

## **SERVICE QUALITY OF THE ENFORCEMENT OFFICES: COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTING AND PILOT APPLICATION OFFICES OF TURKEY**

**Erhan ÖNAL<sup>1</sup>**

**Ertuğrul ÇAVDAR<sup>2</sup>**

**Emrullah KIPÇAK<sup>3</sup>**

Received: 08.02.2019, Accepted: 09.05.2019

### **Abstract**

In this study, five quality dimensions of Servqual scale in terms of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy, as well as informing as a new dimension, the quality of service of the enforcement offices has been evaluated. The study included the evaluation and comparison of the quality of service offered by the current enforcement and Bankruptcy departments and the pilot enforcement departments established within the scope of the project carried out by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Turkey. In this context, enforcement offices in Van, Bitlis, Muş, Malatya and Gaziantep have been implemented. Application results show that the quality level of enforcement services is low. Although the applications in pilot regions have increased the quality of service, this increase has not been sufficient.

**Keywords:** *Service Quality, Service Quality Dimensions, Enforcement Office*

**JEL Codes:** *K20, M11*

---

*This study was supported by the Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit of Van Yüzüncü Yıl University. Project Number: SYL-2016-5117*

<sup>1</sup> Ph. D. Candidate, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, erhanocal1313@hotmail.com, ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2460-9617>

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Kastamonu University, Kastamonu, Turkey. cavdare@hotmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Ph. D. Candidate, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, emrullahkipcak@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4543-9020>

## **Introduction**

Living together as a society creates many needs. Justice in social relations is one of the most pronounced of these needs. Compulsory Enforcement services are one of the services where the perception of justice is experienced very intensely. Such services are also a responsibility for the state to carry out. The fulfillment of these services is under a state monopoly and carried out by the power of the state. The state has to offer an Enforcement service that is high quality, fast and secure because the service is offered by the state as a monopoly. However, the Turkish Enforcement system is the most criticized area among judicial services because of its low performance.

In this study, the dimensions of the existing service quality were evaluated within the scope of Total Quality Management, and an attempt was made to redefine them in terms of the quality of the judicial system. Two services were evaluated and compared to assess the quality of services: (1) the quality of service offered by Enforcement and Bankruptcy Offices and (2) the quality of service offered by pilot enforcement offices created under a project carried out by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Turkey. In this scope, the study was carried out at the pilot enforcement offices in Malatya and Gaziantep provinces — which were created within the scope of the project titled “Improving the Efficiency of Enforcement Offices” — as well as the Enforcement and Bankruptcy Departments operating according to the existing system in the Palaces of Justice of Van, Bitlis and Muş provinces.

## **The Concept of Service and Enforcement Offices’ Services**

Depending on economic and sociological values, the concept of service is addressed in very different ways, leading to different definitions (Gümüšoğlu, Tavmergen, Akan, & Akbaba, 2007, pp. 10-12)The service is the collection of benefits, without having any relationship with a property, purchased by consumers (Yılmaz, Yaprak, & Filiz, 2007, p. 301).

Because services are abstract concepts, they are named as a benefit or satisfaction by consumers (Karahana, 2006, p. 27). Gronross defines the service as an activity or sequence of activities with a more or less intangible structure, forming at the moment of interaction between customers and service personnel and/or systems, and being provided as a solution to customer problems (Gronroos, 1994).

It is possible to list the following characteristics based on the scope of the concept of service.

- ❖ It is the action in which one party provides benefits to another party by carrying out works or actions and meeting the other party's needs.
- ❖ These actions are based on a certain accumulation of knowledge and skills.
- ❖ It has an abstract nature due to the fact that there is a work or action done.
- ❖ The goods and services are intertwined in general.
- ❖ Services emerge based on actions, processes and interactions.
- ❖ Services are products that are consumed instantly.
- ❖ Services do not have material outputs (Gümüšoğlu, Tavmergen, Akan, & Akbaba, 2007, pp. 12-13).

### **The concept of service quality**

Service quality is seen as an ambiguous and complicated concept to grasp, implement and inspect since it does not contain many concrete characteristics (Çakmakkaya, Batur, Akpınar, Erbay, & Kopuz, 2015, p. 23). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) carried out a study to understand how customers judge service quality. Based on the results, they defined service quality as the level and direction of the difference between customers' perceptions of service and their expectations.

