SERVICE QUALITY MODELS: A REVIEW

Ms. Prachi Jain, Research Scholar
University School of Management Studies
GGS Indraprastha University Dwarka Sector 16 Delhi
Email:praachijain29@yahoo.com

Dr. Vijita S. Aggarwal, Associate Professor
University School of Management Studies
GGS Indraprastha University Dwarka Sector 16 Delhi
Email: vijitasaggarwal@gmail.com.

Abstract

Purpose – *The main objective of this paper is to critically review and assess the value of various service quality models and to identify the linkage between them on the basis of an in depth analysis of literature.*

Design/methodology/approach – The paper critically examines various service quality models on the basis of review of literature. The main objective of this critical review is to identify the linkage between them and highlight the area for further research in order to develop one standardised measurement model of service quality.

Findings – *The review of various service quality models revealed that none of the models is perfectly applicable in different cultural settings and different sectors. Thus, there is a need to further add to the research in the area of service quality measurement to develop a more reliable and valid yardstick.*

Research limitations/implications – *This research developed a linkage between the different service quality models from 1992 to 2010.However, research after 2010 has not been taken into consideration. Measurement of service quality in context of e-commerce has also not been focussed upon.*

Practical implications – *This paper is of immense importance to the new researchers as it provides clear cut information about the sequential development of various service quality measurement models and suggests the development of a more refined model.*

Originality/value – *This paper provides a valuable insight in service quality measurement and offers practical help to researchers and practitioners in providing a direction for service quality improvement.*

Keywords: SERVQUAL, SERVPERF, RSQS, service quality

1. Introduction

In today's globalised world, service quality (SQ) has become an area of utmost importance for practitioners, managers and researchers because of its association to customer satisfaction (Bolton, 1994), customer retention (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990), costs (Crosby, 1987), profitability (Buzzell and Gale, 1987; Rust and Zahorik, 1993; Zahorik and Rust, 1992);, and positive word of mouth. Service quality is considered as an important function of corporate marketing and financial performance. Although, there has been a lot of research on different aspects and angles of service quality and it relationship to customer satisfaction, profitability, behavioural intentions etc, this research is an attempt to explore new aspects of service quality in order to make changes in the existing service quality measurement models and to extend the research further in order to develop one standardised measurement instrument in order to be in line with the changing world scenario.

This paper makes an attempt to study various service quality models and their application in various service industries in order to help the management to understand the factors which affect the quality of services across various sectors in a retail environment and thus enable them to enhance the quality of the organisation and its offerings.

2. Need for present study

In today's competitive environment, the mantra for success has changed from profit maximization to customer satisfaction. Satisfied customers are the keys to success for an organisation. It is very important for the organisations to gather information on various components and aspects of service quality so as to identify the areas that need to be focussed upon for improvement in order to attain competitive advantage in this monopolistic world. Good service quality paves the road for an efficient and profitable organisation.

To succeed and to outlive in this antagonistic environment, it is critical to provide customers with service that meets or exceeds their expectations (Lee et al., 2000). In addition, customers do not evaluate service quality only on its result, but they also take into consideration the process of service delivery and specific circumstances (GroÈnroos, 1990; Kotler, 1994).

With regard to the factors like globalisation, increase in the use of online resources, increased customer awareness etc., it becomes imperative to provide the quality of services that exceeds its competitors at agreed price. Therefore, the topic of service quality needs to be revised taking into consideration the current business scenario. This study is thus an attempt to find out the research gaps in order to provide benefits to practicing managers and researchers.

3. Service quality models

The present study is an important contribution to evaluate various service quality models with regard to changed business environment and identify the need for modification of the existing models in the current context. Each model is analysed through a brief discussion and the major observations on the models. The next section evaluates each of the models with regard to various factors. The brief discussions on the models are as under:

(Lehtinen, 1982) gave three broad dimensions of service quality, physical quality, interactive quality and corporate (image) quality. He defined physical quality as the tangible part of service, interactive quality as two way interactions that occur between the customer and the service provider. Corporate quality has been defined by him as the perceived image of service provider by his existing and future customers.

Thereafter, in 1982 Grönroos also defined service quality in terms of three dimensions as technical, functional and According to him, the technical quality is actually the bi-product of customers' and service provider's interactions, functional quality is the technique used to deliver technical quality and image is actually made up of both technical and functional quality including some other factors like customs, beliefs, word of mouth, pricing and public associations. He further in his service quality model shows that both technical and functional quality are interconnected and directly affect the image portrayed to the customer.

