



Manuscript Title Evaluation of Service Quality Gaps in Construction Professional Service Firms in Nigeria

Authors Aluko Olusola Raphael, Omoniyi Sunday Samuel and Adedotun Ayodele Dipeolu

Submitted Date 14-May-2020 (1st Submission)

Accepted Date 21-Dec-2020

EARLY VIEW

Evaluation of Service Quality Gaps in Construction Professional Service Firms in Nigeria

*Aluko Olusola Raphael, Omoniyi Sunday Samuel and Dipeolu, Adedotun Ayodele

Department of Architecture, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ibogun Campus
Ogun State, Nigeria

*Corresponding author: olusola.aluko@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

Abstract: The study aims at evaluating and comparing service quality of consultancy firms who provide professional services in building projects in Nigeria. The paper seeks to address the general perceptions of dissatisfaction with the quality of services in order to enhance performance of building projects, and ensure competitiveness in the industry. A cross-sectional survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire as an instrument of data collection. The population of the study consisted of 488 representatives of public and private clients with a sample size of 385. Data were analyzed using weighted Mean and paired-sample t-test to determine the severity of differences in the expected service quality and perceived service quality. The result shows significant differences between the expected service quality and perceived service quality in structural engineering, mechanical/electrical engineering and quantity surveying services along all the dimensions of service quality. However, Tangible dimension of architectural services had no positive differences in the service quality, but had differences in Responsiveness, Empathy, Reliability and Assurance dimensions. The results imply that professional service providers require fundamental improvement in their services to their clients. This study offers an opportunity for consultancy firms to evolve global best practices by creating and maintaining high service quality as a team.

Keywords: Building projects, Clients, Consultancy firms, Service quality, Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

The building industry is unique because it incorporates services of different stakeholders at different project phases in its bid to deliver the project successfully. The delivery activities involve different stakeholders, various processes, different phases and stages of work. These stakeholders are the users' group, the client group, the contracting group, the supply chain group and the project management group (Nzekwe-Excel, 2007). The contracting group consists of the main contractors, sub-contractors and

specialist contractors. The supply chain group consists of manufacturers and suppliers. The project management group consists of Architects, Engineers, Designers, Quantity Surveyors, project managers operating as consultancy firms or professional service providers.

The project activities equally entail a lot of inputs from both the public and private sectors (Hughes, 2012). Each project is unique by its context and the diverse skills of individuals or organisations involved in its execution and it is characterised by its temporariness, lasting for a few months or years (Tan, 2012). The service quality of the different stakeholders is an important vehicle of firm's sustainability in the globalized industry.

According to Sunindijo, Hadikusumo and Phangchunun (2014), service quality is an important element affecting client satisfaction and behavioural intention and it often leads to the business success of the service providers. The client is often of the opinion that the professional service firms possesses standard expertise, and therefore are expected to operate within accepted guidelines. Findings from previous studies (Torbica and Stroh, 2001; Soetanto and Proverbs, 2002; Tang, Lu and Chan, 2003) showed that clients perceive service quality in the construction industry in different ways. This could be as a result of different background and knowledge of the client concerning the services being rendered.

In recent time, service quality has received attention by business managers, researchers and practitioners over the years (Angelova, 2011).

According to Hoxley (2000), the Service Quality (ServQual) model with some adaptations has been used in several service industries, including hotels, travel, higher education, accountancy, hospitals and construction services. Keltinger, Park & Smith (2009) equally reiterated that ServQual instrument had been widely utilized by practitioners and academics to assess client's perceptions of service quality in banks, information technology, repair and maintenance companies. Aga and Safakli (2007) also used the ServQual instrument to measure service quality and client satisfaction in professional accounting firms. Ismail, Othman and Amat (2012) examined contractors' service quality performance and client satisfaction in higher institutions of learning in Malaysia using the five service quality determinants of ServQual.