There are two perspectives in the definition of service quality: internal and external. According to the internal perspective, no mistakes should be made while providing a service. In other words, everything must be done properly and according to norms from the very beginning. In the external perspective, the service quality is explained by customer perceptions, expectations, satisfaction and attitudes. As customer awareness grows and customer expectations and demands change rapidly, the external perspective also becomes increasingly important (Çatı & Baydaş, 2008, p. 237).

In summary,

- ❖ Customers' assessment of the quality of a service they receive is more difficult than their assessment of the quality of a product they purchase.
- ❖ Customers' perceptions of service quality form as a result of comparing the performance of the service received with expectations.

- ❖ Quality assessments are not done only by considering the outcome of a service; the process in which the service is provided also plays an important role in quality assessments (Çakmakkaya, Batur, Akpınar, Erbay, & Kopuz, 2015, p. 23).

### ***Dimensions of service quality***

Parasuraman, Berry and Zeithaml have divided the dimensions of service quality into 10 service components after a research study that involved four different service groups. They used the 10 service dimensions as input to a factor analysis and developed a service quality measurement instrument called Servqual, consisting of 5 dimensions and 22 questions (Saat, 1999). Besides this study, there are several service quality scale based on this scale of service quality about different services (Özdağoğlu and Güler, 2016)

The Tangibles, reliability and responsiveness dimensions of the 10 dimensions were kept in the new scale, and the remaining dimensions were included in the scale as the empathy and assurance dimensions. The assurance dimension includes credibility, security, competence and kindness, and the empathy dimension includes the dimensions of understanding the customer, accessibility and communication (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985).

*Tangibles:* They are defined as physical facilities, equipment, other tools related to service, clothing of employees, decoration and communication tools.

*Reliability:* It includes subjects such as the ability to accurately and reliably fulfill the service promised and to solve problems experienced by customers. The sustainability of performance is expected.

*Responsiveness:* It includes to have the desire to help customers and to provide the service properly and rapidly.

*Assurance:* The following characteristics are considered within this scope: the ability of employees to be knowledgeable and polite, to create confidence in customers, and to respond to customer inquiries.

*Empathy:* It includes the action in which service providers can put themselves in the customers' place, give consequence to each customer and know customer needs (Kozak, Özel, & Yüncü, 2011, p. 188-189).

**Table 1:** New Servqual Dimensions (Zeithaml, Parasuraman , & Berry, 1990).

New Dimensions of Servqual					
Five Dimensions Ten Dimensions	Tangibles	Reliability	Responsiveness	Assurance	Empathy
Tangibles					
Reliability					
Responsiveness					
Competence Courtesy Credibility Security					
Accessibility Communication Understanding the Customer					

In addition to these dimensions, Çavdar et al. (2017) have contributed to the literature the information dimension, which is considered as a necessary dimension in terms of the quality of service of social service institutions and that of Enforcement and bankruptcy offices. Çavdar et al. have raised four basic questions about the information dimension: (1) the presence of units where information can be received, (2) presentation of the necessary information about the conditions for benefiting from the service, (3) presentation of information about the status of ongoing processes, and (4) whether sources of information about the service are sufficient (Çavdar, Kıpçak, & Önal, 2017, p. 147).

In the Servqual method — proposed by Parasuraman et al. in terms of service quality dimensions — customers' expectations are obtained regarding the variables that are determined before receiving a service. After receiving the service, the expectations of the customers are compared with the service they perceive. If the service perceived by the customers meets their expectations, there will be little or no difference between what is perceived and what is expected. In the end, an assessment can be made to reveal whether the service has good quality (Çakmakkaya, Batur, Akpınar, Erbay, & Kopuz, 2015, p. 29).

While Parasuraman et al. regarded service quality as the difference between the expected and perceived service, Cronin and Taylor — who did not give support to the Servqual scale — developed the Servperf

scale as an alternative to the theory of Parasuraman et al. (Cronin & Steven, 1994). Cronin and Taylor investigated the relationship between the concept of service and its measurement, and the satisfaction and purchase tendencies of customers. The researchers compared the calculated differences with perceptions. They found that perceptions were a better indicator of service quality measurements. They developed the Servperf method, which is a measurement instrument based solely on performance (Cronin & Steven, 1992).