Several researchers have supported the argument service quality should be evaluated based on both technical and functional quality. (Baker and Lamb, 1993; (Grönroos, 1982, 1990; Mangold and Babakus, 1991).Richard and Allaway (1993) also contended that it is necessary to study both technical and functional quality in order to predict consumer's behaviour correctly. Thus, Lehtinen in 1993 restricted himself to only two dimensions of service quality i.e. process quality and output quality. Process quality can be identified during the process of delivery whereas output quality can be identified after delivery of the service. Berry, Parasuraman and Zeithaml (1985) are among the most admired and accredited researchers on service quality. Berry et al. (1985) and Parasuraman et al. (1985) also contended that quality of a service does not depend exclusively on the outcome of service but also on the service-delivery procedure. Berry, Parasuraman and Zeithaml through administrative interviews and focus groups gave a model comprising of 10 dimensions namely Reliability, Responsiveness, Competence, Access, courteousness, Communication, trustworthiness, safety, Understanding/Knowing the customer and Tangibles that customers use in forming expectations about and perceptions of services. Parasuraman et al., 1985; 1988 defined service quality as the difference between perceptions and expectations, also known as GAP 5.The wider the gap, the more is the need to improve service quality by the service provider. According to Berry (1986), there is a great need for retailers to provide good service quality in order to

achieve differential competitive advantage. However, after collecting and analysing the data of four service sectors: banking, credit card, appliance repair and maintenance and long distance telephone, Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry(1988) laid the foundations of a well acknowledged 22 item scale called SERVQUAL which comprises of 5 dimensions: reliability (The ability to perform the promised service reliably and precisely), assurance (The awareness and politeness of employees and their ability to develop faith and assurance of customers), tangibles (The appearance of physical amenities, equipment, employees and communication resources), empathy (The dimension of helpful, individualized attention to customers), responsiveness (The eagerness to help consumers and to provide quick services).According to Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1988) service quality means "the customer's overall judgment of the excellence of the service or the difference between one's expectation and the actual service performed." Servqual has been widely used in a number of studies in different industrial settings like accounting firms (Freeman and Dart, 1993), architectural services (Baker and Lamb, 1993), apparel retailing (Gagliano and Hathcote, tyre retailing (Carman, 1990), travel and tourism (Fick, 1991), business schools (Rigotti and Pitt, 1992), higher education (McElwee and Redman, 1993), hospitality (Johns, 1993), business-to business channel partners (Kong, 1993), airline catering (Babakuset al., 1993a), banking (Kwon, 1994; Wong, 1991)) and local government (Scott, 1993). (Haywood-Farmer, 1988) advocated a service quality model comprising of three equally important dimensions of service quality: people's behaviour; physical facilities and processes; and professional judgment. Each attribute consists of several factors. According to this model, a "high quality" service organization consistently meets customer preferences and expectations. The researcher has made an effort to develop a model applicable across various service settings with regard to intensity of contact and interaction, degree of labour intensity and intensity of service customization in to this model. For example services such as transportation of goods etc which have lower degree of customer and labour intensity rank higher in terms of physical facility and process attribute. Thus, reliability and ease of use are two important factors with regard to such services. (Brogowicz, 1990) proposed a synthesized model of service quality based on earlier service quality models from the two streams of research on service quality i.e Nordic and North American. This model takes into account the perceptions of not only actual customers but also potential customers and suggests that service quality expectations depend on three factors namely: Co. Image, External Influencers(culture, social structure, word of mouth communication, media exposure and competition etc) and traditional marketing activities(advertising, public relations, personal selling, sales promotion, pricing, marketing channels etc).According to this model, management's job is first to determine the Co.'s mission and objectives and then to plan, implement and control service marketing strategies. In 1991, Parasuraman et al. published a refined study based on his previous work so that customers' normative expectations could be taken into account. Cronin and Taylor (1992) contended that "performance-based" score service quality measurement is a better technique to measure service quality than "performance-Expectations" score and thus developed a new scale called SERVPERF. This scale was less tedious than SERVQUAL as it consists of only 22 items instead of 44 items. They also suggested that good service quality leads to customer satisfaction which then provokes repurchase intentions of the customers. (Teas, 1993) pointed out several concept related, theoretical and measurement issues with the SERVQUAL model and thus laid down two new models called as EP and NQ models. The EP model takes into the typical ideal point theory and NQ model combines ideal point theory and SERVQUAL revised expectation concept. Thus, Teas' model measures service quality as the gap between perceived performance and ideal performance instead of customers' expectations as in SERVQUAL model. (Parasuraman A. B., 1993) defined three levels of expectations as desired level, minimum level and actual level of service. Rust and Oliver have expanded Gronroos model in 1994 by adding service environment as a new dimension. (Berkley, 1994)developed a model with the help of case study data from various sectors (manufacturing, courier,

