

An Empirical Assessment of Expected and Perceived Service Quality in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company

Kuldeep Chaudhary

Assistant Professor in Institute of Management Studies and Research (IMSAR) , M. D. University, Rohtak

Nisha Chaudhary

Research Scholar in Institute of Management Studies and Research (IMSAR), M. D. University, Rohtak

Abstract

Present study focuses on assessment of the expected and perceived service quality level along with gaps on the basis of Service Quality model by Sureshchandar et al. (2001) in one of the leading private sector life insurance company in India, Birla Sun Life Insurance Company (BSLI). In the beginning years, collectively, private sector has significantly captured the market share but these days, most of the private sector companies are struggling for a regular growth in business and market share and BSLI is one them. Most of the life insurance companies are complained of poor customer services and grievance handling, which obviously indicate that there is something wrong in customer strategies of these companies. The same is proved in the findings about BSLI, that there exists a significant negative gap in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of the selected company. Present paper is a result of an empirical study on 180 BSLI customers residing in Haryana, Chandigarh and Delhi regions of northern India, selected randomly.

Keywords: Service Quality, Expected Service Quality, Perceived Service Quality, Customer satisfaction and Market Share.

Introduction

Privatization and liberalization of life insurance services in India has started a new phase of transition in the industry. Because of the new liberal policies, the competition is getting tougher and tougher with entry of more and more private life insurers in the industry. Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDA), the apex governing institution of insurance sector, has helped the industry evolve at a fast pace and emerge as one of the fastest growing industries in the country. People's

perception of insurance has also changed from an instrument of saving to a risk-hedging tool. This change has been facilitated by the emergence of a range of new insurance products suiting diverse needs of consumers.

Competition between the LIC and the private sector insurers continues to intensify. While innovative products have been underpinning private insurers' premium growth, the threat of losing market share has also led to more aggressive pushes by LIC to stay competitive such as to develop new distribution channels like bancassurance. As a result, though LIC lost significant market share to private companies in the post-liberalization period, it still retains a commanding position in the life insurance segment. While, most of the product innovations came from the private players initially, later LIC joined the race soon in order to protect its turf. While LIC still dominates in segments like endowments and moneyback policies, private insurers have already wrested a significant share of the annuity and pension products market. Such intense competition has resulted in faster premium growth as well as deeper penetration for the entire market.

At the same time, the profile of Indian customer is also evolving. Customers are more actively managing their financial assets, and are increasingly looking to integrated financial solutions that can offer stability of returns along with more comprehensive protection. Insurance has emerged as an attractive and stable investment alternative that offers total protection for life, health as well as wealth. These factors have contributed to changes in demand for insurance products. While traditional life insurance products like individual insurance, whole life insurance and term life insurance continue to remain popular to this day, new products such as single premium, investment-linked, retirement products, variable life and annuity products are on a growth trajectory.

By the discussion it is evident that though collectively, private sector has significantly captured the market share in initially, but now a days, most of the private sector companies are struggling for a regular growth in business and market share, and the BSLI is one them. Also the customer often complaints of poor services in life insurance services, which obviously means there is something wrong in customer strategies of these companies. Also it is well accepted that there is a relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty, customer loyalty and sustainable profitability. So in the light of above construct, this study is purposed to determine the level of service quality delivered as a whole and on selected service quality dimensions in BSLI.

Review of Literature

Service Quality – A Conceptual Framework

Although service quality is an extensively researched concept but still its discussion is not straightforward. To understand the concept of service quality better, discussion of its components, i.e. service and quality is required.

Services are processes of activities aiming to provide solutions to customers' problems, with most other characteristics of services being consequences of their process nature (Gronroos, 2000; 2001).

The majority of services are first sold and then simultaneously produced and consumed, very often requiring the physical presence of customers (Berry, 1999). The “inseparability” of production and consumption, prevents services from being subject to a predetermined quality control process or marketed in traditional ways (Gronroos, 2000).

Being very often produced during service employee-customer encounters (Drew-Rosen et al., 2003), services are “heterogeneous” as the performance of humans, whether employee or customer, is not same all different service encounters. Services are heterogeneous even when delivered through automated channels due to varying customer behavior in interacting with automated and information technology using electronic machines of this new era tech world.

Although certain tangible elements may be included, the essence of services is “intangibility” (Zeithaml et al., 1990) that leads customers to perceive services in subjective and often highly abstract ways (Gronroos, 2000). Services are perceived as performances, and these performances are “what” the service provides and “how” it is delivered, depending on front-line employees' interactions with customers, the organization and its facilities. A number of “peripheral” services facilitate the offering of the core service (Gronroos, 2000).