However, the quality of service of consultancy firms has remained a problematic issue in Nigeria. This is because their services are important drivers of the activities in the building industry. Some previous studies have been done based on an individual service provider, and mostly about contracting organisations (Oke, Timothy and Olaniyi, 2010; Lau et al, 2016); banking industry (Khan and Fasih, 2014) and airline industry (Lubbe, Douglas and Zambellis, 2011). Each building project involves a team of Architectural, Structural Engineering, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, and Quantity Surveying firms. The performance of each firm influences one another. The need for team approach was highlighted by Olatunde, Ogunsemi, and Oke (2017), who emphasised that the composition of the team and the quality of their services tend to impact positively or negatively on the outcome of building projects. In the service of these consultancy firms, there exists a

general perception of dissatisfaction with their performance in the industry (Kamara, Anumba and Egbnomwan, 2002). This was corroborated by Oyedele (2010) which emphasized continuous research on performance of consultants on building project in order to achieve client satisfaction. Meanwhile quality of service as a lifeblood of service delivery is a predictor of client satisfaction. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate and compare the service quality of a team of consultancy firms providing services to client's building project in order to improve competitiveness and financial sustainability.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Service Quality

Service quality is a process of conforming to requirements of an assignment, and a key factor that contributes to satisfaction of clients in the construction industry. Service providers are expected to improve service quality from time to time so as to remain competitive in the globalized world of business (Sunindijo *et al.*, 2014). The characteristics of services in the professional sub-sector of the construction industry make it difficult to measure. Services are intangible, heterogeneous and involve interaction between the service provider and the clients. As a result, the level of control of the service quality by service providers is low. Services are related to performances as evaluated by clients other than through products that can be counted,

verified and tested (Parasuraman, Zeithami & Berry, 1985). This process of performance evaluation often relies on the background and level of knowledge of the client.

Fundamentally, the concept of service quality is a product of the European School of thought led by the work of Gronroos (1984). According to the concept, service quality is viewed from both technical and functional quality. In the study of Parasuraman *et al.*, (1985), service quality is considered as a function of the difference (gap analysis) between expectations and perceptions of the service. According to the study, it is the customer's overall impression of the relative inferiority and/or superiority of the organisation and its services.

Based on this gap analysis, Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1990) developed a Service Quality (SERVQUAL) gap model. This was viewed as the delivery of excellent or superior service relative to customer's expectations. In the model, ten dimensions of service delivery that are generic and relevant to services in general were identified. These dimensions are tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, communication, credibility, security, competence, courtesy, understanding the customer and access. Factor analysis was used in later studies to condense the dimensions into tangibles, reliability, responsibility, assurance and empathy (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1994); which have formed the basis of studies on service quality.

The American school of thought conceptualised service quality as the overall assessment of the difference between perception and expectation of service delivery using 19 generic items. Service quality theory was

established as a theory of task performance and satisfaction. The theory posits that performance is mostly determined by goal achievement while satisfaction is a function of the difference between performances achieved and performances targeted (Soetanto & Proverbs, 2002). Satisfaction is a comparison between the perceptions of an individual about an outcome compared to his expectations (Singh & Khanduja, 2010).

The concept of service quality has also become a major area of attention because it has a strong impact on organisational performance, client satisfaction, client loyalty and profitability. The knowledge base in this provides a direction on how to explore or modify the existing service quality concepts (Seth & Deshmukh, 2005). The superior service quality reinforces the competitiveness of an organisation and enhances efficiency. The benefits include increased client satisfaction, client retention, positive word of mouth, reduced staff turnover, enlarge market share, increased profitability and improved financial performance.

The technical quality considers if the service meets client expectations while functional quality measures the perception of the client about the production and delivery of the service (Razavi, Safari, Shafie and Khoram, 2012). Performance refers to the client's evaluation of the service provider. Ensuring service quality is meeting or exceeding the expectations from the service (Ismail *et al.*, 2012). Other important elements of service quality are corporate image and reputation, and managing the service quality gives a

clear understanding of what service means to the client. This measure of service quality is an indicator of client satisfaction (Vincent, William & Godwin, 2008).

Sunindijo et al., (2014) described service quality as an important factor that affects client satisfaction and behaviour, and are indicators of business success in the construction sector. Such client behaviour includes word-of-mouth, re-purchase intention, positive or negative feedback and the willingness to pay for services (Grierson & Brennan, 2017). The study of Tabaku and Cerri (2016) concluded that the perceived quality of the customer has a significant effect on the creation of client satisfaction. The service quality dimensions and their corresponding measures as used by Sunindijo et al., (2014) was adopted for this study. Other researchers (Singh & Khanduja, 2010; Adat & Noel, 2014) have also used these service quality dimensions in the past.

Theoretical Framework

In order to establish a framework within which to examine the different variables of this study, Gap Model (Parasuraman, Zeithami and Berry, 1985) and the Disconfirmation of Expectation Model (Oliver, 1993) theories were reviewed.