transportation, banking etc.)so as to find out various IT tools can be used to collect customer data, supervise operations and facilitate service recoveries so as to improve service quality. However, Dabholkar, Thorpe, and Rentz (1996) argued that retail services which are also associated with merchandise quality are different from pure services (Gagliano and Hathcote, 1994;Das et al., 2010;) which thus makes SERVQUAL inapplicable in different retail settings. Therefore a more comprehensive and hierarchical second order model consisting of 28 item scale (17 of which came from the existing SERVQUAL scale and the remaining 11 items from the researchers' review of literature and qualitative research)was developed by them to measure customer perceptions of retail service quality (RSQ). The scale consists of the following five dimensions:

(1) Physical aspects (PA): store appearance and convenience of store layout;
(2) Reliability (RE): keeping promises and doing things right by retailer to customer;
(3) Personal interaction (PI): associates are courteous, helpful and they inspire Confidence and trust from the customer;
(4) Problem solving (PS): associates are trained to handle potential problems, such as customer complaints, returns, and exchanges; and
(5) Policy (P): operating hours, payment options, parking and so forth.

(Philip, 1997) argued that SERVQUAL model lacks the ability to sufficiently measure more critical issues associated with Thus, they proposed a P-C-P model (Pivotal-Core-Peripheral model) which is applicable across all service segments. Pivotal attributes have been described as the "end product" or "output" from the service encounters i.e. what the consumer expects to achieve and receive. Core attributes have been defined as the combination of the people, processes and the service organizational structure through which consumers must interact. Peripheral attributes have been descried as the "incidental extras" to make the whole experience wonderful for the customer. However, some of the dimensions of SERVQUAL like reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy have been considered as relevant. Mei et al. (1999) identified the dimensions of service quality in the Australian hotel industry and develop a new scale of service quality in the hospitality industry, called "HOLSERV," with three dimensions: (1) employees, (2) tangibles, and (3) reliability. Bahia and Nantel (2000) performed a study in Canada on a sample of retail banking customers and proposed a scale called Banking Service Quality(BSQ) which comprises of 31 items with six dimensions: effectiveness and assurance; access; price; tangibles; services portfolio and reliability.

(Cronin J. J., 2001) proposed a third order factor model similar to that of (Rust, 1994) called as HSQM model. This model consisted of three dimensions with their sub dimensions. The first dimension i.e. interaction quality is composed of sub dimensions such as attitude, behaviour, and expertise. The second dimension i.e physical environment has sub dimensions namely ambient conditions, design and social factors. through qualitative and empirical research developed a third order factor model of service quality named HSQM which consisted of three primary dimensions (interaction quality, physical environment and outcome quality) and nine sub dimensions (Attitude, behaviour and expertise form the sub dimension of interaction quality; form the second sub dimension of physical environment quality and waiting time, tangibles and valence form the third sub dimension of outcome quality). All variables were tested by factor analysis across four service industries. The proposed model is similar to Rust and Oliver (1994) three component model of service quality. Long (2004) proposed a hierarchical model by taking into account the customers' experiences of online shopping to measure perceived online service quality. This new model gave less weightage to interpersonal interactions and instead laid more stress on technological aspect. The researcher added a new dimension to take into account the aspect of geographic distance and facelessness of customers' experience.

Svensson (2004a) presented a modified construct of chronological service quality and highlighted the importance of time, context, and performance threshold in service-encounter chains. Furthermore, he presented a generic five-phase performance process, and a customized six-dimensional construct of sequential service quality.