Fitzsimmons and Fitzsimmons (2001) define a service bundle as a package of goods and services consisting of supporting facilities, facilitating goods, and explicit services.

The American Society for Quality (www.asq.org/), in line with Feigenbaum (1983), define quality as “a subjective term for which each person has his or her own definition” while the international standard ISO 8402 (1994) defines quality as “the totality of characteristics of an entity (product, service, process, activity, system, organization, person) that bear on its ability to satisfy stated and/or implied needs”.

Intangibility implies that the criteria for a flawless service are not only less specific than the criteria for a defect-free tangible good (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991) but also exceptionally complex and not very difficult to realize. Marketers view service quality as the level needed to make the service acceptable in the market place and try to ascertain certain standard of service quality prior to delivery of service to customers.

On the other hand, customers make “during” and “after use” evaluations (Marwa, 2005) comparing the service delivered to them with their previous experiences (Groenroos, 1982, 1984; Lehtinen and Lehtinen, 1982; Lewis and Booms, 1983). The result of this comparison is perceived service quality (Groenroos, 1982; 1984; Takeuchi and Quelch, 1983; Parasuraman et al., 1985; 1988). Hence, services must conform to the wishes of customers rather than to any predetermined set of specifications (Berry et al., 1988). As Lewis (1993) put it, “there is no other fact or reality about service quality but what customers perceive about a service”.

Service Quality Assessment

Accepting the definition of perceived service quality as the result of comparing actual service delivery with prior experience (Groenroos, 1982; 1984; Lehtinen and Lehtinen, 1982; Lewis and Booms, 1983; Parasuraman et al., 1985), researchers have generally followed two main theoretical perspectives. The Nordic (European) (Groenroos, 1982, 1984) perspective views service quality as having two dimensions: “technical” and “functional” quality, reflecting the service outcome and the service process respectively. Customers’ perceptions of these two dimensions are filtered through the service firm’s image.

The American model defines service quality as the discrepancy between expected and perceived service through five core components:

Reliability – performing the promised service dependably and accurately;

Responsiveness – helping customers and providing prompt service;

Assurance –inspiring trust and confidence;

Empathy – providing caring, individualized attention to customers; and

Tangibles – the tangible elements of service (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Although the American model dominates the literature there is no unanimity between researchers on which of the two, or some other, better reflects perceived service quality (Brady and Cronin, 2001).

Another service quality model which was used by Sureshchandar et al. (2001) have stated that the customer's perceived quality depends upon five factors:

- (1) Core service.
- (2) Human elements of service delivery.
- (3) Non-human element of service delivery.
- (4) Tangibles of services.
- (5) Social responsibility.

The core service refers to the essence of a service. In a service sector the service features offered are as important as how they are delivered.

Human element of service delivery refers to all aspects (reliability, responsiveness, assurance empathy, moments of truth, critical incident and recovery) that will fall under the domain of the human element in the service delivery.

The non-human element in the service delivery is in contrast to the human element. Service delivery processes should be perfectly standardized, streamlined, and simplified so that customers can receive the service without any hassles.

The tangible of the service facility refers to the equipment, machinery, employee appearance, etc., or the man-made physical environment, popularly known as the "servicescapes".

The social responsibility is the obligation of organization management to make decision and take actions that will enhance the welfare and interests of society as well as the organization. When an organization shows enough evidence on its Social responsibility it is natural to attract more customers.

Acknowledging the importance of the model used by Sureshchander et.al (2001), present study has also followed the same model and dimensions with certain customized sub dimensions. These sub dimensions were selected after a thorough study and critical evaluation of service factors regarding life insurance sector in India.

Objectives of the Study

- (i) To assess the overall service quality expected and service quality perceived in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- (ii) To assess the gap of service quality expected and perceived in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- (iii) To assess the service quality gaps of selected service quality dimensions in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- (iv) To give practicable suggestions so that if implemented, the service quality in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company can improve in future.

Hypotheses

- H₀₁. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- H₀₂. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on core product dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- H₀₃. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on human element dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- H₀₄. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on systemization of service dimension n in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- H₀₅. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on tangibles of service dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.
- H₀₆. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on social responsibility dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

Research Methodology

Though there is no dearth of literature in the field of service quality but still there is very less literature available regarding use of service quality in life insurance industry, so the present study is both exploratory and descriptive in nature and is empirical one. Apart from using all kind of literature available, a survey of customer was conducted during period of 2011-2012. The population of the survey

consist of all the customers of Birla Sun Life Insurance Company (BSLI) residing in State of Haryana, Capital of India- Delhi, and U.T of Haryana and Punjab- Chandigarh.

