

Customer Satisfaction in the Intercom Service Sector: A Case Study in Mongolia

Ariunbold Uranbaigail¹, Tumurkhuyag Uyanga¹ and Erdenebaatar Ariuntuya^{2*}

¹*Department of International Business Management*

Da-Yeh University, Changhua

Taiwan

²*Department of Economics*

University of Finance and Economics

Mongolia

Received May 2019; revised May 2019

ABSTRACT.

The intercom service sector in Mongolia has developed and is incredibly competitive since the different intercoms companies are also interested in subscribers. Therefore, this study looks to empirically measure the impact of the quality of its service and distribution on the customer's satisfaction of intercoms supplies in Mongolia. The data used for this study was collected through a structured questionnaire according to the SERVQUAL model, 15 items which judge the expectations of consumers and 15 items that decide their beliefs of a given service. The questionnaire used closed items with 5 Likert scales. The sample consists of 120 subscribers of intercoms companies in Mongolia, using a simple random sampling technique distributed online in Ulaanbaatar city. The review was analyzed by using SPSS. The review was limited to the Ulaanbaatar city, to subscribers who request and receive service in one of the respective service companies.

Keywords: Intercom, customers satisfaction, service, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

1. Introduction

Customer satisfaction has been a topic of great interest to organizations and researchers alike. The main objective of organizations is to maximize benefits and minimize costs. Maximizing profits can be achieved through an increase in sales with lower charges. One of the factors that can help increase sales is customer satisfaction because satisfaction leads to customer loyalty [1], recommendation and repeated purchase. Customers became

particularly important in business during the marketing era of the 1950s, when companies could produce what they could sell and not just sell what they could supply as it was during the production era. Since the beginning of the period of consumption in marketing, the focus on customers has increased as the age of use also advances towards post-consumption; where organizations are obliged to supply more services in addition to what they offer as offers to their clients. Therefore, this investigation originated in the fact that the client/consumer is the key to the business. Your satisfaction is an essential tool that helps increase sales and generate profits in the business environment. In addition, the importance of customer satisfaction and quality of service has proven to be relevant to help improve the overall performance of organizations [2]. At that time, a customer is satisfied with the product or service; it is called satisfaction; Satisfaction can also be the feeling of pleasure or disappointment of a person that results from comparing the performance or the perceived result of a product with their expectations [3]. The services to the client are the production of a substantial benefit, either in its right or as a non-casual critical element of a physical product that, through a form of exchange, satisfies an identifiable need of the client [4].

In total, the service can also be defined as an imperceptible offer from one party to another in exchange for money for pleasure. The perceived quality of service is defined as the attitude of the global client or the judgment of general excellence or the superiority of the service. The quality of the services considered results from comparing the tendencies of the clients with their beliefs of the service supplied by [5]. It has been argued that the key to ensuring a good understanding of the quality of service is to meet or exceed what customers expect from the service. Therefore, if knowledge of the current service offered by the supply is not expected, a gap is created, which must be addressed through strategies that influence the direction of expectations or beliefs, or both [6]. The client's expectations are beliefs about a service that serves as the standard for which service performance is judged [7]. What consumers think is that the service supplier should offer more than what can be supplied [8]. The expectations of the client play an essential role in the creation of satisfaction. Customer expectations are customer beliefs for performance based on the product based on earlier experience and communications. When companies do not meet these expectations, consumers are unhappy. When companies overcome them, consumers are satisfied. In both

cases, consumers are emotionally charged by their experience. Satisfactions are more likely to be loyal, and dissatisfied ones are more willing to give up [9].

It may seem that customer satisfaction is a simple concept that quickly supplies an evaluation. However, after a more detailed examination, it can be considered as a complex and multifaceted concept that has attracted extraordinary attention from the academic and professional communities, not only because it is recognized as being significant for the wellbeing of the people and the economy. Pleasure is known as a pleasant result, "a final state of desirable consumption" [11]. The precise definitions of satisfaction vary, but common themes emphasize that the consumer's judgment of the consumer experience formed through a psychological process implies a way of comparing what was expected with what was received. This does not exclude the possibility of making provisional satisfaction decisions and allows the chance of making judgments of satisfaction after specific transactions or in a series of accumulated sales.

2. Customer satisfaction and quality of service.

Since it is considered that customer satisfaction is based on the customer's experience in a particular service meeting, the quality of the service is a determining factor in customer satisfaction, because the quality of the service comes from the result of the customer's functions. The clients, some authors affirmed in their theory that "the definitions of consumer satisfaction are related to a specific transaction (the difference between expected service and perceived service) in contrast to" attitudes ", which are more durable and less oriented to the situation "[12] This is in line with the idea of Zeithaml et al. [7]. Concerning the relationship between customer satisfaction and quality of service, it was suggested that the quality of service would be a precursor to customer satisfaction, regardless of whether these constructions were cumulative or specific to the transaction. According to the researchers, they have found empirical support for the point of view mentioned previously [10]; Where customer satisfaction was due to the quality of the service.

3. Methodology

For this study, the questionnaire was used with 30 items divided into two sections, respectively, for the dimensions according to the VARIOUS models. The survey was distributed to 124 individuals, of whom only 80 respondents received a fast response to the continuation of the data analysis. The SERVQUAL models of Parasuraman et al. [8].

