

MKTG3117 Individual Assignment

Student:

SID:

Marker: Iain Black

Comments:

This is a reasonable start, you clearly understand service quality and how to apply it. Though you could do a better job of the actual application. This report though is easy to read but could be helped by further sub-headings

Part 1: _____

You use industry awards and company information well to construct a picture of the quality of Fone Zone. Do you have any personal experience or thoughts on this?

Part 2: _____

This sets up your chosen quality framework well by talking about the differences between service and tangible goods quality evaluation. Whilst the Servqual and Gaps models are legitimate ideas they are limited and can be critiqued regarding their applicability to particular services. I would hope in the re-submission that you are able to use this work as the starting point for a more detailed evaluation of service quality. It is not that the servqual or gaps models are wrong or not relevant to use here, just that there are additions/changes that would make it more useful than the simple addition of methods used. Have a look at either Cronin, J. J. Jr and Taylor, S. A., 1992. "Measuring Service quality. A Re-examination and Extension". *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (July), 55-68 or Buttle, F ((1996) SERVQUAL: Review, Critique, Research Agenda. *European Journal of Marketing*, vol 30, 1, pp8-32, as a starting point for this. Also please change the examples used to one regarding fone zone, it shows you have a deeper understanding of the model if you can apply it to different settings.

Part 3: _____

I would like to see a more detailed exploration of what they actually do under the headings provided by your framework. This section should be about a critique of the company, leading to recommendations, at the moment there is not enough critique.

Mark: 64%

MKTG3117 Individual Assignment

Student:

SID:

Marker: Iain Black

Comments:

This is a good report. In parts one and two it is well structured and clearly written. I like the way you have tried to combine 2 different approaches however would like to see you being a little more critical.

Part 1: _____

Using the 7 P's to structure this section is a good idea. I am intrigued by the "concept store" idea. Sounds like an attempt to do more selling than servicing. In some parts you give a view on what they do but don't really make a case for them being a quality organisation service provider, please work on this for the resubmission.

Part 2: _____

Combining these two approaches is an admirable attempt at creating a specific framework for analysing bank quality. Your reading has paid off here and you make the framework explicit for me (many students didn't). However what you do, with the exception of one paragraph in the middle, is descriptive. This is not to say it isn't a good start or good work, it is, but for the resubmission I would like you to think more about critiquing the approaches you use and also approaches you could have used. There must be some reasons you chose Gronroos and Servqual, so let me know about them.

Part 3: _____

This section is based on explaining customer expectations rather than exploring NAB according to the framework you have chosen, for example what I would prefer to read about is your analysis of gap 3, does it exist, if so why and how can it be closed. Be more methodical in your application of the framework. Some good recommendations here but ensure they flow from the analysis.

Mark: 75%