Gap Model (Parasuraman, Zeithami and Berry (1985))

Service quality was considered as a function of the difference (gap analysis) between expectations and perceptions of the service. Based on the gap analysis, Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1990) developed gap model

called SERVQUAL, and Parasuraman et al. (1994) used factor analysis to determine Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy as SERVQUAL dimensions which formed the basis of studies on service quality.

The Disconfirmation of Expectation Model (Oliver, 1993)

The model predicts that as expectations increase, satisfaction decreases. The difference is held as a standard against which performance information is evaluated (Gunning, 2000). The clients would form expectations before purchasing a product or service (Singh & Khanduja, 2010), and the service received serves as an experience which produces a level of perceived quality (Siami & Gorji, 2012). If perceived performance is less than expected performance, the satisfaction level is negative, and when the difference is positive, satisfaction is also positive (Adat & Noel, 2014). The model uses five generic factors of tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy of SERVQUAL as variables of measurement.

Research Hypothesis

As pointed earlier, service quality is an important predictor of client satisfaction. Client satisfaction itself is an important factor in client referral which forms a basic foundation of new client acquisition in professional services (Grierson and Brennan, 2017). Moreover, service gaps determine either negative or positive levels of how the needs and requirements of

clients are met. This present study investigates the gaps in the service quality of professional service providers by testing the hypothesis that is stated below:

H₀: There is no significant difference between the expected service quality and the perceived service quality of professionals in building projects.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a survey approach using a questionnaire to collect the needed data. The study covers the South-Western geographical area of Nigeria. The population of the study consisted of 488 representatives of both public and private clients with a sample size of 385. The variables of service quality which formed the questionnaire were adopted from Hoxley (2000). All the items are predominantly from the SERVQUAL instruments and reliability testing was done using values of Cronbach's alpha coefficient range between 0 and 1. The larger the alpha value, the higher the reliability of the generated result or Likert scale of measurement. The Cronbach alpha coefficient value for the questionnaire used for this study is 0.88. This suggests that the questionnaire items are reliable and significant.

The questionnaire items are presented in Table I. The items are classified into five dimensions and it contains two types of responses. The first section is the expected level of service quality of the respondents, while the second portion is the perceived level of service quality using a 5-point Likert scale format. The expected service quality was measured using 1 = Nil, 2=Low, 3=

Moderate, 4=High and 5=Very High, while the perceived service quality used 1=Poor (P), 2=Fair (F), 3=Average (Av), 4= High (H) and 5=Very High (VH).

The weighted mean for the dimensions and mean differences were calculated and ranked appropriately. Paired sample t-test was used to determine the differences in the expected service quality and perceived service quality for Architectural firms, Structural engineering firms, M&E Engineering firms and Quantity Surveying firms.

Table I: Service quality dimensions and their corresponding variables

Service Quality Dimensions	Variables
Responsiveness	Willingness to help the client Prompt service to the client Keeping client informed about when services will be performed
Assurance	Readiness to respond to client's request Employees who instil confidence in customers Employees who are consistently courteous
Empathy	Making clients feel safe in their transactions Convenient business hours Giving clients personal attention Employees who understand the client's needs
Tangibles	Having the clients' best interest at heart Employees who have a neat professional appearance Visually appealing facilities
Reliability	Up-to-date modern equipment Providing services at the promised time Dependability in handling customers' service problems Performing the service right the first time Maintaining error-free records

Source: Hoxley (2000).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Weighted Mean and Ranking

The results of the weighted mean scores of the data collected on expected and perceived service quality of professional services of architectural consultancy firms are presented in Table II below.

Table II: Weighted Mean of Client's assessment of service quality of consultancy firms

