

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY



Customer satisfaction analysis of metro bus service

MS THESIS

BY

Irfan Rashid Farooqui

ID # 11292004

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MS MANAGEMENT

2016

Abstract

Metro Bus System (MBS) is operative in Lahore, Pakistan for last few months; it is a project that has a heavy financial liability on a developing nation while its justification is based on its claim of meeting the customers' (passengers) requirement. This thesis aimed to find if MBS meets customer expectations and deliver them satisfaction especially in contrast with the other Public Bus Service (PBS) operating in the city.

SERVQUAL was used through survey technique by means of its 22 variables and five constructs to find customers' expectations about a good bus service and their perception about the actual level of service delivered by both types of bus services. With the help of descriptive statistics and *t* test, it was found that customers are satisfied with MBS and their level of satisfaction is also higher than PBS since results showed that customers are not satisfied with PBS. The mean value of satisfaction from MBS is 0.44 and for PBS is - 0.16 (dissatisfaction as indicated by negative number), hence an overall advantage of MBS is 0.60; all the differences are statistically significant.

The main satisfying factor for MBS are safety, promptness and in time service, while the dissatisfaction was for convenient operating hours and personalized attention. The major contributors of customer dissatisfaction in PBS were delays and lack of promptness. MBS as per survey results is delivering satisfaction to customers and meeting their expectations but it has to maintain the current practices in long run and may focus on increasing its operating hours to further increase the satisfaction. PBS would require improving on delays and promptness of their service if they intend to increase the satisfaction.

Acknowledgement

I acknowledge the support given to me by my supervisor Professor Dr. Tashfeen M. Azhar (UMT) and co-supervisor Mr. Kamran Rashid (Assistant Professor, UMT) for guiding me in my thesis and the research related to the thesis. The persuasion of Mr. Asher Ramish (Assistant Professor, UMT) is worth appreciating for making me complete my project. I desire to thank Dr. Ahmad F. Siddiqui (Professor of UMT) and Dr. Khalid Mehmood (Professor of Punjab University) for educating me on how to conduct statistical tests. Three professors of Punjab University Dr. Khalid Mehmood, Dr. Hassan Mobeen and Dr. Khalid Khan were instrumental in obtaining the research articles required for this thesis.

I thank my corporate management, Mr. Aftab Ahmad (CEO - Century Paper) and Mr. Iqbal Lakhani (Chairman Lakson Group) who backed my desire on doing the MS.

Finally I must acknowledge Professor Dr. A. Rashid Kausar (UMT) and Professor Dr. Sarwar M. Azhar (UMT) since they are the beacon of knowledge; the ones who have made me become a life time student.

Declaration

I certify that this thesis contains my original work submitted in fulfillment of the requirement of the degree of MS Management submitted to the Center for Graduate Research (CGR), School of Business & Economics, University for Management & Technology, Lahore, Pakistan. It consists of no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree in my name, in any university, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree in any university.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my family Sohela (my wife), Adham (my son) and Ameena (my daughter) who were with me in all my work and who shared part of their time with this thesis.

Table of Content

Sr. No.	Title	Page Number
1	Introduction	1
2	Literature Review	5
2.01	Mode of mass transport	5
2.02	Pakistan, Economic Conditions	8
2.03	Role of Service Sector in the growth of economies	9
2.04	Opportunities for Pakistan	10
2.05	Lahore and public transport	11
2.06	Need of improved transportation	12
2.07	Lahore Metro conception and history	12
2.08	Importance of Customer and its satisfaction	14
2.09	Service quality, problems and theories	17
2.10	SERVQUAL and its evolution	18
2.11	Use of SERVQUAL	23
2.12	Metro and SERVQUAL	25

3	Theoretical Framework	26
3.01	Hypothesis	30
4	Methodology	31
4.01	Research Design	31
4.1.01	Objective of the study.	31
4.1.02	Defining satisfaction.	31
4.1.03	Type of research	31
4.1.04	Research Strategy	34
4.02	Sample	34
4.2.01	Sampling frame	36
4.2.02	Sample Size	36
4.2.03	Sampling Unit	36
4.03	Data Collection	37
4.3.01	Instrument development and its dimensions	37
4.3.02	<i>How data was collected</i>	38
4.3.03	<i>Procedures analysis and data quality</i>	39
4.04	<i>Analytical Procedures/Methods of Analysis</i>	39

