QUALITY SERVICE EVALUATION TECHNIQUES AND TOOLS

Cesar M. Mercado, Ph.D.
Founding President/CEO

Development Center for Asia Africa Pacific (DCAAP)
Manila, Philippines
October 2007
FOCUS OF PAPER

• How to evaluate service quality in government organizations

UNIQUE FEATURE

• Covers from planning to reporting of service quality evaluation
TARGET AUDIENCES

• Human resource managers
• Training managers
• Frontline employees
COVERAGE OF PAPER

- Organizing service quality (SQ) unit/staff
- Plan in measuring service quality (SQ)
- Techniques in measuring SQ
- Designs in measuring SQ
- Tools in measuring SQ
- Procedures in measuring SQ
- Reporting SQ data
IMPORTANCE OF QS

• Government office – bring the government closer to the people
• Private office – greater profitability
• Frontline staff – greater job satisfaction, reduced stress and hassle, enhance job success
CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

• Service – assistance to others

• Quality – grade or degree of excellence of a product or service; level of satisfaction of clients; state of mind

• Quality of service – assistance given by service provider that satisfy the expectation of the client

• Evaluation – process of knowing if the expectation of the client has been achieved or the standard set by the office has been met

• Evaluation technique – how to gather the data

• Evaluation tool – what to use to record the data
SUSTAINING SERVICE QUALITY

• Sustained periodic training on service quality
• Evaluation of trained staff
• Linking evaluation results with performance evaluation
• Linking performance evaluation with merit system and promotion
• Organizing service quality evaluation staff
PACKAGE OF INPUTS NEEDED FOR EVALUATING SERVICE QUALITY

• Core staff
• Simple evaluation plan
• Alternative evaluation techniques
• Classical evaluation designs
• Tailored evaluation tools
• Focused evaluation procedures
CORE STAFF

• 2-3 technical
  – One team leader
  – One technical staff
  – One admin staff

• Main functions
  – Organize QS training
  – Monitor and evaluate courses
SIMPLe EVALUAtION PLAN

- Rationale – why evaluate
- Objective – what to find out
- Methodology – what technique, design and tool to use
- Schedule of activities – what are the tasks, person responsible and dates
- Budgetary requirement – how much budget is needed annually
ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION TECHNIQUES AND TOOLS

• Informal evaluation techniques
  ◆ Direct experience
  ◆ Informal conversation
  ◆ Feedback boxes

• Formal evaluation techniques and tools
  ◆ Participant observation – fieldnotebook
  ◆ Focus group discussion – guide question list
  ◆ Survey – questionnaire or interview schedule
CLASSICAL EVALUATION DESIGNS

• Before only
• During
• After
• Before-after
STEPS IN MEASURING SERVICE QUALITY

• Prepare simple evaluation plan
• Prepare focused measuring tool
• Gather baseline data before training session from sample clients
• Conduct the training
• Gather terminal evaluation data after training session from sample clients
• Prepare dummy tables
• Tabulate and analyze the data
• Prepare the tables
• Interpret the data
• Prepare the report
• Submit report
SAMPLE TOOL FOR MEASURING SERVICE QUALITY BY OBSERVATION

• The sample evaluation tool is called a sample Checklist for Rating Service Quality. It is a simplified version designed for use by evaluators within the office of the staff to be evaluated.

• The checklist may be used as a baseline or evaluation tool for evaluating the performance of a single or a group of frontline service providers.
• The checklist is completed by one or more evaluators while observing the actual interaction between a client and a service provider

• The checklist measures skill
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Score _____________

EVALUATION BY OBSERVATION OF SERVICE QUALITY

CHECKLIST FOR RATING SERVICE QUALITY

This checklist was prepared to rate the quality of service of a frontline service provider before or after training on Quality Service (QS). The rater simply check/tick those good service behaviors in the list below that were shown by the service provider to each client. Please indicate below the:
Name of service provider: ___________________________________________________________
Name of rater: ___________________________________________________________
Date: ___________________________________________________________________

Please observe the service provider by using the checklist as guide. Check/tick those items that were observed by the service provider in dealing with the client.

1. Establish eye contact with the client.
2. Greet the client.
3. Ask client about the assistance that he/she need.
4. Express understanding of the customer want/need.
5. Give simple instructions.
6. Provide fast service.
7. Consistently show willingness to help.
8. Avoided raising voice.
9. Show sustained sense of importance to client.
10. Thank the client for his/her patience.