Shahin A. a.(2010) laid down a more comprehensive model of service quality by taking into account the suggestions and reviews of 16 experts in the area. This model consists of five additional components and eight more gaps as compared to the previous GAP model. The five new components included in the developed model were ideal standards; transformation of strategy and policy into service quality specifications; service quality strategy and policy; employee perceptions of customer perceptions; and management perceptions of customer perceptions. Also, the eight new additional service quality gaps were as follows:

- **Gap2:** Management perception versus service quality strategy and policy;
- **Gap3:** Service quality strategy and policy versus service specifications;
- **Gap4:** service specifications versus ideal standards;
- **Gap5:** service specifications external communication;
- **Gap11:** Customers' perceptions versus management perceptions;
- **Gap12:** The discrepancy between management perceptions and service quality strategy;
- **Gap13:** Customers' perceptions versus employee perceptions; and
- **Gap14:** The discrepancy between employee's perceptions and management

4. perception of customers

Applications of service quality models in various sectors

Saleh and Ryan (1991) analysed service quality for hotel guests and management staff in the hospitality industry in Canada using the SERVQUAL model. They identified 4 dimensions for hotel guests: tangibles and reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy and 5 dimensions for management staff: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance empathy.

Bouman and Wiele (1992) developed and tested an instrument to measure service quality in the car service industry in Netherlands. By measuring perceptions minus expectations score, they identified 3 factors of service quality as customer kindness, tangibles, faith.

Vandamme(1993) applied the SERVQUAL instrument developed by Parasuraman et al to the health care sector in Belgium. The dimensions obtained in their study i.e. tangibles, medical responsiveness, assurance I, assurance II, nursing staff and personal beliefs and values only partially represent the dimensions of SERVQUAL. This led to the conclusion that health care services have only a few common elements with other service industries, thus relying on SERVQUAL may not lead to reliable results.

Tomes and Ng(1995) identified seven factors relating to the service quality of in-patient care in England – five intangible factors: empathy, relationship of mutual respect, dignity, understanding, religious needs, and two tangible factors: food and physical environment. They also developed a service quality measurement scale for use in the NHS hospital context.

Johnston(1997) assessed the relative importance of quality factors and their effect on satisfaction and dissatisfaction in banking industry. He suggested that certain actions, such as increasing the speed of processing information and customers will lead to delighment among the customers; however other activities, such as improving the reliability of equipment, will lessen dissatisfaction rather than delight customers. He further suggested that it was very important to deal with dissatisfiers before satisfiers.

Siu and Cheung's (2001) conducted a research on service quality in warehouses in Hong Kong and found out, using an adapted instrument, that the dimensions of service quality applicable to warehouse industry are physical aspects, reliability, personal interaction, policy and trustworthiness.

Choi et al (2004) explores the effects of web retail service quality at the point of purchase on perceived product quality, value and willingness to buy according to product categories. The results of the study suggested that functional web retail service quality has a direct effect on willingness to buy and technical web retail service quality influences consumer perceptions of product quality and value. Also, product categories moderate the relationships among web retail service quality, perceived product quality, perceived value, and willingness to buy.

Kang (2004) empirically examined the European perspective (i.e. Gronroos' model) suggesting that

service quality consists of three dimensions, technical, functional and image, and that image functions as a filter in service quality perception. The results from a cell phone service sample in Korea revealed that Gronroos' model is a more appropriate representation of service quality than the American perspective with its limited concentration on the dimension of functional quality.

Svensson G.(2004b) examined the construct of interactive service quality in service encounters. Interactive service quality requires the simultaneous consideration of the service provider's perspective and the service receiver's perspective. The study was conducted in the Swedish automotive industry and focused on the issues of interactive service quality between a vehicle manufacturer and a selection of its most important suppliers. The major contributions of the research provide an on-the-spot account of interactive service quality.

(Chow, 2005) measured service quality in fast-food industry and developed an AHP approach that would help managers identify which service dimensions (reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness) require attention to create a sustainable competitive advantage and how the firm's service improvement by prioritized and also act as a comparative service improvement technique. Jabnoun and Khalifa (2005) developed an empirically tested measure of service quality in context with UAE conventional and Islamic banks. The measure consists of four dimensions of service quality: personal skills, reliability, values, and image. The study also revealed that customers of Islamic banks are more concerned of personal skills and values dimensions of service quality whereas reliability and image are insignificant for them.

Kang (2006) empirically examined the conceptualisation of service quality (both technical and functional) in mobile phone service industry in Korea. The results revealed that a two-component model yields better fit than a model concentrating on functional quality alone (such as SERVQUAL).

