International Journal of Commerce and Management Research
ISSN: 2455-1627
www.managejournal.com
Volume 2; Issue 2; February 2016; Page No. 17-23

Customer satisfaction surveys: Issues and Concerns

Pratap Chandra Mandal
Associate Professor (Marketing), Silver Jubilee Tower, VIT Business School, VIT University, Vellore, Tamil Nadu - 632 014, India.

Abstract
Customer satisfaction is essential for the long-term success of any organization. Customer satisfaction might be measured based on customer satisfaction surveys. Customer satisfaction surveys are conducted based on questionnaires. Although customer satisfaction surveys are very popular, the surveys are not without drawbacks. In the study, both the benefits and the drawbacks of conducting surveys are discussed. The process of identification of some of the drawbacks is discussed. The paper also suggests solutions for overcoming the drawbacks. Researchers, practitioners, and companies are suggested to be aware of the limitations of questionnaire survey while conducting the surveys and interpret the results of the analysis keeping the limitations in mind. The arguments presented and the solutions suggested are expected to help researchers, practitioners, and companies while applying customer satisfaction surveys for measuring customer satisfaction.

Keywords: customer satisfaction; surveys; questionnaire design; sampling; sampling frame.

Introduction

Customer satisfaction is considered the essence of success in today's highly competitive business environment. It has been mentioned by Prabhakaran & Satya (2003) [36]. That the customer is the most important person in any form of business. Generally speaking, if the customers are satisfied with the provided goods or services, the probability that they will use the services again increases (East, 1997) [11]. Also, satisfied customers will most probably talk enthusiastically about their buying or the use of a particular product or service. This will lead to positive word of mouth (File & Prince, 1992; Richins, 1983) [13, 39]. On the other hand, dissatisfied customers will most probably switch to a different brand. This will lead to negative word of mouth (Nasserzadeh, Jafarzadeh, Mansouri, & Sohrabi, 2008) [30]. The significance of satisfying and keeping a customer in establishing strategies for a market and customer-oriented organization cannot be ignored (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990) [23].

Meeting customer's needs, and thus assuring customer satisfaction, is ultimately the responsibility of the management of a company. The first step in ensuring customer satisfaction is to measure the present levels of customer satisfaction. It is the responsibility of the company to ensure that quality measurements of customer satisfaction are obtained. Many companies are systematically measuring how well they treat their customers, identifying the factors shaping satisfaction, and changing operations and marketing as a result (Morgan, Anderson, & Mittal, 2005) [29]. Wise firms measure customer satisfaction regularly, because it is one key to customer retention (Seiders, Voss, Grewal, & Godfrey, 2005) [41].

Periodic surveys can track customer satisfaction directly. For this reason, companies advocate customer satisfaction surveys for capturing and measuring customer satisfaction. The increasing emergence of customer satisfaction surveys as a tool for measuring customer satisfaction is a remarkable development over the past few decades. The use of customer satisfaction surveys was pioneered by the automobile industry. Later, customer satisfaction surveys as a measurement of customer satisfaction was adopted by other sectors also (Kirkpatrick, 1992; Loro, 1992) [22, 25]. One of the largest and most diversified new-home builders, Pulte Homes constantly measures how well it is doing with customers and tracks them over a long period of time. Pulte surveys customers just after they buy their homes and again several years later to make sure they are still happy (Rooney, 2006) [40].

The above discussion indicates that companies use customer satisfaction surveys as a tool for the assessment of customer satisfaction and also to ensure that their customers are satisfied. These surveys usually fulfill two needs. The surveys indicate the performances of different business units of a company (with respect to customer satisfaction) in different time periods and locations (Jones & Sasser, 1995) [21]. The surveys also provide valuable information about customers. Different customer segments might be identified based on the customer satisfaction scores obtained from the surveys. Customers might be clustered based on their satisfaction scores. The individual satisfaction levels of customers might be measured. Also, satisfaction levels of a particular segment of customers might be measured. The satisfaction levels of customers in different aspects of products and services provided by the company might be determined. This will give an indication to the company about the areas to improve for higher customer satisfaction. Companies need to investigate the reasons for low customer satisfaction levels in those dimensions where customer satisfaction levels are low and develop strategies for improvement in those areas. The surveys can be a rich source of information for generating continuous quality improvements. For achieving this, the surveys need to be examined carefully and used within a consistent framework.