In the Servqual model, 22 units were used for expectation and 22 units for perception, whereas the service performance of businesses was directly measured by using only 22 units in the Servperf model. In the model, it was not considered necessary to measure expectations of consumers, which are measured in the Servqual scale (Örs, 2007, p. 159).

### **Enforcement Offices**

The most important organ of the Enforcement organization is the enforcement office. The enforcement offices are the primary responsible party in the area of law of Enforcement. The first place to apply to is the enforcement office, no matter which track one chooses to pursue.

In the law of Enforcement, in order to be able to have a writ of Enforcement issued, the creditor applies to the enforcement office with a request for initiation of a writ of Enforcement. Thereupon, the enforcement office sends an order of payment or writ of Enforcement to the judgment debtor. When the order of payment (or Enforcement) is received by the debtor, it is finalized if no appeal is made or no suit is filed with regard to it. Accordingly, in debts of money, the enforcement office levies the judgment debtor's goods, sells them, and pays the sum of the judgment creditor; the office forcibly enforces judgments which involve something other than money (Kuru, 2004, p. 68).

The enforcement office is independent and can communicate and exchange correspondence directly with every office and position with regard to the operations it carries out. The enforcement office executes the tasks assigned to it directly by itself.

If the office acts illegally while performing its duties, the action it has carried out will be canceled or corrected by the enforcement court on the complaint of the persons concerned. The enforcement office is under permanent surveillance and supervision of the judge of the enforcement court, and its operations are examined upon complaint or objection by the enforcement court to which it is affiliated. The enforcement office has

the authority to use force and can issue orders to law enforcement officers on this issue. The enforcement office may authorize enforcement offices of other places for operations that need to be performed outside its authorization area (Kuru, 2013, pp. 65-67).

Every enforcement office has an enforcement officer managing it. There are assistant enforcement officers and enforcement agents in enforcement offices where the workload and number of files are high. The Ministry of Justice is entitled to keep enforcement offices together and to link them to the same enforcement court (Kuru, 2013, pp. 41-42).

### ***Duties of the enforcement offices (officers)***

The enforcement offices are the primary responsible party in the operations related to the law of Enforcement. The creditor or deputy who will be pursuing to have a writ of Enforcement issued applies to the enforcement office with a request for initiation of a writ of Enforcement. After the request for initiation of a writ of Enforcement, the necessary Enforcement procedures are initiated by the enforcement office. These procedures consist of various stages, from the receivable collection to the payment of the creditor, such as issuance of the payment/Enforcement order and its delivery to the debtor; seizing of the debtor's movable goods, immovable goods, and rights and receivables in third persons; payment of the creditor's receivable with the money obtained by selling the seized goods; and forced Enforcement of decisions that involve something other than money.

The enforcement officer is not entitled to use discretion as a rule in the conduct of operations; for example, the enforcement officer must prepare an order of payment and send it to the debtor if the enforcement officer receives a writ of Enforcement. However, in some operations, the enforcement officer is entitled to exercise discretion, for example, to evaluate whether a property can be seized or not based on the elements defined in the law. In such cases, the enforcement officer has to take best care of the benefits of the interested parties when using the discretion (Kuru, 2013, p. 83). The enforcement officer must address every request he receives, and he must make a decision on the issue regardless of whether his decision is negative.

A time limit is envisaged by law for operations undertaken by the enforcement officer. According to this, as a rule, the enforcement officer is obliged to perform an action within 3 days regarding a request received by him. By law, he has to carry out the operations that have not been

assigned a certain period of time within an appropriate timeframe depending on the characteristics and qualifications of the operation. The enforcement officer (office) is under permanent surveillance and supervision of the judge of the enforcement court; the complaints against his actions are referred to the enforcement court to which he is affiliated (Kuru, 2013, p. 56).