(Voon, 2006) sought to develop a service-driven market orientation (SERVMO) that consists of six components (customer orientation, competitor orientation, inter-functional orientation, performance orientation, long-term orientation, and employee orientation) and examined its relationship with customer-perceived service quality in a higher education setting in Malaysia. He found a strong and positive correlation between SERVMO and each and every dimension of service quality.

Jain et al. (2010) developed a multidimensional scale to measure service quality and concluded that service quality in higher education comprises of twelve factors such as visual appeal, outcome, campus, reputation, input quality (students),industry interaction, support facilities, input quality (faculty), inter personal relationships, curriculum, academic facilities and processes.

(Malik, 2010) analyzed the impact of service quality on student satisfaction in higher educational institutes of Punjab province of Pakistan. They found that tangibility, assurance, reliability and empathy have a strong and significant impact on the students' satisfaction.

Tan et al. (2010) used SERVQUAL model to evaluate the relationship between service quality dimensions and knowledge sharing in Malaysia. They found that assurance and the reliability dimensions of service quality were the two most important dimensions and had significant positive relationship with knowledge sharing.

Shahin et al (2012) proposed an integrated approach for the analysis and improvement of service quality and effectiveness in the process of recycling pavilions in Isfahan municipality. The proposed approach was structured in four steps including measuring the service quality of recycling pavilions by SERVQUAL, measuring service effectiveness using the OAE indicator, analysing the effectiveness indicator, and improving service quality and effectiveness. The results revealed that citizens' expectations of recycling pavilions services exceed their perceptions, and this difference was found to be greater in the empathy and responsiveness dimensions.

Observations and evaluation of service quality models

With the increasing importance of service quality, there has been a systematic development of a variety of concepts and models.

5. Development of service quality models

It is evident from the review of literature that there has been a sequential development in the field of service quality and it seems that the development is still continuing owning to the increasing importance of the concept of service quality in order to survive in today's competitive world. Each and every step of the ladder of the service quality development seems to be an updation of the previous findings or observations. From the review, no well- accepted conceptual or operational definition of service quality measurement could be identified. However, most of the measures of service quality support the SERVQUAL model.

Limitations of various service quality measurement models

Year		Limitations
1982	Lehtinen	• Researchers have argued the validity of the model given by Lehtinen in the manufacturing industry (Gliatis & Minis, 2007).The model is also not applicable in this era of technology where internet and self service technologies have revolutionised the working of retail sector.
1982	Gronroos	• The model only laid down the components of service quality as technical, image and functional without mentioning about the techniques or tools to measure these components.
1983	Lehtinen	• The study has been conducted in restaurant industry only thereby limiting its applicability to other industries. • The model can be applied to only specific situations.
1985	Parasuraman, Berry and Zeithaml	• Researchers such as (Peter, Churchill &Brown, 1993) , (Babakus and Boller, 1992), (Babakus and Mangold, 1992) , (Cronin and Taylor, 1992) (Boulding, Kalra, Staelin and Zeithaml, 1993) , (Oliver and Bearden , 1985) do not support the view of PZB to measure service quality as the gap between perceptions and expectations of the consumers. • It has also been argued that the GAP model has led to an ambiguity between the two concepts: Service quality and customer satisfaction (Ladhari, 2008). • Customers do not use expectations to evaluate services as there is no reasonable tool to measure expectations. (Buttle, 1995).Cronin and Taylor (1992) contended that the model is based on disconfirmation model rather than attitudinal model. • SERVQUAL model focuses on the process of service rather than on the outcome of service (Babakus and Boller, 1992).

		• Carman (1990) pointed out the SERVQUAL had good stability, but the five factors are not neutral indicators for different service sectors, and isn't universally applicable. • The negative items in the scale and perceptions and expectations score create confusion among the respondents which creates hindrance in the comprehensive measurement of all five dimensions of service quality. (Babakus and Boller, 1992). • A high degree of correlation has been found amongst the five dimensions. (Nadiri & Hussain, 2005 , Buttle F, 1995).
1988	Haywood-Farmer	• The proposed model does not provide any information about the measurement scale. • The model fails to provide a direction to the management on the method and procedures that could be adopted to identify service quality problems and then to keep a check on such problems.
1990	Brogowicz et al	• The relative importance of each of the three factors in affecting expectations needs to be empirically researched.
1992	Cronin and Taylor	• No explanation is given as to how human and physical resources can be effectively combined to achieve the expected technical and functional service quality. • The model is not universal and needs to be modified for different types of service settings. • The model does not have a good ranking on goodness of fit index in case of different cultures as people from different cultures would have different expectations and scripts to the service encounters. • The model needs to be validated in high involvement industries. • Multiple measures of the constructs have not been examined.
1993	Teas	• This model lacks validity because of a poor research design with a very small and narrow sample which limits the applicability of the model.
1994	Berkley and Gupta	• The model limits itself to only the impact of IT on service quality. • There is no description about the level of IT use for different service settings • The model does not offer a way to measure and monitor service quality
1996	Dabholkar ,Thorpe, and Rentz	• There is a serious disagreement regarding the number of items to be used in various retail