Customer satisfaction surveys are very popular because of the reasons already mentioned above. But these surveys are not without problems. The common problems include a lack of standard, valid, and reliable satisfaction scales. The surveys also tend to indicate a high level of satisfaction. Since the

administration of customer satisfaction surveys is relatively easy, there is proliferation and excessive use of surveys (Atlany, 1993; Mehta, 1990) [2, 28]. Also, due to the increasing usage of customer satisfaction surveys, the customers are usually tired and bored of being surveyed (Reichheld, 1996) [38].

Customer satisfaction surveys are a set of questions which are easy to administer to the respondents. Because of this there seems to be a tendency among companies to have just random data collection about customer perceptions and opinions with little effort for intelligent follow-up and meaningful investigations (Godfrey, 1993) [18]. The reliability of the method of data collection through surveys needs to be evaluated. This is because of the fact that although attitudinal studies using questionnaires are the most common method of data collection and measurement, there is a lack of standardized instrument for measuring customer experience and satisfaction.

The main purpose of the paper is to emphasize the importance of studying customer satisfaction surveys and also to point out some of the most common methodological problems encountered by companies in conducting these surveys. The study focuses on the four most critical issues encountered in these surveys, namely sampling frames, quality of survey data and instruments, non-response problems, and reporting and interpretation of the collected data. The methodological aspects discussed are applicable to both management and marketing research. Finally, the suggestions for customer satisfaction surveys in the future are laid out.

Sampling Frames

In any survey it is not possible for a company to reach out to each and every customer availing a particular product or service. Companies rely on selecting and analyzing representative samples that constitute rather small percentages of the total population. One of the important requirements of any survey instrument is its validity. A measure is valid when the differences in observed scores reflect true differences on the characteristic one is attempting to measure and nothing else (Churchill, 1979) [4]. Customer satisfaction surveys tend to have a high level of internal validity because customer satisfaction is expressed only in terms of those customers who have been surveyed and not all customers in general. The sampling procedures followed for selecting the respondents are arbitrary that introduce biases of unknown magnitudes into their results. This also makes the data collection based on these surveys, vulnerable. It is important to construct a proper sampling plan for eliminating potentially large biases. Any sample needs to be evaluated based on the process by which it was selected more than by the results obtained. Sampling frame is the first step in evaluating the quality of a sample. The characteristics which are important in choosing a sampling frame are comprehensiveness, probability of selection, and efficiency (Fowler, 1993) [15]. One problem found in customer satisfaction surveys is uncontrolled sampling. It is also questionable whether the use of sampling theory is appropriate in selecting the respondents for a customer satisfaction survey. Sometimes, there is no basis of selection of a consecutive series of respondents and so, it cannot be regarded as a random sample.

- **Sample Sizes**

Customer satisfaction surveys are ultimately focused on understanding the whole scenario. So, small samples are used and analysis done on those small samples is inferred to draw conclusions for a larger population (Hayslip, 1994) [20]. Researchers indicate that the sample size needs to be large enough and should be representative of the total population (DeVellis, 2003) [9]. The sample should provide enough variation in the variables of interest to demonstrate the theoretical relationship. Nunnally (1978) [31]. Suggests that responses from 300 people are an adequate number. However, practical experience suggests that even smaller samples can be used. The number of questions in the survey questionnaire has a direct bearing with the sample size. For example, if there are only 20 questions, fewer than 300 responses might suffice. McDaniel & Gates (1993) [27]. Suggest that a sample should be large enough to obtain at least 100 respondents in each major subgroup of the target population and a minimum of 20 to 50 respondents in each of the less important subgroups.

