Problem area - It is well known belief that services vary from products in different major respects, it seems improbable that quality definitions were developed for manufacturing practices can be used straightforward to service operations. Opposing to product manufacturing, where it is comparatively simple to assess for example conformance to specifications of an final-product, much of the quality in service operations is in the view of the customer. As a result, statistics on service quality is to be received by capturing customer perceptions. On the other hand, a series of devoted discussions on business support based services held during the second half of 2005 - considering not only practitioners from different large customer organizations, but also financial managers from a broad range of supplier institutions- pointed out that quality in affiliation to services has a unlike meaning to almost each individual - indicating huge difference of perception and definition. More in-depth questioning exposed more usually recognized attributes of service quality such as ‘**reliable and company reputation**’ and ‘**on-time service delivery**’ as well as ‘pro-active and skilful service personnel and open communication. Investigating the effect of such traits on total perceived service quality as well as customer and satisfaction supplier performance, though, led to energetic and unanswered discussions. Even though both customers and vendors of business support
services alleged that superior service quality can have a positive effect on organizational performance for both sides, a number of troubles were recognized. First, it is hard to reach on an agreement on the features that make up service quality. Second, it is tough to grade these features in order of significance. Third, it is very tough to recognize and evaluate the impact of service quality on customer satisfaction and finally supplier performance. To conclude, all problems enlisted are further complex due to the association of numerous stakeholders from both vendors and customers of business support services.

3.8 Research Focus

By developing and testing a evaluation instrument to evaluate service quality in a B2B setting, it is planned to merge three genuine paths to attain the degree of Ph.D.:

- Give attention on a ignored aspect of a topic;
- Determining the insufficiency of existing approaches; and
- Evaluating a not previously used construct.

This grouping is expected to yield a contribution to knowledge and to get better our knowledge in the field of service quality management. Deserted aspect of a topic - Within the B2B setting, outsourced business support services continue to enlarge within both the private and public segment. Within the public sector, administrations guidelines on competitive bidding and the use of the FDI have been key factors for privatization. In the case of private sector the important parameters include: reducing risk whilst increasing flexibility, releasing capital for core business processes, and securing scarce skill resources. On the other hand, it is not common to find service quality development as a key driver for outsourcing. However, a continued focus on the monetary benefits of
outsourcing eventually will lead to substandard service quality levels, which in sequence will adversely impact the performance of both customers and vendors of business support services. To conclude, service quality can be taken as an underrepresented feature in outsourcing business support services.

3.9 Previously Used Approaches

To completely capture the service quality construct in relation to business support services, service quality considered as a ignored aspect of business support services and present methods regarded as inadequate, we will develop and test a service quality evaluation instrument for telecom industry. While conventional data collecting and analysis tools such as SERVQUAL and SERVPERF were designed with specific situation to evaluate service quality in a B2B background, instruments used to measure service quality in a B2B environment have still to be grown and experienced.

This thesis emphasizes on the development and subsequent testing of a evaluation tool to assess service quality in B2C setting in telecom sector.

3.10 Deficiency of Existing Approaches

Generally outsourced contracts are developed around Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). As KPIs are to be evaluated and checked throughout the life of a service contract, they are likely to focus on the physical aspects of service condition. Afterwards, it is strange to find KPIs that point of attraction on the more insubstantial features of services and although customer satisfaction levels are often incorporated as a KPI within SLAs, such evaluations does not precisely arrest the affluence of the service quality construct. In brief, there is a call for to focus research
efforts away from the tangible aspect of service provision to fully capture the service quality construct.

3.11 Chapter Conclusion

The discussion starts with relevance of service quality. Deming’s 14 point quality principles were dealt in length. In onwards discussions it was emphasized that how quality is useful in service operations and how it differs from products. Further various determinants of service were interpreted. Through Oliver’s model, relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction was explained.

Three main and widely accepted models of service quality were also dealt in depth. First one was explained by Grönroos, who explained that the customer's experience of any particular service may be divided into two dimensions: technical quality (i.e. what the consumer receives or the technical outcome of the service delivery process) and functional quality (i.e. how the consumer receives that technical outcome).

Through second model was developed by (Arun Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). They identified five gaps that could impact the consumer’s evaluation of service quality in four different industries (retail banking, credit card, securities brokerage and product repair and maintenance). These observed gaps were; Gap-1: Consumer expectation - management perception gap; Gap-2: Management perception - service quality specification gap ; Gap-3: Service quality specifications – service delivery gap ; Gap-4: Service delivery – external communications gap ; Gap-5: Expected Service – perceived service gap

Third model studied, which was developed by (Cronin Jr & Taylor, 1992) on SERVPREF which was based upon performance measures of service quality.
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