### ***The new enforcement office model***

A new Enforcement model has been proposed within the scope of the Matching Project entitled “Improving the Efficiency of Enforcement Offices” in order to overcome organizational and structural deficiencies. This new model is based on three main ideas:

1. The collection of all micro-units under a single enforcement office, under one administration in every center.
2. Establishment of specialized units within a single enforcement office that will manage the successive operations of an Enforcement proceeding.
3. Improvement of existing information technology tools for day-to-day operations carried out in the enforcement office, processing files online, handling electronic sales and Internet banking. Backup printouts and states of documents that can be obtained by a few clicks on the keyboard (T.C Adalet Bakanlığı, 2012, p. 7) .

### **Brief Information of Service Quality on the Enforcement Offices**

Several previous studies were found as a result of the literature review on the service quality of enforcement offices. The relevant studies are limited in number and scope.

Çakmakkaya et al. (2015) mentioned the concept of quality in his book titled “Judicial Buildings and Total Quality Management.” He included topics such as measurement methods and aims of service quality, as well as the connection of quality and total quality management with the construction sector. He also included recommendations on the physical conditions of courthouses mentioned in the report prepared by Cepej, which aimed to improve the efficiency and functioning of jurisdiction. In addition, Çakmakkaya referred to how the quality of buildings was mentioned in old laws, how the elements of Total Quality Management were applied in the construction sector/architecture, and the effect of the quality of life. He emphasized the necessity of planning the interior organization as well as external formation of courthouses. In

brief, he examined from an architectural perspective how the principles of total quality management would be reflected in courthouse buildings. He emphasized designing buildings that were healthy, useful, economical, strong, aesthetic, and in compliance with their urban and historical environment. He focused on providing improvements for prospective or existing buildings in the light of these common principles. In another study, Çakmakkaya et al. (2014) foresaw the implementation of total quality management in which continuous improvement, measurement and analysis techniques were used extensively also in judicial activities of courthouses in addition to administrative activities of courthouses, in his book titled Total Quality Management in Courthouses. He focused on the reasons why total quality management practices in courthouses became the main topic of conversation and the studies carried out at that time to enhance the quality of service in courthouses.

Çavdar et al. (2017) studied services of enforcement offices and services of social welfare. They stated that the information dimension was also important in terms of service quality in addition to the dimensions of existing service quality.

### **Selection and Size Of Sample**

385 samples were found to be sufficient for 95% confidence level in which the volume of the mass is unknown (Brinkman, 2009, p. 51). The questionnaire was administered in Van, Bitlis, Malatya and Gaziantep provinces. A total of 400 questionnaire forms were administered, 100 in each province. All of these 400 questionnaires were included in the analysis as valid data. The respondents of the questionnaire were selected using the simple random sampling method from among people who were served by the enforcement offices.

### **Research findings**

Table 2 shows the data distribution of the questionnaire results according to gender, age, educational status, frequency of visits to enforcement offices, and reasons for visiting enforcement offices:

**Table 2:** Frequency Table

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Gender</b>		

Man	318	79,5
Woman	82	20,5
<b>Age</b>		
18-25	105	26,25
26-35	222	55,5
36-45	63	15,75
46-55	7	1,75
56 and over	3	0,75
<b>Education</b>		
Primary School	6	1,5
High School	58	14,5
Academy	27	6,75
University	280	70
Master	29	7,25
<b>Going Frequency Level</b>		
I Went Once	6	1,5
I Went Several Time	33	8,25
I Go Often	361	90,25
<b>Which Reason to Go</b>		
Payee	17	4,25
Creditor	350	87,5
Payer	9	2,25
Debtor	24	6
General	400	100

### Reliability analysis

Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be 0,91 in the reliability analysis of the questionnaire data. The scale was highly reliable. It was observed that removing the 26 assessment questions from the model did not improve the Cronbach's Alpha value. There was no question that reduced the reliability of the scale.

**Table 3:** Means of Service Quality Dimensions in Service Quality of Enforcement Offices

Dimensions of Quality	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	2,80	0,850	0,042	0,000
Reliability	2,53	0,897	0,045	
Responsiveness	2,43	0,919	0,046	
Assurance	2,72	0,876	0,044	
Empathy	2,66	0,843	0,042	
Informing	2,67	0,970	0,049	
General	2,63	0,901	0,018	

The table shows that there were differences in the service quality of enforcement offices according to the Means of service quality dimensions, and these differences were statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ).