There are several risks in using a small sample size. First, the patterns of covariation among the items may not be stable. Secondly, the sample may not represent the population for which the construct is intended. A small sample is more likely to exclude certain types of individuals. Both the size and the composition of the development sample need to be kept in mind while selecting the sample.

There are at least two different ways in which a sample may not be representative of the larger population. The first involves the level of attribute present in the sample versus the intended population. For example, a sample might represent a narrower range of the attribute than would be expected of the population. Another major problem is when the sample is qualitatively rather than quantitatively different from the target population. The survey questions might have different meanings for different respondents. Because of the differences in meanings, the responses obtained will also differ. If a researcher has reasons to believe that the meaning ascribed to a specific question will differ in a sample, great caution should be used in interpreting the findings obtained from that sample.

- **Choice of a Target Population**

The choice of a target population depends on the number and the quality of the survey questions. Usually, the target population will be all the actual and potential customers and from them a random sample may be chosen. Another way of choosing the target population is to limit it to a sub-group with certain characteristics e.g. income group, age group etc. The sample techniques used must be sensitive to statistical considerations.

- **Segments in a Target Population**

Different customers within a particular segment define satisfaction differently, and that the same customer may well define customer satisfaction differently over time (Etherington, 1992) [12]. Customer satisfaction surveys need to identify these segments and also design management actions to achieve satisfaction by segments. Many companies are changing the way they segment their customers. One example is to segment the customers based on the frequency, size, and timing of their purchases. Companies need to align their customer satisfaction surveys to the new segments in order to track the specific requirements for each segment.

- **Improvement of the Quality of Survey Data and Instrument**

Customer satisfaction surveys are used to assess the quality of any product or service. For this reason, the quality of questionnaire design becomes very important (Dillman, 1983) [10]. The quality of customer satisfaction surveys depends on the quality of the collected data itself. There are four dimensions to ensure data quality. They are timeliness, completeness, usability, and accuracy (Redman, 1992) [37]. Timeliness is important because, as already discussed previously, satisfaction for the same customer may change over time. Completeness indicates that the collected data need to be complete with respect to certain aspects namely, concepts of strata, sample sizes, coverage, and thoroughness of survey design. Usability indicates how the survey questions are designed. It deals with the format of survey, survey instructions, and understandability issues. The questionnaire cannot be too lengthy because it discourages the respondents to respond. The instructions need to be given in simple ways for the respondents to understand. There may not be any ambiguous terms in the questions. Also, only one aspect needs to be asked in one single question. The collected data also needs to be accurate so that it gives a true picture of the information that is encoded. It is also important for the data to be consistent so that the same attributes of the information are invariably considered in the encoding process.

Various types of errors might be introduced during the survey. They influence the behavior of customers leading to variations in the measurements made. Two major types of measurement errors which might occur in a customer satisfaction survey can be response error and procedure error. Response errors and procedure errors occur due to the responses given by the respondents. It might occur due to the following reasons.

- A respondent might not be willing to express his or her true feelings.
- Responses might vary due to transient personal factors, e.g. a person's mood, state of fatigue while answering the questions.
- Differences in responses might occur due to situational factors, e.g. whether the interview was conducted at home or at a central facility.
- Differences in responses might occur due to sampling of items, e.g. the specific items used in the questionnaire. If the items or the wordings of those items are changed, the responses might also change.
- Differences might occur due to lack of clarity of measuring instruments, e.g. vague or ambiguous questions might be interpreted differently by different respondents.
- Differences in responses might occur due to mechanical factors, e.g. a check mark in the wrong box or a response which is coded incorrectly.
- The customer may vary from time to time in their willingness to provide responses to specific questions. Again, respondents may skip certain questions while responding to surveys.

The above-mentioned errors will be present in every measurement. The errors distort the observed scores away from the true scores.

