Research On Convenience Store Service Quality Demand Strategy

Yi-Chan Chung

Department Of Business Administration, Yuanpei University Of Medical Technology, Taiwan

Abstract:
The convenience store is close to reaching its full capacity. To draw in more customers, it is crucial to understand and fulfill their needs efficiently. Through the use of Kano model analysis, this research pinpointed five essential factors that can greatly boost customer satisfaction and reduce dissatisfaction. Improving these factors can result in increased customer satisfaction and revenue growth for the convenience store.

I. Introduction

As the convenience store market becomes more crowded, operators must understand and fulfill customer needs with top-notch services to boost their competitiveness. This research classifies service quality assessment into responsiveness, tangibility, reliability, caring, and assurance, based on the model introduced by Parasuraman et al. (1988). By examining these elements,   the results can provide valuable insights for the company to create successful competitive tactics.

II. Literature Review

Service Quality

According to Bateson and Hoffman (2002), service quality refers to how customers assess the performance of service providers over time. Kotler et al. (2009) stressed the importance of services or products meeting customer needs and increasing their satisfaction through quality. Parasuraman et al. (1985) pointed out that service quality is determined by customers' perceptions and expectations, which are measured by the gap between them. Parasuraman et al. (1988) identified five main components of service quality: Reliability, Responsiveness, Empathy, and Tangible factors. The tools used to measure service quality in this study are based on questionnaires created by Phan & Phan (2021), Chung & Chen (2015), and Parasuraman et al. (1988).

Kano model

Kano's quality model classifies quality aspects into five categories: Attractive Quality Element (A), One-Dimensional Quality Element (O), Must-Be Quality Element (M), Indifferent Quality Element (I), and Reverse Quality Element (R) (Kano et al., 1984). Matzler and Hinterhuber (1998) later introduced a revised version of this model, which includes a classification table for Two-Dimensional Quality Elements according to the updated Kano model, shown in Table 1.

III. Research Method

The study used quality measurement items based on questionnaires from Phan & Phan (2021), Chung & Chen (2015), and Parasuraman et al. (1988), which were adapted to fit the operational features of H convenience stores. The participants in the research were store customers, and a total of 31 questionnaires were gathered between March 1 and March 30, 2024. The measured variable items include: (1) Responsiveness: Content includes: employees can respond quickly to customer needs (Item1); employees will provide detailed instructions (Item2); proactively assist and serve customers (Item3). (2) Tangibility: Content includes: employees keep neat clothing and appearance (Item 4); have modern and professional equipment internally (Item 5); internal facilities, circulation, and guidance notices are clear (Item 6); service facilities meet customer needs (Item 7). (3) Reliability: Contents include: employees can try their best to help customers solve problems (Item8); employees can truly fulfill their commitments to customers (Item9); employees can do things right the first time (Item10). (4) Caring: Content includes: employees will take the initiative to provide individual care to customers (Item11); employees will give priority to customers' interests (Item12); employees will understand individual customer needs (Item13); the workplace will understand customers Required services need to be provided (Item14). (5) Guarantee: Contents include: sufficient professional knowledge to respond to customer questions (Item 15); the workplace provides services that reassure customers (Item 16); employees can provide responsible services (Item 17); product prices are marked (Item 18).

IV. Research Results

This study uses the calculation of Matzler and Hinterhuber's (1998) customer satisfaction coefficient to find a total of three "efficiency improvement service quality projects" that can simultaneously increase customer satisfaction and reduce customer dissatisfaction (Table 2). Including employees can respond quickly to customer needs (Item1); employees can try their best to help customers solve problems (Item8); employees can truly fulfill their commitments to customers (Item9); employees will take the initiative to provide individual care to customers (Item11); the workplace provides services that reassure customers (Item 16). The results obtained based on this analysis can help H Convenience Store identify priorities for improving service quality, thereby enhancing the company's competitiveness. In addition, a two-dimensional quality classification was made for service quality items, of which 14 items were classified as attractive qualities; and 4 items were classified as one-dimensional qualities (Table 2).

V.   Conclusion

This research focuses on H convenience store customers and utilizes Kano's two-dimensional quality model to pinpoint "efficiency improvement service quality items." The goal is to offer operators insights on enhancing service quality and developing business strategies for future growth. The study identified five items that can boost customer satisfaction while decreasing dissatisfaction. Business operators must prioritize these efficiency-quality projects to sustain high service quality and maximize benefits.

