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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to validate the five dimensions (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) of service quality contained in the DINESERV Instrument (Stevens, Knuston, and Patton, 1995), in a fast food restaurant and explore the differences in perceived service quality for customers.

The study focused on black consumers as they are the majority race group in South Africa and also considered an important client group to many fast food enterprises. Chicken is the most popular fast food item in South Africa (Euromonitor International, 2005: 1, 6). With KFC being the dominant global player in fast food in South Africa, it was the restaurant of focus where information was collected from.

A questionnaire containing the modified DINESERV instrument was distributed to staff and students of the University of Zululand. The questionnaire was provided in both English and Zulu. Cronbach Coefficient Alpha was used to test construct reliability of the DINESERV instrument. ANOVA was used to determine the difference of dimension scores in the five service dimensions. Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between customers’ perceived service quality and characteristics such as gender, age, and education achieved.

The results of the questionnaire revealed both the DINESERV instrument and service dimension to be reliable. Responsiveness was regarded the most important dimension of service quality with Assurance being the least. Empathy was shown to be the most important dimension of the dining experience. Black consumers in the
Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that empathy is the dimension that fast food restaurants are least successful in achieving when compared to the other dimensions. Also it was found that black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality visit chicken restaurants because of the taste that chicken restaurants create, variety of menu and value for money.

The author recommends that chicken fast food restaurants consider expanding their number of outlets as well as offering both grilled and fried chicken to increase service quality and choice. Programs can also be designed using elements in DINESERV to improve the empathy dimension in fast food restaurants. Further research must however be done to explore the reasons why fast food restaurants are less successful in achieving empathy and also why people choose restaurants.
1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

1.1 Introduction

South Africa’s restaurant industry is a large, ever growing industry whose presence is visible in almost every area of the country. It provides a range of products and services that impacts households, in one way or another.

The country’s development and globalisation has seen South Africans over the years working longer hours and, as a result, limiting the time spent with family time. Thus, eating out has become the option of choice for many. Families often choose a dining outlet which caters for the whole family unit (Euromonitor International, 2005: 3).

Hartford revealed that in 2007, the South African Department of Trade and Industry reported that consumption spending in the country had risen more than 7 percent in the first quarter of 2007. The article also revealed that the national statistics board Statistics South Africa in March 2007, reported total nominal income at fast-food restaurants to be up more than 18 percent over the previous year.

Euromonitor International, (2005) further revealed that the main factor affecting foodservice growth in South Africa is convenience. As mentioned earlier the changing lifestyle patterns, an increase in both parents working and an increase in single parent households, with the result that less time is spent on the preparation of food for the family than was the case in previous generations makes fast foods a popular option to many.
Chicken fast food is expected to continue to lead, in terms of average sales per outlet, increasing over 55% to the 2004 figures by 2009 to an estimated R4.2 million per outlet. This will be closely followed by burger fast food, representing R3.9 million per outlet (Euromonitor International, 2005: 13).

Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC), the Yum! Brand Inc-owned company, is the dominant global player in fast food in South Africa. With more than 600 KFCs in South Africa now, the chicken chain has a 44% share of the country’s $1.8 billion fast-food market, followed by South African chain Nando’s, with 6%, and McDonald’s and the local Chicken Licken, each with a 5% share. (Jargon 2010)

“KFC is a significant investor in Africa. We have announced plans to invest R1 billion in South Africa over the next few years, opening around 100 new restaurants a year and creating some 9 000 jobs. We are particularly proud of the fact that we have given first-job opportunities and life skills training to many thousands of young people in South Africa and Africa. Our staff members are offered further training and promotion opportunities. We offer education bursaries to deserving youngsters, including children of our staff,”

Nikki Lawson, a Trustee of the KFC Social Responsibility Trust. (Grow South Africa 2010).

Black South Africans, make up around 70% of the population and are the largest racial group among South Africa’s middle class. This ever increasing consumer group is perceived as an important client base to many fast food enterprises. KFC for example has been proactive in supporting black franchisees in order to gain entry
into previously disadvantaged areas allowing fast food to establish itself in a previously untapped area. With fast food becoming the newly adopted lifestyle, most fast food outlets cater to children and therefore are popular amongst families and are often the preferred choice for children’s birthday parties amongst low income families (Euromonitor International, 2005: 7, 10).

Andaleeb and Conway (2006: 3) state that, the customer today has more restaurant options available than ever before, allowing them to be more particular and demanding. Customers’ expectations for value, in relation to price, also seem to be on the rise: people want “more” for their money.

The findings mentioned have interesting theoretical and practical implications for the service literature, service establishments, and especially the restaurant industry which is very profitable, fiercely competitive, and very important to the public. It is thus very important to understand the dynamics of this industry from the customer’s point of view. The customer after all is the final supreme authority on how much to spend and where, when and what to eat (Andaleeb and Conway, 2006: 3).

Therefore, an understanding of the factors that influence customer satisfaction ought to be useful in guiding restaurant owners and managers to design and deliver the right offering.

Customer satisfaction is the customer’s evaluation of a good or service in terms of whether that good or service has met the customer’s needs and expectations (McDaniel et al/2009). In today’s world competitiveness can be found in almost every sector of the economy. Competitors strive to be on top through many ways, one of which is customer satisfaction. Understanding customers’ perception of a product or
service gives one insight into problems, solutions and recommendations which could be used to further improve the product or service (Johnson, 2001).

Customer satisfaction forms part of Total Quality (TQ) which is the unyielding and continually improving effort by everyone in an organisation to understand, meet and exceed the expectations of customers. Customer satisfaction falls into TQ as one of the three significant elements which are: employee involvement, focus on the customer and continuous improvement (Evans and Lindsay, 2008). Focus on customer is where customer satisfaction fits in, as this is where an organization finds out what customers want and try to meet their needs and expectations.

Customer satisfaction is at the heart of marketing. The ability to satisfy customers is vital for a number of reasons. For example, it has been shown that dissatisfied customers tend to complain to the establishment or seek redress from them more often to relieve cognitive dissonance and failed consumption experiences (Oliver, 1987; Nyer, 1999). Service providers that fail to properly address such behaviour, can suffer serious consequences.

Measuring customer satisfaction is however complex as customer satisfaction is a psychological attitude (Evans and Lindsay 2008). A number of customer satisfaction measures have been designed, and are used to measure customer satisfaction in various industries and sectors. SERVQUAL is one of these instruments designed to measure customer satisfaction. SERVQUAL however is designed specifically as a generic instrument to measure customer satisfaction in the service industry. SERVQUAL measures customer satisfaction by measuring perceived service quality that is viewed as the degree and direction of discrepancy between consumers’ perceptions and expectations (Yen-Lun Su 2001).
Parasuraman et al. (1985) concluded that consumers evaluated service quality by comparing expectations with perceptions on ten dimensions namely:

1. Tangibles
2. Reliability
3. Responsiveness
4. Communication
5. Credibility
6. Security
7. Competence
8. Courtesy
9. Understanding/knowing customers
10. Access

These ten dimensions were subsequently collapsed into five generic service-quality dimensions, as follows:

1. Tangibles (measured by four items): the appearance of physical facilities, equipment, and personnel
2. Reliability (five items): the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately
3. Responsiveness (four items): the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service
4. Assurance (four items): the knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence
5. Empathy (five items): the level of caring and individualised attention the firm provides to its customers. (Ladhari 2009)
These five dimensions are thus assessed by a total of 22 items. Each item is measured on the basis of responses to two statements that measure:

1. The general expectations of customers concerning a service; and

2. The perceptions of customers regarding the levels of service actually provided by the company within that service category (Ladhari 2009).

Each statement requires the respondent to indicate his or her opinion on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). The data are converted into “perception-minus-expectation” scores for each statement, which results in a difference score ranging from -6 to +6. (Ladhari 2009)

The gap score (G) is calculated on an item-by-item basis as the difference between the raw perception-of-performance score (P) and the raw expectation score (E) for matching items; therefore, \( G = P - E \). Following this calculation, the greater the perception-minus-expectation score, the greater is the perceived service quality. (Ladhari 2009)

Studies have questioned whether SERVQUAL is applicable as a generic scale for all settings (Akbaba, 2006). A number of researchers have suggested that industry-specific measuring instruments might be more appropriate than a single generic scale and even if adapted, the scale is insufficient to measure service quality across diverse service industries (Caro and Garcia, 2007).

A number of alternative scales tailored to specific service industries have therefore been developed in recent years. One of these is DINESERV an adapted version of the SERVQUAL instrument designed by Stevens, Knutson, and Patton (1995) for the restaurant industry. DINESERV was tested in three restaurant segments: quick
service, casual/theme, and fine dining and was found to also have a high degree of reliability (Stevens, Knutson, and Patton, 1995).

The instrument has also been used in a number of cultural contexts with results sometimes differing for certain attributes. For example physical design in one study was shown to be insignificant contrary to secondary research that supported it (Andaleeb and Conway 2006). Research on Malaysian fast food restaurants (Tang and Bougoure 2006) however, shows that this is the opposite reflecting the need for study about the construct of service quality in the different cultural contexts.

1.2 Problem Statement

The purpose of this study is to validate five dimensions of service quality contained in the DINESERV Instrument in a fast food restaurant and explore the differences in perceived service quality for customers.

The growth in services marketing research has been significant and is a direct response to the growth of service industries and their increasing importance to economies around the world (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2000). As important as this is, most research in the area has been conducted on American soil. Not much is known about service quality in Africa, where as research suggests, has a booming fast food and restaurant industry. Thus, this study empirically tests western-based theory in Africa, utilising DINESERV to examine service quality in the South African fast food industry.

With Black Africans making up around 70% of South Africa’s population, the group is perceived as an important client base to many fast food enterprises. Thus their
perceptions on service quality in the fast food industry need to be explored in order to better provide and tend to their needs.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The objectives of this study are

- To validate the five dimensions of service quality (Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy) in a fast food restaurant
- To determine which of the service quality dimensions are important amongst blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality in the fast food restaurant industry
- To validate DINSERV as a reliable instrument to be used in fast food restaurants in a South African context.
- To determine whether the service quality dimensions have a positive effect on service quality.
- To determine reasons why blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality prefer chicken restaurants.

Managers, waiters and all staff involved in the fast food restaurant business will benefit from the findings of this research. Managers will be able to make decisions in the right areas to improve customer service to realise numerous benefits such as

- Customer loyalty
• Reduced complaints

• Increased customer referrals

• Increased brand value

• Repeat purchases

1.4 Hypotheses

The research hypotheses for the study are as follows:

H_{1a}: The physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant has a strong relationship with service quality

H_{1b}: The better the physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant, the greater the level of service quality

H_{2a}: The reliability dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H_{2b}: The more reliable the service provided the greater the level of service quality

H_{3a}: The responsiveness dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H_{3b}: The more responsive the service provided the greater the level of service quality

H_{4a}: The assurance dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H_{4b}: The assurance dimension has a positive effect on service quality
H$_{5a}$: The empathy dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H$_{5b}$: The empathy dimension has a positive effect on service quality

H$_6$: A negative relationship exists between age and service quality

H$_7$: A negative relationship exists between gender and service quality

H$_8$: A negative relationship exists between education achieved and service quality

H$_9$: A negative relationship exists between age and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services.

H$_{10}$: A negative relationship exists between gender and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services

H$_{11}$: A negative relationship exists between education achieved and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services

### 1.5 Value of the Study

The study will enhance the literature on restaurant service management in the following ways:

- The findings could improve fast food quality of service by disseminating the relevant information.

- The study unlike other studies done in the past will enable fast food restaurants to understand the black client base better

- A number of businesses have failed in this service area in attracting black customers. This research will provide information which will assist in this
regard and help in understanding the behaviour of Black clients in the
restaurant industry.

1.6 Research Methodology

According to Jankowicz (2005) research methodology is a systematic and orderly
manner taken in the collection and analysis of data so that information can be
obtained from data. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods will be used
to properly analyse and give a clearer picture of the study. The study subjects are
going to be Black customers of fast food restaurants.

1.6.1 Sampling

For purposes of this study the geographical parameters of this study are going to be
restricted to the Empangeni, eSikhaleni and Richards Bay area of the Umhlathuze
Municipality. Since chicken is the most popular fast food item in South Africa
(Euromonitor International, 2005: 1, 6) the study focused on chicken fast food
restaurants. With KFC being the dominant global player in fast food in South Africa it
is going to be the restaurant of focus where information will be collected from.

The study focused on perceptions of black fast food consumers. For purposes of this
study black people are going to be defined as Black Africans. The definition does
not include Indians, Coloureds or Chinese persons as indicated in the South African
Constitution.
1.6.2 Sample Size

Our study focused on black consumers from ages 15 to 64. The sample size used for the study was 350 consumers.

1.6.3 Data Collection Methods

DINESERV instrument was used in assessing the level of customer satisfaction and overall service quality. It was modified and translated into Zulu and English questionnaires. It contains 22 questions divided into five service quality dimensions namely, tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Responses are on a 5-point Likert scale from ‘strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1).

1.6.4 Distribution of questionnaires

The questionnaires were distributed at the University of Zululand amongst staff and students. Convenience random sampling was used with the criteria for selection to fill out the questionnaire being any black person within the ages of 15 and 64. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

1.6.5 Data Analysis Techniques

In analysing the data descriptive statistics, regression analysis, correlation analysis ANOVA and content analysis will be used.
1.7 Delimitations

For this study, the focus was on Blacks. The study could have focused on all racial groups and compared them. Though comparisons among racial groups will be valuable, that would have required more resources such as finances and extra assistants to ensure success. To allow more depth of understanding regarding the group the study was restricted to Blacks who are after all the majority in the area.

Interviews, group studies and other data collection methods and qualitative analysis could have been employed in order to gain a better understanding for customer perception of customer service. The study however focuses on validating DINESERV as a reliable instrument to be used in South African fast food restaurants as well as determine which service dimensions are important to Blacks. Thus, employing other data collection and analysis will be unnecessary.