4.4.01	<i>Most appropriate statistical tools</i>	39
4.05	<i>Ethical Issues</i>	40
4.06	<i>Definition of Terms</i>	40
4.07	<i>Time Line Sheet</i>	41
5	Result and discussion	42
5.01	Generalized view of results	43
5.02	<i>Hypothesis testing</i>	44
5.03	<i>Metro Bus Service (MBS) analysis</i>	48
5.04	Public Bus Service (MBS) analysis	49
5.05	Construct wise Analysis	50
5.5.01	Tangibility	50
5.5.02	Reliability	51
5.5.03	Responsiveness	52
5.5.04	Assurance	52
5.5.05	Empathy	53
5.06	Variable brief	54
5.6.01	Variable 1: Modern Equipment	54

5.6.02	Variable 2: Facilities are visually appealing	55
5.6.03	Variable 3: Neatness of Employees	55
5.6.04	Variable 4: Visually appealing pamphlets	55
5.6.05	Variable 5: Meeting the promise	55
5.6.06	Variable 6: Sincere interest at problem solving	56
5.6.07	Variable 7: Doing things right first time	56
5.6.08	Variable 8: In time service	56
5.6.09	Variable 9: Error free records	56
5.6.10	Variable 10: Tell when service will be done	56
5.6.11	Variable 11: Prompt service	57
5.6.12	Variable 12: Willing to help	57
5.6.13	Variable 13: Staff never too busy	57
5.6.14	Variable 14: Behavior will instill confidence	57
5.6.15	Variable 15: Feel safe in transactions	58
5.6.16	Variable 16: To be courteous	58
5.6.17	Variable 17: Knowledge to answer questions	58
5.6.18	Variable 18: Give individual attention	58
5.6.19	Variable 19: Convenient operating hours	58
5.6.20	Variable 20: Employees give personal attention	59
5.6.21	Variable 21: Customer's interest at heart	59

5.6.22	Variable 22: Understand specific needs	59
6	Conclusion and Implication	60
6.01	Tangibility	61
6.02	Reliability	61
6.03	Responsiveness	62
6.04	Assurance	63
6.05	Empathy	63
7	Limitation and future research direction	65
8	Reference	67
9	Annexure	74

List of Tables, Figures, Models, and Equations

Sr. No.	Title	Page Number
Figures		
1.1	Fig 1. Service Quality Model	19
1.2	Fig 2. Determinants of perceived Quality	20
1.3	Fig 3. Constructs of SERVQUAL	22
Models		
2.1	Model 1. Relationship in SERVQUAL	23
2.2	Model 2. Customer Satisfaction of MBS Compared with Other Bus Services	29
Equations		
3.1	Equation 1	38
In-Text Tables		
5.1	In-Text Table # 5.1: Summary of construct satisfaction	43
5.2	In-Text Table 5.2 Analysis of E and P for MBS	45
5.3	In-Text Table 5.3 Independent Sample t test E and P of MBS	45
5.4	In-Text Table 5.4 Analysis of E and P for PBS	46
5.5	In-Text Table 5.5 Independent sample t test of E and P for PBS	47
5.6	In-Text Table 5.6 Comparison of QM and QP	48
5.7	In-Text Table 5.7 Independent sample t test of QM and QP	48

