International Journal of Applied Operational Research
Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 41-49, Winter 2015

Journal homepage: ijorlu.liau.ac.ir

# A Quality Function Deployment Based Approach in Service Quality Analysis to Improve Customer Satisfaction

M. Moradi*, S. Raissi

**Received:** 3 June 2014 **;** **Accepted:** 29 October 2014

**Abstract** In metropolitan development management, quality of public services is influential in every public sector to satisfaction of citizens on quality of services. Nowadays, satisfaction are with such important matters that should be considered in the planning, implementation, management and maintenance of many public services such as subway, transportation, traffics, parks, markets and so on. The purpose of this study, using quality function deployment (QFD) methodology and mathematical optimization is improving the quality of services in Tehran's municipality to deliver services from. QFD methodology acts as a technical translator of citizens' requirements to engineering characteristics. Consequently, this method used to reduce the gap between municipal managers and citizens. In the present research, we apply QFD and linear programing to improve leaflet of service's tariff, urban and civil laws based on collecting data from citizens' requirements and expert's opinions. Finally, the priority ranking indicators based on citizen preferences weights were obtained mathematically. The results show that QFD is a very effective tool that enables municipal managers to identify demands of the citizens and to perform engineering and technical requirements.

**Keywords**: Service quality, Customer satisfaction, Municipality management, Urban development management, Quality Function Deployment (TQM).

## 1 Introduction

In developed countries, Service organizations were employed maximum a third of the human resources in last decades. Today, more than three-quarters of the human resources are employed in these organizations, and is rising. To manage the big cities, municipals gives some services to their citizens in various sectors such as town cleaning, public transportation, repair and maintenance of streets, entertainment of the citizens, inner city development management and etc. This research has tried to analyze service quality in urban development duties in Tehran municipality based on applying QFD and linear programing method and provided solutions to improve the quality of services.

* **Corresponding Author. (✉)**
**E-mail:** st_m_moradi@azad.ac.ir (M. Moradi)

**M. Moradi**
Ph.D. candidate, Department of Industrial Engineering, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

**S. Raissi**
Accociate Prof., Department of Industrial Engineering, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

QFD is a Japanese development and design technology. Yoji Akao was the first pioneer of QFD in 1972 at Mitsubishi's Kobe shipyard site. Then Toyota Company and its suppliers developed it further for a rust prevention study. Thereafter, the popularity of QFD spread across the world. QFD was introduced in the US through auto manufacturers and parts suppliers, many US firms, such as AT&T, Digital Equipment, Ford, GM, Hewlett-Packard, Procter & Gamble, and Raychem, applied QFD to improve product development and communication [1].

Quality may define as meeting customer needs and providing superior value [2]. Product designers need to know how to make trade-off in the selection of design features that result in the highest level of customer satisfaction. QFD translates the customer needs into the target values for the engineering characteristics of a product [3]. Main goal of QFD is maximization of customer satisfaction. QFD provides the opportunity for companies through three strategies to reduce costs, increase revenues, reduce production time and provide a new product or service, to maintain their competitiveness [4].

In addition, QFD has also been used in other areas such as for business process, medical treatment, quality improvement in the service industry, education, etc. Rong-Tsu Wang studied on improving service quality using quality function deployment: The air cargo sector of China's airlines case study. They employed quality function deployment to integrate quality technology and the voice of consumers, and using "House of Quality," illustrates the performance of the company in terms of service and offer suggestions for improvement [5].Kay, C. Tan and Theresia A. Pawitra Integrating SERVQUAL and Kano's model into QFD for service excellence development. The approach aims to help organizations to consider customer satisfaction, to guide improvement efforts in strengthening their weak attributes, and to accelerate the development of new services through the identification of attractive attributes and set them into future services.

A case study presented to evaluate the image of Singapore from the Indonesian tourists' perspective. Several strong and weak attributes on Singapore's tourism were identified and analyzed [6]. Thirumanas K R and K C Joseph improved the service quality and customer satisfaction in automobile service industry using QFD [7].For For improving customer satisfaction and to enhance the shopping experience, Hui-Ming Kuo and Cheng-Wu Chen, understand the customer quality needs particular to the Internet shopping website, then to meet these needs through suitable website interface design by using QFD [8].Ben Clegg and Boon Tan show how QFD can be used as part of a structured planning and analysis framework for micro-sized enterprises to build-up their e-business capabilities [9].