	Expected Service Quality			Perceived Service Quality			MD
	N	Weighted Mean	R	N	Weighted Mean	R	
RESPONSIVENESS							
Architectural Firms	335	4.47	1	335	3.84	3	0.63
Structural Engineering firms	335	4.49	1	335	3.88	4	0.61
M & E Engineering firms	335	4.45	2	335	3.87	5	0.58
Quantity Surveying firms	335	4.36	3	335	3.84	5	0.52
ASSURANCE							
Architectural firms	335	3.58	5	335	3.33	5	0.25
Structural Engineering firms	335	4.44	2	335	3.98	3	0.46
M & E Engineering firms	335	4.46	1	335	4.09	1	0.37
Quantity Surveying firms	335	4.38	1	335	4.01	2	0.37
EMPATHY							
Architectural firms	335	4.13	2	335	3.87	2	0.26
Structural Engineering firms	335	4.41	3	335	3.99	3	0.42
M & E Engineering firms	335	4.36	4	335	3.99	3	0.37
Quantity Surveying firms	335	4.33	5	335	4.00	3	0.33
TANGIBLES							
Architectural firms	335	3.99	3	335	4.03	1	-0.04
Structural Engineering firms	335	4.29	5	335	3.87	5	0.42
M & E Engineering firms	335	4.26	5	335	3.88	4	0.38
Quantity Surveying firms	335	4.36	3	335	3.92	4	0.44
RELIABILITY							
Architectural firms	335	3.99	3	335	3.65	4	0.34
Structural Engineering firms	335	4.28	4	335	4.05	1	0.23
M & E Engineering firms	335	4.38	3	335	4.09	1	0.29
Quantity Surveying firms	335FF	4.38	1	335	4.04	1	0.34H

N =Number of Respondents, R=Rank; MD= Mean Difference

The assessment of the expected service quality of architectural services shows that 'responsiveness' was ranked 1st with a weighted mean of 4.47, 'empathy' was ranked 2nd with 4.13 while 'assurance' was 5th with 3.58. For structural engineering services, 'responsiveness' was also ranked 1st while 'tangible' was ranked 5th. In M&E engineering services, 'assurance' was ranked 1st, 'responsiveness' ranked 2nd while 'tangible' was ranked 5th. However, 'reliability and assurance' and 'empathy' were ranked 5th for quantity surveying services.

In the perceived service quality assessment, however, tangible was ranked 1st with a weighted mean of 4.03 while 'assurance' was ranked 5th with 3.33 for Architectural services. 'Reliability' was ranked 1st for Structural engineering with a weighted mean of 4.05, M&E engineering (4.09) and Quantity surveying services (4.04). On the other hand, 'responsiveness' was ranked 5th both for M&E engineering and Quantity surveying services at the weighted mean of 3.87 and 3.84 respectively.

The results show that the most important dimension of service quality as assessed by the client for architectural services is 'tangible' whose variables are neat appearance of the professional staff, up-to-date modern equipment and visually appealing facilities of the organisation. This is consistent with the study of Teo, Ofori, Tjandra and Kim (2016) which stated that the adoption of up-to-date facilities is an effective tool to improve safety performance, reduce fragmentation in the industry, allow accurate updating of changes, and enhance project efficiency and productivity. In the same way, reliability dimension with variables of timeliness, dependability in communicating clients' needs and error-free records was the most important for Structural engineering, M&E engineering and Quantity surveying services. This is also supported by Chan, Olawumi, and Ho (2019) which stated that collaboration and communication enhance the performance of major benefits of better cost estimation and control, efficient construction planning and management, and improvement in

design and project quality. It is therefore important for consultancy firms to appreciate these multi-disciplinary needs of projects to improve performance.

Differences between expected and perceived service quality of Consultancy firms

The investigation to determine the differences between expected and perceived service quality of professional services of consultancy firms by the clients remains a critical knowledge with which to evaluate services. Paired-sample t-test was used to test the hypothesis formulated for this purpose. The hypothesis was tested at $p \leq 0.05$. When the p-value ≤ 0.05 , the test rejects the hypothesis but when the p-value > 0.05 , the test accepts the hypothesis. The results of the analysis are shown in Tables III-VI.

Differences between expected and perceived service quality of Architectural consultancy firms

Having established the weighted mean scores of expected and perceived service quality of professional services of consultancy firms, the study proceeds to investigate the differences between expected and perceived service quality of professional services of consultancy firms by the clients. The hypothesis (H_0) formulated for this purpose states that there is no significant difference between the client's expected and perceived service quality of consultancy firms in building projects. The hypothesis was tested using the paired samples t-test at $p \leq 0.05$. The results are shown in Table III.

