

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

RELATIONSHIP QUALITY BETWEEN CUSTOMER AND PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE SECTOR

ARYATY BINTI ALWIE

GSM 2008 11



RELATIONSHIP QUALITY BETWEEN CUSTOMER AND PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE SECTOR

Ву

ARYATY BINTI ALWIE

Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School of Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 2008



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

RELATIONSHIP QUALITY BETWEEN CUSTOMER AND PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE SECTOR

By

ARYATY BINTI ALWIE

October 2008

Chair: Associate Professor Jamll Bojel, PhD

Faculty: Graduate School of Management

The relationship quality can be used to assess the effectiveness of relationship marketing (Hennig-Thurau, et al., 2002). By adopting Nordic approach, relationship quality in this study consists of two levels of interaction, i.e. interpersonal and organizational levels. In addition, since the relationship quality is not tied down to any standardized dimension, the study aims to investigate the dimensions of relationship quality in services sector, using two types of services, i.e. credence and experience services.

The data was collected using personal interview on the selected residents of Putrajaya. For this purpose, two sets of questionnaire were developed for the two services studied (credence & experience services). The study gathered 421 completed questionnaires. The data were then analyzed using factor analysis, multiple regression and discriminant analysis to fulfil the research objectives.

UPM N

The findings showed that both levels were empirically important for service sector. However, the findings tend to differ slightly according to the type of service. At interpersonal level, closeness factor was significant for credence services but not for experience services. Communication and special care were significant for both service types, whereas a new dimension (communication quality), that emerged from the study, was not significant for both service types. At organizational level, trust was significant for experience services but not for credence services. Nonetheless, commitment and satisfaction showed significant findings for both service types.

Based on the study, it is recommended that credence service firms can exploit 'closeness' through friendliness, trustworthiness, responsiveness, competency, and empathy in service to build relationship with customers. Contrary to that of credence service firms, experience service firms might focus on developing customers trust on the organization by delivering highly skilled services along with strong support from the organization.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

KUALITI HUBUNGAN ANTARA PELANGGAN DAN PENYEDIA PERKHIDMATAN DALAM SEKTOR PERKHIDMATAN

Oleh

ARYATY BINTI ALWIE

Oktober 2008

Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Jamil Bojel, PhD

Fakulti: Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah Pengurusan

Kualiti hubungan boleh digunakan untuk menilai keberkesanan pemasaran hubungan (Hennig-Thurau, et al., 2002). Dengan menggunakan pendekatan Nordic, kualiti hubungan dalam kajian ini terdiri dari dua peringkat, iaitu peringkat antara perorangan dan peringkat organisasi. Oleh kerana kualiti hubungan tidak terikat dengan mana-mana dimensi yang standard untuk kualiti hubungan, maka tujuan kajian ini ialah untuk mengkaji dimensi kualiti hubungan dalam sektor perkhidmatan dengan menggunakan dua kategori perkhidmatan digunakan, iaitu perkhidmatan kreden dan perkhidmatan pengalaman.

Data telah dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan temubual perorangan dikalangan penduduk terpilih di kawasan Putrajaya. Untuk tujuan ini, dua set borang soal selidik telah dibentuk untuk dua jenis perkhidmatan yang dikaji (perkhidmatan kreden dan perkhidmatan pengalaman). Kajian ini telah

UPM N

mengumpul 421 set soal selidik yang telah dilengkapkan. Data kajian kemudiannya dianalisa menggunakan analisis faktor, regresi berbilang dan analisis diskriminan untuk menjawab objektif penyelidikan.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa kedua-dua peringkat secara impirikalnya adalah penting untuk sektor perkhidmatan. Walau bagaimanapun, hasilan menunjukkan terdapatnya sedikit perbezaan berdasarkan ienis perkhidmatan. Di peringkat antara perorangan, factor kedekatan adalah signifikan untuk perkhidmatan kreden tetapi tidak untuk perkhidmatan pengalaman. Komunikasi dan perhatian istimewa adalah signifikan untuk kedua-dua jenis perkhidmatan tersebut, manakala dimensi baru (kualiti komunikasi), yang terhasil dari kajian, adalah tidak signifikan untuk keduadua jenis perkhidmatan. Di peringkat organisasi, kepercayaan hanyalah signifikan untuk perkhidmatan pengalaman dan tidak singnifikan untuk perkhidmatan kreden. Akan tetapi, komitmen dan kepuasan, menunjukkan hasil yang signifikan untuk kedua-dua jenis perkhidmatan.