A sample of 180 respondents was selected through multi stage random sampling process with the help of Voter List of the selected geographical region, choosing 60 each from selected geographical limits and their responses are measured on a customized schedule based on Service Quality Model by Sureshchander et.al (2001) in Seven Point Likert Scale. This model measures service quality on five dimensions; Core service, Human elements of service delivery, Non-human element of service delivery, Tangibles of services and Social responsibility of service quality which were incorporated in self structured schedule with certain tested life insurance services specific sub dimensions. Further data have been organized, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted with the help of selected model and appropriate statistical techniques. The analytical techniques used among others include Mean, Standard Deviation and t-test.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Service Quality Expected

To measure expected service quality level of the customer of BSLI, all respondents of the selected sample were simply asked to show the extent to which they think life insurance companies should possess selected service quality dimensions. And further, it is clearly stated to the respondents that the researcher is keenly interested in knowing the ranking of their expectation about services of BSLI on the same selected dimensions of service quality on seven- point likert scale given in survey schedule.

The expected service quality responses of selected respondents are explained by mean, standard deviation values tabulated in Table 1.0. The average expected service quality score for the 180 respondents is assessed 6.989 which is certainly very high and falls in strongly agree region of scale which also means customers of the selected company expect very service quality.

Table 1.0
Service Quality in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company

Summary Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Expected Service Quality	6.989	.0315
Perceived Service Quality	4.375	.3420
Gap in Service Quality	-2.614	.3428

Source: Customer Survey

Service Quality Perceived

To measure perceived service quality by the customer of BSLI, all respondents were simply asked to show the extent to which they feel or experience about their life insurance company. And further, it is clearly stated to the respondents that the researcher is keenly interested in knowing the ranking of their perception about their life insurance company on the same selected dimensions of service quality on seven- point likert scale on given in survey schedule. It is important to mention here that the dimensions are same as used in measuring customer service quality expectation.

The perceived service quality scores of selected respondents tabulated above in Table 1.0. The average expected service quality score for the 180 respondents is assessed 4.375 which is comparatively quite low to service quality expected and falls close to neutral level of response which means, customers are least agree with the service quality level they are perceiving. It can also be said that customer service quality delivery level of BSLI which is very low and they are nowhere close to expected service quality level.

Service Quality Gap

To measure customer service quality gap, responses of selected customer respondents on expected service quality are subtracted from responses on perceived service quality. Average gap scores of the respondents are given above in Table 1.0.

Here, the customer service quality gap score is assessed -2.614, which is considered very high and as this gap is in negative zone which means there is an acute shortfall from life insurance service providers in delivering expected service quality.

Dimensionwise Service Quality

Core Product in Service Delivery

The expected service quality score of the respondents exhibited in Table 2.0 is 6.957 which is very close to the strongly agree region which means that expectations of customers are very high about core product sub dimensions of service quality. The perceived service quality score of the respondents shown in Table 2.0 is 4.772 which is very close to somewhat agree level. This means customer are somewhat agree that they are perceiving expected service quality on core product dimension. If compared with scores of other dimensions, core product dimension perception score is highest and this means customers of BSLI are getting comparatively better service quality.

The service quality gap score of the respondents tabulated in Table 2.0 is -2.184 which is quite high and indicate deficiencies in core product offerings of the company. But comparatively this score is lowest in all dimensions which mean company is comparatively doing better on core product in service front.

Human element in service delivery

The expected service quality score of the respondents revealed in Table 2.0 is 7.000 which is a perfect strongly agree score which means that expectations of customers are very high about selected subdimensions or say variables of service quality. Also the human element expected service quality score is second highest of all the selected five dimensions. This also hints that core product of life insurance service providers is second topmost priority of the customers. The perceived service quality score of the respondents shown in Table 2.0 is 4.022 which is a neutral and response level. This means customer are least agree of the perceived level of service quality on this dimension. If compared with scores of other dimensions, human element dimension scores comes at third place after tangibles of service which come second place in scores of perceived service quality and this means customers of BSLI are getting poor services on human fronts on their second topmost priority.

The service quality gap score of the respondents tabulated in Table 2.0 is -2.977, which is quite high and highest score among all the dimensions, which indicate that company requires a substantial improvement in service quality on human element front.