The Means of service quality dimensions in the service quality of enforcement offices show that Tangibles had the highest Mean, followed by the assurance, information, empathy, reliability and responsiveness dimensions.

**Table 4:** Comparative Mean Differences of Service Quality Dimensions in Service Quality of Enforcement Offices

X	Y	Mean difference (X-Y)	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	Reliability	0,266	0,632	0,000
	Responsiveness	0,368	0,632	0,000
	Assurance	0,073	0,632	0,857
	Empathy	0,138	0,632	0,249
	Informing	0,128	0,632	0,329
Reliability	Tangibles	-0,266	0,632	0,000
	Responsiveness	0,102	0,632	0,588
	Assurance	-0,193	0,632	0,028
	Empathy	-0,129	0,632	0,323
	Informing	-0,138	0,632	0,245
Responsiveness	Tangibles	-0,368	0,632	0,000
	Reliability	-0,102	0,632	0,588
	Assurance	-0,295	0,632	0,000
	Empathy	-0,231	0,632	0,004
	Informing	-0,240	0,632	0,002
Assurance	Tangibles	-0,073	0,632	0,857
	Reliability	0,193	0,632	0,028
	Responsiveness	0,295	0,632	0,000
	Empathy	0,064	0,632	0,912
	Informing	0,055	0,632	0,954
Empathy	Tangibles	-0,138	0,632	0,249
	Reliability	0,129	0,632	0,323
	Responsiveness	0,231	0,632	0,004
	Assurance	-0,064	0,632	0,912
	Informing	-0,010	0,632	1,000
Informing	Tangibles	-0,128	0,632	0,329
	Reliability	0,138	0,632	0,245
	Responsiveness	0,240	0,632	0,002
	Assurance	-0,055	0,632	0,954
	Empathy	0,010	0,632	1,000

The table shows that among the quality dimensions, the Tangibles received the highest score, followed by the assurance, information, empathy, reliability and responsiveness dimensions, according to the comparative Mean differences of service quality dimensions in the service quality of enforcement offices. The responsiveness dimension,

which had the lowest Mean, was statistically different from the dimensions of Tangibles, assurance, empathy and information, and this difference was significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). Responsiveness had the lowest service quality score.

**Table 5:** Assessment of Service Quality Dimensions in Enforcement Offices According to Gender

Dimensions of Quality	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	Man	318	2,79	0,046	0,852
	Woman	82	2,80	0,104	
Reliability	Man	318	2,57	0,049	0,015
	Woman	82	2,30	0,103	
Responsiveness	Man	318	2,47	0,051	0,016
	Woman	82	2,20	0,095	
Assurance	Man	318	2,75	0,047	0,045
	Woman	82	2,54	0,102	
Empathy	Man	318	2,70	0,046	0,031
	Woman	82	2,47	0,093	
Informing	Man	318	2,71	0,054	0,042
	Woman	82	2,47	0,105	

The table shows that the service quality scores regarding the reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and information dimensions differed according to gender in the service quality dimensions of enforcement offices, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). In terms of the specified quality dimensions, probably due to different levels of expectation, the means show that males rated the service quality of executive offices higher than females, but the ratings of both groups were at a mediocre level.

**Table 6:** Assessment of Service Quality Dimensions in Enforcement Offices According to Age Groups

Dimensions of Quality	Groups of Age	N	Mean	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	18-25	105	2,83	0,080	0,056
	26-35	222	2,73	0,055	
	36-45	63	2,84	0,111	
	46-55	7	3,61	0,400	
	56 and over	3	3,25	0,721	
Reliability	18-25	105	2,46	0,091	0,016
	26-35	222	2,51	0,055	
	36-45	63	2,51	0,123	

	46-55	7	3,66	0,397	
	56 and over	3	2,73	0,769	
Responsiveness	18-25	105	2,36	0,090	0,001
	26-35	222	2,40	0,058	
	36-45	63	2,37	0,113	
	46-55	7	3,75	0,204	
	56 and over	3	3,25	1,010	
	18-25	105	2,71	0,090	
26-35	222	2,67	0,052		
36-45	63	2,69	0,121		
46-55	7	3,96	0,167		
56 and over	3	3,08	1,157		
18-25	105	2,62	0,083	0,036	
26-35	222	2,62	0,055		
36-45	63	2,66	0,103		
46-55	7	3,57	0,263		
56 and over	3	3,20	0,642		
18-25	105	2,62	0,094		0,030
26-35	222	2,60	0,063		
36-45	63	2,78	0,119		
46-55	7	3,46	0,395		
56 and over	3	3,75	0,661		

The table shows that the service quality scores regarding the reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and information dimensions differed according to age ranges, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). In terms of the specified quality dimensions, the 36–45 and 46–55 age groups rated the services of enforcement offices higher than the other age groups.