The study focuses on chicken fast food restaurants, in particular KFC. The study could have included other fast food restaurants and made comparisons. This also will have been a time, financial and human capital intensive task. The variables and analysis will have been complex and the sample size would have been pretty huge. Thus it was decided to focus on Chicken fast food and stick to KFC as a measure of what Blacks perceive as important in fast food restaurants.

Empangeni, eSikhleni and Richards Bay constitute only a portion of the Umhlathuze Municipality. The study focused on these areas due to the convenience to the researcher but also because of budgetary constraints.
The above delimitations are a clear indication that the findings of the study cannot be generalized to the Black population of South Africa. The results give an insight to Black consumer perceptions, as well as an idea of which service dimensions are important to consumers in the region. The results can be compared to similar studies conducted within South Africa to test validity and reliability.

1.8 Summary

This first chapter has given an overview of the study and some insight as to what to expect in the coming chapters. The next chapter is an overview of the literature. This looks into the literature reviewed in arriving at the topic as well as studies that have built on the subject being explored.
2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

Any business or organisation that strives for high customer satisfaction is also improving the quality of service its organisation offers its customers. Quality, customer service and satisfaction are not terms which have been around since the beginning of time. Their conceptualization, measurement and analysis have evolved over years and are still being improved today.

Dr. W. Edwards Deming (1900 – 1993), emphasised on the importance of quality and was viewed by many as an individual with the most influence on quality management (Evans and Lindsay 2008). Deming played a key role in developing Japanese quality and his philosophy on quality saw businesses such as Ford, GM and Procter & Gamble revolutionise their approach to quality.

Deming however was not the only influence on quality in his time. Others such as Joseph Juran, Philip B. Crosby, A. V. Feigenbaum and Kaoru Ishikawa all contributed in developing the concept of quality as we see it today. All the above mentioned individuals were also Honorary Members of the American Society for Quality. (Brocka & Brocka, 1992).

The contribution made by these prestigious individuals however focused more on the manufacturing industry than the service industry. Since the context that we are exploring customer satisfaction in is the service industry, this review will explore methods as well as research in this area that has helped shape knowledge in customer satisfaction in restaurants.
Thus in this section of the study we shall outline the connection between quality and customer satisfaction, look into how customer satisfaction is measured in different industries and finally focus on how customer satisfaction is measured in restaurants.

2.2. Total Quality

2.2.1 Quality

Quality is a term that describes a number of attributes about a product or service. The various perspectives from which quality is viewed make it both a complex subject and an essential one in the world of business. According to Evans and Lindsay (2008) neither consultants nor business professionals agree on a universal definition. Managers of 86 firms in the eastern United States were asked in a study to define quality. Their responses included the following:

Table 2.1

RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfection</th>
<th>Speed of Delivery</th>
<th>Doing it right the first time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Compliance with policies and procedures</td>
<td>Delighting or pleasing customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating Waste</td>
<td>Providing a good, usable product</td>
<td>Total customer service and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: Tamimi and Sebastianelli, 1996
2.2.2 The Construct of Service Quality

Quality is applied mainly in two main industries namely the manufacturing and service industry. Manufacturing deals more with offering a tangible product such as a television set or a motor vehicle for sale. Service organizations on the hand offer an intangible product or service for sale such as food, event management and law firms. However the two have differences that imply a different application of the concept of quality.

These differences highlight four distinctive features of services namely: intangibility, heterogeneity, perishability and inseparability (Ladhari 2009)

Services, as operations, are difficult to appraise before a sale, thus making them intangible (Lovelock, 1981). Hence service providers can have trouble in determining how consumer view their services (Parasuraman et al., 1985). The heterogeneous nature of services is due to the fact that they differ from day to day, place to place, producer to producer, and from customer to customer (Parasuraman et al., 1985; Markovic, 2006); furthermore, customer involvement in the production of service delivery gives the service provider less control over the consistency of the service experience. Since services cannot be stored for another day or sold in the future they are also perceived to be perishable. Majority of services are likewise simultaneously produced and consumed thus making them inseperable.

These four distinctive characteristics suggest that service quality is a more subtle and abstract construct than product quality (Parasuraman et al., 1985, 1988). Gro¨nroos (1984) defined perceived service quality as: “. . . the outcome of an
evaluation process, [whereby] the consumer compares his expectations with the service he perceives he has received”.

### 2.2.3. Total Quality (TQ) definition

As quality evolved and companies recognized its broad complexities, the concept of total quality (TQ) emerged. In 1992 a definition was endorsed by the chairs and CEO’s of nine major U.S corporations in cooperation with Deans of business and engineering departments of major universities and recognized consultants:

Total Quality (TQ) is a people-focused management system that aims at continual increase in customer satisfaction at continually lower real cost. TQ is a total system approach (not a separate area or program) and an integral part of high-level strategy; it works horizontally across functions and departments, involves all employees, top to bottom, and extends backward and forward to include the supply chain and the customer chain. TQ stresses learning and adaptation to continual change as keys to organizational success.

The foundation of total quality is philosophical: the scientific method. TQ includes systems, methods, and tools. The systems permit change; the philosophy stays the same. TQ is anchored in values that stress the dignity of the individual and the power of community action. (Procter & Gamble, 1992).

### 2.2.4 TQ Principles

Total quality is based on three key principles namely: Focus on customers and stakeholders, participation and teamwork and continuous improvement and learning (Evans and Lindsay, 2008)
All three principles together work to create total quality. This study in particular focuses on quality in relation to customers, thus we shall look more into the total quality principle that focuses on customers and stakeholders. This will enable us to explore the concept of customer satisfaction. Both quality and customer satisfaction apply to both the manufacturing industry and the service industry. However, the differences in the two industries imply a different application of the concept of quality.

2.3 Customer Satisfaction

2.3.1. Definition

Customer satisfaction is the customer’s evaluation of a good or service in terms of whether that good or service has met the customer’s needs and expectations (McDaniel et al. 2009). Customers’ opinions of customer satisfaction are influenced by a number of different factors which are experienced by the customer during purchase, ownership, and service experience. In order for any business to satisfy a customer, they need to be close to them. This enables them to know what they need and how they expect a product to work or how a service is to be rendered. In other words, businesses must fully understand the dimensions of a product or service that lead to a customer being satisfied.

2.3.2. Importance of Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty

The effect of poor customer satisfaction is detrimental in the service industry. Dell Computers, Home Depot, and Northwest Airlines are a few companies that have
suffered from poor customer satisfaction due to executives losing track of the delicate balance between efficiency and service (Hindo 2006).

Studies show that companies on average receive 65% of their business from existing customer, and it costs five times more to find a new customer than to keep an existing one happy (Norman 1998). Another study found that customers are five times more likely to switch because of perceived service problems than for price concerns or product quality issues (The Forum Corporation 1988).

Reichheld and Sasser (1990), reveal that companies can boost their profits by almost 100 percent by retaining just 5 percent more of their customers than their competitors retain.

As important as satisfaction is, businesses need to look further if they want to achieve strong profits and market share. Satisfied customers in this case make up only half of the cake. Customers who are simply satisfied will usually purchase from other competitors due to reasons such as convenience and promotions. Customer satisfaction is important to businesses, however loyal customers is what they should be striving for. This cannot be created without first having satisfied customers (Evans and Lindsay 2008).

Loyal customers spend more, are willing to pay more, give positive referrals and are less costly to do business with.

The above statistics reveal the importance of customer satisfaction and its capability to damage businesses. Though the above statistics focus more on the loss that is generated from poor service it does not shed light on the competitive advantage that can be gained from quality service.
2.4. Quality and Competitive Advantage

Competitive advantage is what sets an organisation apart from others and provides it with a distinctive edge in the marketplace (Daft 2007). S.C Wheelwright identified six characteristics of a strong competitive advantage.

The first characteristic of a strong competitive advantage is that it is driven by customer wants and needs.

A strong competitive advantage makes a significant contribution to the success of the business.

It matches the organization’s unique resources with opportunities in the environment. No two companies have the same resources; a good strategy uses the firm’s particular resources effectively.

It is durable lasting and difficult for competitors to copy, provides basis for further improvement and provides direction and motivation to the entire organization.

The above characteristics reveal a link to quality as a source of competitive advantage. Studies in the past have indicated that quality is indeed a strong component in achieving competitive advantage.

PIMS Associates, Inc., a subsidiary of the Strategic Planning Institute, maintains a database of 1200 companies and studies the impact of product quality on corporate performance. Researchers in PIMS identified the following:

1. Product quality is an important determinant of business profitability.
2. Businesses that offer premium quality products and services usually have large market shares and were early entrants into their markets.

3. Quality is positively and significantly related to a higher return on investment for almost all kinds of products and market situations. (PIMS studies showed that firms whose products were perceived as having superior quality earned more than three times the return on sales of firms whose products were perceived as having inferior quality.)

4. Instituting a strategy of quality improvement usually leads to increased market share but at the cost of reduced short-run profitability.

5. High-quality producers can usually charge premium prices. (The PIMS Letter on Business strategy 1986)

The results from PIMS as highlighted earlier strongly indicate that quality is a strong feature in a company having competitive advantage. Quality simply is a necessary base for any business or organisation striving for competitive advantage. Crosby reiterates this point in his book Quality is Free. He states:

“Quality is not only free, it is an honest-to-everything profit maker. Every penny you don’t spend on doing things wrong, over, or instead of, becomes half a penny right on the bottom line. In these days of “who knows what is going to happen to our business tomorrow,” there aren't many ways left to make a profit improvement. If you concentrate on making quality certain, you can probably increase your profit by an amount equal to 5 percent to 10 percent of your sales. That is a lot of money for free.” (Crosby 1979).
2.5 Creating Satisfied Customers

To create a satisfied customer one needs to comprehend the different dimensions of quality. Research reveals that services have five key dimensions of service quality which contribute to customer perceptions. They are:

Reliability: The ability to deliver what was advertised, agreed upon or promised by the business

Assurance: The ability of employees to convey trust and confidence to customers

Tangibles: These are the physical facilities, equipment and aesthetics of the area and staff

Empathy: This involves the caring and individual attention given to customers.

Responsiveness: The ability of personnel to offer prompt service willingly (Zeithaml et al 1990)

Customers in any industry before purchasing a product or receiving a service expect a certain degree of quality. These assumptions will be put against the actual quality of the product or service and depending on the results will leave a customer either satisfied or dissatisfied. This process or cycle is conveyed in the Figure 1.1 below.

In certain instances word of mouth, advertising and negative experiences may change perceptions of perceived quality. According to Goodman, Ward and Broetzmann (2002), the majority of the causes of dissatisfaction are however not traceable to production or service defects or employee mistakes. Customers may not use the product properly or have unreasonable expectations of the service to be delivered. This may be due to misleading adverts or marketing campaigns.
Figure 2.1

Source: Evans and Lindsay (2008)

To understand a customer better a system of customer satisfaction measurement must be employed. This enables an organization to obtain feedback on their service or product and enables them to better meet customers’ expectations. It will also help in enabling them to understand the customer better and puts them in a position to anticipate what they would like in order for them to deliver results which exceed expectations.
2.6. Measuring Customer Satisfaction

As indicated in the above section, customer feedback is essential to an organization. It completes the customer-driven quality cycle shown in Figure 2.1. Measures of customer satisfaction enable a business to learn customer perceptions of how well the business is doing in meeting customer needs and spot causes of dissatisfaction and failed expectations as well as drivers of delight.

It allows comparison of performance with competitors to support planning and better strategic initiatives.

In addition to that it enables discovery of areas for improvement in the design and delivery of products and services and areas for training and coaching of employees, and allows companies to follow trends to determine whether changes actually result in improvements.

A number of customer satisfaction measures have been designed, and are used to measure customer satisfaction in various industries and sectors.

Measuring customer satisfaction is however complex as customer satisfaction is a psychological attitude (Evans and Lindsay 2008). Customer satisfaction deals with customers and each is different and unique in their own way, requiring different expectations each time.
The next sections will focus on some of these measures and some of the research that have been done to expand on the knowledge in this area. The measures we will be looking into include the following:

1. American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)
2. Kano Model
3. SERVQUAL
4. DINESERV.

2.7. American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) is an economic indicator that measures the satisfaction of consumers across the U.S. economy. Developed at the University of Michigan in 1994 by National Quality Research Centre (NQRC) researchers who worked with counterparts at the American Society for Quality (ASQ), the ACSI interviews about 80,000 Americans annually and asks about their satisfaction with the goods and services they have consumed. The ACSI was based on a model originally implemented in 1989 in Sweden called the Swedish Customer Satisfaction Barometer (SCSB). (Evans and Lindsay 2008)
2.7.1 Methodology

Two interrelated and complementary methods are used by ASCI in the measurement and analysis of customer satisfaction. They are:

- Customer interviewing
- Econometric modelling.

In calculating the index interviewing is first done. A market research firm contracted by the ACSI and employing Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technology collects data from randomly selected and screened customers of companies and organizations.

Structural equation modelling is then used with the collected data to provide scores for measured latent variable components (such as customer expectations, overall quality, perceived value, etc.), and the relationships between these measured components. Each measured company or organization is given a customer satisfaction index score which reflects a weighted average of three satisfaction proxy questions each scored on a 1 - 10 scale. (Evans and Lindsay 2008)

ACSI reports scores on a 0-100 scale at the national level and produces indexes for 10 economic sectors, 44 industries (including e-commerce and e-business), and more than 200 companies and federal or local government agencies. (ASCI) Scores have tended to range from the low 50's to the high 80's.
A summarised figure of the ASCI model is displayed below:

**Figure 2.2**

![ASCI Model Diagram](image-url)

*Source: National Quality Research Centre*

**Customer Expectations:** This is a measure of the customer's anticipation of the quality of a company's products or services. These represent both prior consumption experience, such as advertising and word-of-mouth, and a forecast of the company's ability to deliver quality in the future.

**Perceived Quality:** This is a measure of the customer's evaluation through recent consumption experience of the quality of a company's products or services.