4. Data analysis

The objective of the study is to determine the general quality of service perceived by consumers, the quality of the service which supplies satisfaction, the factors that hinder customer satisfaction and what must be done to improve customer satisfaction. The analysis in this study was carried out in two steps, detailed review and analysis according to SPSS. For the preliminary report that mainly includes descriptive statistics to summarize the data, the demographic characteristics of the respondents that were implemented to simplify the understanding of the data. The demographic profile of the respondents as described below; the males were 42% and the females 58% given in Table-1.

Table-1 Personal Profile of Respondents

Characteristics	Description	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	42
	Female	58

Expectations and perceptions were measured using the 5 Likert scales, where higher numbers indicate a higher level of expectation or understanding. In general, the client's expectation exceeded the perceived service level shown by the perception scores. This resulted in a negative gap score. According to [8], it is common for the client's expectation to exceed the perceived real service, which means that there is always a need to improve.

In general, it was found that customer perceptions about the quality of service offered by intercoms companies did not meet their expectations (all gap scores, dimensions are negative) descriptions of aspects reported as follows.

Table-2. The general quality of service perceived by customers.

Dimension	Expectation Score in Percentage	Perception Score in Percentage	Gap Score in Percentage	Overall Gap Score	Average Gap Score
perceptibles	5	4	-1		
	4	4	0		
	5	2	-3	-4	-1.33
Reliability	5	2	-3		
	5	2	-3		
	4	2	-2		
	5	2	-3		
	5	4	-1	-12	-2.4
Responsiveness	5	2	-3		
	5	4	-1		
	5	2	-3		
	4	2	-2	-9	-2.25
Assurance	5	4	-1		
	5	2	-3		
	5	2	-3		
	4	2	-2	-9	-2.25
Empathy	5	4	-1		
	4	2	-2		
	2	2	0		
	4	4	0	-3	-0.75
					-8.98

The results show that there is a positive and important relationship between:

-perceptible perception and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.451$, $p < 0.01$),

-perceptibly and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.528$, $P < 0.01$)

-responsiveness and customer satisfaction ($r = .534, p < 0.01$)

-guarantee and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.574, P < 0.01$)

-empathy and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.530, < 0.01$).

Also, it is indicated that the highest relationship was found between the guarantee and customer satisfaction ($r = 0.574, p < 0.01$).

The hypothesis test is based on the standardized coefficients beta and value of P to check whether the hypotheses are rejected or not.

Ha1: Perceptibly would not have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Hb1: Perceptibly would have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

The study can reject the null hypothesis, and it is accepted that perceptibly has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Ha2: Reliability would not have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Hb2: Reliability would have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

The study rejected the null hypothesis and it is accepted that reliability had a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Ha3: the response capacity would not have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Hb3: the response capacity would have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

The study rejected the null hypothesis and it was accepted that the response capacity has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Ha4: the guarantee would not have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Hb4: the guarantee would have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

The study rejected the null hypothesis and safety had a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Ha5: Empathy would not have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Hb5: Empathy would have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

As a result, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis. So empathy had a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

The results revealed that all independent variables represented 35% of the variation in customer satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.5974$). According to the result, 59.74% of the difference in customer satisfaction could be explained by the five dimensions of quality of service and other unexplored variables can explain the difference in customer satisfaction, which represents approximately 40%, which is shown in the table.

5. Conclusions

The analysis of the performance of the gap revealed which the general quality of the service is low, as consumers perceive it and, therefore, its low satisfaction. Consumers have higher expectations than intercoms companies currently have, although the difference is not very important. The perceived general quality of service is low, while expectations exceed perceptions; That is, consumers demand more than what is offered. Due to the existing gap, it is clear that consumers are not satisfied.

Reference

1. A. Wilson;V.A. Zeithaml;M.J. Bitner;D.D. Gremler. (2008) *Services Marketing*, McGraw-Hill Education
2. A. Magi & C.R. Julander. (1996). Perceived service quality and customer satisfaction in a store performance framework. An empirical study of Swedish grocery retailers, *Journal of Retailing and consumer services*, Vol. 3, Number 1 p.33-41.
3. P. Kotler &K.L. Keller. (2009) *Marketing management*, 13th edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc, Upper Saddle River,
4. Miller and Layton. (2000), *Fundamentals of marketing*, p.661, 4th edition, McGraw-Hall.
5. V. A. Zeithaml. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52, 2-22.

6. A. Parasuraman; V.A. Zeithaml & L.L. Berry. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research, *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50.
7. V. A. Zeithaml; M.J. Bitner & D.D. Gremler. (2006) *Services marketing*, 4th edition, McGraw-Hill.
8. A. Parasuraman; V.A. Zeithaml & L.L. Berry (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*.
9. A. Gilbert; J. Churchill & D. Lacobucci. (2005) *Marketing research, Research: ethological Foundations*, 9th edition. USA: Stratford publishing service.
10. E.W. Anderson. C. Fornell & D.R. Lehmann. (1994), Customer satisfaction, market share and profitability: findings from Sweden, *Journal of Marketing*.
11. R.L. Oliver (1999). "Whence Customer Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63, Special Issue, pp. 33-44.
12. B.R. Lewis. (1993). "Service quality: recent developments in financial services". *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 2 (6), 19-26.