**Table 7:** Assessment of Service Quality Dimensions in Enforcement Offices According to Educational Status

Dimensions of Quality	Educational Status	N	Mean	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	Primary School	6	3,67	0,167	0,000
	High School	58	2,81	0,110	
	Academy	27	3,17	0,189	
	University	280	2,77	0,047	
	Master	29	2,35	0,189	
Reliability	Primary School	6	2,87	0,272	0,353
	High School	58	2,58	0,113	
	Academy	27	2,76	0,153	
	University	280	2,49	0,053	
	Master	29	2,36	0,206	
Responsiveness	Primary School	6	2,83	0,441	0,004
	High School	58	2,59	0,107	

	Academy	27	2,77	0,175	
	University	280	2,38	0,053	
	Master	29	1,98	0,187	
Assurance	Primary School	6	2,87	0,391	0,207
	High School	58	2,70	0,113	
	Academy	27	2,99	0,148	
	University	280	2,71	0,052	
	Master	29	2,44	0,161	
Empathy	Primary School	6	2,90	0,345	0,105
	High School	58	2,74	0,111	
	Academy	27	2,97	0,169	
	University	280	2,62	0,048	
	Master	29	2,43	0,174	
Informing	Primary School	6	2,79	0,435	0,013
	High School	58	2,83	0,117	
	Academy	27	3,06	0,209	
	University	280	2,63	0,056	
	Master	29	2,23	0,191	

The table shows that the service quality scores regarding the Tangibles, responsiveness, and information dimensions differed according to educational status, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). In terms of the specified quality dimensions, it was understood that the elementary school graduates rated the services of enforcement offices higher compared to the other educational levels in general.

**Table 8:** Dimensions of Service Quality and Provinces

Dimensions of Quality	Provinces	N	Mean	Standard Error	p
Tangibles	Bitlis	100	2,78	0,086	0,087
	Van	100	2,62	0,084	
	Malatya	100	2,91	0,078	
	Gaziantep	100	2,84	0,087	
Reliability	Bitlis	100	2,54	0,086	0,246
	Van	100	2,52	0,089	
	Malatya	100	2,63	0,093	
	Gaziantep	100	2,38	0,088	
Responsiveness	Bitlis	100	2,33	0,085	0,190
	Van	100	2,34	0,089	
	Malatya	100	2,56	0,087	
	Gaziantep	100	2,39	0,099	
Assurance	Bitlis	100	2,48	0,078	0,004
	Van	100	2,53	0,080	
	Malatya	100	2,86	0,075	
	Gaziantep	100	2,73	0,095	
Empathy	Bitlis	100	2,38	0,061	0,005

	Van	100	2,30	0,069	
	Malatya	100	2,53	0,046	
	Gaziantep	100	2,58	0,060	
Informing	Bitlis	100	2,36	0,089	
	Van	100	2,55	0,096	0,000
	Malatya	100	2,91	0,098	
	Gaziantep	100	2,80	0,094	

The table shows that the service quality scores regarding the assurance, empathy, and information dimensions differed according to provinces, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). In terms of the specified quality dimensions, it was understood that the services of the enforcement offices of Malatya and Gaziantep provinces were rated higher than those of Van and Bitlis. The reason for the difference between the means is, in the context of quality improvement studies, that pilot implementations have been started in the provinces of Malatya and Gaziantep.

**Table 9:** Assessments of Current and New System Enforcement Offices

System	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	p
Current System	200	2,52	0,689	0,049	0,006
New System	200	2,72	0,749	0,053	

The table shows that the service qualities were found to be different when the enforcement offices that provide services in the current system and the enforcement offices in the new system were compared in terms of services of enforcement offices, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). The Means of the quality ratings show that the new regulations in the enforcement offices improved the service quality of the enforcement offices to a limited extent but were not enough.