To get the quality service rating (QSR) of the service provider, count the number of check/tick. 0-3 checks or correct answer means low, (Lo) quality service; 4-6, moderate (Mo) quality service; and 7-10, high (Hi) quality service. Service providers who got Lo score (0-3) should be considered first priority for retraining; those who got Mo score (4-6) should be considered second priority for retraining. The Hi scorers (7-10) need not be retrained on quality service. This checklist could also be used in a before-after test.
TITLE:
Determining Service Performance of Frontline Government Employees

INTRODUCTION
• This performance evaluation study will help in identifying the frontline government employees who need to be renewed or undergo training on service quality.

OBJECTIVE
• To determine the service quality performance of frontline government employees
METHODOLOGY

• The actual observation method was used in gathering the data.
• The before training design was used in determining the time of gathering the data.
• A 10-item checklist designed to rate the performance of the frontline service providers was used in gathering the data.
• Each frontline employee whose appointment will be renewed and/or retrained on service quality was observed and his/her actual performance was rated using the checklist that follows.
• The observation was done between September 10-20, 2007.
• To know the rating of each frontline employee, the observer checked the items that were properly demonstrated.
• The number of properly demonstrated items constitutes the raw score of each employee.
• The raw score constitutes the skill of the staff. The higher the score, the higher the skill.
To know the rating of all the staff, we can use this formula:

\[
\text{Level of skill (SOS)} = \frac{\text{Highest possible score}}{\text{Desired Level of skill}}
\]

- Highest possible score = 10 because there are 10 items to follow
- Desired level of skill = 3 such as low, moderate, high
Thus:

\[
\text{LOS} = \frac{10}{3} = 3.3 \text{ or } 3.0
\]

Thus:

- This means that those who scored:
  - 0 – 3 have low (Lo) skill
  - 4 – 6 have moderate (Mo) skill
  - 7 – 10 have high (Hi) skill
RESULTS

- The results of the evaluation show that of the ten frontline employees evaluated, 5 got high score; 3 moderate score; and 2, low score. The table looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Skill</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

• Based on the results of the performance evaluation, the five frontline employees who got high skill should be renewed and no need to train them on the basic course on service quality.
• The three employees who got moderate skill should be renewed and retrained on the basic course on service quality.
• The two low scorers who got low score may not be rehired.
• The items that were least followed by the employees should be given the greatest emphasis during the training.
• The items that were the most followed by the employees should be given the least emphasis during the training
SAMPLE TOOL FOR MEASURING SERVICE QUALITY BY INTERVIEW

• The sample evaluation tool is used as a Questionnaire for Measuring Service Quality
• The questionnaire may be used as a baseline performance of a single or group of frontline service providers
• The questionnaire is completed by a client of the frontline service provider. It may be used also as an interview schedule in evaluating the public
• The questionnaire measures attitude
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MEASURING THE QUALITY OF SERVICE
(SAMPLE TOOL)

We need your assistance in determining the quality of our service. Kindly indicate your level of satisfaction of the service provided by the staff when you were paying your tax. Please complete this questionnaire and drop it on our Feedbox. Your answers will help us improve our services. Thank you for your assistance.

Name (optional) __________________________
Contact number __________________________

A. Demographic
1. Gender (check one) ______ Male ______ Female
2. Age last birthday ________________
3. Position: ______ Student ______ Employee ______ Others ________________________
   (specify)

B. Quality
1. What service did you receive from our office this time? __________________________
2. Have you received the same or other services from our office before? ______ Yes ______ No
3. How would you rate the delivery of the service by our staff this time in terms of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>No Comment (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This sample questionnaire could be used before and after the application of intervention such as training to the service providers. This has to be completed by the customers or clients. This can be used also in measuring quality of service even if there is no intervention applied to the service providers.)
TITLE: Study of Training Influence on Service Quality

INTRODUCTION

– The evaluation results will help determine the influence of training in improving service quality provided by frontline employees to the public
– It will also determine the strong and weak features that need to be improved among frontline employees in providing better quality service to the public.

– Better quality service by frontline employees will bring about better appreciation of government agencies.
OBJECTIVES

– The objectives of the evaluation are:
  ❖ To determine the influence of training in improving the service of frontline employees to their clients.
  ❖ To determine the strong and work features of their service practices to the clients.
METHODOLOGY

– The survey method, before-after design, and tailored attitude questionnaire were used in the study

– Ten clients of government frontline employees participated in the evaluation

– The before data were gathered on September 10 and the after data were gathered on September 12, 2007

– The questionnaire contains five relevant features of quality service such as friendliness, courtesy, honesty, speed, and attention
– Each feature was rated “very satisfactory” which was assigned a value of 5; Satisfactory, 4; No comment, 3; Unsatisfactory, 2; and Very unsatisfactory 1.

