

FLUENTIA INVESTMENT CC

Research Methodology · Version 1.0

THE FLUENTIA CUSTOMER SATISFACTION MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY

(FCSMM)

An internal methodology adapted from ISO 10004:2018 and the SERVQUAL service quality model, calibrated for statutory bodies and regulated industries.

Published: July 2026

Fluentia Investment CC · Windhoek, Namibia

Registration No. CC/2021/04282

www.fluentia.org · research.fluentia.org

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this document

This document sets out the Fluentia Customer Satisfaction Measurement Methodology (FCSMM), the internal methodology applied by Fluentia Investment CC on customer satisfaction and stakeholder perception assignments. The FCSMM is an internal adaptation and combination of two internationally accepted frameworks: ISO 10004:2018 (Quality management — Customer satisfaction — Guidelines for monitoring and measuring) and the SERVQUAL service quality model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry.

The document is published to make Fluentia's methodological approach verifiable to prospective clients, evaluation committees and independent reviewers. It is available online at research.fluentia.org and as a downloadable PDF.

1.2 Attribution and scope of ownership

ISO 10004:2018 is a standard of the International Organization for Standardization. SERVQUAL is a service quality model developed by A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml and L. L. Berry. Fluentia does not claim ownership of either framework. The FCSMM is Fluentia's internal adaptation, combining these frameworks with a specific set of analytical, sampling and reporting choices calibrated for statutory bodies and regulated industries.

1.3 Version control

Version	Date	Notes
1.0	July 2026	First published version. Establishes the five-pillar framework, the process cycle, the measurement instrument and the reporting architecture.

2. RATIONALE

Customer satisfaction assessments for statutory bodies and regulated industries must produce evidence of Board-quality standard. The evidence must be methodologically defensible, comparable across measurement cycles, and directly traceable to the commitments the organisation makes to its stakeholders. Most off-the-shelf approaches fall short in one direction or the other.

ISO 10004:2018 defines a robust process cycle for planning, designing, implementing, analysing and reviewing a customer satisfaction measurement exercise. It does not, however, specify the measurement instrument or how the results should be aggregated into decision-ready outputs.

The SERVQUAL model defines a validated measurement instrument for perceived service quality, structured around five dimensions and a 22-item expectation-versus-perception scale. It does not, however, specify how the instrument is embedded in an accountable, auditable process or how the results are converted into prioritised recommendations.

The FCSMM combines the two. It runs the SERVQUAL instrument inside the ISO 10004:2018 cycle, stratifies the sample by the client's actual stakeholder ecosystem, computes a single weighted Customer Satisfaction Index for board-level reporting, and closes the loop with an impact-feasibility roadmap of recommendations mapped to the client's Service Level Charter.

3. THE FIVE PILLARS

3.1 Pillar 1 — ISO 10004:2018 process cycle

Every engagement follows the ISO planning, design, implementation, analysis and review cycle. The process is auditable, comparable across cycles and integrable with the client's wider quality management system. The cycle mandates that measurement data must be linked to organisational objectives and used to drive continual improvement, rather than being reported and archived without action.

3.2 Pillar 2 — SERVQUAL five-dimension instrument

Perceived service quality is measured across five dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. The instrument uses a 22-item expectation-versus-perception scale on a seven-point Likert format. The gap between expectation and perception at item level and at dimension level provides the primary diagnostic. The full instrument is set out in Section 8 of this document.

3.3 Pillar 3 — Stakeholder-stratified sampling

The respondent base is stratified into categories that reflect the client's actual stakeholder ecosystem. Each stratum contributes proportionally to the composite index and is reported separately, so differentiated concerns are visible rather than blended into an undifferentiated average. For statutory bodies, typical strata include member organisations, principal beneficiaries, service providers, regulatory partners and industry associations.

3.4 Pillar 4 — Weighted composite Customer Satisfaction Index

Respondents allocate importance weights across the five SERVQUAL dimensions. A single Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) number is computed as the weighted aggregate of perception scores. The CSI gives the client a board-level headline figure that is defensible and trackable over time. The full computation formula is set out in Section 6.3 of this document.