Appendices

Sr. No.	Title	Page Number
	Annexure	74
1	Statistical Analysis	75
1.2	Table # 1 Variable Coding	75
1.3	Table # 2 Domain Coding	75
1.4	Table # 3 Descriptive Statistics for MBS	75
1.5	Table # 4 Descriptive Statistics PBS	76
1.6	Table # 5 Results of t test for means of P and E of MBS	77
1.7	Table # 6 Results of t test for means of P and E of PBS	79
1.8	Table # 7 Results of t test for means of E of MBS and E of PBS	82
1.9	Table # 8 Results of t test for means of P of MBS and P of PBS	86
1.10	Table # 9 Customer satisfaction Q for MBS and PBS	89
1.11	Table # 9A MBS: P is significantly higher than E	89
1.12	Table # 9B MBS: No difference in P and E	90
1.13	Table # 9C MBS: P is significantly lower than E	90
1.14	Table # 9D PBS: P is significantly better than E	90
1.15	Table # 9E PBS: P is significantly lower than E	91
1.16	Table # 9F PBS: Numerically or significantly no difference in P and E	91
1.17	Table # 10A Results of t test for means of Q of MBS and Q of PBS	91
1.18	Table # 10B Customer Satisfaction Analysis	95
1.19	Table # 11A Mean values for Construct Tangible 1,2	95
1.20	Table # 11B Result of t test for Construct Tangible 1,2	96
1.21	Table # 11C Mean values for Construct Tangible 3,4	96

1.22	Table #	11D	Result of t test for Construct Tangible 3,4	96
1.23	Table #	11E	Mean values for Construct Tangible 5,6	97
1.24	Table #	11F	Result of t test for Construct Tangible 5,6	97
1.25	Table #	12A	Mean values for Construct Reliability 1,2	98
1.26	Table #	12B	Result of t test for Construct Reliability 1,2	98
1.27	Table #	12C	Mean values for Construct Reliability 3,4	98
1.28	Table #	12D	Result of t test for Construct Reliability 3,4	99
1.29	Table #	12E	Mean values for Construct Reliability 5,6	99
1.30	Table #	12F	Result of t test for Construct Reliability 5,6	99
1.31	Table #	13A	Mean values for Construct Responsiveness 1,2	100
1.32	Table #	13B	Result of t test for Construct Responsiveness 1,2	100
1.33	Table #	13C	Mean values for Construct Responsiveness 3,4	101
1.34	Table #	13D	Result of t test for Construct Responsiveness 3,4	101
1.35	Table #	13E	Mean values for Construct Responsiveness 5,6	101
1.36	Table #	13F	Result of t test for Construct Responsiveness 5,6	102
1.37	Table #	14A	Mean values for Construct Assurance 1,2	102
1.38	Table #	14B	Result of t test for Construct Assurance 1,2	102
1.39	Table #	14C	Mean values for Construct Assurance 3,4	103
1.40	Table #	14D	Result of t test for Construct Assurance 3,4	103
1.41	Table #	14E	Mean values for Construct Assurance 5,6	104
1.42	Table #	14F	Result of t test for Construct Assurance 5,6	104
1.43	Table #	15A	Mean values for Construct Empathy 1,2	104
1.44	Table #	15B	Result of t test for Construct Empathy 1,2	105
1.45	Table #	15C	Mean values for Construct Empathy 3,4	105
1.46	Table #	15D	Result of t test for Construct Empathy 3,4	105

1.47	Table #	15E	Mean values for Construct Empathy 5,6	106
1.48	Table #	15F	Result of t test for Construct Empathy 5,6	106
2	Variable wise detailed analysis			107
3	General Annexure			120
3.1	GE1	Facts & Figures (London Underground)		120
3.2	GE2	Lines operating in London		121
3.3	GE3	Pakistan economic indicators		122
3.4	GE4	China economic indicators		126
3.5	GE5	Export Routes of China		132
3.6	GE6	Survey Form for MBS (Expectation)		133
3.7	GE7	Survey Form for MBS (Perception)		135
3.8	GE8	Survey Form for PBS (Expectation)		137
3.9	GE9	Survey Form for PBS (Perception)		139

1. Introduction

Does it look justified if a developing country that has a national debt reaching around US\$200 billion and whose 50% of population is living under the line of poverty decides to launch a rapid transit system with a project cost of about \$300 million while one third of running cost is met by taking subsidy from the government?

Rapid transport system, operating on dedicated rail or road tracks (called Bus Rapid Transport system or BRT in case of roads), is a common phenomenon in large cities of developed countries that can afford heavy investment for such service and who have already provided basic facilities to the citizens. Starting such project in developing country raises a very legitimate concern on the justification of the expense.