**Perceived Value:** This is a measure of quality relative to price paid. Although price is often very important to the customer's first purchase, it usually has a somewhat smaller impact on satisfaction for repeat purchases.

**Customer Complaints:** These are measured as a percentage of respondents who indicate they have complained to a company directly about a product or service within a specified time frame. Satisfaction has a negative relationship with customer complaints, as the more satisfied the customers, the less likely they are to complain.
**Customer Loyalty:** This is a combination of the customer’s professed likelihood to repurchase from the same supplier in the future, and the likelihood to purchase a company’s products or services at various price points. (ASCI.org 2009)

Over the years ACSI data has shown that manufacturing industries tend to perform well. With an established, “old economy” that has had a longer-running focus on quality control procedures it is no surprise that these industries have such a high performance. Service industries, on the other hand have tended to perform below average since they rely more on customer service and human intervention in the consumption process. (ASCI.org 2009)

### 2.8 Kano Model

The Kano model is a theory of product development and customer satisfaction developed in the 80’s by Professor Noriaki Kano (Kano 1984)

The Kano Model of Customer (Consumer) Satisfaction classifies product attributes based on how they are perceived by customers and their effect on customer satisfaction. These classifications are useful for guiding design decisions in that they indicate when good is good enough, and when more is better.

Project activities in which the Kano Model is useful:

- Identifying customer needs
- Determining functional requirements
- Concept development
- Analysing competitive products
Kano’s model focuses on differentiating product features, as opposed to focusing initially on customer needs. Kano also produced a methodology for mapping consumer responses to questionnaires onto his model.

Figure 2.3

Source: Kano 1984

The Kano Model of Customer satisfaction (Figure 2.4) divides product attributes into three categories: dissatisfiers, satisfiers, and exciters.

- **Dissatisfiers**: These are product elements that a customer expects to see or experiences with a product. They are deemed essential and can be categorised as elements that are barely needed with the product. In laptop computers, for example, a USB port and CD-ROM drive are features that are generally not stated by customers but are assumed as given. These features, if not present make a customer dissatisfied.
• Satisfiers: These are product elements that a customer states that they want. They are add ons that the customer knows are possible. Laptop computer buyers, for example, want the computer to come fitted with a webcam, Bluetooth, wireless network connectivity and a multi card reader. These features, if not present does not necessarily make a customer dissatisfied. However if present they make a customer satisfied.

• Exciters/delighters: These are new product elements or features that a customer does not expect. The Apple ipod for example in 2006 was known as solely an mp3 player. Later that year when it was also able to play movies, video and show pictures it blew consumers away with its many functions.

A competitive product meets basic attributes, maximises performances attributes, and includes as many “excitement” attributes as possible at a cost the market can bear.

Many consider meeting customer expectations as the minimum requirement for staying in business (Evans and Lindsay 2008). However to create loyal customers one needs to go beyond customer expectations. The Kano model shows us that providing satisfiers enable businesses to stay afloat but providing exciters makes one a trendsetter and a leader. In other words to succeed in meeting or exceeding customer requirements, one must find out what the dissatisfiers, satisfiers and exiters are of a product or service.

Dissatisfiers and satisfiers are easily acquired through market research. Exciters on the other hand are not so simple to acquire. Ford in the past listened to a sample of customers who were asked whether they wanted a fourth door on one of its minivans. About one third thought it was a nice idea. The response from customers
according to Ford was not convincing, so they let the idea go. Chrysler, on the other hand, spent a lot more time living with the owners of vans and observed their behaviour in how they got stuff in and out of their vehicles. This enabled them to notice how convenient a fourth door will be. The company from their experiment implemented the fourth door into their vans and were very successful in doing so (Across the Board 2000).

Listening to customer feedback does not always provide one with the answers to provide an exciter. Henry Ford was quoted as saying “If I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses” (Evans and Lindsay 2008).

2.9 SERVQUAL

SERVQUAL is a generic instrument for measuring perceived service quality that is viewed as the degree and direction of discrepancy between consumers’ perceptions and expectations (Yen-Lun Su 2001). Hence, service quality, as perceived by consumers, stems from a comparison of what they feel service providers should offer with their perceptions of the performance of service provided by service providers (Parasuraman, et al, 1988).

According to Parasuraman et al. (1985), customers’ perceptions of service quality are influenced by five “gaps”:

1. Gap 1 represents the difference between customer expectations and management perceptions of customer expectations.
2. Gap 2 is the difference between management perceptions of consumer expectations and the translation of these perceptions into service-quality specifications.

3. Gap 3 is the difference between the service actually delivered by frontline service personnel on a day-to-day basis and the specifications set by management.

4. Gap 4 represents the difference between service delivery and what is promised in external communications to consumers.

5. Gap 5 is the difference between customer expectations and perceptions

Gap 5 is influenced by Gaps 1-4, which are all within the control of an organisation and therefore need to be analysed to identify any changes that should be implemented to reduce or eliminate Gap 5 (Ladhari 2009). Parasuraman et al. (1985) argued that such “gap analyses” are vital for identification of discrepancies between the provider’s perceptions of service-quality dimensions and the consumers’ perceptions of those dimensions.

The SERVQUAL was constructed based on Gap 5. Information from 12 focus-group interviews with consumers provided the required data for construction of the instrument (Ladhari 2009). Parasuraman et al. (1985) concluded that consumers evaluated service quality by comparing expectations with perceptions on ten dimensions namely: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness Communication, Credibility, Security, Competence, Courtesy, Understanding/knowing customers, Access
These ten dimensions were subsequently collapsed into five generic service-quality dimensions, as follows:

1. **Tangibles** (measured by four items): the appearance of physical facilities, equipment, and personnel

2. **Reliability** (five items): the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately

3. **Responsiveness** (four items): the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service

4. **Assurance** (four items): the knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence

5. **Empathy** (five items): the level of caring and individualised attention the firm provides to its customers. (Ladhari 2009)

These five dimensions are thus assessed by a total of 22 items. Each item is measured on the basis of responses to two statements that measure the general expectations of customers concerning a service; and the perceptions of customers regarding the levels of service actually provided by the company within that service category (Ladhari 2009).

Each statement requires the respondent to indicate his or her opinion on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). The data are converted into “perception-minus.expectation” scores for each statement, which results in a difference score ranging from -6 to +6. (Ladhari 2009)
The gap score ($G$) is calculated on an item-by-item basis as the difference between the raw perception-of-performance score ($P$) and the raw expectation score ($E$) for matching items; therefore, $G = P - E$. Following this calculation, the greater the perception-minus-expectation score, the greater is the perceived service quality. (Ladhari 2009)

### 2.9 Widespread use of SERVQUAL scale

SERVQUAL has been used to measure service quality in a variety of service industries, including: Healthcare sector, Banking, Fast food, Telecommunications, Retail chains, Information systems, Library services (Ladhari 2009).

SERVQUAL has also been applied in several countries, including the USA, China, Australia, Cyprus, Hong Kong, Korea, South Africa, The Netherlands, UK (Ladhari 2009).

The use of SERVQUAL facilitates comparability with other studies conducted in the past (Arasli et al. 2005).

### 2.10 Debates about SERVQUAL scale

Despite the wide use of the SERVQUAL model as a means to measure service quality, there have been debates about various aspects of the instrument. These include the use of difference scores, the reliability of the model and its convergent validity. These issues and other will be briefly discussed below.
2.10.1 Use of difference scores

Brown et al. (1993) and Peter et al. (1993) revealed that gap scores have poor reliability and problems with variance because the reliability of a difference score decreases as the correlation between its two components increases. Brown et al. (1993) further questioned the construct validity of gap scores because such scores are unlikely to be distinct from their component scores.

Because consumers are inclined to rate expectations more highly (Buttle, 1996) it is no surprise that the perception scores are the dominant contributor to the gap scores (Babakus and Boller 1992). According to Cronin and Taylor (1992) perception-only scores (as used in the SERVPERF model) are superior to the perception-minus-expectation difference scores (as in the SERVQUAL model) in terms of reliability and convergent validity. To confirm the superiority of SERVPERF over SERVQUAL, Brady et al. (2002) replicated and extended Cronin and Taylor’s (1992) research. The results affirmed SERVPERF as a superior methodology for measuring service quality over SERVQUAL.

Parasuraman et al. (1994), however, argue that to derive information about strengths and weaknesses within each service-quality attribute the gap methodology should be used. Perception only scores do not tell the strengths and weaknesses of service attributes. Bolton and Drew (1991, p. 383) in an empirical study, agreed with this view; concluding that the gap between performance and expectation was the key determinant of overall service quality. To complement this Angur et al. (1999)
revealed that the gap model aided in explaining specific service deficiencies compared to the perception-only model.

Although the perception-only measure has been shown in several empirical studies to possess impressive convergent and predictive validity, the gap model appears to have better diagnostic capabilities (Kilbourne et al., 2004).

2.10.2 Reliability

Cronbach’s alpha has been used by many researchers to measure the reliability of SERVQUAL. Many have expressed how inappropriate the measure is in assessing psychometric quality (Finn and Kayande, 1997; Diamantopoulos, 1999, 2005; Rossiter, 2002). The use of Cronbach’s alpha has led to some inconsistent use of the measure, such as the mechanistic application of exploratory factor analysis models to identify the dimensionality of constructs or the expectation of journal referees that unless the 0.70 level is reached by coefficient alpha, a multi-item measure cannot be any good (Diamantopoulos 1999).

Rossiter (2002) in light of the arguments against the Cronbachs alpha proposed a new approach for scale development (C-OAR-SE). He further added that the appropriate method for estimating scale-score reliability differs according to:

- Who is performing the rating (individual, self-rating, panel of experts, group of consumers, and so on); and
- The type of attribute in the construct (concrete, formed, eliciting, and so on).
2.10.3 Convergent validity

According to Ladhari (2009) the factor-loading pattern of SERVQUAL has revealed some weaknesses in convergent validity in a number of studies. Several of the SERVQUAL items in these studies had higher loadings on dimensions that were different from those suggested for these items by Parasuraman et al. (1988).

2.10.4 Discriminant validity

Parasuraman et al. (1988) proposed five “universal” dimensions that were supposed to measure service quality in any industry. Majority of studies however have revealed that more than five dimensions exist. Ladhari (2009) in his review on SERVQUAL over the past two decades highlighted some of these instances.

- Carman (1990) tested the SERVQUAL scale in four service settings and found six to nine dimensions, depending on the industry.

- Cook and Thompson (2000) tested SERVQUAL in a library setting and reported a three-factor structure – “tangibles”, “reliability”, and “affect of service” – with the last being comprised of three of the original dimensions (“assurance”, “responsiveness”, and “empathy”).

- Pitt et al. (1995) found three, five, and seven dimensions of service quality in three different sample sites, with no structure having a close resemblance to the standard five SERVQUAL dimensions.
Durvasula et al. (1999) reported that, apart from “tangibles”, the other four dimensions (“reliability”, “responsiveness”, “assurance”, and “empathy”) were not distinct from each other, and could therefore be combined into one factor.

Baldwin and Sohal (2003) merged the dimensions of “assurance” and “empathy” to form one factor.

Arasli et al. (2005) reported a three-dimensional structure in the bank sector, with the items for “responsiveness” and “empathy” loading onto one dimension and the “assurance” dimension being eliminated.

Kilbourne et al. (2004), who applied SERVQUAL to long-term health-care service quality in the USA and the UK, reported a four-factor structure of “tangibles”, “reliability”, “responsiveness”, and “empathy”.

Gounaris et al. (2003) studied four industries and reported that the “empathy”, “assurance”, “reliability”, and “responsiveness” dimensions were collapsed into one dimension that reflected the behavioural elements of the service-delivery process.

Finn and Lamb (1991) found that the SERVQUAL scale failed to exhibit the predicted five-factor structure when tested in four types of retail stores; that is, confirmatory factor analysis revealed a poor fit for the five-factor structure. Similar results have been reported in the residence utility sector (Babakus and Boller, 1992), in the banking sector (Spreng and Singh, 1993), in leisure activities (Taylor et al., 1993), in information systems (Kettinger and Lee, 1994), in career services (Engelland...
et al., 2000), and in the higher education and the information technology sectors (Badri et al., 2005).

2.10.5 Emphasis on process

According Rust and Oliver (1994), service quality is based on perceptions of:

- The consumer-employee interaction (functional quality);
- The outcome (technical quality); and
- The service environment.

It is apparent from this that the SERVQUAL model clearly focuses on the service-delivery process. Thus it might be wrong to stipulate that functional quality attributes explain or predict consumers’ behaviour regarding service quality (Richard and Allaway 1993).

A model was proposed by Brady and Cronin (2001) in which service quality was constituted by three primary dimensions, each of which included three sub-dimensions.

The primary dimensions and their sub-dimensions were:

1. Interaction quality with attitude, behaviour, and expertise as sub dimensions

2. Physical environment with ambient conditions, design, and social factors as sub dimensions

3. Outcome quality with waiting time, tangibles, and valence as sub dimensions.
2.10.6 Hierarchical structure of service-quality constructs

The SERVQUAL model paints service quality as a multidimensional element. There however have been arguments suggesting that service quality is not only multidimensional but also hierarchical (Ladhari 2009).

A multilevel model of service quality was proposed by Dabholkar et al. (1996) as a third-order construct containing five primary dimensions and six sub-dimensions; the five primary dimensions were:

1. Physical aspects
2. Reliability
3. Personal interaction
4. Problem solving
5. Policy

Wilkins et al. (2007) also proposed and validated a hierarchical model for the hotel industry. His model composed service quality of three primary factors namely

1. Physical product
2. Service experience
3. Quality food and beverage

these three factors were further defined by seven sub-factors.
2.10.7 Use of reflective (versus formative) scales

A number of research into service quality has been done using reflective scales. Due to scepticism about the use of reflective scale development, formative models have been proposed as an alternative approach (Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer, 2001; Rossiter, 2002; Jarvis et al., 2003). The direction of causality in formative models is from the measure to construct, reflective models on the other hand show the opposite. Reflective scales should possess internal consistency reliability, whereas, for formative models, there is no reason to assume the measures to be correlated (Jarvis et al., 2003).