– The standard rating system used for rating each feature was based on the mid-point and the system is like this: 1.0 – 1.5 Very unsatisfactory; 1.6 – 2.5 Unsatisfactory; 2.6 – 3.5 No comment; 3.6 – 4.5 Satisfactory; and 4.6 – 5.0 Very satisfactory

– The total number of respondents (TORs) before the training was selected purposively
– The total number of respondents (TORs) after the training was the same as the before survey

– The total score per quality feature was computed by multiplying the number of respondents per category by the assigned score to the number of respondents and adding the products under each category belonging to the same feature

– To get the mean score per quality feature, divide the total score with the total number of respondents
To get the rating per quality feature, look at the standard rating system and compare the mean score to the standard. Then indicate under the column on Rating the meaning of the mean score.

To get the total means, add all the mean scores of the different features.

To get the mean of means, either before or after activity, divide the total of means by the number of items. The mean of means tell us about the rating of the quality of our service as a whole.

To know which features of the activity either before or after, was rated highest or lowest, see the column on Mean.
RESULTS

– The results show that the training was effective in increasing the quality of service of the frontline employees

– Before the training, their service got a mean score of 2.2 or unsatisfactory

– After the training, their service showed an increase in the mean score from 2.2 to 4.9 or very satisfactory

– Of the five features of quality, the highest rated were friendliness (5.0) and attention (5.0)

– The lowest rates were courtesy (4.8) and honesty (4.8). But these rating were still excellent
RECOMMENDATIONS

– Based on the results of the evaluation the training on service quality improvement should be continued

– Each training components should be maintained
(NOTE: The methodology was presented in detail to explain the three tables thoroughly. The same methodology may be shortened if the report is designed for management and not for instructional purposes).
# Table 1. Sample Quality of Service Score Before Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/Features</th>
<th>Very Satisfactory (5)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (4)</th>
<th>No Comment (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (2)</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>To RS</th>
<th>To SC</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Friendliness</td>
<td>2 – 8</td>
<td>3 – 9</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Courtesy</td>
<td>2 – 4</td>
<td>2 – 6</td>
<td>6 – 12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honesty</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>8 – 16</td>
<td>1 – 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Speed</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7 – 14</td>
<td>2 – 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>2 – 6</td>
<td>6 – 12</td>
<td>2 – 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of means</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean of means</strong></td>
<td><em><em>= \frac{11.0}{5</em>} = 2.2</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No of characteristics

* Standard Rating System- 1.0 – 1.5 (VU), 1.6 – 2.5 (U), 2.6 – 3.5 (NC), 3.6 – 4.5 (S), 4.6 – 5.0 (VS)

Data should come from the completed questionnaires by the customers or clients.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/Features</th>
<th>Very Satisfactory (5)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (4)</th>
<th>No Comment (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (2)</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>To RS</th>
<th>To SC</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Friendliness</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Courtesy</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honestly</td>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Speed</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of means</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean of means</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong> VS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Rating System: 1.0 – 1.5 (VU), 1.6 – 2.5 (U), 2.6 – 3.5 (NC), 3.6 – 4.5 (S), 4.6 – 5.0 (VS)

Data should come from the completed questionnaires by the customers or clients.
Table 3. Effect of Training on Quality of Service (Before-after intervention) data derived from Table 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY TRAINING</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF MEANS</th>
<th>MEANS OF MEANS</th>
<th>MEANING*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0 ÷ 5 *</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.5 ÷ 5 *</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Rating System – 1.0-1.5 Very unsatisfactory (VU); 1.6-2.5 Unsatisfactory (U); 2.6-3.5 No Comment (NC); 3.6-4.5 Satisfactory (S); 4.6-5.0 Very Satisfactory

* Number of features of quality measured = 5
** The training improved the quality of service of the staff from unsatisfactory (2.2) to very satisfactory (4.9).
SUMMARY

• This brief paper presents some doable ideas on how to organize and operate a simple quality service unit (QSU) in government organizations. However, it emphasizes evaluation techniques and tools on service quality (SQ).

• A core staff of 2-3 people can start to prepare a QSU. To do this, they should know: 1) how to prepare a simple plan for measuring service quality (SQ); 2) some informal and formal techniques used in measuring SQ; 3) some alternative designs in measuring SQ; 4) how to prepare focused measuring tools for SQ; and 5) the procedures in determining SQ.
• The paper focuses on how to measure the service quality of frontline government employees using a tailored performance evaluation checklist and an attitude survey questionnaire. The specific steps in handling the data from planning to reporting using the two evaluation tools are enumerated.

• Tables on how to tabulate, analyze, interpret and report the data presumably given by facilitator or clients are presented. Hopefully, the detailed presentation will encourage some government offices to organize and operate a simple quality service unit (QSU) for measuring the quality of their staff services. This will help a lot in sustaining the positive image of their office before their public.
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