Customer satisfaction surveys also need to be reliable. Reliability is the degree to which measures are free from errors and therefore yield consistent results (Peter, 1979) [34]. A measure is reliable to the extent that independent but comparable measures of the same trait or construct agree. Reliability depends on how much of the variation in scores is attributable to random or chance errors. The quality of the inferences made depends directly on the procedures that are used to develop the measures. It typically takes the form of some reliability index. The problem with reliability index is that there exist a number of reliability measures. If a survey is not reliable, different results will be obtained each time a survey is conducted (Flynn, Sakakibara, Schroeder, Bates, & Flynn, 1990) [14]. The number of points used in the rating scale can also affect the reliability of the scale (Churchill & Peter, 1984) [5]. Also, multiple questions need to be administered in the survey. The reasons for having multiple items can be as follows:

- Individual items usually have considerable uniqueness or specificity in that each item tends to have only a low correlation with the attribute being measured and tends to relate to other attributes as well.
- Single items tend to categorize people into a relatively small number of groups. For example, a seven-step rating scale can at most distinguish among seven levels of an attribute.
- Individual items typically have considerable measurement error. They produce unreliable responses in the sense that the same scale position is unlikely to be checked in successive administration of an instrument.

The above-mentioned measurement difficulties can be diminished with multi-item measures in the following ways:

- The specificity of the items can be averaged out when they are combined.
- By combining items, one can make relatively fine distinctions among people.
- The reliability tends to increase and measurement error decreases as the number of items in a combination increases.

The most commonly reported measure of reliability is Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) [6]. It absolutely should be the first measure one calculates to assess the quality of an instrument. A low coefficient alpha indicates that the sample of items performs poorly in capturing the construct which motivated the measure. If the value of alpha is low, it indicates that some items do not share equally in the common core and should be eliminated. What is "low" for alpha depends on the purpose of the research. For early stages of basic research, Nunnally (1978) [31]. Suggests reliabilities of 0.50 to 0.60 suffice and that increasing reliabilities beyond 0.80 is probably wasteful. In many applied settings, however, where important decisions are made with respect to specific test scores, a reliability of 0.90 is the minimum that should be tolerated, and a reliability of 0.95 should be considered the desired standard. For customer satisfaction surveys, the usual criterion is 0.70 which is based on Nunnally's 1978 edition of Psychometric Theory (Peterson, 1994) [35].

The internal homogeneity of the measure should not be assessed based on the calculation of split-half reliability. In split-half reliability, the measure is divided into two halves. The first half may be composed of all the even-numbered items and the second half all the odd-numbered items. The analyst then calculates a total score for each half and correlates these

total scores across subjects. The problem with this approach is that the size of this correlation depends on the way the items are split to form the two halves. With, say, 10 items, there are 126 possible splits. Because each of these possible divisions will likely produce a different coefficient, the split-half reliability cannot be determined.

Once the reliability of a customer satisfaction survey is determined, its validity also needs to be assessed. Validity is a scale's ability to measure what it sets out to measure (Churchill, 1979) [4]. Customer satisfaction surveys must be valid; that is, they must truly measure the satisfaction variables they are intended to measure. Construct validity can be of two types – convergent validity and discriminant validity. Evidence of convergent validity of the measure is provided to the extent to which it correlates highly with other methods designed to measure the same construct (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) [3]. Discriminant validity is the extent to which the measure is indeed novel and not simply a reflection of some other variable (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) [3].

It is critical for studies using survey methods to follow guidelines regarding questionnaire construction and administration (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) [43, 7]. This is to ensure that the data collected are relevant and appropriate. The steps proposed by DeVellis (2003) [9]. might be followed. The steps are:

1. Clear determination of what needs to be measured
2. Generation of item pool
3. Determination of the format for measurement
4. Review of the initial pool of items by experts
5. Inclusion of validation items
6. Administration of items to a development sample
7. Evaluation of the items
8. Optimization of the number of items

Each of the steps is explained in brief.