From this it is clear that future studies need to explore the service-quality construct as a formative construct rather than a reflective judgment (Ladhari, 2009).

Recent studies focusing on the measurement of electronic service quality (e-service quality) (Parasuraman et al., 2005; Collier and Bienstock, 2006) support the use of a formative model for measuring customer satisfaction. Parasuraman et al. (2005), questioned their own study (E-S-QUAL a scale for e-service quality) which was based on a reflective model. They suggested that it might be appropriate to treat the first-order dimensions of e-service quality as a formative indicator. According to Collier and Bienstock (2006, pp. 271-2) one has to question if previous results of service quality using reflective indicators have led to biased results that do not accurately explain and describe service quality.
2.10.8 Applicability of a generic scale for measuring service quality in all settings

SERVQUAL was created as a generic scale for measuring service quality. However, studies have questioned whether SERVQUAL is applicable as a generic scale for all settings (Akbaba, 2006). A number of researchers have suggested that industry-specific measuring instruments might be more appropriate than a single generic scale and even if adapted, the scale is insufficient to measure service quality across diverse service industries (Caro and Garcia, 2007).

A number of alternative scales tailored to specific service industries have therefore been developed in recent years.

- Knuston, Wullaert, Patton & Yokoyama (1990) drafted LODGSERV to improve on what a generic instrument might do in defining and measuring service quality, specifically for lodging properties.

- Stevens, Knutson, and Patton (1995) drafted DINSERV after adapting the instrument SERVQUAL to the restaurant industry and using the lessons learned in developing and refining LODGSERV.

- Parasuraman et al. (2005) developed a scale called “E-S-QUAL”, which is made up of 22 items divided in four dimensions; namely: Efficiency, System availability, Fulfilment, Privacy.
2.10.9 Cultural contexts

Several researchers questioned the applicability of SERVQUAL in certain cultural contexts. In particular, it would seem that measurement of service quality in the banking industry is dependent on the cultural context (Lam, 2002; Zhou et al., 2002; Chi Cui et al., 2003). Research using SERVQUAL in certain cultures revealed that the instrument did not fit the data.

Research in the banking sector using SERVQUAL in China (Zhou et al., 2002), Macau (Lam, 2002), Korea (Chi Cui et al. 2003) and Greece (Arasli et al. 2005) revealed the dimensionality of SERVQUAL is unstable across cultural contexts (Ladhari 2009).

2.11 Using SERVQUAL

Despite the apparent shortcomings of the SERVQUAL scale, many researchers and practitioners continue to find that the instrument is useful for measuring service quality (Ladhari 2009). Moreover, Pitt et al. (1995) noted that practitioners need a generic model that provides the potential for cross-industry and cross-functional comparisons. Despite the numerous critics, the SERVQUAL instrument still continues to appeal to both academics and practitioners. After reviewing the numerous applications and critiques of SERVQUAL, the present study concludes that, despite legitimate concerns about the validity of the scale, it remains a useful tool for measuring and managing service quality. Nevertheless, it is important to note
that the SERVQUAL scale should not be used as it is in all circumstances. Researchers should either:

- Adapt the SERVQUAL methodology to develop their own instrument for a specific industry or specific study context; or
- Validate the instrument after data collection through reliability and validity analysis.

2.12 DINESERV

Knuston, Wullaert, Patton & Yokoyama (1990) designed LODGSERV to improve on what a generic instrument might do in defining and measuring service quality, specifically for lodging properties. Reliability was found to be the most important of the five dimensions (Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy) followed, in ranking, by assurance, responsiveness, tangibles, and empathy.

Patton, Stevens and Knutson (1994) then translated the instrument into other languages and pilot-tested LODGSERV in five other cultures. In each scenario the instrument worked well, retaining its high validity level.

Following the success of LODSERV, Stevens, Knutson, and Patton (1995) adapted the instrument SERVQUAL to the restaurant industry and created DINESERV. DINESERV was tested in three restaurant segments: quick service, casual/theme, and fine dining and was found to also have a high degree of reliability (Stevens,
Knutson, and Patton, 1995). The following sections explore the findings from DINESERV used in different studies.

2.12.1 STUDIES USING DINESERV

Wu, Goh, Lin and Chen (1999) conducted a study using the DINESERV instrument. The instrument was used in measuring service quality in a mid-price multi-unit Chinese restaurant. The study identified the differences in customer perceived service quality between lunch and dinner and between new customers and regular customers (Wu, Goh et al. 1999).

Another study in Korea validated the five dimensions of the DINESERV instrument in casual dining restaurants and explored the differences in perceived service quality. The hypothesis of the study was that perceived service quality differs based upon characteristics of the patrons. (Kim, McCahon, and Miller 2000)

Reliability proved to be the most important factor of service quality in the Malaysian fast food industry (Tang and Bougoure 2006). This supports prior research from the west (Gupta and Chen, 1995). Other findings of the study indicated that the Malyasian consumer found tangible issues relating to service quality and the ability of fast food operators to provide amenities such as parking areas and attractive building exteriors, to be of great importance for their consumers. Responsiveness ended up as the fourth most important dimension for Malaysian consumers, contrary to Chow and Luk’s (2005) findings on Canadian fast food consumers.
The study proved and suggested that DINESERV is valid in a Malaysian context and that fast food organisations may achieve overall customer satisfaction by improving their provision of elements within DINESERV.

Andaleeb and Conway (2006) also explored customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry by examining the transaction specific model of the full scale restaurant industry. Using the transaction-specific framework, the study tested a model of customer satisfaction for the restaurant industry. The model satisfactorily explains customer satisfaction and suggests that full service restaurant owners and managers should focus on three major elements namely service quality, price, and food quality (Andaleeb and Conway 2006). These translate to two of the five elements of DINESERV – Reliability and responsiveness. Of the two, responsiveness was the most important to customers.

An interesting find from the study was that the construct “food quality” or reliability ranked third in importance. This might come as a surprise at first since food seems to be the reason why people dine out. The authors explained that perhaps, restaurants have refined the science of food preparation to the point where this is not the distinguishing factor any more (Andaleeb and Conway 2006).

Physical design in this study was shown to be insignificant contrary to secondary research that supported it (Andaleeb and Conway 2006). The research on Malyasian fast food restaurants (Tang and Bougoure) shows that this is the opposite reflecting the need for study about the construct of service quality in the different cultural contexts.
2.13 Summary

This section of the paper explored the roots of quality management and how it helped shape up customer service in the service industry. Measures of how to measure customer satisfaction as well as their setbacks were explored. We further looked into research that led to this study and their short comings.

The section gives us an idea for what to look out for and suggests certain statistical tools that can be used in acquiring the data needed. It further provides assures the feasibility of the study as well as provide a benchmark for there to be comparison in certain areas.

The next section looks into the study that will be carried out and includes the problem statement, objectives, hypothesis and the planning of the methodology used in conducting the study.
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

According to Jankowicz (2005) research methodology is a systematic and orderly manner taken in the collection and analysis of data so that information can be obtained from data. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods will be used to properly analyse and give a clearer picture of the study. The study subjects are going to be Black customers of fast food restaurants.

In this section the problem statement and objectives of the study will be discussed. This will be followed by the hypothesis, sampling and sampling size to be used. Finally the data collection and data analysis methods will be discussed to conclude the chapter.

3.2 Problem Statement

The purpose of this study is to validate five dimensions of service quality contained in the DINESERV Instrument in a fast food restaurant and explore the differences in perceived service quality for customers. The results serve to provide evidence for the external validity and applicability of the DINESERV tool in South Africa, with support gained for all hypotheses.

With Black South Africans being the largest racial group among South Africa’s middle class, the group is perceived as an important client base to many fast food
enterprises. With Blacks being the majority in the South African population it is important to explore their perceptions on service quality in the fast food industry to better provide and tend to their needs.

3.3 Objectives of the study

With the economic importance of service sectors around the world growing and the subsequent research interest aroused within the services marketing literature, much knowledge has been gained, yet largely it remains in the domain of western economies. As such, this paper seeks to examine a number of services marketing concepts to see whether they also explain consumer perceptions of service quality in a Non-Western economy and answering calls in the literature for the external validation of marketing theory (Doran, 2002; Patterson and Smith, 2003).

As mentioned in the above sections, customer services are an important aspect of the service or hospitality industry. With black South Africans making up 70% of the South African population (Euromonitor International, 2005: 7), the increasing black middle class sector and the affordability and alternative meal option that these enterprises offer this consumer group make the study significant. Understanding the significance and differences amongst the different elements of DINESERV will help the management identify the strength and weakness of service quality amongst blacks and implement an effective strategy to meet the customers’ expectations.

As such the objectives of this study are:
• To validate the five dimensions of service quality (Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy) in a fast food restaurant.

• To determine which of the service quality dimensions are important amongst blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality in the fast food restaurant industry.

• To validate DINSERV as a reliable instrument to be used in fast food restaurants in a South African context.

• To determine whether the service quality dimensions have a positive effect on service quality.

• To determine reasons why blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality visit chicken restaurants

• To determine whether a negative relationship exists between frequency of utilisation and age, gender and education achieved.

• To determine whether a negative relationship exists between service quality and age, gender and education achieved.

3.4 Hypotheses
Prior research suggests that not all service quality elements are able to predict a consumer’s overall service quality perceptions or (OSQ) (Oliva, Oliver and MacMillan, 1992). Thus identifying the importance of service quality and its dimensions in determining overall service quality (OSQ), as perceived by customers is paramount in this study. In doing this, fast food restaurants can gain an
understanding of the areas they should concentrate on when seeking to improve their overall service quality provisions (Oliva, Oliver and MacMillan, 1992).

The research hypotheses for the study are as follows:

H\textsubscript{1a}:

The physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant has a strong relationship with service quality

H\textsubscript{1b}:

The better the physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant, the greater the level service quality

H\textsubscript{2a}:

The reliability dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H\textsubscript{2b}:

The more reliable the service provided the greater the level of service quality

H\textsubscript{3a}:

The responsiveness dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H\textsubscript{3b}:

The more responsive the service provided the greater the level of service quality

H\textsubscript{4a}:

The assurance dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H\textsubscript{4b}:

The assurance dimension has a positive effect on service quality

H\textsubscript{5a}:

The empathy dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H\textsubscript{5b}:

The empathy dimension has a positive effect on service quality

H\textsubscript{6}:

A negative relationship exists between age and service quality

H\textsubscript{7}:

A negative relationship exists between gender and service quality
H₈: A negative relationship exists between education achieved and service quality

H₉: A negative relationship exists between age and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services.

H₁₀: A negative relationship exists between gender and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services

H₁₁: A negative relationship exists between education achieved and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services

3.5 Populations and sample issues

For purposes of this study the geographical parameters of this study are going to be restricted to the Empangeni, eSikhaleni and Richards Bay area of the Umhlathuze Municipality. Since chicken is the most popular fast food item in South Africa (Euromonitor International, 2005: 1, 6) the study is going to focus on chicken fast food restaurants. With KFC being the dominant global player in fast food in South Africa it is going to be the fast food restaurant of focus where information will be collected from.

The study focuses on perceptions of black fast food consumers. For purposes of this study black people are going to be defined as African natives of dark skin. The definition does not include Indians, coloureds or Chinese persons as indicated in the South African Constitution.

Students and staff of the University of Zululand as well as residents of Empangeni, eSikhaleni and Richards Bay will be used for the study as they make use of fast food
restaurants and fit the criteria of study subjects. Subjects will be chosen randomly and questionnaires will be distributed in a manner to represent the total population.

### 3.5.1 Sample Size

The target population to be used for the research will be black people that make use of KFC outlets. Now the population size for black people in the Empangeni, eSikhaleni and Richards Bay Areas are shown in the table below.

**Table 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population groups</th>
<th>Richards Bay</th>
<th>Empangeni</th>
<th>eSikhaleni</th>
<th>eNseleni</th>
<th>Other areas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Africans</td>
<td>20207</td>
<td>13605</td>
<td>72342</td>
<td>14653</td>
<td>178712</td>
<td>299519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: uMhlathuze Statistics 2009*

From the table the population size for black people in Empangeni, eSikhaleni and Richards Bay Area is 106154 (20207+13605+72342 = 106154).
Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>POPULATION (N)</th>
<th>POPULATION (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>18028</td>
<td>18028</td>
<td>36056</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14 years</td>
<td>37392</td>
<td>36724</td>
<td>74116</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-34 years</td>
<td>76192</td>
<td>70167</td>
<td>146359</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-64 years</td>
<td>40739</td>
<td>39042</td>
<td>79781</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 years</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>3380</td>
<td>9464</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>178435</strong></td>
<td><strong>167341</strong></td>
<td><strong>345776</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: uMhlathuze Statistics 2009*

Our study is going to focus mainly on consumers from ages 15 to 64 which is about 65% of the total population. Thus the population group of 0-4, 5-14 and over 65 years will be excluded from the study. This reduces our population group to about 69000 (106154 x 65% = 69000).

In determining the sample size reference is made to the below figure. The figure below suggests the great benefit that randomly-selected samples afford. (Population size is noted by uppercase “N” and sample size by lower case “n”.)
Figure 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size (N)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From the above figure our sample size should be around 383. This sample size was compared to the following previous studies:

- Service Quality: An investigation into Malaysia consumers using DINESERV (Bougre, U and Tang, K, 2006) – This study looked into the Malaysian fast food industry using DINESERV, and made use of 300 questionnaires.

- Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: an examination of the transaction-specific model (Andaleeb and Conway, 2006) – This study looked into the restaurant industry in the USA it made use of 85 questionnaires.

Based on this 500 questionnaires were given out. 350 questionnaires were returned and thus became our sample size.
3.6 Instrumentation

DINESERV instrument was used in assessing the level of customer satisfaction and overall service quality. It was modified and translated into Zulu and English questionnaire and pilot-tested. It contained 22 questions divided into five service quality dimensions namely, tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Responses were on a 5-point Likert scale from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1).