John J. Cristiano et al, have presented the design of a product and the manufacturing system to produce it is indeed a process very influenced by the organizational structure and culture that support it [10]. Glenn H. Mazur has used QFD to design a new course in TQM that has increased the ration of number of students to teacher in a course, grown from one section to three and continuously sends student teams into various departments in the university and local businesses to improve their quality programs as well [11].

Franceschini [2002] believed that the principal stages necessary for the construction of the first HOQ matrix includes:

- Identifying customer requirements (CRs) and their perceptions.
- Identifying product and engineering design requirements (ECs)
- Drawing up a relationship matrix
- Planning and deploying expected quality (by listing CRs in order of importance and benchmarking competitive products)
- Comparing ECs through a technical importance ranking

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

- Analyzing the correlations existing between the various characteristics (correlation matrix)
- Prioritizing ECs.

Figure 2 illustrates the functional bonds linking operative phases and appropriate HOQ zones.




**Fig. 2** Main components of the house of quality (HOQ)

As previously said, the QFD technically translates the voice of customers into the target values for the engineering characteristics of a product or service. By using this translation, managers and experts identify the Strength and weakness departments then provide solutions for improving the customer's satisfaction. In the next section, quality of services in urban development management of Tehran municipality will analyze and provide some solutions for improving the customer's satisfaction.

## 2 Analyzing Citizens' Requirements

The QFD progresses implemented by development of a composite matrix known as "House of Quality" or HOQ. The conceptual features of HOQ are shown in Figure 1. As shown, HOQ consists of six main sub matrices [12].

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]




**Figure 1:** House of Quality

**Fig. 1** House of Quality

For municipal services, the structure of HOQ starts with listing the customer demands in the rows in the left part of the house. QFD team define voice of customer as flow:

**Table 1** Voice of Customer

| Parameter | Voice of Customer |
|---|---|
| $W_1$ | Ensure that the rules apply equally to the citizens |
| $W_2$ | Calculation of tax correctly and without error |
| $W_3$ | Appropriate and respectful behavior of incumbents |
| $W_4$ | Reducing the traffic of the citizens to the Electronic Services Office for conforming the architectural map |
| $W_5$ | Expert or owner able to takes time for two-way communication at any stage of the process |
| $W_6$ | Get a sheet of Engineers (Architectural, Structural, Mechanical, observer and surveyor) as soon as possible |
| $W_7$ | Owner able to view an inspection report and comments on its |
| $W_8$ | Owner able to view and accept (or reject) his unlike in urban development system |
| $W_9$ | Acceleration in comment of detailed design |
| $W_{10}$ | Uploading documents via the Internet for filing and view the tariff |
| $W_{11}$ | Acceleration in final confirmation of license exportation and post it for owner in one day |

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

| | |
|---|---|
| $W_{12}$ | Inquiry of separation, partition and license are visible in Land Office |
| $W_{13}$ | State the owner rights clearly in ordered map |
| $W_{14}$ | Immediately notification to fix incomplete files |
| $W_{15}$ | Office cleaning |
| $W_{16}$ | Waiting room convenience |

Consequently, the degree of importance of the customer needs is developed. The values indicating the ranks of the customer needs are determined by considering the municipality's affordability in fulfilling the customer needs.

Experts were designed questionnaire to obtain the importance of each customer's demands. Then distribute them to the 17 experienced employ managers of urban development department of municipal region 9. In questionnaire, managers and employees assigned 16 customer needs in 1 to 16 levels. Individual Approach is allocated 15 points to first level, 14 points to second level, … and zero points to last level. Table 2 shows allocated points to level of customer needs by Managers and employees:

**Table 2** Allocated points to level of customer needs by Managers and employees

| Parameter | Managers and employees number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Sum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | |
| $W_1$ | 15 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 2 | 15 | 14 | 213 |
| $W_2$ | 14 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 168 |
| $W_3$ | 13 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 8 | 15 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 161 |
| $W_4$ | 12 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 7 | 150 |
| $W_5$ | 11 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 160 |
| $W_6$ | 10 | 13 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 100 |
| $W_7$ | 9 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 115 |
| $W_8$ | 8 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 132 |
| $W_9$ | 7 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 157 |
| $W_{10}$ | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 76 |
| $W_{11}$ | 5 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 121 |
| $W_{12}$ | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 67 |
| $W_{13}$ | 3 | 3 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 143 |
| $W_{14}$ | 2 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 141 |
| $W_{15}$ | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 70 |
| $W_{16}$ | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 66 |