- The theory of customer satisfaction needs to be clear before the development of questions for the survey. This will give clarity as to what exactly needs to be measured. This in turn will help in developing the questions.
- Those items need to be included which reflect the issue of customer satisfaction in the specific context considered. Redundant items need to be eliminated because they tend to reduce the reliability of the measure. The number of items needs to be decided based on how strongly the items correlate with one another. The reliability increases with increase in the number of items. However, it becomes difficult to administer the pool of items on a single occasion if the number of items is more. If the pool of items is exceptionally large, some items need to be eliminated based on certain predetermined criteria, such as lack of clarity, questionable relevance, or undesirable similarity to other items. The items in the questionnaire need to be unambiguous. Exceptionally lengthy items need to be avoided, as length usually increases complexity and diminishes clarity. Again, it is not desirable to sacrifice the meaning of an item in the interest of brevity. Reading difficulty of the questions also needs to be at a minimum level (Fry, 1977; Dale & Chall, 1948) [16, 8]. Fry (1977) [16]. Notes that semantic and syntactic factors should be considered in assessing reading difficulty. Short words tend to be more common and short sentences tend to be syntactically simpler. Double-barreled items should also be avoided. Ambiguous pronoun references should be avoided. Items need to be worded both positively and negatively in order to avoid an acquiescence, affirmation, or agreement bias. The wordings of the questions should follow established rules of grammar. This will help to avoid some of the sources of ambiguity. Overall, the questions and the instructions need to be written as clearly as possible.
- Different formats for measurement might be adopted depending on the requirement. Some of the scales adopted for the questionnaires are Thurstone scale, Guttman scale, scales with equally weighted items, Likert scale, semantic differential scale, visual analog, and binary scales. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the scales and its suitability of application in the specific situation need to be kept in mind before administration.
- The initial pool of items needs to be reviewed by experts. This review serves multiple purposes related to maximizing the face and the content validity of the scale. The experts review the item pool and confirm or invalidate the definition of the phenomenon of customer satisfaction. The experts suggest how relevant they think each item is to what is intended to be measured. Reviewers can also evaluate the clarity and conciseness of the items. They can also point out the ways of tapping the phenomenon that might not have been included. Overall, the reviewers can help in maximizing the face validity and the content validity of the scale.
- Validation items need to be included in the questionnaire. This serves to detect flaws or problems in the questions. Respondents might not be answering the items of primary interest. One type of motivation that can be assessed fairly easily is social desirability. Also, if theory asserts that the phenomenon of customer satisfaction to be measured relates to other constructs, then the performance of the scale vis-à-vis measures of those other constructs can serve as evidence of its validity.
- Administration of items to a development sample needs to be done. The sample needs to be sufficiently large to eliminate subject variance (Ghiselli, Campbell, & Zedeck, 1981; Nunnally, 1978) [17, 31]. There are several risks in using a small sample. First, the patterns of covariation among the items may not be stable. Secondly, the sample may not represent the population for which the scale is intended. Both the size and the composition of the sample need to be considered. A troublesome type of sample non-representativeness involves a sample that is qualitatively rather than quantitatively different from the target population. If there are reasons to believe that the meaning ascribed to items may be atypical among a development sample, great caution should be used in interpreting the findings obtained from that sample.
- Evaluation of items needs to be done so that only appropriate items are administered. Initial examination of the performance of items is done based on reliability. The more reliable the individual items are, the more reliable will be the questionnaire. Reverse scoring needs to be done for those items whose correlations with other items are negative. Some other aspects which need to be considered include item-scale correlations, item variances, item means, and coefficient alpha. For single item

measures of customer satisfaction, test-retest correlation might be measured.

- The number of items in the questionnaire needs to be optimized. Shorter scales are good because they place fewer burdens on respondents. Longer scales, on the other hand, are good because they tend to be more reliable. Again, if a scale's reliability is too low then brevity is of no virtue. Items which reduce the value of coefficient alpha need to be eliminated. Items which contribute least to the overall internal consistency should be the first to be considered for exclusion.

Non-response

Response rate is usually very low in customer satisfaction surveys. This affects the inferential value of the sample survey methods. It also affects the validity, reliability, and the generalizability of the findings because the characteristics of the non-respondents remain unknown. Researchers have tried to address the issue of non-response in different ways. For increasing the response rates, researchers provide some incentives for the respondents to respond e.g. advanced letters to the respondents informing them about the survey, asking the customers about their willingness to participate in the survey, payments to respondents, and strategic call timings to the respondents (Groves, 1989) [19]. Many researchers handle the problem of non-response by reducing the errors arising from non-response through post-survey adjustments (Little & Rubin, 1987) [24].