Table III: Paired Sample t-test between expected and perceived service quality of Architectural consultancy firms

Variables	MS _{exp}	MS _{pcv}	Gap	t	df	p-value	Remarks	Decision
Expected Vs Perceived Responsiveness	4.40	3.84	0.56	15.57	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Assurance	3.58	3.32	0.26	7.45	332	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Empathy	4.16	3.87	0.29	5.99	327	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Tangibles	3.99	4.03	-0.04	-0.81	334	0.420	NS	Accept
Expected Vs Perceived Reliability	3.98	2.91	1.07	24.78	334	0.001	S	Reject

*Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). NS=Not Significant, S=Significant, MS_{exp}= Mean Score Expected MS_{pcv}=Mean Score Perceived, Vs = Versus, t-test value, $p \leq 0.05$

From the results in Table III, the p-values for the test of the difference between expected and perceived responsiveness, assurance, empathy and reliability are less than the critical p-value (0.05). . This indicates a significant difference between the expected and the perceived responsiveness, assurance, empathy and reliability dimensions of service quality of architectural consultancy firms. The gap analysis here measures the variance between perceived and the expected service quality for the architectural firm. This implies that the firm need to improve on the performance of service quality for effective project deliverery (Oyewole and Dada, 2019). This indicates service quality perception of clients, which are parameters towards developing client's relationship management (Naidoo, 2011). Fodness and Murray (2007) referred to this as a gap theory, which

determines service quality by analysing the differences between the expected service quality and the actual service quality received. This is further confirmed by Tabaku and Cerri (2016) which concluded that the perceived service quality has a significant effect on the creation of service quality. This requires improvement in service delivery across these dimensions. However, the result of the test of the difference between expected and perceived tangibles dimension was greater than the critical value (0.05). Thus, indicating that there is no significant difference. This meant that clients rated performance better than expectations in this dimension.

These gaps are highlighted in Tables III to VI for Architectural, Structural Engineering, M & E Engineering and Quantity Surveying firms. According to Fishchgrund and Omachonu (2014), a gap analysis value that measures above 1 shows a positively significant gap, while a value less than 1 (tangibles for Architectural firms) show a weak gap in that particular dimension of service quality. The weak significant values gap means that the respondents required for little extent of the needs for any difference in the expected and the perceived level of the service quality for the dimension concerned. This has a lot of influence on the performance of the firms which itself constitute a key factor for the construction industry to thrive and achieving sustainable goals (Detsimas, Coffey, Sadiqi and Li, 2016).

Differences between expected and perceived service quality of Structural Engineering consultancy firms.

The Paired sample t-test for structural engineering consultancy firms is shown in Table IV.

Table IV: Paired Sample t-test between expected and perceived service quality of Structural Engineering consultancy firms.

Variables	MS _{exp}	MS _{pcv}	Gap	t	df	p-value	Remarks	Decision
Expected Vs Perceived Responsiveness	4.49	3.88	0.61	19.28	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Assurance	4.44	3.94	0.46	13.75	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Empathy	4.41	3.99	0.42	15.04	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Tangibles	4.31	3.93	0.38	10.19	291	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Reliability	4.48	4.05	0.43	12.84	334	0.001	S	Reject

*Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). NS=Not Significant, S=Significant, MS_{exp} = Mean Score Expected MS_{pcv} =Mean Score Perceived, Vs = Versus, t-test value, p ≤ 0.05

The results in Table IV indicate that a significant difference exists between the expected and the perceived service quality indicators of responsiveness, assurance, empathy, tangibles and reliability dimensions of service quality. This implies that the performance of service quality is less than the expected service quality as assessed by the clients. This requires a comprehensive improvement in service delivery across all the dimensions of service quality.

Differences between expected and perceived service quality of M & E consultancy firms.

The results of the test of difference using Paired t-test are shown in Table V.

Table V: Paired Sample t-test between expected and perceived service quality of M&E Engineering consultancy firms

Variables	MS _{exp}	MS _{pcv}	Gap	t	df	p-value	Remarks	Decision
Expected Vs Perceived Responsiveness	4.48	3.87	0.61	11.04	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Assurance	4.46	4.01	0.37	11.06	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Empathy	4.38	4.01	0.37	7.54	334	0.001	S	Reject

Expected Vs Perceived Tangibles	4.28	3.86	0.42	11.76	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Reliability	4.38	4.11	0.35	8.94	334	0.001	S	Reject

*Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). NS=Not Significant, S=Significant, MS_{exp} = Mean Score Expected, MS_{pcv} =Mean Score Perceived, Vs = Versus, t-test value, p ≤ 0.05

The results in Table V equally indicate a significant difference between the expected and the perceived service quality for M & E engineering consultancy firms. It shows that the perceived mean scores for responsiveness, assurance, empathy, tangibles and reliability are less than the expected mean scores. This implies that the performance of service quality is less than the expected service quality as assessed by the clients, and firms are expected to improve their service delivery processes.

Differences between expected and perceived service quality of Quantity Surveying consultancy firms.