According to the sum of the points in table 2, customer needs deploys based on the follow order.

$$W_1 > W_2 > W_3 > W_5 > W_9 > W_4 > W_{13} > W_{14} > W_8 > W_7 > W_{11} > W_6 > W_{10} > W_{15} > W_{12} > W_{16}$$

Hence, importance levels for the customer needs calculated using the previous ranking based on [13] model. Consequently the customer preferences could be obtained based on solving a linear presented by Model 1.

$$\begin{aligned} &Max\ Z \\ &s.t: \quad Z-(W_1-W_2)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-2(W_2-W_3)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-3(W_3-W_4)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-4(W_4-W_5)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-5(W_5-W_6)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-6(W_6-W_7)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-7(W_7-W_8)\le 0 \\ &\qquad Z-8(W_8-W_9)\le 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

$$Z - 9(W_9 - W_{10}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 10(W_{10} - W_{11}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 11(W_{11} - W_{12}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 12(W_{12} - W_{13}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 13(W_{13} - W_{14}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 14(W_{14} - W_{15}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 15(W_{15} - W_{16}) \leq 0$$
$$Z - 16W_{16} \leq 0$$
$$\sum W_i = 1$$

Figure 2 presents the HOQ after applying the customer preferences achieved based on Model 1.




**Fig. 2** House of quality structure

The next step is listing the engineering requirements in the columns in the top of the House of Quality, and entering values to present the degree of relationships between customer needs and the engineering requirements. The symbols that show these relationships are: strong

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

relationship: ● , moderate relationship: ○ , weak relationship: Δ. A blank field indicates that no relationship exists. These symbols were substituted with numbers: 9, 3 and 1 [14].
QFD team define engineering requirements to answer the voice of customers:

**Table 3** Engineering requirements

| Parameter | Engineering Requirements |
|---|---|
| $H_1$ | Leaflet of services tariff, urban and civil laws, and allows the owner to view and make comments by providing access to municipal urban development system |
| $H_2$ | Make intelligent system for calculating the taxes |
| $H_3$ | Teaching skills of the work and deal with clients |
| $H_4$ | Synchronic meeting between architect engineering, owner and the expert architecture controller of municipal maps |
| $H_5$ | Owner scan reserve time in urban development system for visiting expert |
| $H_6$ | Developing the link of the urban development system to construction engineering organization (until exportation of the license) |
| $H_7$ | Make accessibility for owners to view an inspection report and add their comments in urban development system |
| $H8$ | Make accessibility for owners to view their unlike offence report and add their comments in urban development system |
| $H_9$ | Linking the Floor and mainland Department and Urban Development management |
| $H_{10}$ | Make accessibility for owners to uploading their document in urban development system |
| $H_{11}$ | Monitoring the continuous presence of the manager and experts |
| $H_{12}$ | linking the Land Office and Floor and mainland Department |
| $H_{13}$ | Change the formation and text of the ordered map |
| $H_{14}$ | Sending message (SMS) to owners in all steps |
| $H_{15}$ | Cleaning schedule |
| $H_{16}$ | Entertainment facilities |

Last step is the correlation matrix, which is constructed by entering the values to represent the correlation between the technical requirements. Like relationship matrix, symbols of the correlation matrix are: strong relationship: ●, moderate relationship: ○ , weak relationship: Δ, and no relation is empty.

In this step, normalized value of engineering requirement and normalized value of correlated weight are obtained.

$$Normalized\ value\ of\ engineering\ requirement\ = \frac{weight\ of\ engineering\ requirement}{\sum_{i=1}^{16} weights\ of\ engineering\ requirement}$$

If $d_{ij}$ define the relation between the customer need (i) and engineering requirement (j) then weight of engineering requirement ($w_j$) calculated as follow:

$$w_j = \sum_{i=1}^{16} w_i d_{ij} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 16 \ , j = 1, 2, \dots, 16$$

$$Normalized\ value\ of\ correlated\ weight\ = \frac{Correlated\ weight\ of\ engineering\ requirement}{Sum\ of\ correlated\ weight}$$

Summing of the normalized value of engineering requirement and normalized value of correlated weight presents the importance level of each engineering requirement. Ranking of engineering requirements are shown in table 4:

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

**Table 4** Ranking of engineering requirements

| Engineering Requirements | Ranking |
|---|---|
| Leaflet of services' tariff, urban and civil laws, and allows the owner to view and make comments by providing access to the municipal urban development system | 37.76 |
| make intelligent system for calculating the taxes | 18.53 |
| teaching skills of the work and behavior to clients | 16.9 |
| Synchronic meeting between architect engineering, owner and control expert of municipal map for architect surveying | 11.2 |
| Owners can reserve time in urban development system for visiting expert | 25 |
| Developing the link of the urban development system to engineering system organization (until exportation of the license) | 9.76 |
| Make accessibility of urban development system for owners to view an inspection report and add their comments | 10.81 |
| Make accessibility for owners to view their unlike report and add their comments in urban development system | 10.6 |
| Linking Land Office, Floor and mainland Department, Urban legislation Department and Urban Development management together | 14.1 |
| Make accessibility for owners to uploading their document in urban development system | 5.5 |
| Supervising on continuous presence of manager and experts | 14.3 |
| Improving the link of Land Office and Floor and mainland Department | 7.48 |
| Change the formation and text of the ordered map | 3.96 |
| Sending message (SMS) to owners in all steps | 11.8 |
| Cleaning schedule | 1.26 |
| Entertainment facilities | 0.23 |

## 3 Conclusion

In our research in Tehran municipality, customer satisfaction means fulfillment of citizen's expectations and it is the most important issue in this service organization. Here, managers tend to seek ways to deploy citizens requirements. Applying QFD help us to transform qualitative citizen's demands into quantitative parameters, to deploy the functions forming quality, and to deploy methods for achieving the design quality into subsystems and ultimately to specific elements of the servicing process. Hence deriving rankings of citizens' requirements and the relevant engineering characteristics is a crucial step towards successful QFD process especially when experts and managers have different points of view. Ranking on the importance of each citizens' requirement is extremely important in every QFD process and is on the main focus of the present effort. In this paper, we proposed a method to prioritize the Tehran citizens' requirement in a two sequentially phases. The proposed methodology having already been used an efficient voting process to assess perception information in the QFD process based on a linear programing model. Based on the proposed model, the most important engineering requirements for responding to the voices of citizens are: "Leaflet of services' tariff, urban and civil laws, and allowing owners to view and make comments by providing access to the municipal urban development system". QFD here helped us to focus on characteristics of a existing services from the viewpoints of citizens' segments. Also this technique help us to transform citizen's need into a list of prioritized engineering characteristics while simultaneously setting development targets for services.

[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]

## References


1. Chih-Hung Hsu, Tsan-Ming Chang, Shih-Yuan Wang, Pei -Yi Lin (2007). Integrating Kano's Model into Quality Function Deployment to Facilitate Decision Analysis for Service Quality.
2. Kenneth Crow and DRM Associates, (2002). Customer-Focused Deployment with QFD.
3. Ibo van de Poel, (2007). Methodological problems in QFD and directions for future development.
4. Chan, Lai, Kow & Wu, Ming Lu (2002). Quality Function Deployment: A Literature review, European Journal of Operational Research.
5. Rong-Tsu Wang (2007). Improving service quality using quality function deployment: The air cargo sector of China airlines case study.
6. Kay, C. Tan and Theresia A. Pawitra, (2001). Integrating SERVQUAL and Kano's model into QFD for service excellence development.
7. Thirumanas K R and K C Joseph, (2013). Service Quality Analysis and Improving Customer Satisfaction in Automobiles Service Industry Using QFD.
8. Hui-Ming Kuo and Cheng-Wu Chen, (2011). Application of Quality Function Deployment to Improve the Quality of Internet Shopping Website Interface Design.
9. Ben Clegg, Boon Tan, (2007). Using QFD for e-business planning and analysis in a micro-sized enterprise.
10. John J. Cristiano, Jeffrey K. Liker, and Chelsea C, (2001). Key Factors in the Successful Application of Quality Function Deployment (QFD).
11. Glenn H. Mazur, (1996). The application of quality function deployment to design a course in total quality management at the university of Michigan of engineering.
12. Kumar and Midha, Han, (2001). A QFD based methodology for evaluating a company's PDM requirements for collaborative product development.
13. Noorossana, R, Asgharpour, M and Nasiri, Z (2006). Prioritize Customer Needs by QFD method. (in persian)
14. Ms. Nandini Nayar , Ms. Tanu Sharma Angra, Mr. Sushil Kumar Bansal, (2013). Improving the Requirement Elicitation Process in Extreme Programming: The QFD Approach.


[ Downloaded from ijaor.ir on 2026-11-28 ]