Non-response can be of two types. Sometimes, the respondent does not respond at all. Sometimes, the respondent might skip some of the questions. Researchers have tried to distinguish between non-response due to non-compliance and non-response due to inaccessibility (Stinchcombe, Jones, & Sheatsley, 1981; Mayer & Pratt, 1966) [42, 26].

Low response rates are sometimes due to the managers of the company. Questionnaires are sometimes administered to respondents before validation. They are sometimes administered to a non-representative customer sample. This reduces the response rate. Companies try to minimize non-response by certain ways:

a. The company encloses a reply paid envelope along with a letter to encourage customers to complete the questionnaire.
b. The company sometimes offers monetary incentives to those respondents who complete the survey. (Yammarino, Skinner, & Childers, 1991) [91].

The above techniques might help in increasing the response rates. But at the same time, they introduce sample composition bias which arises because the respondents differ in some important aspects from the non-respondents. This makes the sample non-representative of the total population (Parker & McCrohan, 1983) [33].

Reporting and Interpretation

Several problems exist with the reporting of the collected data and interpretation of the results obtained through analysis. One major problem arises because traditional surveys focus only on a specific transaction (Oliver, 1981) [32]. Customer satisfaction is a continuous process and does not happen because of only one specific transaction. Secondly, some of the customer satisfaction surveys might not include some major determinants of customer satisfaction in the questionnaire. So, customer satisfaction with those major determinants are not captured and not included in the analysis. Some other issues with reporting and interpretation are discussed below.

- **Complex Distinctions among Customer Segments**

The customer segments are not homogeneous. The customer segments might differ based on their social conditions, psychological set-up, and various other factors. These external factors might affect customer satisfaction. These issues are not captured in customer satisfaction surveys (Reichheld, 1996) [38].

- **Item Heterogeneity**

There are usually multiple items in a customer satisfaction survey. This is because there are issues in measuring customer satisfaction based on a single item. The issues have already been discussed in details in the section on the improvement of the quality of survey data and instrument. The remedies suggested try to ensure the highest internal consistency and reliability as measured by Cronbach's alpha. Again, Cronbach's alpha cannot be used as a measure of reliability if the items are not homogeneous. If the survey tries to measure a number of traits then Cronbach's alpha is not a suitable measure to determine reliability (Allen & Yen, 1979) [1].

- **Survey Instruments**

The issues related to survey instruments have already been discussed in details in the section where the steps followed for data collection and analysis were discussed. Some more issues need to be addressed. Some surveys use a free-response technique to determine the important factors affecting customer satisfaction whereas other studies ask the respondents to respond to certain pre-determined factors on a ranking scale. The free-response technique is supposed to obtain better in-depth information about customer satisfaction. But companies usually prefer to conduct survey based on pre-determined factors because it is easy to administer and saves time, energy, and money. Also, it is easy to analyze the responses received based on ranking scales than to analyze information collected through free-response techniques where qualitative analysis needs to be done.

There is a time lag between receiving customers' responses and the service time. During this time lag, the requirements of customers might change. These changes will not be captured in the customer satisfaction survey and so, the company will be unaware about the current requirements of the customers. To solve this problem, companies may create online customer satisfaction surveys through which the customers can give feedback regarding his or her satisfaction immediately after using a specific product or service. A company may also adopt other measures to track customer satisfaction through online services. This will eliminate the issue of time lag to some extent. A company may also request the customer to respond to surveys each time a particular product or service is used. This will help the company to keep track of customer satisfaction in real time.

- **Statistical Analysis**

Appropriate statistical analysis needs to be done on the collected data to arrive at suitable conclusions. The analysis done on the collected data needs to be both valid and reliable for making accurate inferences. For example, if the respondents are asked to provide their responses on ordinal scale, parametric analysis cannot be done because parametric analysis requires data on interval scale. So, in this particular

case, the analysis may provide misleading results. The company needs to understand this and it should not take any management decision based on incorrect results.