The result of the analysis of Paired sample t-test is shown in Table VI. There is a significant difference between the expected and the perceived service quality.

Table VI: Paired Sample t-test between expected and perceived service quality of Quantity Surveying consultancy firms.

Variables	MS_{exp}	MS_{pcv}	Gap	t	df	p-value	Remarks	Decision
Expected Vs Perceived Responsiveness	4.42	3.86	0.56	11.04	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Assurance	4.38	4.01	0.37	11.06	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Empathy	4.32	4.00	0.32	7.54	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Tangibles	4.36	4.36	0.44	11.76	334	0.001	S	Reject
Expected Vs Perceived Reliability	4.38	4.03	0.35	8.94	334	0.001	S	Reject

*Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). NS=Not Significant, S=Significant, MS_{exp} = Mean Score Expected, MS_{pcv} =Mean Score Perceived, Vs = Versus, t-test value, p ≤ 0.05

The results also indicate a significant difference between the expected and the perceived responsiveness, assurance, empathy and reliability dimensions of service quality of quantity surveying consultancy firms. This means that the perceived mean scores for responsiveness, assurance, empathy, tangibles and reliability dimensions are less than the expected mean scores. The implication of this is that the performance of service quality is less than the expected service quality, thus, indicating the need for improvement in service delivery.

The results for firms of architecture, structural engineering, M&E engineering and quantity surveying clearly show an emerging situation of concerns to all stakeholders in the building industry. The statement of the hypothesis of the study has been rejected through the results for all the consultancy firms. The only exception is the tangible dimension of the architectural consultancy firms. This however is consistent with the study of Elhendawi, Omar, Elbeltagi and Smith (2019) which stated that investments in up-to-date modern equipment are growing rapidly worldwide as a tool for improving efficiency in the building industry. The perceptions of the client concerning the service quality of consultancy firms have an important impact on client satisfaction. It equally shows the significant importance of the clients of the building industry to build the needed confidence. Sunindijo et al., (2014) equally established that the dimensions of reliability,

responsiveness and assurance are the most important for contractors to encourage client behavioural intentions.

On the other hand, Ojekalu, Ojo, Oladokun, Olabisi and Omoniyi, (2018) hinted that tangible, assurance and empathy dimensions are better in establishing service quality of property managers. The dimensions of responsiveness and reliability dimensions were equally emphasized by Lau, Li, Tang, and Chau (2016) as requiring the attention of engineering consultants. These dimensions were classified as people management and remain a major factor of total quality management (TQM) principles to sustain long-term business objectives.

Comparison of the service quality gaps of Consultancy firms

The results of the t-test in Tables III to VI for the firms shows the service quality gaps as evaluated by the respondents. For Architectural services, the gap in service quality dimensions for responsiveness is (0.56), assurance is (0.26), empathy is (0.29) and reliability is (1.07). This shows a positively significant gap because the values are more than 1 (> 1). However, tangible (-0.04) has a negative gap, implying a weak significant gap between the expected and perceive service quality in this dimension (Fiscchgrund and Omachonu, 2014). For Structural Engineering, the gaps are positive for all the dimensions (responsiveness = 0.61, assurance = 0.46, empathy = 0.42, tangibles = 0.38, and reliability = 0.43). The situations are similar for M & E Engineering (responsiveness = 0.58, assurance = 0.37, empathy = 0.37, tangibles = 0.42, and reliability = 0.35), and Quantity Surveying (responsiveness = 0.56,

assurance = 0.37, empathy = 0.32, tangibles = 0.44, and reliability = 0.35). These results show a positively significant gap because the values are more than 1 (Fiscchgrund and Omachonu, 2014).

This shows the extent of needs for improvement in service quality in order to enhance the performance of service providers (Oyewole and Dada, 2019). The importance of this is immense as it determines the satisfactory levels of client and a determinant of future patronage and sustenance in business. This is in consistent with the study of Ehigie and Jesse (2018) which affirmed the need for improvement in responsiveness, empathy and assurance dimensions in professional services of tax practitioners in Liberia. The study of Monferrer et al., (2019) in Spain, emphasised that in addition to these dimensions, effort must be geared towards the importance of social and ethical issues towards fulfilling the loyalty of clients. Sunindijo et al., (2014) emphasised that reliability, responsiveness and assurance are the most important dimensions influencing service quality in the construction industry in Thailand. These differences in findings could be explained as the peculiarities of each country.