Berdasarkan kajian, adalah dicadangkan agar firma perkhidmantan kreden mengeksploitasikan kedekatan melalui keramahan, kebolehpercayaan, keresponsifan, kecekapan dan empati dalam perkhidmatan mereka untuk membina hubungan dengan pelanggan. Berbeza dengan firma perkhidmatan kreden, firma perkhidmatan pengalaman mungkin perlu menfokuskan ke atas membangunkan kepercayaan pelanggan terhadap organisasi dengan memberi perkhidmatan berkemahiran tinggi disamping sokongan padu dari organisasi.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey, that seems to be never-ending, has finally come to an end. This journey is very unforgettable to me because it teaches me to appreciate people around me. Many people have walked a while with me, in their own extraordinary way, to help me along this journey.

From the beginning of this journey to the end, my main supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jamil Bojei has showed me his constant guidance, comments, critiques and support throughout my PhD program. His passion on this profession always gives me strength to embark on the academic world. I also thank Prof. Dr. Aliah Hanim Mohd. Salleh for her comments and suggestions, which challenge me to come up with the best that I can. My appreciation also goes to Assoc. Prof. Dr Jegak Uli, who refreshes my statistics skills and showed how interesting it is to deal with numbers. Prof. Dr. Samsinar, thanks for your insights and thoughts during classes, during the expert opinions stage and along the way of my journey. My deepest appreciation also goes to Prof. Dr. Shamsher, Prof. Dr. Rozhan, and all lecturers at the Graduate School of Management who showed me their passion for the academic world.

Along the journey, I would like to thank all of my friends who were with me all the way. Amalina, Loga, Maisarah, Aniza, Rahayu, Ong, Loke, Zahira, Neilson, Zubir, Nusrah and all postgraduate students and staffs of GSM, your constant support, cheers and motivations, in your own unique ways, give me strength to go on with the journey. I would like to thank all my classmates — class of Jun 2004/2005 — for your support during the earlier stage of the journey. It is the most interesting class that I ever had.

Lastly, to my family members, my father, Alwie, Mak Ros, Saiful, Mahathir, Hairull Ann, Erna Marlini and Haziq, your undying support gave me the will power to endure this journey. To my families in Sibu, Kabong & Saratok thanks a lot. This is a new beginning of a wonderful endless journey.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | Pag | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|------|--|--|
| AB: | STRAC | т | ii | | |
| ABS | STRAK | | iv | | |
| AC | KNOW | LEDGEMENTS | vi | | |
| API | PROVA | AL . | vii | | |
| DE | CLARA | TION | ix | | |
| LIS | T OF T | ABLES | xvi | | |
| LIS | T OF F | IGURES | xvii | | |
| LIS | T OF A | BBREVIATION | xix | | |
| СН | APTEF | R . | | | |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY | | | | |
| | 1.0 | Introduction | 1 | | |
| | 1.1 | Background of the Study | 1 | | |
| | 1.2 | Issues of the Study | 5 | | |
| | | 1.2.1 Problem Statement | 9 | | |
| | 1.3 | Objectives of the Study | 11 | | |
| | | 1.3.1 General Objective | 11 | | |
| | | 1.3.2 Specific Objectives | 12 | | |
| | 1.4 | Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Study | 12 | | |
| | 1.5 | Scope of the Study | 16 | | |
| | 1.6 | Importance of the Study | 18 | | |
| | 1.7 | Overview of the Research Framework | 20 | | |
| | 1.8 | Organization of the Thesis | 21 | | |
| 2 | SERVICE SECTORS IN MALAYSIA | | | | |
| | 2.0 | Introduction | | | |
| | 2.1 | Industrial Master Plans | | | |
| | 2.2 | The Growth of Services Sector during IMP2 | 29 | | |
| | | 2.2.1 Trade in Services Sectors | 31 | | |
| | 2.3 | Framework of the Third Industrial Master Plan | 22 | | |



