MACHAKOS UNIVERSITY

University Examinations for 2019/2020 Academic Year

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

THIRD YEAR SECOND SEMESTER EXAMINATION FOR

BACHELOR OF COMMERCE

BBA 307: MARKETING RESEARCH

DATE:16/11/2020 **TIME: 2:00 – 4:00 PM**

INSTRUCTIONS:

Answer Question one and any other two Questions.

JOURNAL ARTICLE BY Mark and Christine

Traditional measures of service quality (for example Parasuraman *et al*., 1985) focus on measurement of the gap between service user perceptions and expectations across a series of dimensions that characterize the service. Notwithstanding shortcomings of conceptualizing service quality in this manner, recognized in the SERVQUAL debate (for example Carmen, 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Van Dyke *et al.,* 1997), the use of such a disconfirmation approach is widely reported in the literature (e.g; Robinson, 1999)

The number and nature of constructs, which represents the service encounter, are a function of a service relationship in a particular industry or situation. Each of these relationships defers and is, in reality, unique. Gummessom (1994) identifies a series of general qualities characterizing relationships such as collaboration, dependency, trust, longevity, frequency, closeness, content, as well as personal and social properties. In so doing, he emphasizes the breadth of properties that may be deemed relevant by the parties involved in a particular service relationship. However, it is unlikely that all of these properties are of similar relevance to every relationship. Consequently it has been argued that a series of generic dimensions against which to measure service quality is inappropriate (Carmen, 1990). In a review of quality, as one of the primary outcome measures of service relationships, Rosen and Supernant (1998) support this view. They conclude that global measures of service quality (such as SERVQUAL) may not provide the details necessary to asses the strengths and weaknesses of a relationship. In particular, they may fail to take account of the uniqueness and the realities of specific relationships and how they are interpreted and expressed by the parties involved.

Research has also highlighted that the interdependencies between organizations are established and maintained through the encounters and interactions of individuals within each organization (de Burca 1995). The measurement of the quality of such encounters therefore needs to reflect the perspectives of all this individuals. Rosen and Supernant (1998) suggest that traditional measures fail to reflect fully the dyadic nature of service encounters as they generally asses the quality construct from only one partners' point of view. They call for the evaluation of service relationships to accommodate this by including the perspectives of both parties. Although they suggest that this may result in the need to reconcile different views, they also highlight the need for awareness and understanding the views of all parties involved in a service encounter. We would contend that these processes could result in both parties involved in the service questioning the relevance of the norms against which they evaluate the encounter. This, we believe, supports our contention that approaches which have the ability to capture a diversity of service users' and providers' experience of such concepts, are likely to be of more value. Furthermore we have argued that where measures focus only on specific transactions, they may fail to take account of the ongoing nature of service relationships that are based upon repeated encounters (Williams *et al*., 1999).

Rosen and Supernant (1998) support Smith's (1995) arguments when they point to the short comings of the global nature of the quality construct as a diagnostic tool for remedial action. This implies that the assessment of the relationship's quality should lead to action to enhance the benefits obtained by both parties from it. Data collected to assess quality should therefore be useful. In this context, usefulness can be reviewed from two key perspectives…

QUESTION ONE (30 MARKS)

a) Develop the title of the research study whose literature review is discussed in the case study above (2 marks)

b) Outline the general objective and three specific objectives of the study captured in the case study (8 marks)

c) Discuss the possible beneficiaries of the study captured in the case study (10 marks)

d) Discuss any five reasons why the literature review in the case study was carried out (10 marks)

QUESTION TWO (20 MARKS)

a) Discuss the criteria that you would use when evaluating secondary data. (10 marks)

b) A good research must have given characteristics. Discuss. (10 marks)

QUESTION THREE (20 MARKS)

a) Discuss any five disadvantages of Personal interviews (10 marks)

b) Discuss the benefits that a sponsor draws from Research proposals. (10 marks)

QUESTION FOUR (20 MARKS)

a) Hypotheses are majorly used in research. Discuss the functions that they play in research (10 marks)

b) Organizations use outside research firms sometimes. Discuss any five reasons why this is so (10 marks)

QUESTION FIVE (20 MARKS)

a) Briefly discuss any five classifications of research designs. (10 marks)

b) Researchers use samples in different research studies conducted. Discuss why sample are used (10 marks)