CONCLUSION

The study examined the client assessment of service quality of consultancy firms in building projects using the generic dimensions of responsiveness, assurance, empathy, tangible and reliability. The result shows that significant differences exist between the expected service quality and perceived

service quality in Structural engineering, Mechanical/Electrical engineering and Quantity surveying services along with all the dimensions of service quality. However, the tangible dimension of Architectural services had no differences in the service quality but had differences in responsiveness, empathy, reliability and assurance dimensions.

The perceptions of respondents indicate that the levels of service quality are generally low. The results imply that professional service providers require fundamental improvement in their services to the clients. This scenario is a reflection of the myriad of challenges of poor performance, failure to meet clients' needs and expectations, safety issues and conflicts among parties which are prevalent in the building industry. The service providers need to appreciate that appropriate solutions to these challenges can only guarantee a continuous investment in the building industry by prospective clients.

Since it has been established that adequate service quality is important to meet clients' aspirations which can lead to financial performance and competitiveness, service providers need to focus on maintaining a high level of service quality. This will establish the propensity of clients for referrals for a future relationship, as the final measure for the success of the project and the indicator of quality is the satisfaction of the client. In the same way, the comprehensive knowledge of the client's aspirations by the service providers in respect of both physical and intangible forms are critical towards achieving the success of construction projects.

References

- Adat, N., and Noel, D. T. (2014). Customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality: The case of a retail pharmacy chain in South Africa, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20): 2648
- Aga, M. and Safakli, O.V. (2007). An empirical investigation of service quality and customer satisfaction in professional accounting firms: Evidence from North Cyprus. *Journal of Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 5(3): 84-98.
- Angelova, B. (2011). Measuring Customer satisfaction with service quality using the American Customer Satisfaction Model (ACSI). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 1(3): 232-258.
- Chan, D.W.M., Olawumi, T.O. and Ho, A. M.I. (2019). Perceived benefits of and barriers to Building Information Modelling (BIM) implementation in construction: The case of Hong Kong, *Journal of Building Engineering*, 25(2019): 1-10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobbe.2019.100764>.
- Detsimas, N., Coffey, V., Sadiqi, Z. and Li, M. (2016). Workplace training and generic, generic and technical skill development in the Australian construction industry, *Journal of Management Development*, 35(4), 486-504.
- Ehigie, C.J and Jesse, S.K. (2018). Impact of service quality on customer satisfaction of the Liberia Revenue Authority. An M.Sc Thesis Submitted to the Department of Business and Economics Studies, University of Galve.
- Elhendawi, A., Omar, H., Elbeltagi, E., and Smith, A. (2019). Practical approach for paving the way to motivate BIM non-users to adopt BIM. *International Journal of BIM and Engineering Science*, 2(2):1-22.

- Fishchgrung, J and Omachonu, V. (2014). Quality in construction: Identifying the gaps. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. 3(2), 65-73
- Fodness, D., & Murray, B. (2007). Passengers' expectations of airport service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 5(3), 225-250.
- Grierson, S., and Brennan, R. (2017). Referrals for new client acquisition in professional services. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 20(1):28-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-04-2016-0039>
- Gronroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18 (4): 36-44.
- Gunning, J. G. (2000). Models of customers' satisfaction and service quality as research instruments in construction management. In Akintoye, A (Ed), *16th Annual ARCOM Conference, 6th-8th Sept 2000*. Glasgow Caledonian University, 1: 21 -30.
- Hoxley, M. (2000). Measuring UK construction service quality: The what, how, when and Who. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 17(4/5): 511-526.
- Hughes, W. (2012). The business of construction procurement: Selecting, defining and managing procurement. Proceedings of 4th West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference in Nigeria, 24th -26th July 2012, 1-7.
- Ismail, S., Othman, M. H., and Amat, S. C. (2012). Measuring refurbishment contractors' service quality and client satisfaction: A case study at public institutions of higher education. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 20(1): 107 – 120
- Kamara, J.M., Anumba, C.J. and Evbnomwan, F.O. (2002). Capturing client requirements in construction projects. *Thomas Telford, London. UK*.
- Kettinger, J.K., Park, S.S., and Smith. J. (2009). Understanding the consequences of information systems service quality on information service reuse. *Journal of Information and Management*, 46, 367-388.