| | 2.4 | Education and Training Services | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----|--|--|
| | | 2.4.1 | The Growth Prospects of Education and Training Services | 39 | | |
| | | 2.4.2 | The Challenges of Education and Training Services | 40 | | |
| | 2.5 | Health : | Services | 41 | | |
| | | 2.5.1 | The Growth Prospects of Health Services | 43 | | |
| | | 2.5.2 | The Challenges of Health Services | 44 | | |
| | 2.6 | Tourism | n Services | 45 | | |
| | | 2.6.1 | The Growth Prospects of Tourism Services | 49 | | |
| | | 2.6.2 | The Challenges of Tourism Services | 50 | | |
| | 2.7 | Conclus | sion | 52 | | |
| 3 | LITERATURE REVIEW | | | | | |
| | 3.0 | Introduc | ction | 53 | | |
| | 3.1 | Relation | nships in Businesses | 53 | | |
| | | 3.1.1 | Relationships in Asian Cultures | 56 | | |
| | 3.2 | Relation | nship Marketing | 61 | | |
| | 3.3 | Relation Though | nship Marketing from Different Schools of at | 62 | | |
| | | 3.3.1 | Selected Schools of Thought in Detail | 63 | | |
| | 3.4 | Definition Marketi | ons and Selected Studies on Relationship | 67 | | |
| | 3.5 | Quality | in Businesses | 70 | | |
| | | 3.5.1 | Quality in Service Sectors | 72 | | |
| | | 3.5.2 | A Framework for Analyzing Relationship Quality | 75 | | |
| | 3.6 | Relation | nship Quality in Services Sector | 79 | | |
| | 3.7 | The His | story of Relationship Quality Dimensions | 82 | | |
| | | 3.7.1 | The Dimensions of Relationship Quality | 86 | | |
| | 3.8 | | lection of Study Dimensions for zational Level | 88 | | |
| | | 3.8.1 | Trust | 94 | | |
| | | 3.8.2 | Commitment | 96 | | |
| | | 383 | Satisfaction | 100 | | |



| | 3.9 | | sonal Interactions between the Customers Service Provider | 103 |
|---|------|------------------|--|-----|
| | | 3.9.1 | The Customer-Employee Relationships and Relationship Quality | 105 |
| | | 3.9.2 | Customers from Resource Based View Perspective | 110 |
| | 3.10 | | ection of Study Dimensions for sonal Level | 114 |
| | | 3.10.1 | Communication | 116 |
| | | 3.10.2 | Closeness | 119 |
| | | 3.10.3 | Relationship Benefits | 124 |
| | 3.11 | Custom | er Loyalty | 128 |
| | | 3.11.1 | Reviews on Service Relationship and Its Link with Loyalty | 133 |
| | 3.12 | Researc | ch Gaps | 135 |
| | 3.13 | Conclus | sion | 139 |
| 4 | RESE | ARCH F | RAMEWORK | |
| | 4.0 | Introduc | tion | 141 |
| | 4.1 | Theories Studies | s Underlying the Relationship Marketing | 141 |
| | | 4.1.1 | The Social Exchange Theory | 142 |
| | | 4.1.2 | The Relationship Exchange Theory | 145 |
| | | 4.1.3 | The Concept of Reciprocity in Exchange Relationship | 148 |
| | 4.2 | | ndamentals of Establishing Relationship Framework | 150 |
| | 4.3 | | hing the Research Framework for aship Quality | 153 |
| | 4.4 | The Res | search Framework of Relationship Quality | 161 |
| | | 4.4.1 | Hypotheses of the Study | 165 |
| | 4.5 | Operation | onal Definitions of Study Dimensions | 169 |
| | | 3.5.1 | Trust | 169 |
| | | 3.5.2 | Commitment | 171 |
| | | 3.5.3 | Satisfaction | 172 |
| | | 3.5.4 | Communication | 173 |
| | | 3.5.5 | Closeness | 175 |
| | | 3.5.6 | Relationship Benefits | 177 |