**Table 10:** Quality Dimensions and System Evaluations

Dimensions of Quality	System	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	p
Tangibles	Current System	200	2,71	0,858	0,031
	New System	200	2,89	0,834	
Reliability	Current System	200	2,54	0,881	
	New System	200	2,52	0,915	
Responsiveness	Current System	200	2,35	0,888	
	New System	200	2,51	0,945	
Assurance	Current System	200	2,62	0,820	
	New System	200	2,83	0,920	

Empathy	Current System	200	2,52	0,807
	New System	200	2,80	0,858
Informing	Current System	200	2,47	0,944
	New System	200	2,87	0,959

According to the table, it was understood that there were certain differences between the Tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and information dimensions of enforcement offices of the current system and the new system in terms of service quality dimensions, and these differences were statistically significant ( $p < 0,05$ ). When the existing system and the new system were compared, it was seen that certain improvements were made in the new system in terms of Tangibles, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and information. The improvement made for the quality dimension did not differ very substantially. Considering the reliability and quality dimensions, it was seen that only the reliability dimension was worsened, although it was understood that the quality improvement of the enforcement offices was progressing adversely in the transition from the existing system to the new system. The table shows that the highest improvement among the improvements in the quality dimensions was in the information dimension. Consequently, considering the table in terms of all quality dimensions, it can be said, based on the data, that the service quality of enforcement offices was improved, but the desired service quality values had not been reached.

### Conclusion

As societies evolve, their quality expectations for property and services also increase. In present conditions, the quality of public services has become more questionable, and such expectations of people have begun to be taken into account to provide these services.

In this study, an application was carried out on enforcement offices to evaluate the quality of the services provided in the forensic area and presented. In this study, the quality of service of enforcement offices were assessed by taking into account the information dimension, in addition to assessing current service quality dimensions within the scope of Total Quality Management. In this study, two services were evaluated and compared to assess the quality of services: the quality of service offered by the existing Enforcement and Bankruptcy Offices and the quality of service offered by pilot enforcement offices created under a project carried out by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Turkey. In this scope, the study was carried out at the pilot enforcement offices in the Malatya and Gaziantep provinces — which were created within the

scope of the project titled “Improving the Efficiency of Enforcement Offices” — as well as the Enforcement and Bankruptcy Departments operating in the existing system in the Palaces of Justice of Van, Bitlis and Muş provinces.

Based on the analyses, the Means and Mean differences of service quality dimensions regarding the service quality of enforcement offices show that Tangibles had the highest Mean, followed by the assurance, information, empathy, reliability and responsiveness dimensions. The quality of service in enforcement offices were evaluated according to demographic factors — according to both gender and age groups. It was understood that there were differences between the other quality dimensions besides the Tangibles dimension, and these differences were statistically significant. Considering the Means, it was seen that males rated the service quality dimensions higher than females in the service quality of enforcement offices. According to the Means of age groups, it was understood that those who had the highest ratings were the individuals in the ages of 36–45 and 46–55. It was seen that Tangibles, responsiveness and information dimensions varied according to educational level, regarding the service quality dimensions of enforcement offices, and this difference was statistically significant. Considering the Means, it was understood that the elementary school graduates generally had higher ratings.

In terms of the service quality of enforcement offices, it was understood that the Means and the Mean differences of the service quality dimensions, as well as the Means according to the demographic factors were generally mediocre. Therefore, it was understood that the service quality of enforcement offices was not good enough.