3.6.1 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was divided into four sections, as displayed in Appendix 1

Introduction, purpose of the questionnaire and research

Section A: Demographic questions

Section B: A question regarding service quality dimensions

Section C: Questions relating to customers’ service quality perceptions in fast food restaurants

Section D: Questions aimed at finding which chicken restaurant customers preferred and their reasons of choice

3.6.2 Questions in the questionnaire
The first page of the questionnaire is used to introduce the researcher as well as the reason for the study. Instructions pertaining to administration of the questionnaire are also included. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 1.

**Section A**

This section is used in gathering demographic data about the respondents.

**Question 1** relates to age

**Question 2** relates to gender

**Question 3** relates to the respondents’ level of education

**Question 4** relates to the respondents’ consumption pattern

**Section B**

This section is used to enable the respondent distinguish which of the five service quality dimensions is the most important. The dimensions are however not explicitly named but rather described.

**Section C**

This section is based on the DINESERV measuring instrument developed and published by Stevens, Knutson and Patton in April 1995 as discussed in Chapter 2.

The instrument measures service quality in restaurants based on five service quality dimensions identified through the SERVQUAL instrument. The mean of each dimension is calculated, this number then serves to suggest the perceptions that
customers have of the restaurants performance on that particular dimension. The mean of the five means is then calculated to determine customers' overall perception of the service quality of the restaurant. (Stevens et al, 1995)

Due to the number of questions within the DINESERV instrument and the fact that it was designed for restaurants, it was decided to omit some questions in order to maximize validity and reliability, make answering by the respondents less tedious and also to make the questionnaire more suited to fast food restaurants. The original DINESERV instrument contains 10 questions pertaining to tangibles, five questions pertaining to reliability, three questions pertaining to responsiveness, five questions pertaining to assurance and five questions pertaining to empathy.

The original 10 questions on tangibles pertaining to DINESERV are shown below:

1. Must have visually attractive parking areas and building exteriors
2. Has a visually attractive dining area
3. Has staff members who are clean, neat and appropriately dressed
4. Has decor in keeping with its image and price range
5. Has a menu that is easily readable
6. Has a visually attractive menu that reflects the restaurants image
7. Has a dining area that is comfortable and easy to move around in
8. Has restrooms that are thoroughly clean
9. Has dining areas that are thoroughly clean
10. Has comfortable seats in the dining room

The five that were omitted were:

1. Must have visually attractive parking areas and building exteriors
2. Has a visually attractive dining area
3. Has a menu that is easily readable
4. Has restrooms that are thoroughly clean
5. Has comfortable seats in the dining room.

The original 3 questions on responsiveness pertaining to DINESERV are shown below:

1. During busy times, has employees shift to help each other maintain speed and quality of service
2. Provides prompt and quick service
3. Makes extra effort to handle your special requests

The one that was omitted was:

1. Makes extra effort to handle your special requests

The original 5 questions on empathy pertaining to DINESERV are shown below:

1. Has employees who are sensitive to your needs and wants rather than always relying on policies and procedures
2. Makes you feel special
3. Anticipates your individual needs and wants

4. Has employees who are sympathetic and reassuring if something is wrong

5. Seems to have the customer’s best interests at heart

The question omitted was:

1. Anticipates your individual needs and wants

With the exception of omitting these questions the DINESERV instrument was used in its entirety.

Section D

This section comprised of two questions aimed at finding which chicken restaurant customers preferred and their reasons of choice. The first question was a closed ended question which gave choices between four chicken restaurants namely: KFC, Nandos, Hungry Lion, Chicken Licken.

The second was an open ended question asking the respondents to comment on their reasons of choice.

3.6.3 Distribution of questionnaires

The questionnaire was randomly distributed to black students and staff at the University of Zululand Main Campus as well as people residing in Richards Bay, eSikhalene and Empangeni shopping centres. 500 questionnaires were distributed and 350 were returned.
Research assistants were employed to assist in the distribution and collecting of questionnaires. A hundred questionnaires were each distributed to students, staff, residents in Richards Bay, residents in eSikhaleni and residents in Empangeni respectively. The distributed and returned questionnaires are displayed in the table below

**Table 4.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaires distributed</th>
<th>Questionnaires received</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students of University of Zululand</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of University of Zululand</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Richards Bay</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of eSikhaleni</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Empangeni</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SPSS estimates*

### 3.8 Data Analysis Techniques

Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry. They seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning. In contrast, quantitative studies emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework. (Denzin and Lincoln 1998:8)
Data analysis techniques, in contrast to methods, are particular, step-by-step procedures which are followed in order to gather data, and analyse them for the information they contain (Jankowicz, 2005). In analysing, a mixed methods approach using both qualitative and quantitative methods will be utilized. The methods used will be data descriptive statistics, correlation, regression and content analysis.

- Descriptive Statistics describes quantitative data in a summarised fashion in the form of pie charts and bar graphs (Blanche et al, 2006). This will be helpful in understanding consumer behaviour as well as getting a picture of the situation. Descriptive statistics will also be used to ascertain measures of central tendency as well as measures of dispersion. This will aid in understanding the differences between service dimensions.

- According to Zikmund and Babin (2007) regression analysis is a technique for measuring the linear association between a dependent and a number of independent variables. The explanatory power of regression lies in hypothesis testing. Regression is often used to test relational hypothesis (Zikmund and Babin 2007). It will be used in this study to test whether a relationship exists between a service quality dimension and service quality, and whether that effect was positive.

- ANOVA is the appropriate statistical technique to examine the effect of a less-than interval independent variable on an at least interval dependent variable (Zikmund and Babin 2007). In simple terms it enables the means of more than two groups to be compared. Analysis of variances (ANOVA) will be used to determine the difference of dimension scores in tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurances and empathy.
• Correlation analysis will be used to determine the relationship between customers' perceived service quality and their characteristics such as gender, age, and education achieved.

• Content analysis is a type of secondary data analysis used to analyze text, including, interview transcripts, newspapers, books, manuscripts, and Web sites to determine the frequency of specific words or ideas. The results of content analysis allow researchers to identify, as well as quantify, specific ideas, concepts, and their associated patterns, and trends of ideas that occur within a specific group or over time (Krippendorff 1980)

### 3.9 Validity and reliability issues

In order to delve into the issues of reliability and validity, it is proper to first layout a definition for the two. The definition of reliability and validity are as follows:

According to Joppe (2000), the definition of reliability is:

“…The extent to which results are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population under study is referred to as reliability and if the results of a study can be reproduced under a similar methodology, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable.”

“Validity determines whether the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are. In other words, does the research instrument allow you to hit "the bull’s eye" of your research object? Researchers generally determine
validity by asking a series of questions, and will often look for the answers in the research of others” (Joppe 2000 cited in Golafshani 2003).

With the definitions clearly stated we can begin to look into the issues relating to them. The issue lie mainly with the instrument used for data collection. The questionnaire design provides some measure of how reliable and valid the instrument is. In social sciences, insights about effective questionnaire design have been widely accepted. Oppenheim (1992) suggested that the words used in questions should be understandable to all respondents, and the meanings assigned to those words should be universal as possible among respondents. Parten (1950) suggested that question wording should avoid bias that would push answers one way or another. To minimise the impact of idiosyncrasies of item wordings, Likert (1932) suggested that it is best to aggregate answers to a battery of items into a single index. The items or questions used in the instrument, should be the few, efficient and effective, tapping the construct of interest, in order to maximize validity, minimize respondent burden, and minimize the financial costs of data collection.

The questionnaire used in this study is basically an adapted version of DINESERV. The questionnaire was pilot tested in English, to assess which questions needed to be eliminated or reconstructed as mentioned above. The next thing was to translate the instrument into Zulu as this is the local dialect spoken by many Blacks in the region. The questionnaire was translated and pilot tested repeatedly to ensure that the meanings of the questionnaire were as close as possible to the English version. The English and Zulu versions of the instrument were not separated but were on opposite sides on the same leaf of paper to reduce bias and also offer respondents the opportunity to choose which language they prefer in filling the questionnaire.
The DINESERV instrument as mentioned in Chapter 2, has been used successfully in measuring customer perceptions of customer service in a number of different contexts in restaurants for over a decade. The instrument validity and reliability is clear and has been adapted to fulfill and achieve the objectives of the study. Aside this, the reliability scores revealed in past studies using DINESERV have proven the instrument reliable in different countries. Nevertheless, the instrument needs to be tested for reliability in this context. Measures have been taken as mentioned above to maximize the instrument’s reliability and validity. These undertakings have enabled the instrument to truly measure South African consumers’ perceptions about customer service in fast food outlets.

The above is argued from a quantitative standpoint. Qualitatively, Stenbacka (2001) argues that since reliability issue concerns measurements, has no relevance in qualitative research. However, Stenbacka argues that the concept of validity needs to be redefined for qualitative purposes. Validity viewed from a qualitative standpoint can be interpreted to mean quality, rigor and trustworthiness (Stenbacka, 2001).

In maximising the validity and reliability both qualitatively and quantitatively, employment of triangulation in the study could be done. According to O’Donoghue and Punch (2003), triangulation is a “method of cross-checking data from multiple sources to search for regularities in the research data.” Denzin (1978) identified four basic types of triangulation:

- **Data triangulation**: involves time, space, and persons
- **Investigator triangulation**: involves multiple researchers in an investigation
- **Theory triangulation**: involves using more than one theoretical scheme in the interpretation of the phenomenon
• *Methodological triangulation*: involves using more than one method to gather data, such as interviews, observations, questionnaires, and documents.

One can thus view this study as employing methodological triangulation as the instrument’s validity is being compared to that of past studies in similar areas.

In concluding this area, the issues raised and discussed will be concluded finally in the final chapter, after the results obtained have been analysed to provide the answers sought.

### 3.9 Ethical Consideration

The permission to conduct this research will be sought from the Supervisor. All respondents will be informed about the confidentiality of the information gathered from them as the questionnaire will not require participants to identify themselves. To ensure this a consent form attached to the questionnaire is provided, addressing issues of confidentiality and stating clearly the risks benefits and contact details if any questions are raised about the instrument. In addition a brief of the research itself is provided to enable respondents to understand the study being conducted.

### 3.10 Summary
In this chapter we explored the methodology utilised for the study. Issues of sample size, distribution, instrumentation, as well as methods of analysis, validity and reliability issues were tackled. The all lead us to the Chapter four, which deals with the results of the study conducted and the analysis carried on them

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter a description of the results of the study will take place on a question-by-question basis. Section C of the questionnaire will be discussed with the five
individual service dimensions. All results will be presented in tables and diagrams. Recoding may be utilized for certain questions to simplify discussion.

4.2 Realization rate

350 elements, selected using non-probability convenience sampling made up the sample size for the study. For the sample frame Black individuals residing in the Umhlathuzi municipality were selected.

500 questionnaires were utilized for the study. Of the 500 dispersed, 350 were returned. The returned questionnaires contained instances where not all questions were answered. The realization of each individual question shall thus be given when the results are discussed.

4.3 Results on a question-by-question basis

Results on scaled questions will be reported by making use of mean values and the standard deviation. The realization rate by question will also be indicated. Section D as mentioned above, will be discussed using the five individual service dimensions.

4.3.1 Section A

Section A provided data collection for demographics to be used in classification. These classifications will be used for cross-tabulation later on in the analysis.
i) Question 1: Age in years

This question required that respondents indicate their age in years according to the preset age brackets. The results for question 1 is illustrated in Tables 4.1 and 4.2

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

Figure 4.1

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (RECODED)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 30</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and older</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

The largest percentage of respondents (53.1%) fell in the 20-29 year age bracket. This question was completed by all 348 respondents. Using 30 years of age as a midpoint, results were recoded into two categories namely younger than 30 years of age and respondents older than 30 years of age. Utilizing the recoded brackets younger than 30 years of age respondents represented 74.8% of respondents and older than 30 years of age respondents represented 24.6%.

ii) Question 2: Gender

This question asked respondents to indicate their gender. The results for question 2 are illustrated in Table 4.3

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates
Question 2 has been answered by the total sample of 349 respondents. Of the 349 respondents 145 (41.4%) were male and 204 (58.3%) were female.

iii) Question 3: Highest level of academic education achieved.

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest level of academic education achieved. The results for question 3 are illustrated in Table 4.4

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION ACHIEVED</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School lower than Grade 12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric / Grade 12</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree / Diploma</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Qualification</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of Data: SPSS estimates*

*Figure 4.2*
This question was answered by 340 of the 350 respondents. The results of this question are illustrated in Table 4.4 and Figure 4.2 and show that the majority of respondents (60.3%) had achieved grade 12 as their highest academic education. The second largest percentage (22.9%) of respondents had obtained a degree or diploma whilst only 4.3% obtained a post-graduate qualification. Respondents achieving other qualification accounted for 0.6%.

iv) Question 4: Number of times visit

Respondents were asked to indicate how many times they made use of a fast food restaurant during the past three months. The results for question 4 are illustrated in Table 4.5
### FREQUENCY OF RESTAURANT UTILISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times fast food restaurant has been visited in the past month</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

**Figure 4.3**

![Frequency of Restaurant Utilisation](image)

*Source of Data: SPSS generated bar graph*

This question was answered by 341 of the respondents resulting in a **97.5%** realization rate. A large percentage (28%) of respondents indicated that they had frequented restaurants more than 5 times in the foregone month.
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The major finding is that 28% of Black respondents have made use of a fast food restaurant service in the Umhlathuzi Municipality more than five times in a four week period.

4.3.2 Section B

Section B contained only one question. The question required respondents to choose between the five customer service dimensions, which dimension they felt was the most important. A brief description of each dimension was provided and respondents were asked to choose which of these dimensions they felt was important. The results for this section are illustrated in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability of the restaurant to perform the promised service accurately</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and dependably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The willingness of the staff to assist customers and to provide prompt</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge and courtesy of the staff</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalised or customised service that makes customers feel unique and</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of the restaurant, the equipment and the staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: SPSS estimates

From table 4.6 we can see that willingness of staff to assist customers and to provide prompt service was ranked the most important trait making up 22% of the responses.
This was followed by personalized or customized service that makes customers feel unique, which made up 17% of respondents. The ability of the restaurant to perform the promised service accurately and dependably and the appearance of the restaurant, equipment and staff both each contributed to 14% of the responses. Knowledge and courtesy of the staff made the lowest percentage (9.4%).