| | 3.5.7 | Loyalty | 177 |
|------|----------|---|-----|
| 4.6 | Conclus | sion | 178 |
| RESE | EARCH N | METHODOLOGY | |
| 5.0 | Introduc | etion | 180 |
| 5.1 | Resear | ch Design | 180 |
| | 5.1.1 | Research Application | 181 |
| 5.2 | Catego | ries of Services Used in the Study | 185 |
| 5.3 | Samplin | ng Design Process | 190 |
| | 5.3.1 | The Target Population | 190 |
| | 5.3.2 | The Sampling Frame | 191 |
| | 5.3.3 | The Sampling Technique | 192 |
| | 5.3.4 | The Sample Size | 194 |
| 5.4 | Data Co | ollection Procedure or Fieldwork | 195 |
| | 5.4.1 | Phases in Data Collection | 197 |
| 5.5 | Questic | onnaire Design | 197 |
| 5.6 | Measur | ement Development Process | 199 |
| 5.7 | Measur | ements and Scales of the Study | 200 |
| | 5.7.1 | Measurements of the Relationship Quality Dimensions | 200 |
| | 5.7.2 | Scales of the Study Dimensions | 207 |
| 5.8 | Analysi | s used in the Study | 209 |
| 5.9 | • | tory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Analysis | 211 |
| 5.10 | Multiple | Regression Analysis (MRA) | 212 |
| | 5.10.1 | Assumptions of Multiple Regression Analysis | 214 |
| | 5.10.2 | Estimating Multiple Regression Analysis and Assessing Overall Model Fit | 216 |
| | 5.10.3 | Assessing Multicollinearity | 219 |
| 5.11 | Discrim | inant Analysis (DA) | 221 |
| | 5.11.1 | Assumptions of Discriminant Analysis | 222 |
| | 5.11.2 | Assessing Discriminant Analysis | 224 |
| 5 12 | Conclus | sion | 229 |

5



| FIND | INGS AN | D DISCUSSIONS | |
|------|---------------------|---|-----|
| 6.0 | Introduc | tion | 229 |
| 6.1 | Respon | dents' Profiles and Study Background | 229 |
| 6.2 | Dimensi | ons of Relationship Quality | 233 |
| | 6.2.1 | Steps in Measurement Process | 233 |
| 6.3 | Data Re (EFA) (S | eduction using Exploratory Factor Analysis Step 6) | 238 |
| | 6.3.1 | Data Reduction Process using Exploratory Factor Analysis | 239 |
| | 6.3.2 | Testing Assumptions for Exploratory Factor Analysis | 240 |
| | 6.3.3 | Exploratory Factor Analysis Findings | 242 |
| 6.4 | | rification and Confirmation using atory Factor Analysis (CFA) (Step 8) | 249 |
| | 6.4.1 | Overall Model Estimation from Confirmatory Factor Analysis | 250 |
| | 6.4.2 | Confirmatory Factor Analysis Findings for Overall Model | 254 |
| | 6.4.3 | Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Research Questions 1b and 1c | 267 |
| | 6.4.4 | Discussions of the Findings | 268 |
| 6.5 | Relation Categor | ship Quality Dimensions and Services ies | 271 |
| | 6.5.1 | Multiple Regression Analysis Findings | 271 |
| | 6.5.2 | Multiple Regression Analysis and Research Hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 | 277 |
| | 6.5.3 | Discussions of the Findings | 278 |
| 6.6 | Discrimi Categor | nant Predictors between Services ies | 283 |
| | 6.6.1 | Discriminant Analysis Findings | 283 |
| | 6.6.2 | Discriminant Analysis and Research Hypotheses H5 and H5 | 286 |
| | 6.6.3 | Discussions of the Findings | 287 |
| 6.7 | Conclus | ion | 290 |