		service settings. • Also, it is not a generalized model applicable in all areas of retail. Researchers have argued that the effect of factors such as environment, price, distance, promotion etc has not been not considered. • The model has operational problems as it is not very successfully applied to find out the relation between service quality and other variables (Martinez and Martinez, 2010). • RSQS model involves a very complicated statistical procedure because of t he presence of dimensions and sub dimensions (Martinez & M , 2010) • The hierarchical structure lacks empirical evidence (Ladhari, 2008).
1997	Philip and Hazlett	• The model does not provide working dimensions for each of the three levels of attributes. • Lacks empirical validation
1999	Mei et al.	• The model lacks generalisation. • The model is not valid in other types of accommodation such as bed and breakfast, motels, resorts etc. • The model lacks validity across different countries as the research of the study is limited to Australian Hospitality Industry only.
2000	Bahia and Nantel	• The scale has been validated only in French language version. • The scale has been constructed only on the basis of e xperts o pinion and published literature and thus lacks validation • The sample size is too small.
2001	Brady and Cronin	The research is based on the perceptions of only three organisational types. The study is based on the data gathered at a particular point of time only. The sample is skewed.
2004	Long and McMellon	The model lacks validity as convenience sampling technique has been used. Only limited dimensions of online service quality have been considered. The model lacks on reliability scores.
2004 (a)	Svensson	The research is based on only a small sample in the vehicle industry.
2010	Shahin and Samea	• The model lacks validity. • The research is silent on the measurement of the additional gaps proposed.

5. Conclusion

This paper provides a valuable insight of the different models of service quality developed over a period of time. After reviewing both the traditional and hierarchical models, it may be noted that there has been a considerable change in the expectations of the customers over a period of time with respect to factors such as time, competitive environment, facilities etc. A noticeable change has also been made in the service quality models parallel to the changes in the customers' expectations and perceptions e.g. Berkley and Gupta (1994) suggested the use of IT in service delivery process. Despite the changes already incorporated, there is still a need to make subsequent changes in service delivery process and service outcome. The present paper is an attempt to review such changes and their incorporation in service quality models. Although each of these models have made a significant contribution in the field of service quality measurement, it must be noted that they were developed specifically for the measurement of service quality in a particular culture and sector and therefore whether and to what extent they are applicable to other culture and sectors remains undetermined. No reliable universal yardstick has yet been established for the objective measurement of service quality. (Chowdhary, 2007) investigated whether any generalization in importance of service quality dimensions was possible or not. The study which took place across 16 industries revealed that no generalization of relative importance of determinants of service quality is possible across different service types. However, Berry et al. (1994) suggested 10 lessons as Listening, Reliability, Basic Service, Service Design, Recovery, Surprising Customers, Fair Play, Teamwork, Employee Research and Servant Leadership that he believes apply across industries and are essential to the service-improvement journey. Edvardsson (1996) suggested 13 important propositions that characterize successful service companies:

1. The Managing Director should as a leader design quality policies and should also establish goals and make plans to achieve those goals. It is his duty to delegate responsibility in the interests of the organisation.
2. Quality should be given the prime importance.
3. Customers should be the main focus of successful service companies.
4. It should be everybody's responsibility to improve quality.
5. Focus on new service development and service design.
6. Continuous quality improvements in the process and "process re-engineering" complement each other.
7. Improved quality is the keystone to achieve increased productivity and profitability.
8. Successful companies improve upon themselves by benchmarking i.e. comparing one's own organization with others
9. Service guarantees of various kinds can make a service more distinct and help create rational customer expectations.
10. Complaint management as a tool for discovering customer dissatisfaction is stressed upon.
11. Stress on employee commitment and customer involvement for customer perceived total quality.
12. Increased stress on the systematic measuring of quality for customers, employees and owners.
13. Rewarding quality improvement based on facts is, according to Juran, "a prerequisite for successful quality work in the long run".