Each of the statements in Section B of the questionnaire were brief descriptions for the five service quality dimensions. The dimensions will now be discussed in relation to the results displayed in Table 4.6.

**Statement 1- The ability of the restaurant to perform the promised service accurately**

This statement referred to the reliability dimension. This dimension in importance ranking was third along with tangibles.

**Statement 2- The willingness of the staff to assist customers and to provide prompt service**

This statement referred to the responsiveness dimension. This dimension in importance ranking was the most important.

**Statement 3- The knowledge and courtesy of staff**

This statement referred to the assurance dimension. This dimension in importance ranking was the least important.

**Statement 4- Personalized or customized service that makes customers feel unique and special**
This statement referred to the empathy dimension. This dimension came second in importance ranking.

**Statement 5- Appearance of the restaurant, the equipment and the staff**

This statement referred to the tangibles dimension. This dimension in importance ranking was third along with reliability.

### 4.3.2.1 Major findings for Section B

After analyzing the results for Section B the following major findings were established:

1. Responsiveness was the most important dimension amongst Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality.

2. Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality view Empathy as the second most important dimension, followed by tangibles and reliability which in terms of importance are perceived to be equal.

3. Assurance to Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality is the least important.

### 4.3.4 Section C

Section C was based on the DINESERV instrument that was developed by Stevens, Knutson and Patton (1995) as described in Chapter 2. The instrument was used in this section to determine how respondents (customers) perceive service quality of
restaurants in the Umhlathuzi Municipality. Respondents were required to evaluate their last dining experience in a KFC fast food outlet by indicating the degree of agreement with the statements.

As mentioned earlier, Section C will not be discussed on a question-by-question basis but rather by individual service quality dimension. The effects of demographic characteristics on the perception of the dining experience will then be analyzed.

**Reliability analysis for Section C**

A reliability analysis was conducted on section C by utilizing Cronbach’s alpha. The results of the analysis are illustrated in Table 4.7.

### Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>11 – 12</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>13 – 18</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>19 – 22</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 – 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.941</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha ≥ 0.7 is indicative of reliability applies, the Cronbach’s alpha recorded for Section C overall of 0.964 indicates reliability in the overall measurement of all the service quality dimensions.

**Tangibles**

Questions 1-5 of Section C relate to the tangibles dimension. The results are illustrated in Table 4.8 and Figures 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8
Figure 4.4

Q1: This restaurant has staff members who are clean, neat and appropriately dressed

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.5
Q2: This restaurant has decor in keeping with its image and price range

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.6

Q3: This restaurant has a visually attractive menu that reflects the restaurant’s image

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.7
Q4: This restaurant has a dining area that is comfortable and easy to move around in

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.8

Q5. This restaurant has dining areas that are thoroughly clean

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Table 4.8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: This restaurant has staff members who are clean, neat and appropriately dressed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2: This restaurant has decor in keeping with its image and price range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3: This restaurant has a visually attractive menu that reflects the restaurant’s image</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4: This restaurant has a dining area that is comfortable and easy to move around in</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5. This restaurant has dining areas that are thoroughly clean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tangibles dimension overall | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
---------------------------|---|------|---------------|
Valid                     |    | 3.76 | 0.9399        |
Missing                   |    |      |               |

Source of data: SPSS estimates

As can be seen in Table 4.8, the mean for the tangibles dimension is 3.76 indicating that respondents overall are generally satisfied with tangibles. From the pie charts above, majority of the respondents agreed with the questions in this dimension.

A lower standard deviation is indicative of consistency. The standard deviation recorded for the different questions relating to this service dimension all indicate that the responses were relatively consistent in the answers of respondents.

Within this dimension and the questions posed it appears that staff that are clean, neat and appropriately dressed is the tangible indicator that restaurants seem to achieve more regularly as observed with a mean score of 3.7. The standard deviation for this question was also the lowest recorded for this dimension indicating that answers for this question were more consistent than recorded for the other four questions.

The mean for question 4 was the lowest in the group and the standard deviation the highest, an indication of mixed responses and also an indication that the restaurant could improve in this area.

Reliability analysis for tangibles dimension
The decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha $\geq 0.7$ is indicative of reliability was applied. The Cronbach’s alpha recorded for this dimension is 0.844, indicative of reliability in the measurement of this dimension.

**Reliability**

Questions 6 – 10 relate to the reliability dimension of service quality. The results recorded are illustrated in Figures 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13 and Table 4.9

**Figure 4.9**

![Pie chart](source_of_data)

*Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart*

**Figure 4.10**
Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.11

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.12
Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.13

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Table 4.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6: This restaurant serves you in the time promised</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: This restaurant quickly corrects anything that is wrong</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: This restaurant is dependable and consistent</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: This restaurant provides an accurate bill</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: This restaurant serves your food exactly as you ordered it</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability dimension overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td>0.970492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of data: SPSS estimates*

Overall respondents indicated that the fast food restaurant was relatively successful in delivering on the reliability dimension. This is proven by the overall mean score for the dimension (3.685). As mentioned above, a lower standard deviation is indicative of consistency. The standard deviation recorded for the different questions relating to this service dimension all indicate that the responses were relatively consistent in the answers of respondents.

The mean for question 6 and 7 was the lowest in the group and the standard deviation for both questions were the highest. This is an indication of mixed responses for the questions and also an indication that the restaurant could improve in these areas.

Within this dimension it would appear that the fast food restaurants are successful in serving food exactly as ordered as indicated by the highest mean score of 4.17 and the second lowest standard deviation of 0.899.

*Reliability analysis for reliability dimension*
If the decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha $\geq 0.7$ is indicative of reliability applies, the Cronbach’s alpha recorded for this dimension of 0.838 would indicate reliability in the measurement of this dimension as indicated in Table 4.7

**Responsiveness**

Questions 11 – 12 relate to the reliability dimension of service quality. The results recorded are illustrated in Figures 4.14, 4.15 and Table 4.10.

**Figure 4.14**

**Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart**

**Figure 4.15**
Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11: This restaurant during busy times, has employees shift to help each other maintain speed and quality of service</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12: This restaurant provides prompt and quick service</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness dimension overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.989954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the means of the dimensions analyzed thus far, it would appear that fast food restaurants are less successful in achieving customer satisfaction due to this dimension as implied by the lower mean score (3.47) when compared to the mean scores obtained for tangibles and reliability which were 3.76 and 3.685 respectively. If the decision-rule that a lower standard deviation is indicative of consistency applies, then overall answers for this dimension were rather consistent. Though one could argue that the overall answers for tangibles (0.9399) and reliability (0.970492)
were more consistent than responsiveness \((0.989954)\) due to the relatively lower standard deviations both attained compared to responsiveness.

The results recorded are not surprising, giving that the two questions in this dimension are similar to the question 6 (The restaurant serves you in the time promised) and 7 (The restaurant quickly corrects anything that is wrong) in the reliability dimension. All questions had a mean of about 3.4 and had standard deviations between 1.011 and 0.94, a clear indication that service could be improved in these areas.

Reliability analysis for responsiveness dimension

If the decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha \(\geq 0.7\) is indicative of reliability applies, the Cronbach’s alpha recorded for this dimension of 0.743 would indicate reliability in the measurement of this dimension as indicated in Table 4.7

Assurance

Questions 13 – 18 relate to the assurance dimension of service quality. The results recorded are illustrated in Figures 4.16, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 4.20, 4.21 and Table 4.11
Figure 4.16

Q13: This restaurant has employees who can answer your questions completely

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.17

Q14: makes you comfortable and confident in your dealings with them

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Figure 4.18

Q15: The restaurant has personnel who are able and willing to give you information about menu items, ingredients and preparation

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.19

Q16: The restaurant makes you feel personally safe

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Figure 4.20

Q17: The restaurant has personnel who seem well trained, competent and experienced

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.21

Q18: The restaurant seems to give employees support so that they can do their jobs well

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13:</td>
<td>The restaurant has employees who can answer your questions completely</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14:</td>
<td>The restaurant makes you comfortable and confident in your dealings with them</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15:</td>
<td>The restaurant has personnel who are able and willing to give you information about menu items, ingredients and preparation</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16:</td>
<td>The restaurant makes you feel personally safe</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17:</td>
<td>The restaurant has personnel who seem well trained, competent and experienced</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18:</td>
<td>The restaurant seems to give employees support so that they can do their jobs well</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Dimension overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.961838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

Comparing the means of the dimensions analyzed thus far, it would appear that fast food restaurants are less successful in creating assurance for their customers than they are creating acceptable tangibles and achieving reliability. A mean score of 3.52 compared to 3.76 and 3.685 for tangibles and reliability, respectively supports the argument.

Within this dimension and the questions posed it appears that the fast food restaurants give employees support to do their job well. This is supported by a mean score of 3.65. The standard deviation for this question was also the lowest recorded for this dimension indicating that answers for this question were more consistent than answers recorded for other questions.

The mean for question 15 was the lowest in the group and of all the questions thus far, the standard deviation is also the highest in the group and among the highest overall, an indication of mixed responses and also an indication that the restaurant could improve in this area.
If the decision-rule that a lower standard deviation is indicative of consistency applies, then overall answers for this dimension were rather consistent, since the overall standard deviation \((0.961838)\) when compared to that of tangibles \((0.9399)\), reliability \((0.970492)\) and responsiveness \((0.989954)\) is relatively low.

Reliability analysis for assurance dimension

If the decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha \(\geq 0.7\) is indicative of reliability applies, the Cronbach’s alpha recorded for this dimension of 0.793 would indicate reliability in the measurement of this dimension as indicated in Table 4.7

Empathy

Questions 19 – 22 related to the reliability dimension of service quality. The results recorded are illustrated in Figures 4.22, 4.23, 4.24, 4.25 and Table 4.12
Figure 4.22

**Q19: The restaurant has employees who are sensitive to your needs and wants rather than always relying on policies and procedures**

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.23

**Q20: The restaurant makes you feel special**

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Figure 4.24

Q21: The restaurant has employees who are sympathetic and reassuring if something is wrong

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

Figure 4.25

Q22: The restaurant seems to have the customers best interest at heart

Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart
Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19: The restaurant has employees who are sensitive to your needs and wants rather than always relying on policies and procedures</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20: The restaurant makes you feel special</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21: The restaurant has employees who are sympathetic and reassuring if something is wrong</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22: The restaurant seems to have the customer's best interests at heart</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy dimension overall</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.002769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

Responses in this dimension indicate that the fast food restaurants are not empathetic. This is argued by the overall mean score for the dimension. Empathy (3.383) is the lowest compared to tangibles, reliability, responsiveness and assurance which have a mean score of 3.76, 3.685, 3.47 and 3.52, respectively.

The mean for question 19 was the lowest in the group and of all the questions thus far, the standard deviation is also the highest in the group and among the highest overall, an indication of mixed responses and also an indication that the restaurant could improve in this area.

The decision-rule that a lower standard deviation is indicative of consistency was used. Thus, overall answers for this dimension were heterogeneous in nature, since the overall standard deviation (1.002769) when compared to that of tangibles (0.9399), reliability (0.970492), responsiveness (0.989954) and assurance (0.961838) is relatively high.
Reliability analysis for empathy dimension

If the decision-rule that a Cronbach’s alpha ≥ 0.7 is indicative of reliability then, the Cronbach’s alpha recorded for this dimension of 0.839 would indicate reliability in the measurement of this dimension as indicated in Table 4.7.

4.3.4.1 Major findings for Section C

The following major findings were established from the results for Section C.

I. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are most successful in creating tangibles in an effort to achieve service quality.

II. Within the tangible dimension it appears that staff that are clean, neat and appropriately dressed is the tangible indicator that KFC restaurants seem to achieve more regularly.

III. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are relatively more successful in delivering the promised service (reliability) compared to their staffs knowledge and courtesy (assurance) in their efforts to deliver quality service.

IV. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are successful in serving food exactly as ordered.

V. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurant employees are not successful in their keenness to assist customers and their delivery of prompt service. Delivery of prompt service
relates to the responsiveness dimension, which in Section B was found to be the most important dimension.

VI. All the dimensions of service quality put together, empathy was shown to be the dimension that KFC fast food restaurants are least successful in achieving. This dimension was the second most important dimension to Black customers of the Umhlathuze Municipality in Section B.

4.3.5 Section D

Section consisted of a closed ended and open ended question. The closed ended question asked respondents to make a choice between four chicken restaurants, which they would go to. The restaurants were as follows:

- KFC
- Nandos
- Chicken Licken
- Hungry Lion

The results are illustrated in Figure 4.26

Figure 4.26
Source of Data: SPSS generated pie chart

From Figure 4.26 it is clear that the majority of the respondents prefer Nandos and KFC with KFC being slightly dominant. The next restaurant the respondents preferred was Chicken Licken followed by Hungry Lion. The low percentages for Chicken Licken and Hungry Lion indicate market superiority from Nandos and KFC. Nandos however is a bit of a restaurant and a fast food outlet all in one so, operates slightly differently from the other three chicken restaurants which are all fast food outlets.

The comments made in Section D can be grouped into a number of themes namely service, food and menu, location and marketing.
A summary of the major findings made for each restaurant will be discussed under these themes.

4.3.5.1 KFC

43% of the respondents selected KFC as a restaurant of choice they will visit. Below is a summary of the reasons why the respondents selected KFC.

Service

Under this theme respondents praised KFC in the areas of fast delivery, the neatness and décor of the restaurants, the empathetic nature in which employees treat their customers and the knowledge of employees about the products they are selling.