6



| 7 | REC | OMMEN | DATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS | |
|---|------|----------------------------|---|-----|
| | 7.0 | Introdu | ction | 292 |
| | 7.1 | Contributions of the Study | | 296 |
| | | 7.1.1 | Theoretical Contributions | 296 |
| | | 7.1.2 | Conceptual Contributions | 298 |
| | | 7.1.3 | Methodological Contributions | 302 |
| | 7.2 | Manag | erial Contributions | 302 |
| | | 7.2.1 | Credence Services | 303 |
| | | 7.2.2 | Experience Services | 306 |
| | | 7.2.3 | The Policy Makers | 308 |
| | 7.3 | Limitati | ions of the Study | 309 |
| | | 7.3.1 | Limitations from Methodology's Standpoint | 310 |
| | | 7.3.2 | Limitations from Study Dimensions' Standpoint | 311 |
| | 7.4 | Sugges | stions for Future Research | 313 |
| | 7.5 | Conclusion | | |
| | BIBL | .IOGRAP | PHY | 320 |
| | LIST | OF APP | PENDICES | |
| | APP | ENDICES | S | |
| | BIO | DATA OF | CANDIDATE | |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1.1 | Research Objectives, Research Questions, Dimensions and Statistical Analysis | 13 |
| 2.1 | Growth by Sectors in IMP2 | 27 |
| 2.2 | Contribution to GDP by Sector in IMP2 | 28 |
| 2.3 | Workforce by Sector in IMP2 | 30 |
| 2.4 | Share of Services Sub-sectors to Real GDP | 31 |
| 2.5 | Exports of NGS (selected sub-sectors) | 32 |
| 2.6 | Imports of NGS (selected sub-sectors) | 33 |
| 2.7 | Growth and Contribution to GDP by Sector in IMP3 | 35 |
| 2.8 | Gross Domestic Product by Sector in IMP3 | 36 |
| 2.9 | Employment by Sector in IMP3 | 37 |
| 2.10 | Consumer Expenditure (Selected Asean Countries) on Health Goods and Medical Services 2000-2005 (US\$ million) | 42 |
| 2.11 | Health Human Resources in 2006 | 43 |
| 2.12 | Financial Allocation in 2006 | 43 |
| 2.13 | Comparison of Tourist Arrivals to Malaysia (2006 and 2007) | 47 |
| 2.14 | Tourist Arrivals and Receipts to Malaysia (2002 – 2007) | 48 |
| 3.1 | The Definitions of Quality | 71 |
| 3.2 | The Definitions of Relationship Quality | 82 |
| 3.3 | A Review of Literature on Relationship Quality Dimensions | 90 |
| 3.4 | Customer Roles and the Benefits for the Customer and the Service Firm | 113 |
| 4.1 | Research Objectives, Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Study | 167 |
| 5.1 | Summary of Research Applications | 183 |
| 5.2 | Comparison of Research Procedures | 184 |
| 5.3 | Measurements and Scales of Study Dimensions | 198 |
| 5.4 | Conceptual Definition, Operational Definition, Measurement and Sources of the Study Dimensions | 204 |
| 6.1 | Respondents' Profiles | 230 |