It is clear from the review that none of the models are currently perfect in all aspects and therefore, there is a need for further research in this context.

References

1. Anon., 1993. Customer satisfaction, customer retention, and marketshare. *Journal of Retailing, 69(2), pp. 193-215.*
2. Babakus, E. a. M., 1992. Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: an empirical investigation. *Health Services Research, pp. 767-786.*
3. Berkley, B. a. G. A., 1994. Improving service quality with information technology. *International Journal of Information Management, Volume 14, pp. 109-21.*
4. Berry, L. L., 1986. Retail Businesses Are Service Businesses. *Journal Of Retailing, pp. 3-6.*
5. Bolton, R. a. D. J., 1994. Linking customer satisfaction to service operations and outcomes in Rust, R.T. and Oliver, R.L. (Eds). *Service*

Quality:New Directions in Theory and Practice, pp. 173-200.

6. Boulding, W. K. A. S. R. a. Z. V., 1993. A dynamic process model of service quality: from expectations to behavioral intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research, pp. 7-27.*
7. Bouman, M. a. v. d. W. T., 1992. Measuring service quality in the car service industry: building and testing an instrument. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, pp. 4-16.*
8. Brogowicz, A. D. L. a. L. D., 1990. synthesised service quality model with managerial implications. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, Volume 1, pp. 27-44.*
9. Carman, J., 1990. Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality: *An Assessment of the SERVQUAL Dimensions. Journal of Retailing, pp. 33-55.*
10. Chow, C. L. P., 2005. A strategic service quality approach using analytic *hierarchy process. Managing Service Quality,* Volume 15(3), pp. 278-289.
11. Chowdhary, N. a. P. M., 2007. Prioritizing service quality dimensions. *Managing Service Quality, Volume 17(5), pp. 493-509.*
12. Cronin, J. J. J. A. B. K. M., 2001. Some New Thoughts on Conceptualizing Perceived Service Quality: A Hierarchical Approach. *Journal of Marketing, Volume 65, pp. 34-49.*
13. Cronin, J. J. J. a. S. A. .. T., 1992. Measuring Service Quality: A Re examination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing, pp. 55-68.*
14. Crosby, L. a. S. N., 1987. Effects of relationship marketing on satisfaction,retention, and prices in the life insurance industry. *Journal of Marketing Research, Volume 24, pp. 404-411.*
15. Das, A. K. V. a. S. G., 2010. Retail service quality in context of CIS countries. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, Volume 27, pp. 658-683.*
16. Fick, G. a. R. J., 1991. Measuring service quality in the travel and tourism industry. Journal of Travel Research, Volume 30(2), pp. 2-9.
17. Gagliano, K. a. H. J., 1994. Customer expectations and perceptions of service quality in apparel retailing. *Journal of Services Marketing, pp. 60-69.*
18. GroÈnroos, C., 1990. *Service Management and Marketing. Lexington,* MA: Lexington Books.
19. Grönroos, C., 1982. Strategic Management and Marketing in the Service Sector. *Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsingfors, Finland, (published in 1983 in the US by Marketing Science Institute and in the UK by Studentlitteratur/ Chartwell-Bratt).*
20. Haywood-Farmer, J., 1988. A conceptual model of service quality. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Volume 8(6), pp. 19-29.*
21. Jabnoun, N. a. K. A., 2005. A customized measure of service quality in the UAE. *Managing Service Quality, pp. 374-388.*
22. Jain, R. S. G. a. D. S., 2010. Service quality in higher education: *An exploratory study. Asian J. Market, pp. 144-154.*
23. Johns, N., 1993. Quality management in the hospitality industry, part 3: recent developments. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* Volume 5(1), pp. 10-15.
24. Johnston, R., 1997. Identifying the critcal determinants of service quality in retail banking:importance and efect. *International Journal of Bank Marketing,* Volume 15(4), pp. 11-16.
25. Kang, G., 2006. The hierarchical structure of service quality: *integration of technical and functional quality.* Managing Service Quality, pp. 37-50.
26. Kang, G. a. J. J., 2004. Service quality dimensions: an examination of *Gro¨nroos's service quality model. Managing Service Quality,* 14(4), pp. 266-277.
27. Kong, R. a. M. M., 1993. Measuring service quality in the business-to-business context. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, 8(2), pp. 5-15.*
28. Kotler, P., 1994. Marketing Management,. *Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:* Prentice-Hall.
29. Kwon, W. a. L. T., 1994. Measuring service quality in Singapore retail banking. Singapore Management Review, 16(2), pp. 1-24.
30. lehtinen, J. a. l. U., 1982. Service quality: a study of quality dimensions. *unpublished Working Paper, Service Management Institute,* Helsinki.
31. Long, M. a. M. C., 2004. Exploring the determinants of retail service quality on the

Internet. *Journal of Services Marketing,* 18(1), pp. 78-90.