Food and menu

KFC was praised for its unique blend of spices to create a chicken taste that is consistent all over. The variety of food options and the affordability all contribute to why respondents love the restaurant. The tenderness of the chicken was also mentioned by some as a feature they loved about the restaurant.

Location

This is one area where only KFC received praise. A number of respondents commented to the availability of KFC everywhere they went. One even mentioned that it was the only restaurant in proximity to his home and the only one he knew. To the respondents it seems that the spread of KFC branches all over the country’s suburbs, towns and townships have made the restaurant a favourite in the Black community.
Marketing

KFC adverts and the packaging of their meals as commented by a respondent, is the reason for some making it a restaurant of choice. A number of respondents commented simply using the KFC slogan “its finger licking good”. The loyalty expressed in some respondents’ comments is an indication of good marketing as well as all other factors combined.

4.3.5.2 Nandos

41% of the respondents selected Nandos as a restaurant of choice they will visit. Below is a summary of the reasons why the respondents selected Nandos.

Service

Under this theme respondents praised Nandos particularly in the areas of neatness and décor of the restaurants. The décor of the restaurant was commented in more detail than other restaurants in Section D. The empathetic nature of employees in their service delivery and treatment of their customers seem to win the hearts of a number of respondents.

Food and menu

Nandos was praised in the same manner as KFC for its consistent chicken taste and spices used. The variety of food options and the affordability also received praise. However, Nandos received critical acclaim for “healthy” chicken. The grilling of Nandos chicken with little oil from respondents’ comments seemed to be the major reason why the restaurant was chosen.

Marketing
Nandos adverts were commented by some respondents as an attractive feature that led them to purchasing food and making them loyal customers.

4.3.5.3 Hungry Lion

4% of the respondents selected Hungry Lion as a restaurant of choice they will visit. Below is a summary of the reasons why the respondents selected Hungry Lion.

Food and menu

Hungry Lion was praised mainly for its value for money. A number of respondents commented on the quantity of chicken received for the price paid. The prices from the respondents' point of view are affordable and the varieties of food options make it a reason why the restaurant is chosen by some.

4.3.5.4 Chicken Licken

9% of the respondents selected Chicken Licken as a restaurant of choice they will visit. Below is a summary of the reasons why the respondents selected Chicken Licken.

Food and menu

Chicken Licken was praised mainly for its unique taste. The hot wings and spiced chicken served in this restaurant seemed to be the main reason why respondents choose it. The affordability combined with the taste is enough reason for some respondents to stay loyal to this brand.
4.3.6 Summary of major findings

The results obtained in this study yielded the following findings:

I. The major finding is that 28% of Black respondents have made use of a fast food restaurant service in the Umhlathuzi Municipality more than five times in a four week period. This is indicative of the frequency of use of fast food restaurant services.

II. Responsiveness was the most important dimension amongst Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality.

III. Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality view Empathy as the second most important dimension, followed by tangibles and reliability which in terms of importance are perceived to be equal.

IV. Assurance to Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality is the least important.

V. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are most successful in creating tangibles in an effort to achieve service quality.

VI. Within the tangible dimension it appears that staff that are clean, neat and appropriately dressed is the tangible indicator that KFC restaurants seem to achieve more regularly.
VII. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are relatively more successful in delivering the promised service (reliability) compared to their staffs knowledge and courtesy (assurance) in their efforts to deliver quality service.

VIII. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are successful in serving food exactly as ordered.

IX. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurant employees are not successful in their keenness to assist customers, their delivery of prompt service, ability to serve you in the time promised and quickly correct anything that is wrong. Delivery of prompt service relates to the responsiveness dimension, which in Section B was found to be the most important dimension.

X. All the dimensions of service quality put together, empathy was shown to be the dimension that KFC fast food restaurants are least successful in achieving. This dimension was the second most important dimension to Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality in Section B.

XI. KFC and Nandos were the chicken restaurants of choice with the highest percentages of 45% and 41% respectively.

XII. Service in all chicken restaurants in section D was perceived to have good service in the areas of delivery and the empathetic nature in which employees treat their customers.

XIII. KFC was praised for its unique blend of spices to create a chicken taste that is consistent all over.
XIV. KFC was praised for its availability. To the respondents it seems that the spread of KFC branches all over the country’s suburbs, towns and townships have made the restaurant a favourite in the Black community.

XV. Marketing has an effect on restaurant choice. Nandos and KFC from respondents’ perception use successful marketing tactics especially in the area of advertising to attract customers.

XVI. The grilling of Nandos chicken with little oil from respondents’ comments seemed to be the major reason why the restaurant was chosen.

XVII. Hungry Lion value for money and quantity of chicken received for the price paid is the major reason why the restaurant was chosen.

XVIII. The hot wings and spiced chicken served in Chicken Licken is the main reason why respondents choose it.

4.4 Hypotheses testing

The hypotheses relating to the descriptive component of this study were tested by utilizing regression analysis and correlation analysis. Regression analysis was used to test the first five hypotheses and the rest were tested using correlation analysis.

The first five hypotheses as described in Chapter 3 all test whether a relationship exists between a service quality dimension and service quality, and whether that
effect was positive. To determine this, only respondents who answered all questions in Section C were selected. This amounted to 298 subjects.

The mean of a respondent answers in this case was service quality (dependant variable) and the mean of each of the answers within a service quality dimension were the service quality dimensions (independent variables).

**Hypothesis 1**

$H_{1a}$: The physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant has a strong relationship with service quality

$H_{1b}$: The better the physical design and appearance of the fast food restaurant, the greater the level service quality

Physical design and appearance are represented by the tangibles dimension.

Results for the regression analysis are illustrated in Table 4.13
The coefficient of determination or $R^2$, is 0.987059 as shown in Table 4.13. This may be interpreted to mean that 98.7 percent of the variation in service quality was explained by associating the variable to tangibles. This indicates a strong relationship between the tangibles (independent variable) and service quality (dependent variable). An F test was used to determine whether these results, with such a high $R^2$ value, occurred by chance.

Assuming an Alpha value of 0.05, the probability that an F value this high occurred by chance is 6.3044E-274, an extremely small probability leading us to reject the proposition that this occurrence was by chance.

*Based on the results above $H_{1a}$ must be accepted*

Using the Raw coefficients from Table 4.13, the estimated regression line is
Y = 0.617X + 1.252

Positive slope suggests a positive relationship between tangibles and service quality.

In other words, the stronger a customer perceives tangibles the stronger the perception of service quality.

*Based on the results above H₁b must be accepted*

**Hypothesis 2**

H₂a: The reliability dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

H₂b: The more reliable the service provided the greater the level of service quality

Results for the regression analysis are illustrated in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.995953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000 (Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of Data: SPSS estimates*
The coefficient of determination or $R^2$, is 0.966287 as shown in Table 4.14. This may be interpreted to mean that 96.6 percent of the variation in service quality was explained by associating the variable to reliability. This indicates a strong relationship between the reliability (independent variable) and service quality (dependent variable). An F test was used to determine whether these results, with a high $R^2$ value, occurred by chance.

Assuming an Alpha value of 0.05, the probability that an F value this high occurred by chance is 2.0860E-303, an extremely small probability leading us to reject the proposition that this occurrence was by chance.

**Based on the results above $H_{2a}$ must be accepted**

Using the Raw coefficients from Table 4.14, the estimated regression line is

\[ Y = 0.743X + 0.843 \]

Positive slope suggests a positive relationship between reliability and service quality. In other words, the stronger a customer perceives reliability the stronger the perception of service quality.

**Based on the results above $H_{2b}$ must be accepted**

**Hypothesis 3**

$H_{3a}$: The responsiveness dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

$H_{3b}$: The more responsive the service provided the greater the level of service quality
Results for the regression analysis are illustrated in Tables 4.15.

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9999936</td>
<td>0.999872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(b)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3697.306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35367.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>104.8507</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3802.1567</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

The coefficient of determination or $R^2$, is 0.999872 as shown in Table 4.15. This may be interpreted to mean that 99.9 percent of the variation in service quality was explained by associating the variable to responsiveness. This indicates a strong relationship between the reliability (independent variable) and service quality (dependent variable). An F test was used to determine whether these results, with high $R^2$ value, occurred by chance.

Assuming an Alpha value of 0.05, the probability that an F value this high occurred by chance is $1.3056E-226$, an extremely small probability leading us to reject the proposition that this occurrence was by chance.

Based on the results above $H_{3a}$ must be accepted
Using the Raw coefficients from Table 4.15, the estimated regression line is

\[ Y = 0.439X + 2.061 \]

Positive slope suggests a positive relationship between responsiveness and service quality. In other words, the stronger a customer perceives responsiveness the stronger the perception of service quality.

*Based on the results above \( H_{3b} \) must be accepted*

**Hypothesis 4**

\( H_{4a} \): The assurance dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

\( H_{4b} \): The assurance dimension has a positive effect on service quality

Results for the regression analysis are illustrated in Tables 4.16.
Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.995661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of Squares</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000 (Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: SPSS estimates

The coefficient of determination or $R^2$, is 0.99134 as shown in Table 4.16. This may be interpreted to mean that 99.1 percent of the variation in service quality was explained by associating the variable to assurance. This indicates a strong relationship between the assurance (independent variable) and service quality (dependent variable). An F test was used to determine whether these results, with high $R^2$ value, occurred by chance.

Assuming an Alpha value of 0.05, the probability that an F value this high occurred by chance is 4.7669E-299, an extremely small probability leading us to reject the proposition that this occurrence was by chance.

Based on the results above $H_{a0}$ must be accepted

Using the Raw coefficients from Table 4.16, the estimated regression line is
\[ Y = 0.683X + 1.193 \]

Positive slope suggests a positive relationship between assurance and service quality. In other words, the stronger a customer perceives assurance the stronger the perception of service quality.

**Based on the results above \( H_{4b} \) must be accepted**

**Hypothesis 5**

\( H_{5a} \): The empathy dimension has a strong relationship with service quality

\( H_{5b} \): The empathy dimension has a positive effect on service quality

Results for the regression analysis are illustrated in Tables 4.17.

**Table 4.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.991056</td>
<td>0.982192</td>
<td>0.484874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(b)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( F )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3734.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15884.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>67.70954</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3802.15654</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients: B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized Beta (( \beta ))</th>
<th>Coefficient:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.720657</td>
<td>0.086076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
<td>0.551326</td>
<td>0.024792</td>
<td>1.035375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of Data: SPSS estimates*
The coefficient of determination or $R^2$, is 0.99134 as shown in Table 4.17. This may be interpreted to mean that 99.1 percent of the variation in service quality was explained by associating the variable to empathy. This indicates a strong relationship between empathy (independent variable) and service quality (dependent variable). An F test was used to determine whether these results, with high $R^2$ value, occurred by chance.

Assuming an Alpha value of 0.05, the probability that an F value this high occurred by chance is 5.8211E-254, an extremely small probability leading us to reject the proposition that this occurrence was by chance.

**Based on the results above $H_{5a}$ must be accepted**

Using the Raw coefficients from Table 4.17, the estimated regression line is

$$Y = 0.551X + 1.172$$

Positive slope suggests a positive relationship between empathy and service quality. In other words, the stronger a customer perceives empathy the stronger the perception of service quality.

**Based on the results above $H_{5b}$ must be accepted**

**Hypothesis 6**

$H_6$: A negative relationship exists between age and service quality
For this and the remaining hypotheses correlation analysis will be used. For correlation only respondents who answered all questions were used, this was done to ensure accuracy.

Between age and service quality the correlation coefficient is

\[ r = 0.05087 \]

A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between service quality and age.

**Based on the results above \( H_6 \) must be rejected**

\( H_7 \): A negative relationship exists between gender and service quality

Between gender and service quality the correlation coefficient is

\[ r = -0.0821 \]

A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between service quality and gender.

**Based on the results above \( H_7 \) must be rejected**

\( H_8 \): A negative relationship exists between education achieved and service quality

Between education achieved and service quality the correlation coefficient is

\[ r = 0.0534 \]
A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between service quality and education achieved.

**Based on the results above \( H_8 \) must be rejected**

\( H_9: \) A negative relationship exists between age and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services.

Between age and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services, the correlation coefficient is

\[
r = -0.0158
\]

A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between age and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services.

**Based on the results above \( H_9 \) must be rejected**

\( H_{10}: \) A negative relationship exists between gender and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services

Between gender and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services, the correlation coefficient is

\[
r = -0.0135
\]
A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between gender and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services.

*Based on the results above $H_{10}$ must be rejected*

$H_{11}$: A negative relationship exists between education achieved and frequency of utilisation of fast food restaurant services

Between education achieved and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services, the correlation coefficient is

\[ r = 0.0534 \]

A value close to one is indicative of a strong relationship. A value close to zero is indicative of a poor relationship. The correlation coefficient above is thus indicates a lack of relationship between education and frequency of utilization of fast food restaurant services.

*Based on the results above $H_{11}$ must be rejected*

### 4.5 Summary

This chapter provided results that were recorded for the total sample from which a list of major findings were developed.

The hypotheses formulated for this study were tested by utilizing regression analysis. Based on these results hypotheses accepted were hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Those rejected were 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1 Introduction

Chapter four was dedicated to discussing the results and findings of the study conducted. In this last and final chapter, a provision of a brief summary is made on the problem, methodology and major findings. Based on the results discussed in the previous chapter, recommendations will be made. The research objectives discussed will also be looked at. A brief discussion will take place as to whether they were achieved or not.

5.2 A brief summary of the problem

The purpose of this study is to validate five dimensions of service quality contained in the DINESERV Instrument in a fast food restaurant and explore the differences in perceived service quality for Black customers residing in South Africa. These dimensions were identified and discussed in Chapter 2. These were further tested and analyzed for reliability and importance.
5.3 A brief summary on the methodology

The procedure for carrying out the research and its findings were discussed in Chapters three and four. Utilizing a self completion questionnaire data for quantitative and qualitative research was obtained. The development of the questionnaire and sampling process were all discussed in Chapter 3.

5.4 A brief summary on the major findings

Based on the findings discussed in Chapter four, the following major findings can be drawn.