| 6.2 | Background on Services Used in the Study | 232 |
|------|---|-----|
| 6.3 | Varimax Rotated Component Matrix and Communalities for Interpersonal Level | 244 |
| 6.4 | Varimax Rotated Component Matrix and Communalities for Organizational Level | 245 |
| 6.5 | KMO and Bartlett's Test of Interpersonal and Organizational Levels | 246 |
| 6.6 | Results from Extraction of Component Factors | 247 |
| 6.7 | Indices of Measurement Model at Interpersonal Level by Categories | 255 |
| 6.8 | Indices of Measurement Model at Organizational Level by Categories | 255 |
| 6.9 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Interpersonal Level (CNE Category) | 257 |
| 6.10 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Organizational Level (CNE Category) | 258 |
| 6.11 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Interpersonal Level (Credence Services Category) | 259 |
| 6.12 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Organizational Level (Credence Services Category) | 260 |
| 6.13 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Interpersonal Level (Experience Services Category) | 261 |
| 6.14 | Standardized Estimates of Measurement Model at Organizational Level (Experience Services | |
| | Category) | 262 |
| 6.15 | Second-Order Findings of Relationship Quality Dimensions | 266 |
| 6.16 | Findings of Relationship Quality and Loyalty | 272 |
| 6.17 | MRA Findings of Interpersonal Level | 274 |
| 6.18 | MRA Findings of Organizational Level | 276 |
| 6.19 | Summary Statistics of Discriminant Analysis | 284 |
| 6.20 | Classification Results for Discriminant Analysis | 286 |
| 7.1 | Summary of Hypotheses Findings | 293 |
| 7.2 | Summary of Methodology Limitations and Suggestions | 317 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figu | re | Page |
|------|---|------|
| 1.1 | Overview of Research Framework | 21 |
| 1.2 | Organization of the Thesis | 24 |
| 3.1 | The Model of Customer Perceived Quality | 74 |
| 3.2 | The Interaction Levels in a Relationship | 76 |
| 4.1 | A Framework for the Interaction Process between the Customer and the Service Provider | 155 |
| 4.2 | Summary of the Dimensions of Relationship Quality | 159 |
| 4.3 | The Research Framework of Relationship Quality | 165 |
| 5.1 | Service Classification versus Types of Services | 189 |
| 6.1 | Steps of Measuring the Dimensions of Relationship Quality | 235 |
| 6.2 | Scree Test of Interpersonal Level | 248 |
| 6.3 | Scree Test of Organizational Level | 248 |
| 6.4 | Structure of Measurement Model for Interpersonal Level | 252 |
| 6.5 | Structure of Measurement Model for Organizational Level | 253 |
| 6.6 | Second-Order Model of the Dimensions of Relationship Quality | 264 |
| 7.1 | Dimensions of Relationship Quality for Credence Services | 304 |
| 7.2 | Dimensions of Relationship Quality for Experience Services | 306 |



LIST OF ABBRIVATIONS

AGFI Adjusted Goodness-of-fit Index

AMOS A covariance-based SEM, developedby Dr. Arbuckle, Published

by SmallWaters and marketed by SPSS. Details are available

at http://www.spss.com/amos/

B2B Business-to-business

B2C Business-to-customer

BMRs Business Marketing Relationships

C2C Customer-to-customer

C2E Customer-to-employee

CFI Comparative Fit Index

CNE One category represents both credence services and

experience services.

CR Construct reliability or composite reliability is an indicator of

convergent validity. It can be calculated using squared sum of

standard loading for each dimension and the sum of the error

variance terms for a construct.

EQS A covariance-based SEM developed by Dr. Bentler and sold by

Multivariate Software, Inc. Details are available at

http://www.smallwaters.com/

GDP Gross Domestic Product

GFI Goodness-of-fit Index

ICRs Interpersonal Commercial Relationships

IFI Incremental Fit Index



IMP Industrial or International Marketing and Purchasing

IMP Industrial Master Plan

IMP2 Second Industrial Master Plan

IMP3 Third Industrial Master Plan

KMV Key Mediating Variables

LISREL A procedure for the analysis of Linear Structural RELations

among one or more sets of variables and variates

NGS Non-government Services

PLS Partial Least Squares. A second generation regression model

that combines a factor analysis with linear regressions, making

only minimal distribution assumptions.

PPE Perceived performance Excellence

RBV Resource Based View

RCI Relationship Closeness Inventory

RMSEA Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

SE Service employee

SERVQUAL Service Quality

TLI Tucker Lewis Index

AVE Average variance extracted is a summary indicator of

convergence. This value can be calculated using standard

loading for all items in one dimension.

WOM Word-of-mouth



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

This chapter covers the background of study and the problems faced by service marketers to compete in highly competitive markets. This chapter also outlines the research objectives, the research questions, the scope and significance of the study, finally the organization of this thesis.

1.1 Background of the Study

In Malaysia, the service sector is experiencing an increasingly important role in the economy. In 2004, the service sector grew by 6.7% and made up 57.4% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (MITI, 2005a). In terms of export of services, Malaysia ranked as the 29th largest exporter in 2004, with a total export of US\$18 billion (0.90% of total global exports) as compared to US\$13.5 billion (0.75% of the total global exports) in 2003 (MITI, 2005b). By the end of 2020, the service sector is expected to contribute to 60% of GDP (IMP3, 2006).