References

[1].   Bateson, J.E., Hoffman, K.G., 2002. Essential Of Service Marketing: Concepts, Strategy And Cases, Harcourt, Inc.
[2].   Chung Y.C. And Chen H.C., 2015. Study On The Correlation Among Service Quality, Relationship Quality And Customer Satisfaction– A Case Study Of H Hotel. International Journal Of Latest Research In Science And Technology, 44(4), 1-7.
[3].   Matzler, K., Bailom, F., Hinterhuber, H. H., Renzl, B. And Pichler, J., 2004. The Asymmetric Relationship Between Attribute-Level Performance And Overall 50 Customer Satisfaction: A Reconsideration Of The Importance–Performance Analysis. Industrial Marketing Management, 33: 271-277.
[4].   Parasuraman, A., V.A. Zeithaml And Berry, L.L., 1985. A Conceptual Model Of Service Quality And Its Implications For Future Research. Journal Of Marketing, 49 (4), 41-50 .
[5].   Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. And Berry, L.L, 1988. Servqual: A Multiple-Item Scale For Measuring Consumer Perception Of Service Quality. Journal Of Retailing, 64 (1), 12-40.
[6].   Kano, N., Seraku, N., Takahashi, F., And Tsuji, S., 1984. Attractive Quality And Must-Be Quality, Hinshitsu (Quality, The Journal Of Japanese Society For Quality Control), 14, 39-48
[7].   Kotler, P., Bowen, J.T. And Makens, J. C. ,2009. Marketing For Hospitality And Tourism: Prentice Hall.
[8].   Lovelock, C. H., And Wirtz J. ,2011. Service Marketing(7ed), Ny: Prentice-Hall.
[9].   Matzler, K. And Hinterhuber, H. H., 1998. How To Make Product Development Projects More Successful By Integrating Kano's Model Of Customer Satisfaction Into Quality Function Deployment, Technovation, 18(1), 25-38.
[10].   Phan, D.V. And Phan, T.T. , 2021. Testing The Reliability Of The Banking Service Quality: A Case Study Of Commercial Banks In Vietnam. Academy Of Strategic Management Journal, 20(2), 1-10.

Table 1 Categories of Matzler and Hinterhuber

Negative \ Positive	Like	Must-be	Neutral	Live with	Dislike
Like	Uncertain	Attractive Quality	Attractive Quality	Attractive Quality	One-Dimensional Quality
Must-be	Reverse Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Must-Be Quality
Neutral	Reverse Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Must-Be Quality
Live with	Reverse Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Indifferent Quality	Must-Be Quality
Dislike	Reverse Quality	Reverse Quality	Reverse Quality	Reverse Quality	Uncertain

Table2 Kano classification and customer satisfaction coefficient table

Item	A	O	M	I	R	Q	Category	C(1)	C(2)
1	12	8	3	8	0	0	A	※0.645	※-0.355
2	11	7	3	9	0	1	A	0.6	-0.333
3	13	5	2	10	1	0	A	0.6	-0.233
4	9	10	4	8	0	0	O	0.613	※-0.452
5	13	5	2	8	0	3	A	※0.643	-0.25
6	14	4	3	8	0	2	A	0.621	-0.241
7	11	5	5	8	1	1	A	0.552	※-0.345
8	10	9	1	9	1	1	A	※0.655	※-0.345
9	10	11	2	6	0	2	O	※0.759	※-0.414
10	13	3	3	10	0	2	A	0.552	-0.207
11	10	9	1	9	2	0	A	※0.655	※-0.345
12	16	8	1	5	0	1	A	※0.8	-0.3
13	19	4	1	5	0	2	A	※0.793	-0.172
14	14	5	2	10	0	0	A	0.613	-0.226
15	12	5	4	9	0	1	A	0.567	-0.3
16	10	9	3	7	0	2	A	※0.655	※-0.414

17	8	10	5	8	0	0	O	0.581	※-0.484
18	3	14	6	4	0	4	O	0.630	※-0.741
Total average								0.641	-0.342

A: Attractive quality, O: One-dimensional quality, M: Must-be quality, I: Indifferent quality

C(1): Increase customer satisfaction coefficient = (A+O)/(A+O+M+I)

C(2): Reduce customer dissatisfaction coefficient = (O+M)/(A+O+M+I)×(-1)

※ Absolute value of table coefficient＞Absolute value of overall coefficient average