I. Responsiveness is regarded the most important dimension of service quality amongst Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality. This is followed by Empathy. Tangibles and reliability which follow next in terms of importance are perceived to be equal. Assurance to Black fast food restaurant users in the Umhlathuzi Municipality is the least important.

II. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that KFC fast food restaurants are most successful in creating tangibles in an effort to achieve service quality.

III. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality indicated a perception that fast food restaurants are relatively more successful in delivering the promised service (reliability) compared to their staff knowledge and courtesy (assurance) in their efforts to deliver quality service.
IV. All the dimensions of service quality put together, empathy was shown to be the most important dimension of the dining experience. Black consumers in the Umhlathuzi Municipality believe that empathy is the dimension that fast food restaurants are least successful in achieving when compared to the other dimensions.

V. Black customers of the Umhlathuzi Municipality visit chicken restaurants because of the taste that chicken restaurants create, variety of menu and value for money.

5.5 Limitations

The researcher attempted to conduct extensive research into the literature for this study. It is however possible that relevant or important literature on the subject of service quality on restaurants may have been excluded.

The study was limited in the sense that it was confined to the fast food restaurant industry.

A further limitation is the fact that not all areas in the Umhlathuzi Municipality were involved and that no specific sample frame was available.
5.6 Research Objectives

The research objectives will now be looked at in relation to the findings in Chapter four to assess whether they were met. The research objectives as mentioned in Chapter 1 are:

- To validate the five dimensions of service quality (Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy) in a fast food restaurant.

- To determine which of the service quality dimensions are important amongst blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality in the fast food restaurant industry.

- To validate DINSERV as a reliable instrument to be used in fast food restaurants in a South African context.

- To determine whether the service quality dimensions have a positive effect on service quality.

- To determine reasons why blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality visit chicken restaurants

- To determine whether a negative relationship exists between frequency of utilization and age, gender and education achieved.

- To determine whether a negative relationship exists between service quality and age, gender and education achieved.
Regarding validation of the dimensions of service quality and the DINESERV instrument in fast food restaurants in South Africa, the researcher believes that the findings in Chapter four indicate that both the dimensions and DINESERV instrument are reliable.

From the major findings recently discussed the researcher was able to determine which service quality dimensions are important to blacks in the Umhlathuzi Municipality in the fast food restaurant industry.

Hypothesis testing with regression analysis in Chapter four enabled us to determine that all service dimensions had a positive relationship with service quality.

Section D of the questionnaire administered enabled us to identify reasons why people visit chicken restaurants. The findings here were summarized under major findings.

Correlation analysis enabled us to obtain our last two objectives. Both service quality and frequency of utilization had a negative relationship with age, gender and education achieved.
5.7 Recommendations for restaurant owners and future research

Management has to understand the dynamics of how customers decide how much to spend, where and what to eat. Understanding why people go out to eat is essential. Not just because they’re hungry and have no the time to eat at home, or are away from home and dependent on restaurants. Socializing and doing business also come into the frame (Andaleeb and Conway, 2006: 10).

Restaurants must thus consider the extent to which they can facilitate these business transactions, and social gatherings since, the meal is not the only reason why people visit a fast food restaurant. (Andaleeb and Conway, 2006: 10).

From the results it is clear that Black consumers visit chicken restaurants for a number of reasons. It is however clear that each of the restaurants mentioned in Section D of the questionnaire have a unique marketing mix blend that distinguishes them from competition. That being said it is important to consider the things that Nandos and KFC are achieving that attracts people to them.

Nandos is a popular choice to most people due to the way they prepare their chicken. From respondents' comments it seems that the grilling of their meat as opposed to frying is seen as a healthier and yet tastier option.

This results from the fact that the black consumer today is more weight conscious and looks out for healthier options. Others could learn from this and implement other food items or introduce grilled chicken on their menu to attract black customers.
Though KFC received praise for its consistent and tasty chicken taste it was criticized by a number of respondents that selected Nandos as a restaurant of choice. This was mainly due the method of cooking chicken that KFC used. Some see it as unhealthy and criticize the chicken for being oily. Despite these remarks a lot of people like KFC. One reason that distinguished KFC from the rest according to consumers is the availability due to the large number of outlets the company has. KFC alone has six outlets in Empangeni, Esikhawini and Richards Bay, compared to two for Nandos, three for Chicken Licken and one for Hungry Lion. The likelihood to choose KFC because of convenience and availability is larger than for the other restaurants.

This works for KFC because of its marketing mix. Fast food restaurants or restaurants with a similar mix could use the same strategy to its advantage.

From the results we find that responsiveness is of great importance and empathy is viewed as the dimension that fast food restaurants achieve less successfully. Andaleeb and Conway (2006) comment: “It is important to develop appropriate programs and provide ongoing training on the various attributes of responsiveness to strengthen employees’ ability to improve customer service. Although easy to suggest, instilling these qualities in the frontline personnel and gaining their commitment can be challenging.” Programs can be designed using elements in DINESERV to improve the empathy dimension in fast food restaurants.

Further research must therefore be done to explore the reasons why fast food restaurants are less successful in achieving empathy.

Further research must also go into reasons why people choose restaurants.
As pointed out however, one of the limitations of this study was the fact that it focused on the Empangeni, Esikhawini and Richards Bay areas of the Umhlathuzi municipality. A study of the whole municipality is therefore recommended.
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UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND
Research Participant Information and Consent Form

Title of the Study: An investigation of customer satisfaction amongst black customers in the fast food industry

Principal Investigator: Terry Contogiannis (phone: 0829402345)
(email:econtogi@pan.uzulu.ac.za)

Student Researcher: Paul Forjoe jnr (phone: 0723379250)

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in a research study about the quality of fast food restaurant services.

You have been asked to participate because you meet the research parameters of the sample that is needed for this investigation.

The purpose of the research is to investigate the quality of fast food restaurant services amongst black people within the Umhlathuzi Municipality.

This study will include Black persons within the ages of 15 to 60.

This questionnaire can be answered in your own time and space. Please return the questionnaire back however when you are done.

WHAT WILL MY PARTICIPATION INVOLVE?

If you decide to participate in this research you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire. Your participation will last approximately 15 min per session.

ARE THERE ANY RISKS TO ME?

We don't anticipate any risks to you from participation in this study.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS TO ME?

We don't expect any direct benefits to you from participation in this study.
HOW WILL MY CONFIDENTIALITY BE PROTECTED?

While there will probably be publications as a result of this study, your name will not be used. Only group characteristics will be published.

WHOM SHOULD I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

You may ask any questions about the research at any time. If you have questions about the research after you leave today you should contact the Principal Investigator Terry Contogiannis at 0829402345. You may also call the student researcher, Paul Forjoe jnr at 0723379250.

If you are not satisfied with response of research team, have more questions, or want to talk with someone about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the Faculty Supervisor Irrshad Kaseeram at 035 902 6425

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide not to participate or to withdraw from the study it will have no effect on any services or treatment you are currently receiving.

Your signature indicates that you have read this consent form, had an opportunity to ask any questions about your participation in this research and voluntarily consent to participate.

Name of Participant (please print):_____________________________________

Signature_________________________________________________________

Date_____________________________________________________________
Dear Sir/Madam

I am a MComm student in the Department of Business Management of the University of Zululand. I am currently conducting research into the quality of fast food restaurant services. Your assistance in this research will really be appreciated.

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher, Paul Forjoe Jnr (0723379250).

As the questionnaire is anonymous, please answer the questions as honestly as possible. It should not take longer than a few minutes to complete. Please answer all questions.

SECTION A

Indicate answer by means of a (X) in the appropriate block

1. Age in years

| Younger than 19 | 1 |
| 20 - 29 | 2 |
| 30 - 39 | 3 |
| 40 - 49 | 4 |
| 50 and above | 5 |

2. Gender

| Male | 1 |
| Female | 2 |

3. Highest education achieved

| Secondary school lower than grade 12 | 1 |
| Matric / Grade 12 | 2 |
| Degree / Diploma | 3 |
| Post Graduate Qualification | 4 |
| Other qualification please specify........................................................... | 5 |

4. How many times have you made use of a fast food restaurant service in the past month?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | More than 5 |
**SECTION B**

Please mark with an (X) which of the following is the most important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ability of the restaurant to perform the promised service accurately and dependably</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The willingness of the staff to assist customers and to provide prompt service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge and courtesy of the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalised or customised service that makes customers feel unique and special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of the restaurant, the equipment and the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C**

Instructions

Please evaluate the following statements and choose one of the options which you feel is appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please evaluate a KFC restaurant that you have visited most recently. This restaurant .................**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. has staff members who are clean, neat and appropriately dressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. has decor in keeping with its image and price range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. has a visually attractive menu that reflects the restaurant's image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. has a dining area that is comfortable and easy to move around in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please evaluate a KFC restaurant that you have visited most recently. This restaurant .................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. has dining areas that are thoroughly clean</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. serves you in the time promised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. quickly corrects anything that is wrong</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. is dependable and consistent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. provides an accurate bill</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. serves your food exactly as you ordered it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. during busy times, has employees shift to help each other maintain speed and quality of service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. provides prompt and quick service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. has employees who can answer your questions completely</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. makes you comfortable and confident in your dealings with them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. has personnel who are able and willing to give you information about menu items, ingredients and preparation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. makes you feel personally safe</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. has personnel who seem well trained, competent and experienced</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. seems to give employees support so that they can do their jobs well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. has employees who are sensitive to your needs and wants rather than always relying on policies and procedures</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please evaluate a KFC restaurant that you have visited most recently. This restaurant ..................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. makes you feel special</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. has employees who are sympathetic and reassuring if something is wrong</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. seems to have the customer’s best interests at heart</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D

Of the following chicken fast food restaurants which would you go to

☐ KFC ☐ Nandos ☐ Hungry Lion ☐ Chicken Licken

What's the reason for your choice.................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you
**Questionnaire**

Ngiyakubingelela Mnomphelele Nkomzane noma Nkosikazi


Uma unemibuzo ngicela ungifonele kulenombolo Paul Forjoe Jnr (0723379250).

Ngicela uphendule yonke imibuzo ngokweqiniso. Angeke ikuthathe imizuzwana eminingi.

**ISIGAMU A**

Khombisa ngo (X) uma uphendula ebhokisini.

1. **Iminyaka yakho**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngaphansi kwa 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 -29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaphezu kwa 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Ubulili bakho.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isilisa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isifazane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Ugcinephi ngemfundo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngaphansi kwa-grade 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matric / Grade 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree / Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngabe ugodile kweminye imikhakha kwezemfudo ngicela uchaze…………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Uye kangaki Ukuyodla endaweni yokudla okusheshayo enyangeni edlule?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Ngaphezu kwezikhathi ezingu 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ISIGAMU B**
Beka ngokufaka u (X), okubaluleke kakhulu kuwena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indawo yokudla okusheshayo iyazifeza izethembiso zayo ngezinga lomsebenzi walo</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abasebenzi bayathanda ukusiza abathengi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasebenzi banolwazi lomsebenzi futhi banobuntu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indlela abasebenzi abenza ngayo abathengi bazizwa bekhethekile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuhle bendawo yokudla, abasebenzi abanesineke kanye nemishini yokwenza ukudla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISIGAMU C**
Instructions

Ngicela ufunde negezansi bese ukhetha okukodwa okuhambelana nawe.

Hlola  UKFC onke wawuvakashela. Le ndawo yokudlela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uma</th>
<th>uphikisana kakhulu</th>
<th>uyaphikisana</th>
<th>uphakathinendawo</th>
<th>uyavumelana</th>
<th>Uma uvuma kakhula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Inabasebenzi abahlanzekile, nabagqoke ngendlela enobunono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Inentengo ehambiselana nendlela ebukeka ngayo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Indlela yokukhangisa kokudla iyahambisana nokubukeka kwendawo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lapha okudlelwa khona kunendawo eningi yokukhululeka futhi inesizotha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hlola indawo yokudla okusheshayo oyivakashela njengamanje noma ngokudlula. Le ndawo yokudlela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uma ukuqonda</th>
<th>Uma uphikisana kakhulu</th>
<th>Uma uKhuluphakathinendawo</th>
<th>Uma uyawumelana</th>
<th>Uma uVumela kakhulu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Lapha okudla</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ukusizakala ngesikhathi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amaphutha ayalungiswa ngokushesa</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indawo ethembekile futhi iqoqekile</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Indawo ikuninga irisi idi eliscacie lokudla obukade ukuthenga kunjengoba kunjalo</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ukudla ukuthola ngendlela obukucelo ngayo</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Uma kumatasatasa abasebenzi bayiszana ukuse izingalomsebenzi lingeli</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Usizo luyashinga</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Abasebenzi baphendula imibuzo ngendlela egculisayo</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. uyakhululeka uma nixoxisana</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. abasebenzi abafisayo futhi abakwaziyo ukukushela ngokudla nendlela okulungiselewa ngayo uma ubuza</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. uziizwa uphephile</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. abasebenzi babukeka befundisekile kahle, nabawazi kahle umsebenzi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. iyabagquguze abasebenzi ukuse basebenze kahle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. abasebenzi bayazinaka izimfuno nezidingo zakho bebeka imithetho eceleeni uma kunesidingo</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hlola indawo yukudla okusheshayo oyivakashela njengamanje nomu ngokudlule. Le ndawo yukudlela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uma phikisana kakhulu</th>
<th>phaphikisana</th>
<th>uphakathinendawo</th>
<th>uyaxemelana</th>
<th>Uma uvuma kakhulu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 20. Uziwa ukhetheki
- 21. Abasebenzi bayazwelana futhi bayakududuza uma kukhona okungahambi kahle
- 22. Ubalulekile kubona

Isizathu sempendulo yakho kungabe isiphi?

| KFC | Nandos | Hungry Lion | Chicken Licken |

Isizathu sempendulo yakho kungabe isiphi?

| ............................................................................................................................... |
| ............................................................................................................................... |
| ............................................................................................................................... |
| ............................................................................................................................... |
| ............................................................................................................................... |
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