Table 2.0
Dimensionwise Service Quality in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company

Summary Measures	Core Product	Human Element	Systemisation	Tangibles	Social Responsibility
Expected Service Quality	6.957	7.0000	6.991	7.0000	6.7567
Perceived Service Quality	4.772	4.022	4.485	4.496	4.101
Service Quality Gap	-2.184	-2.977	-2.505	-2.504	-2.898

Source: Customer Survey

Systemisation of Service Delivery

The expected service quality score of the respondents portrayed in Table 2.0 is 6.991 which falls on strongly agree region which means that expectations of customers are very high about selected subdimensions of service quality. Though the expected service quality score is lowest in the selected five dimensions but difference is very small and at same agree region. The perceived service quality score of the respondents shown in Table 2.0 is 4.485 which is in middle of neutral and somewhat agree response level. This means customers are only somewhat agree of the perceived level of service quality on this dimension.

The service quality gap score of the respondents revealed in Table 2.0 is -2.505, which is quite high, which is a matter of great concern for the company. So company require to substantial improvement of systemisation of service front.

Tangibles of Services

The expected service quality score of the respondents exhibited in Table 2.0 is 7.0000 which is a perfect strongly agree score. This means customers of BSLI have accepted that selected dimension is very important in providing service quality and they have high expectation from life insurance providers. The perceived service quality score of the respondents tabulated in Table 2.0 is 4.496 which is at somewhat agree response level. This means customer are somewhat agree of the perceived level of service quality on tangibles of services dimension or say they are bit agree that BSLI is providing service quality on this dimension.

The service quality gap score of the respondents shown in Table 2.0 is -2.504, though it is very high but it is second lowest gap after core product dimension which mean company is doing comparatively better on this front.

Social Responsibility

The expected service quality score of the respondent portrayed in Table 2.0 is 7.0000 which is a perfect strongly agree score. This means customers of BSLI have accepted that selected dimension is very important in providing service quality and they have high expectation from life insurance providers. The perceived service quality score of the respondents tabulated in Table 2.0 is 4.101 which is at neutral response level. This means customer are least agree of the perceived level of service quality on this dimension or say they are somewhat disagree that BSLI is performing in a socially responsible way.

The service quality gap score of the respondents tabulated in Table 2.0 is -2. 2.898, which is quite high and comes as second highest score, hence the company need to improve service quality on this front a lot.

Service Quality Weights

To measure the customers comparative importance of selected service quality dimensions, they were simply asked to allocate 100 points among selected dimension of service quality according to their priority of significance to them. Average score are tabulated in Table 2.1 which clearly shows that Core Product in Service with score of 27.2000 is the topmost priority of BSLI customers, second topmost priority is Human Element in Service with score of 23.7500, Systemisation of Service is middlemost

priority with score of 19.2500, Tangibles of Service is second lowest dimension with score of 16.7000 and lowest in list come Social Responsibility with a weighting of 13.1000 of life insurance provider.

Table 2.1
Dimensionwise Service Quality Weights in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company

Summary Variables	Core Product	Human Element	Systemization	Tangibles	Social Responsibility
Mean (Weights*)	27.2000	23.7500	19.2500	16.7000	13.1000
Std. Deviation	2.95761	3.78561	2.39686	3.70776	2.91114

Source: Customer Survey

* Weights are assigned by the respondents out of 100

Hypothesis Testing

To test the drawn hypothesis Paired t Test was applied on averages of collected responses of BSLI customers and output of the analysis is exhibited in Table 3.0. The output gives t value, degree of freedom, significance level and 95% confidence interval for the mean.

H₀₁. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

Results of Paired t Test

t value of 76.23 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is significant at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI.

H₀₂. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on core product dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

t value of 48.33 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is significant at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI on core product dimension of service quality.

Table 3.0
Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
								Lower	Upper
Pair 1	CPE - CPP	2.1843	.45189	.04519	2.0946	2.2740	48.337	179	.000
Pair 2	HEE - HEP	2.9778	.84590	.08459	2.8099	3.1456	35.202	179	.000
Pair 3	SSE - SSP	2.5057	.46940	.04694	2.4126	2.5989	53.382	179	.000
Pair 4	TSE - TSP	2.5040	1.03455	.10345	2.2987	2.7093	24.204	179	.000
Pair 5	SRE - SRP	2.8983	.50134	.05013	2.7989	2.9978	57.811	179	.000
Pair 6	E - P	2.6140	.34287	.03429	2.5460	2.6821	76.239	179	.000

Source: Customer Survey

Here,

E = Overall Expected Service Quality

P= Overall Perceived Service Quality

CPE= Core Product Expected Service Quality

CPP= Core Product Perceived Service Quality

HEE= Human Element Expected Service Quality

HEP= Human Element Perceived Service Quality

SSE= Systemisation of Service Expected Service Quality

SSP= Systemization of Service Perceived Service Quality

TSE= Tangibles of Service Expected Service Quality

TSP= Tangibles of Service Perceived Service Quality

SRE= Social Responsibility Expected Service Quality

SRP= Social Responsibility Perceived Service Quality

H_{03} . There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on human element dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

t value of 35.20 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI on core human element dimension of service quality.

