**Model answers for examination: as you will see in some cases you have enough information to be able to mark yourself, in other cases (eg C4 and 5) there are many different ‘correct’ answers so these can’t all be listed.**

B1. Identify the errors in the use of the Harvard referencing system in the example below. There are five mistakes in all. Please circle each mistake and annotate the text to explain briefly what is the error. (5 marks)

Several researchers have studied Kano’s model for measuring service quality. In 1984 Kano and his colleagues empirically confirmed the applicability of their model for quality attributes of television products and other manufactured goods. M. Miyakawa & C. K. Wong (1989) studied Kano’s model in manufactured goods. Schvaneveldt et al. (1991) explored the applicability of Kano’s model to four mass-market services – retail banking, cleaning services, family restaurants, and supermarkets. *Technovation* (1998) demonstrated the applicability of Kano’s model, in combination with quality function deployment, using a case study from the ski industry. Sa Moura & Saraiva (2001) used Kano’s analysis to develop an ideal kindergarten.

**References**

Kano, N. et al. (1984) Attractive quality and must-be quality, *Journal of Japanese Society for Quality Control*, 14(2), (in Japanese).

Miyakawa, M. & Wong, C. K. (1989) Analysis of attractive quality and must-be quality through product expectation factors, *Proceedings of 35th Technical Conference*, Japan Society for Quality Control, Tokyo.

Schvaneveldt, S. J. et al. (1991) Consumer evaluation perspectives of service quality: evaluation factors and twoway model of quality, *Total Quality Management*, 2(2).

Matzler, K. & Hinterhuber, H. H. (1998) How to make product development projects more successful by integrating Kano’s model of customer satisfaction into quality function deployment, *Technovation*, 18(1).

Sa Moura, P. & Saraiva, P. (2001) The development of an ideal kindergarten through concept engineering/quality function deployment, *Total Quality Management*, 12(3).

The mistakes are highlighted below. Each mistake correctly identified scores 1 point. [DEPENDING ON NUMBER OF MARKS NEEDED, COULD ALLOCATE AN EXTRA MARK FOR GETTING ALL 5]

Several researchers have studied Kano’s model for measuring service quality. In 1984 Kano and his colleagues [replace with Kano et al (1984)] empirically confirmed the applicability of their model for quality attributes of television products and other manufactured goods. M. Miyakawa & C. K. Wong (1989) [no need for authors’ initials] studied Kano’s model in manufactured goods. Schvaneveldt et al. (1991) explored the applicability of Kano’s model to four mass-market services – retail banking, cleaning services, family restaurants, and supermarkets. *Technovation* [replace with author name] (1998) demonstrated the applicability of Kano’s model, in combination with quality function deployment, using a case study from the ski industry. Sa Moura & Saraiva (2001) used Kano’s analysis to develop an ideal kindergarten.

References

Kano, N. et al. (1984) Attractive quality and must-be quality, Journal of Japanese Society for Quality Control, 14(2), (in Japanese). [page refs for the articles are missing in all cases]

Miyakawa, M. & Wong, C. K. (1989) Analysis of attractive quality and must-be quality through product expectation factors, Proceedings of 35th Technical Conference, Japan Society for Quality Control, Tokyo. [the sources after Kano are in the wrong order: they are in the order they appear in the article, not in alphabetical order based on author surname, as they should be]

Schvaneveldt, S. J. et al. (1991) Consumer evaluation perspectives of service quality: evaluation factors and twoway model of quality, Total Quality Management, 2(2).

Matzler, K. & Hinterhuber, H. H. (1998) How to make product development projects more successful by integrating Kano’s model of customer satisfaction into quality function deployment, Technovation, 18(1).

Sa Moura, P. & Saraiva, P. (2001) The development of an ideal kindergarten through concept engineering/quality function deployment, Total Quality Management, 12(3).

B2. Briefly define all three of the following sampling techniques and explain when it might be appropriate to use them:

Stratified random sampling

Quota sampling

Snowball sampling

1. Probability sampling technique. Population divided into strata and a random sample taken from each (eg from men and women, different age groups, public /private sector). Useful when the aim of the research is to compare one subset of the sample to another and random sampling might not provide sufficient responses. Requires an accessible sampling frame.
2. Quota sampling. Non-probability sampling technique. Requires dividing population into sub-sets (eg age groups) and calculating a quota of responses in each subgroup. A way of covering the whole population when it is not possible to obtain a sampling frame. Usually used for large surveys and relatively cheap and easy.
3. Snowball sampling. Non-probability sampling. Involves getting in touch with one or two members of the population and then using them to refer you to other members. Useful for only hard to reach samples where there are no alternatives (not desirable as huge problems of bias).

B 3 Focus group

Group interview. Small number of participants. Using a topic guide. Researcher acts as moderator. The aim is to encourage interaction and discussion across all participants.

Useful for establishing a breadth of views and discovering differences and similarities. Allows participants to respond to others’ views. Thus helpful when a depth of understanding of an individual respondent’s views is less important. (Eg when you are trying to discover the range of views possible in order to develop a questionnaire).

Case study

C1: The main points (up to 3 or 4 marks each depending on how developed) Did not get proper agreement from the GM. Staff obviously distrusted the motives behind his research (especially those who did ‘party’). Would have been reinforced in reading the questionnaire which seems to be biased against this activity. Sample would not be representative because more of the staff who did not participate in ‘partying’ activities seem to have completed it.

C2. See page 119 Saunders. If taking a more positivist approach, assumes a neutral researcher and he would need to try to ensure that his methods were not biased towards one point of view or another. Realist, interpretativist and pragmatist perspectives assume that the researcher has values which will affect the research – but then necessary to be aware of these and of how they may be affecting the research. Up to 3 marks for identifying the need to remove bias – up to a further 7 marks for discussion of different perspectives.

C3. 1 per problem : includes

1. Over lapping categories (25-30 /30-40)
2. Categories where you could answer more than once (eg be front-of-house and a manager and part-time).
3. Use of jargon that respondents may not understand (presenteeism)
4. Two questions in one – Partying and drinking heavily.
5. And 6 Loaded/leading questions.

B. Could answer more than once (see above)

C Won’t be appropriate to test for significance (small sample size and nos of non- respondents in front of house.

4. 1 mark per question.

5. Up to 10 according to quality of argument but must be a qualitative method (as says mixed methods).