3.5 Pillar 5 — Impact-feasibility recommendation matrix

Findings are converted into recommendations scored on two axes: expected impact on the CSI if the recommendation is implemented, and feasibility of implementation within the client's operating envelope. Each recommendation is mapped to a specific Service Level Charter commitment, ensuring that improvements are traceable to measurable service standards.

4. THE PROCESS CYCLE

The FCSMM process cycle operationalises the ISO 10004:2018 stages into five sequential phases, each with defined activities, deliverables and quality gates.

Step	Phase	Key activities	Deliverable and quality gate
01	Plan	Confirm objectives, scope and success measures. Map the stakeholder ecosystem. Define sampling frame. Establish ethics procedures.	Inception Report signed off by client sponsor.
02	Design	Adapt the SERVQUAL instrument to the client operating context. Draft interview guide. Pilot with no fewer than ten respondents. Refine.	Instruments approved. Cronbach's alpha on pilot at or above 0.70 per dimension.
03	Implement	Deploy online and telephone-administered questionnaires. Conduct semi-structured interviews. Receive and code internal service-point data.	Field completion report. Response rate at or above 60% of stratum target.
04	Analyse	SPSS quantitative analysis. NVivo thematic analysis. Triangulate with internal service-point evidence. Compute CSI.	Draft Report with findings and prioritised recommendations.
05	Report & Review	Incorporate client feedback. Finalise report. Present findings to executive audience. Agree action plan for next cycle.	Comprehensive Report, executive presentation, cycle review note.

5. THE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT

5.1 Structure of the questionnaire

The FCSMM questionnaire has six sections. The full instrument, ready to be adapted to the specific client operating context, is set out in Section 8 of this document.

Section	Content	Purpose
A	Respondent demographics and stakeholder category	Stratification, weighting and disaggregated reporting
B	Expectations (22 items on 7-point Likert scale)	Baseline for the expectation-perception gap analysis
C	Perceptions (22 items on 7-point Likert scale)	Assessment of actual service quality
D	Dimension importance weighting (100 points allocated across 5 dimensions)	Weights for the composite Customer Satisfaction Index
E	Behavioural intentions	Future participation, advocacy, willingness to engage further
F	Open-ended feedback	Sources of dissatisfaction and improvement suggestions

5.2 The five SERVQUAL dimensions

Dimension	Items	What is measured
Tangibility	4	Physical facilities, equipment, personnel appearance, communication materials
Reliability	5	Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately
Responsiveness	4	Willingness to help stakeholders and provide prompt service
Assurance	4	Knowledge and courtesy of staff and their ability to inspire trust and confidence
Empathy	5	Individualised attention provided to stakeholders and understanding of their needs
TOTAL	22	<i>Complete instrument</i>

6. COMPUTATION OF THE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDEX

6.1 Gap score computation

For each of the 22 items, the individual gap score is computed as the perception rating minus the expectation rating. A positive gap indicates that the service exceeds expectations. A negative gap indicates that the service falls short of expectations. The dimension gap score is the mean of the item-level gap scores within that dimension.

$$\text{Gap}_i = P_i - E_i \quad \text{where } P \text{ and } E \text{ are the perception and expectation ratings for item } i$$

6.2 Dimension weighting

Section D of the questionnaire asks each respondent to allocate 100 points across the five dimensions to reflect their view of the relative importance of each dimension. The weight for each dimension is the mean of the allocated points across all respondents, expressed as a proportion:

$$w_d = (\text{mean allocated points for dimension } d) \div 100$$

6.3 Composite Customer Satisfaction Index

The composite Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) is computed as the weighted aggregate of the mean perception scores across the five dimensions:

$$\text{CSI} = \sum (w_d \times \bar{P}_d) \quad \text{for } d = 1 \text{ to } 5$$

where \bar{P}_d is the mean perception rating for dimension d , on a 7-point scale

The resulting CSI is a value between 1 and 7 that can be scaled to a 100-point index for board reporting by applying:

$$\text{CSI}_{100} = ((\text{CSI} - 1) \div 6) \times 100$$

6.4 Reliability and validity checks

- Cronbach's alpha computed for each dimension, with a minimum acceptable threshold of 0.70.
- Exploratory factor analysis conducted where sample size permits (typically $n \geq 200$).
- Paired-samples t-tests used to test the statistical significance of dimension-level gaps.
- One-way analysis of variance used to test differences between strata.
- Inter-rater reliability computed for a subset of qualitative coding, minimum acceptable Cohen's kappa 0.70.