Even though Malaysia experiences an increase in the amount of export of services, at the same time Malaysia still has to import a huge amount of services. The total amount of service imports for Malaysia in 2004 increased to US\$19.2 billion (0.90% of global imports) from US\$17.3 billion (0.97% of global imports) in 2003. Malaysia became the 28th largest importer in 2004 (MITI, 2005a; MITI 2005b). Although the amount of imports exceeds the



amount of exports in terms of global percentages, the imports reduced from 0.97% in 2003 to 0.90% in 2004. It shows that Malaysia tries to reduce the amount of imports for services and, at the same time, tries to increase the export of services in global market. Therefore, Malaysia has to focus on how to develop and improve its service sector if it wants to be a significant player in the global economy.

Furthermore in 2005, service sectors (including government services) grew by 6.5%, slower than the previous year. In 2004, the service sectors grew by 6.8% (DOSM, 2006a). However, the service sector is still the biggest contributor to GDP with the forecast amount of 57.8% in 2005 as compared to 57.4% in 2004 (DOSM, 2006b). The Central Bank of Malaysia has predicted a positive growth for service sectors predicting an increase of 6% for the year 2006 (MITI, 2006).

As Malaysia strives to become a major player in the service sector, competition in business, as usual, is something that cannot be avoided by any firms around the globe or within Malaysia itself. With globalization, competitors could be from within or outside Malaysia. How successful a firm is depends on how the firm reacts to this and how fast it changes to adapt to the current scenario.

As competition increases, core products or services become more homogeneous and it is difficult for the firms to differentiate themselves from others. This is because they know that providing customers with the core



products or services is not enough in today's business. Nowadays, customers have a lot of choices. For that reason, the firms should not only offer the core products or services but offer augmented services as well (beyond the core products or services). The uniqueness of the service will make it difficult for any competitor to duplicate (Sharma & Patterson, 1999). However, providing extra services to the customers is not enough if these customers keep changing over time and the firms have to invest a lot of money and resources to attract new customers to use their products or services. Therefore, the firm should find a way to retain them all the time.

In the 1980s, when Berry introduced the term "Relationship Marketing," the idea in his mind is to encourage the firms to change their effort from getting new customers to an effort to retain them. The reason for his suggestion is that the costs to attract the new customers are higher than retaining the existing ones (Anderson & Fornell, 1994; Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). According to Bauer, Grether & Leach (2002), to win a new customer can be up to five times more expensive than maintaining existing customer relationships (Harrison-Walker & Neeley, 2004). In the long term, a series of studies shows that the longer the relationship with the customer, the higher the profit gained by the firm (Gummesson, 2002). Furthermore, the firms should devote all their resources and energy to maintain their current customers besides getting the new ones. In addition to that, with the new era of globalisation and information, competition becomes more intense. If firms fail to react according to these changes, it will make them lose their current and potential customers. In other words, the success of the firm depends on



how well they adopt new marketing approaches based on the situation and trying to hold the current customers rather than trying to get new ones.

Previously, service industries including airlines, banks, telecommunication, etc, were slow to adopt marketing concepts because they thought that they were in monopolistic industry where it would be difficult for new firm to enter. However, the situation has changed dramatically in the last few years with new firms joining the competition. For example, MAS is facing competition from low fare carrier, AirAsia, for certain domestic routes. To survive in this competition, the firms should understand their customers very well before offering any service. With the emergence of information technology, current customers are more knowledgeable and know what they want. In the case of AirAsia, they introduced on-line ticketing system, which is very convenient especially for the young or Internet savvy customers. This kind of technology gives customers more options to select the best service to fulfil their needs.

Furthermore, these service companies have to offer more than ordinary services to their customers in line with their needs and wants, by using either personal interaction (e.g., financial advisors, customer relations) or non-personal interaction (e.g., automatic teller machine (ATM), Internet), or both. All of these interactions are meant to attract and retain the customers. Therefore, the concept of relationship marketing becomes very important nowadays. The firm tries to build long-term relationship with their customers by understanding them, serving them, and making them loyal customers.