H₀₄. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on systemization of service dimension n in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

t value of 53.38 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI on systemization of service dimension of service quality.

H₀₅. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on tangibility of service dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

t value of 24.20 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI on tangibility of service dimension of service quality.

H₀₆. There is no significant difference in service quality expected and perceived on social responsibility dimension in Birla Sun Life Insurance Company.

t value of 57.81 for 179 degree of freedom (df) is at 0.000 level. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Thus there is significant difference in service quality expected and perceived by the customers of BSLI on social responsibility dimension of service quality.

Conclusion

In Birla Sun Life Insurance Company, customer expectation is quite high whereas the level of service quality perceived is very low and hence there is found a very high negative service quality gap. Apparently this conveys of poor customer services which certainly not a good sign for the company's ambitions. Company's service quality delivery gap is comparatively high with regards to human element, social responsibility and systemization of service fronts which is a matter of great concern for the company. Only respite for the company is regarding customer perception on core product and tangibles of service fronts where customer service quality gap is assessed comparatively low. So lesson here is that there is lot to do for the customers by the company and to improve customer service more efforts must be put to improve service quality on all selected dimensions. Another lesson which all life insurance service providers can take is; customers of life insurance services has very high service quality expectations and to meet these expectations, certainly required more improved customer service quality strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Berry, L.L. (1999), *Discovering the Soul of Service: The Nine Drivers of Sustainable Business Success*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
2. Berry, L.L., Parasuraman, A. and Zeithaml, V.A. (1988), "The service quality puzzle", *Business Horizons*, September-October, pp. 35-43.
3. Berry, L.L. and Parasuraman, A. (1991), *Marketing Services: Competing through Quality*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
4. Drew-Rosen, L., Karwan, K.R. and Scribner, L.L. (2003), "Service quality measurement and the disconfirmation model: taking care in interpretation", *Total Quality Management*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 3-14.
5. Feigenbaum, A. V. (1983), *Total Quality Control*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
6. Fitzsimmons, J.A. and Fitzsimmons, M.J. (2001), *Service Management Operations, Strategy, and Information Technology*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
7. Gronroos, C. (1982), *Strategic Management and Marketing in the Service Sector*, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsingfors.
8. Gronroos, C. (1984), "A service quality model and its marketing implications", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 36-44.
9. Gronroos, C. (2000), *Service Management and Marketing: A Customer Relationship Management Approach*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
10. Gronroos, C. (2001), "The perceived service quality concept – a mistake?", *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 150-2.
11. Lehtinen, U. and Lehtinen, J.R. (1982), "Service quality: a study of quality dimensions", working paper, Service Management Institute, Helsinki.
12. Lewis, B. (1993), "Service quality: recent developments in financial services", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 19-25.
13. Lewis, R.C. and Booms, B.H. (1983), "The marketing aspects of service quality", in Berry, L., Shostack, G. and Upah, G. (Eds), *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL, pp. 99-110. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., and Berry, L.L. (1985), *Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implications for Future Research*, *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (2), 41-50.

14. Marwa, S.M. (2005), "Exploration of SERVQUAL's Efficacy via the Diagnosis and Improvement of Service Quality in Kenya's Insurance industry", PhD Thesis, Lancaster University, Lancaster.
15. Parsuraman, A., Zeithmal, V.A., and Berry, L.L, (1988), SERVQUAL: A Multiple Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perception of Service Quality, *Journal of Retailing*, 64 (2), 12-40.
Parsuraman, A., Zeithmal, V.A., and Berry, L.L, (1985), Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implications for Future Research, *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (2), 41-50.
16. Sureshchandar, G.S., Rajendran, C. and Kamalanabhan, T.J. (2001), "Customer perception of service quality – a critique", *Total Quality Management*, 12(1), 111-24.
17. Takeuchi, H. and Quelch, J.A. (1983), "Quality is more than making a good product", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 61, July-August, pp. 139-45.
18. Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L.L. (1990), "Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations", The Free Press, New York, NY.