7. REPORTING ARCHITECTURE

7.1 Layers of reporting

The FCSMM produces reporting outputs at four layers of granularity. Each layer serves a different audience and decision purpose.

Layer	Audience	Output
Executive headline	Board of Directors	Single CSI figure with year-on-year comparison and top three recommendations
Dimension diagnostic	Executive management	Five-dimension expectation-vs-perception gap chart with stratum breakdown
Item-level detail	Operational teams	Per-item gap scores with statistical significance and thematic commentary
Thematic narrative	Communications and stakeholder teams	Qualitative themes from open responses and interviews, illustrative verbatim

7.2 The impact-feasibility recommendation matrix

Every recommendation produced by an FCSMM engagement is placed on a two-axis matrix. The horizontal axis is feasibility of implementation within the client's operating envelope. The vertical axis is expected impact on the CSI if the recommendation is implemented. Each recommendation is also mapped to a specific Service Level Charter commitment where such a charter exists.

Quadrant	Description	Client action
Q1	High impact, high feasibility	Implement immediately. Categorised as 'quick wins'. Reported to the Board with a target completion date.
Q2	High impact, lower feasibility	Structure into a medium-term roadmap with resource requirements and milestones. Reported to the Board as strategic reforms.
Q3	Lower impact, high feasibility	Fold into ongoing operational improvement. Delegated to line management.
Q4	Lower impact, lower feasibility	De-prioritised. Retained for review in the next measurement cycle.

8. THE FLUENTIA CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INSTRUMENT

The instrument below is the FCSMM measurement instrument at its generic version. On any client engagement, item wording is adapted to the client operating context. Item numbers and dimensional assignments are preserved to maintain comparability with published SERVQUAL literature.

Every item is administered twice: once as an expectation statement (what the respondent expects from an ideal organisation of the type being assessed) and once as a perception statement (how the respondent rates the actual organisation). The response scale is a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

8.1 Section A — Respondent profile

- A1. Stakeholder category (single-select from the client-specific stratum list).
- A2. Length of engagement with the organisation (less than one year; 1–3 years; 4–6 years; more than 6 years).
- A3. Frequency of interaction with the organisation (weekly; monthly; quarterly; less than quarterly).
- A4. Preferred communication channel (in person; telephone; email; online portal; other).
- A5. Optional demographic items (subject to ethics approval).

8.2 Section B and C — Expectations and Perceptions

Section B asks the respondent to indicate the level of service that an ideal organisation of the type being assessed would offer. Section C asks the respondent to indicate the level of service that the specific organisation being assessed actually offers. The item wording is identical between the two sections.

Tangibility dimension (items T1–T4)

- T1. The organisation has modern-looking equipment and facilities.
- T2. The organisation's physical facilities are visually appealing.
- T3. The organisation's staff appear professional.
- T4. Materials associated with the service (such as brochures, statements and online content) are visually appealing and clearly presented.

Reliability dimension (items R1–R5)

- R1. When the organisation promises to do something by a certain time, it does so.
- R2. When a stakeholder has a problem, the organisation shows a sincere interest in solving it.
- R3. The organisation performs its services correctly the first time.
- R4. The organisation provides its services at the time it promised to do so.
- R5. The organisation maintains error-free records.

Responsiveness dimension (items Rs1–Rs4)

- Rs1. Staff at the organisation tell stakeholders precisely when services will be performed.
- Rs2. Staff at the organisation give prompt service to stakeholders.
- Rs3. Staff at the organisation are always willing to help stakeholders.

- Rs4. Staff at the organisation are never too busy to respond to stakeholder requests.

Assurance dimension (items A1-A4)

- A1. The behaviour of staff instils confidence in stakeholders.
- A2. Stakeholders feel safe in their transactions with the organisation.
- A3. Staff at the organisation are consistently courteous with stakeholders.
- A4. Staff at the organisation have the knowledge to answer stakeholder questions.