32. Parasuraman, A. B. L. a. Z. V., 1993. More on improving service quality measurement. *Journal of Retailing, Volume 69,* pp. 140-147.
33. Parasuraman, A. V. A. Z. a. L. B., 1988. SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Customer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing, pp. 12-40.*
34. Parasuraman, A. V. Z. a. L. B., 1985. A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implications for Future Research. *Journal of Marketing,* pp. 41-50.
35. Parasuraman, A. Z. V. a. B. L., 1991. Refinement and Reassessment of the *SERVQUAL Scale. Journal of retailing,* pp. 420-450.
36. Philip, G. a. H. S., 1997. The measurement of service quality: a new P-C-P attributes model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 14(3), pp. 260-286.*
37. Pratibha A. Dabholkar, D. I. T. J. O. R., 1996. A measure of service quality for retail stores: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, pp. 3-16.*
38. R., M. M. a. D., 2010. The Impact of Service Quality on Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab. *Journal of Management Research, 2(2).*
39. Reichheld, F. &. S. W. J., 1990. Zero defections: Quality comes to services. Boston: *Harvard Business Review, pp. 311-324.*
40. Reidenbach, R. a. S.-S. B., 1990. Exploring perceptions of hospital operations by a modified SERVQUAL approach. *Journal of Health Care Marketing, 10(4), pp. 47-55.*
41. Rust, R. T. a. R. L. O., 1994. Service Quality: Insights and Managerial Implications from the Frontier. Ser-vice Quality: *New Directions in Theory and Practice, Roland T. Rust and Richard L. Oliver, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 1-19.*
42. Saleh, F. a. R. C., 1992. Analysing service quality in the hospitality industry using the *SERVQUAL model. Services Industries Journal,* pp. 324-343.
43. Scott, D. a. S. D., 1993. Service quality components and group criteria in local government. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 4(4), pp. 42-53.*
44. Shahin, A. A. a. S. M., 2012. An integrated approach for service quality and effectiveness improvement with a case study in the recycling pavilion service process of Isfahan municipality. *Measuring Business Excellence, pp. 84-99.*
45. Shahin, A. a. S. M., 2010. Developing the Models of Service Quality Gaps: A Critical Discussion. *Journal of Business Management and Strategy, 1(1), pp. 1-11.*
46. Siu, N. a. C. J., 2001. A measure of retail service quality. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning, pp. 88-96.*
47. Soliman, A., 1992. Assessing the quality of health care. *Journal of Health Care Marketing, 10(1-2), pp. 121-141.*
48. Svensson, G., 2004a. A customized construct of sequential service quality in service encounter chains: time, context, and performance threshold. *Managing Service Quality, 14(6), pp. 468-475.*
49. Svensson, G., 2004b. Interactive service quality in service encounters: empirical illustration and models. *Managing Service Quality, 14(4), p. 278–287.*
50. Tan Boon-In, W. C.-H. L. C.-H. O. K.-B. a. C.-Y. N. F., 2010. Assessing the link between service quality dimensions and knowledge sharing: Student perspective. *African Journal of Business Management, pp. 1014-1022.*
51. Teas, R. K., 1993. Expectations, Performance Evaluation, and Consumers' Perception of Quality. *Journal of Marketing, Volume 57, pp. 18-34.*
52. Vandamme, R. a. L. J., 1993. Development of a multiple-item scale for measuring hospital service quality. International *Journal of Service Industry Management, 4(3), pp. 30-49.*
53. Voon, B. H., 2006. Linking a service-driven market orientation to service quality. *Managing Service Quality, 16(6), pp. 595-619.*
54. Walbridge, S. a. D. L., 993. Measuring physician attitudes of service quality. *Journal of Health Care Marketing, 13(4), pp. 6-15.*
55. Wong, S. a. P. C., 1991. Customer service strategies in financial retailing. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 9(3), pp. 11-16.*

❑❑❑