Conclusion

The aim of the article was to sensitize both researchers and companies conducting customer satisfaction surveys about the major issues pertaining to those surveys. Companies and researchers should not come to conclusions based on only the results obtained from analysis for the surveys. They also need to focus on how those results were arrived at. The paper discussed some of the issues which researchers and companies need to be aware of while conducting the surveys. Remedial actions for some of the issues are also suggested. The discussions presented should be interpreted as general guidelines and not as rules for conducting and interpreting the results of customer satisfaction surveys. Some of the major issues which have been already discussed in the paper are highlighted below to draw attention of researchers and practitioners.

The researcher needs to identify the limitations of different customer satisfaction surveys. Limitations regarding sampling, data collection, and data analysis need to be kept in mind before taking any managerial decisions based on the analysis.

As discussed in the article, the present customer satisfaction surveys lack in reliability and validity. Researchers need to ensure reliability and validity of their measurement instruments. Customer needs and requirements also are required to be understood properly.

Customer satisfaction scores obtained need to be compared with the scores obtained (for the same product category or services category) by the competitors. Customer satisfaction scores are relative in nature and are meaningful only when they can be gauged against comparative customer satisfaction scores. The companies would be wise to come to any conclusion only after performing this comparative analysis.

Researchers also need to keep in mind that respondents want shorter customer satisfaction surveys. So, without compromising on the reliability and the validity of the instrument, researchers need to optimize the number of questions in the survey which is realistic for any customer to respond without causing any fatigue or boredom.

Researchers and companies also need to involve customers in the construction of the survey instruments. This will give the customers a sense of belongingness in the construction of the customer satisfaction scale. Also, companies will have more insights into customer satisfaction. This will improve the quality of measurement. Companies will also come to know what customers really want and this will help in making management decisions regarding customer satisfaction.

References

1. Allen MJ, Yen WM. Introduction to Measurement Theory. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979.
2. Atlany DR. (September 20). Bad Surveys Flood the Market. Industry Week, 1993, 12.
3. Campbell DT, Fiske DW. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959; 56:81-105. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0046016
4. Churchill GA. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. Journal of Marketing Research. 1979; 16:64-73. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3150876
5. Churchill GA, Peter JP. Research Design Effects on the Reliability of Rating Scales: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 1984; 21:360-375. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3151463
6. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. Psychometrika 1951; 16, 297-334. doi: 10.1007/BF02310555
7. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct Validity in Psychological Tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955; 52:282-302. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0040957
8. Dale E, Chall JS. A Formula for predicting Readability: Instructions. Education Research Bulletin, 1948; 27:37-54. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1473169
9. DeVellis RF. Scale Development Theory and Applications (2nd ed.). Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003, 26.
10. Dillman DA. Mail and Other Self-Administratered Questionnaires. In P. Rossi, J.D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research New York: Academic Press. 1983, 359-377
11. East R. Consumer Behavior: Advances and Applications in Marketing. London: Prentice Hall, 1997.
12. Etherington B. Putting Customer Satisfaction to Work. Business Quarterly Summer, 1992, 128-131.
13. File KM, Prince RA. Positive word-of-mouth: customer satisfaction and buyer behavior. International Journal of Bank Marketing, 1992; 10: 25-29. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02652329210007867
14. Flynn BB, Sakakibara S, Schroeder RG, Bates KA, Flynn, EJ. Empirical Research Methods in Operations Management. Journal of Operations Management. 1990; 9: 250-284. doi: 10.1016/0272-6963(90)90098-X
15. Fowler FJ. Survey Research Methods. Newbury Park: CA: SAGE Publications, 1993.
16. Fry E. Fry's Readability Graph: Clarifications, Validity, and Extension to Level 17. Journal of Reading. 1977; 21: 242-252. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40018802
17. Ghiselli EE, Campbell JP, Zedeck S. Measurement Theory for the Behavioral Sciences. San Francisco: Freeman, 1981.
18. Godfrey AB. Ten Areas for Future Research in Total Quality Management. Quality Management Journal. 1993; 1:47-70.
19. Groves RM. Survey Errors and Survey Costs. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989.
20. Hayslip WR. Measuring Customer Satisfaction in Business Markets. Quality Progress, 1994, 83-87.
21. Jones TO, Sasser WE. Why Satisfied Customers Defect. Harvard Business Review, 1995; 73(6):88-99. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/1995/11/why-satisfied-customers-defect
22. Kirkpatrick D. Breaking Up IBM. Fortune, 1992, 44-58.
23. Kohli AK, Jaworski BJ. Market orientation: the construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. Journal of Marketing, 1990; 54(2)1-18. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1251866
24. Little R, Rubin DB. Statistical Analysis with Missing Data. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1987.