- Khan, M.M., and Fasih, M. (2014). Impact of service quality on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty: Evidence from the banking sector. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 331-342
- Lau, A.W.T., Li, Y.S., Tang, S.L., and Chau, K.W. (2016). Total Quality Management application by Engineering consultants in Hong Kong" *The TQM Journal*, 28(4): 561-587.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-06-2014-2049>.
- Lubbe, B., Douglas, A., and Zambellis, J. (2011). An application of the airport service quality model in South Africa. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 17(4), 224-227.
- Monferrer, D., Segarra, J.R., Estrada, M., and Moliner, M.A. (2019). Service quality and customer loyalty in a post-crisis context: Prediction-oriented modelling to enhance the particular importance of a social and sustainable approach, *Sustainability*, 2019-mdpi.com.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su11184930>
- Naidoo, V. (2011). Service quality perceptions of students at a South African University. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(27), 199-209.
- Nzekwe-Excel, C. (2007). Improved client satisfaction: A strategic approach in the construction sector. Proceedings of the 3rd Scottish Conference for Post – Graduate Researchers of the Built Environment, 111-120.
<https://www.irbnet.de/daten/iconda/CIB10781>.
- Ojekalu, S.O., Ojo, O., Oladokun, T. T, Olabisi, S.A & Omoniyi, S. S. (2018). Service quality of property managers of shopping complexes in Ibadan, Nigeria: Empirical evidence. *Property Management*, 37(3), 310-326.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-04-2018-0029>.

- Oke, A.E., Timothy, I.O., and Olaniyi, A.I. (2010). Perceptions of construction professionals to the performance of Nigerian Quantity Surveyors. *Journal of Building Performance*, 1(1), 64-72.
- Olatunde, N.A., Ogunsemi, D.R., and Oke, A.E. (2017). Impact of team members' composition on construction projects delivery in selected higher institutions in Nigeria. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 15(3): 355-377.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JEDT-04-2016-0028>.
- Oliver, R.L (1993). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. The Mc Graw – Hill Companies Inc. New York.
- Oyedele, L.O. (2010). Sustaining architects' and engineers motivation in design firms: An investigation of critical success factors. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 17(2): 180-196.
- Oyewole, E.O and Dada, J.O. (2019). Training gaps in the adoption of building information modelling by Nigerian construction professionals. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 9(3), 399-411.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., and Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (3): 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., and Berry, L. L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: Implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (1): 111-124.
- Razavi, S.M, Safari, S, Shafie. H and Khoram, K. 2012. Relationships among service quality, customer satisfaction and customer perceived value: Evidence from Iran's software industry. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 3(3): 28-37.
- Seth, N., & Deshmukh. (2005). Service Quality Models: A Review. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 22(9): 913-949.

- Siarni, S., and Gorji, M. (2012). The measurement of service quality by using SERVQUAL and quality gap model. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 5(1):1956-1960.
- Singh, R., & Khanduja, D. (2010). SERVQUAL and model of service quality gaps: A framework for determining and prioritizing critical factors from the faculty perspective in higher education. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, 2: 3297–3304.
- Soetanto, R., and Proverbs, D.G. (2002). Modelling satisfaction the satisfaction of contractors: The impact of client performance, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 5(6): 453-465.
- Sunindijo, R.Y., Hadikusumo, B.H.W., and Phangchunum, T. (2014). Modelling service quality in the construction industry. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, 15(3): 262-276.
- Tabaku, E., and Cerri, S. (2016) An assessment of service quality and customer satisfaction in the hotel sector. Congress. Proceedings of Tourism and Hospitality Industry. 480- 488.
- Tan, E. S. E. (2012). A study of Architects' perceptions of consulting Engineers' service quality. A PhD thesis of the School of Mechanical and Chemical Engineering, The University of Western Australia.
- Tang, S.L., Lu, M. and Chan, Y.L. (2003). Achieving Client Satisfaction for Engineering Consulting Firms, *Journal of Management in Engineering*, ASCE, 19(4): 166-172.
- Teo, A.I.E., Ofori, G., Tjandra, I.K and Kim, H. (2016). Design for safety: The theoretical framework of the safety aspect of BIM system to determine the safety index, *Construction Economics and Building*, 16(4):1-18. <https://doi.org/s10.5130/AJCEB.v16i4.4873>.

- Torbica, Z.M., and Stroch, R.C. (2001). Customer satisfaction in home building, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 127(1): 82-86.
- Vincent, O., William, C. J., and Godwin, O. (2008). An empirical test of the drivers of overall customer satisfaction evidence from multivariate casualty *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(6): 434-444.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman., A., and Berry L.L. (1990). Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perception and expectations. New York, Free Press.