Empathy dimension (items E1-E5)

- E1. The organisation gives stakeholders individual attention.
- E2. The organisation has operating hours convenient to all its stakeholders.
- E3. The organisation has staff who give stakeholders personal attention.
- E4. The organisation has the stakeholders' best interests at heart.
- E5. The staff at the organisation understand the specific needs of their stakeholders.

8.3 Section D — Dimension importance weighting

The respondent is asked to allocate 100 points across the five dimensions to reflect the relative importance of each. The five values must sum to 100.

- D1. Tangibility: _____ points.
- D2. Reliability: _____ points.
- D3. Responsiveness: _____ points.
- D4. Assurance: _____ points.
- D5. Empathy: _____ points.
- Total: 100 points.

8.4 Section E — Behavioural intentions

The respondent rates the following items on the same 7-point scale.

- BI1. I intend to continue engaging with this organisation.
- BI2. I would recommend this organisation to others in my sector.
- BI3. I intend to make greater use of this organisation's services in future.
- BI4. I have confidence in the future direction of this organisation.

8.5 Section F — Open-ended feedback

- F1. What is the single most important thing this organisation could do to improve the service it provides to you?
- F2. What does this organisation currently do particularly well?
- F3. Is there any aspect of the service that is a source of frustration or complaint for you? Please describe.
- F4. Any other comments you would like to share with the assessment team?

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ETHICS

9.1 Quality assurance framework

The FCSMM applies a four-stage quality assurance framework consistent with the ISO 10004:2018 principle that a customer satisfaction measurement process must itself be planned, designed, implemented and reviewed.

- Design stage. Instruments are peer-reviewed internally and validated against the SERVQUAL literature.
- Pilot stage. Instruments are tested with no fewer than ten respondents and refined for clarity, reliability and cultural appropriateness.
- Analysis stage. Two analysts independently review the SPSS output and NVivo coding. Inter-rater reliability is computed for a subset of the qualitative coding.
- Reporting stage. Draft outputs are subjected to internal review by the Managing Consultant before submission to the client. Observations from client review are addressed in writing with a numbered response table.

9.2 Research ethics

Every FCSMM engagement is conducted in accordance with recognised research ethics principles:

- Informed consent. Every respondent receives a participant information statement disclosing the purpose of the research, the identity of the commissioning organisation, the voluntary nature of participation, the right to withdraw at any point without consequence, the confidentiality of individual responses and the intended use of aggregate findings.
- Voluntary participation. No respondent is coerced or incentivised into participating in a manner that would compromise the integrity of their response.
- Confidentiality. Individual responses are held in confidence. No personally identifiable information is reported in the final deliverables unless the respondent has expressly consented in writing to attribution.
- Data protection. Raw survey and interview data are stored on encrypted systems accessible only to the named engagement team. Transfer between the team and the client uses secure channels.
- Data retention. At the conclusion of the engagement, primary data files are either securely transferred to the client or retained under strict access controls for a period of five years, subject to the client's written instructions.

10. REFERENCES

- Ali, B.J., Gardi, B., Othman, B.J., Ahmed, S.A., Ismael, N.B., Hamza, P.A., Aziz, H.M., Sabir, B.Y., Anwar, G. and Anwar, K. (2021) 'Hotel service quality: The impact of service quality on customer satisfaction in hospitality', *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(3), pp. 470–486.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2019) 'Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis', *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), pp. 589–597.
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 5th edn. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Fida, B.A., Ahmed, U., Al-Balushi, Y. and Singh, D. (2020) 'Impact of service quality on customer loyalty and customer satisfaction in Islamic banks in the Sultanate of Oman', *SAGE Open*, 10(2), pp. 1–10.
- International Organization for Standardization (2018) *ISO 10004:2018 Quality management — Customer satisfaction — Guidelines for monitoring and measuring*. Geneva: ISO.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L. (2020) 'SERVQUAL revisited: A framework for measuring service quality in a digital era', *Journal of Service Research*, 23(2), pp. 115–131.

— END OF DOCUMENT —

© 2026 Fluentia Investment CC. All rights reserved.