25. Loro L. Customer Is Always Right: Satisfaction Research Booms. Advertising Age, 1992, 25.
26. Mayer CS, Pratt RW. A Note on Nonresponse in a Mail Survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1966; 30:637-646. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2746968
27. McDaniel C, Gates R. Contempoary Marketing Research. Minneapolis: West Publishing Company, 1993.
28. Mehta CL. Many Surveys, Too Many Numbers Add up to Confusion. Automotive News, 1990, 13.
29. Morgan NA, Anderson EW, Mittal V. Understanding Firms' Customer Satisfaction Information Usage. Journal of Marketin. 2005; 69(3):131-151. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.3.131.66359
30. Nasserzadeh SMR, Jafarzadeh MH, Mansouri T, Sohrabi B. Customer Satisfaction Fuzzy Cognitive Map in Banking Industry. Communications of the IBIMA 2008; 2: 151-162. Retrieved from http://www.ibimapublishing.com/journals/CIBIMA/volume2/v2n21.pdf
31. Nunnally JC. Psychometric Theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
32. Oliver R. Measurement and Evaluation of Satisfaction Process in Retail Settings. Journal of Retailing, 1981; 57(3), 25-48. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=search.displayRecord&uid=1984-10995-001
33. Parker C, McCrohan KF. Increasing Mail Survey Response Rates: A Discussion of Methods and Induced Bias. In J. Summey, R. Viswanathan, R. Taylor, & K. Glynn (Eds), Marketing: Theories and Concepts for an Era of Change, 1983, 254-256.
34. Southern Marketing Association. Peter JP. Reliability: A Review of Psychometric Basis and Recent Marketing Practices. Journal of Marketing Research, 1979; 16:6-17. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3150868
35. Peterson R. A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Journal of Consumer Research. 1994; 21:381-391. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2489828
36. Prabhakaran S, Satya S. An insight into Service Attributes in Banking Sector. Journal of Services Research. 2003; 3(1):157-169. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/magazine/1P3-1138643321/an-insight-into-service-attributes-in-banking-sector
37. Redman TC. Data Quality: Management and Technology. New York: Bantam Books, 1992.
38. Reichheld FF. Learning from Customer Defections. Harvard Business Review 1996; 74:56-69. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/1996/03/learning-from-customer-defections
39. Richins ML. Negative word-of-mouth by dissatisfied consumers: a pilot study. Journal of Marketing. 1983; 47:68-78. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3203428
40. Rooney J. Winning Hearts and Minds. Advertising Age, 2006, 10-13.
41. Seiders K, Voss GB, Grewal D, Godfrey AL. Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context. Journal of Marketing. 2005; 69:38-60. Retrieved from http://www.unisa.ac.za/contents/faculties/ems/docs/4_3%20Seiders,%20Voss,%20Grewal%20and%20Godfrey.pdf
42. Stinchcombe A, Jones, C, Sheatsley P. Nonresponse Bias for Attitude Questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1981; 45: 359-375.
43. Sudman S, Bradburn NM. Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.
44. Yammarino F, Skinner SJ, Childers T. Understanding Mail Survey Response Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. Public Opinion Quarterly 1991; 55:23-34.