In terms of the service quality of enforcement offices in different provinces, the service quality scores regarding the assurance, empathy, and information dimensions differed according to provinces, and this difference was statistically significant. In terms of the specified quality dimensions, it was understood that the services of the enforcement offices of Malatya and Gaziantep provinces were rated higher than those of Van and Bitlis according to the Means. Although the information dimension was rated higher than the assurance and empathy dimensions, it was understood that the Means were close to each other and mediocre. The service qualities were found to be different when the enforcement offices that provided services in the current system and the enforcement offices in the new system were compared in terms of services of the

enforcement offices, and this difference was statistically significant. It was understood from the Means of the quality ratings that the new regulations in the enforcement offices improved the service quality of the enforcement offices to a limited extent but were not enough. In the service quality of enforcement offices of the current system and the new system, in terms of the ratings of service quality dimensions, it was understood that there were certain differences in terms of all quality dimensions, and these differences were found to be statistically significant. When the existing system and the new system were compared, it was understood that certain improvements were made in the new system in terms of Tangibles, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and information. It was seen that the improvement in the quality dimension did not differ very substantially. In the new system, the highest improvement among the improvements in the quality dimensions was in the information dimension. Considering the service qualities of enforcement offices of the current and new systems in terms of all quality dimensions, it was understood, based on the data, that the service quality of enforcement offices was improved, but the desired service quality values had not been reached in general.

In conclusion, it was understood that in the present system, the service quality in enforcement offices was mediocre. In the new system, the service quality was also below what it should be. It was concluded that healthier regulations must be made for an effective and efficient service quality.

## References

- Brinkman, W. (2009). Design of A Questionnaire Instrument, . *Handbook of Mobile Technology Research Methods*, Nova Publisher, 51.
- Cronin, J. J., & Steven, T. (1992). "Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension". *Journal of Marketing*, 55-68.
- Cronin, J. J., & Steven, T. (1994). "Serperf Versus Servqual: Reconciling Performance-Based". *Journal of Marketing*, 125-131.
- Çakmakkaya Baki Yiğit, B. N. (2014). *Adliyelerde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi*. Bursa: Ekin Yayıncılık.
- Çakmakkaya, B. Y., Batur, N., Akpınar, T., Erbay, M., & Kopuz, A. (2015). *Adliye Binaları ve Toplam Kalite Yönetimi*. Ankara: Bilge Yayıncılık.

- Çatı, K., & Baydaş, A. (2008). *Hizmet Pazarlaması ve Hizmet Kalitesi*. Ankara: Asil Yayıncılık.
- Çavdar, E., Kıpçak, E., & Önal, E. (2017). "Hizmet Kalitesinde Yeni Bir Boyut: Bilgilendirme". *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*(3), 138-155.
- Gronroos, C. (1994). "From Scientific Management to Service Management". *A Management International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 27-46.
- Gümüšoğlu, Ş., Tavmergen, İ. P., Akan, P., & Akbaba, A. (2007). *Hizmet Kalitesi: Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar ve Uygulamalar*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Karahan, K. (2006). *Hizmet Pazarlaması*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayınları.
- Kozak, N., Özel, Ç. H., & Yüncü, D. K. (2011). *Hizmet Pazarlaması*. Ankara: Detay Yayınları.
- Kuru, B. (2004). *İcra ve İflas Hukuku*. İstanbul: Türkmen Kitap Evi.
- Kuru, B. (2013). *İcra İflas Hukuku*. Ankara: Adalet Yayın Evi.
- Örs, H. (2007). *Hizmet Pazarlama Etkinliği ve Kalite*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Özdağoğlu, A. & Güler M. E. (2016). "E-service quality of Internet based banking using combined fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS". *Technicki Vjesnik*, 23 (4), 1109-1116
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. (1985). "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implication for Further Research". *The Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Saat, M. (1999). "Kavramsal Hizmet Modeli ve Hizmet Kalitesini Ölçme Aracı Olarak Servqual Analizi". *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 107-118.
- T.C Adalet Bakanlığı. (2012). *İcra Dairelerinin Etkinliğinin Arttırılması Eleştirme Projesi*. Hatay: Adalet Bakanlığı.
- Yılmaz Veysel, Y. B. (2007). "Servqual Yöntemiyle Yüksek Öğretimde Hizmet Kalitesinin Ölçülmesi". *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* , 299-316.

*Önal et. al. / Service Quality of the Enforcement Offices: Comparison Between Existing and Pilot Application Offices of Turkey*

*www.ijceas.com*

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman , A., & Berry, L. L. (1990). *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.



impeccable.

15	Enforcement office employees tell exactly when a service will be given.	1	2	3	4	5
16	The employees of the Enforcement Offices serve to the persons in an urgent manner.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Enforcement office employees always want to assist their interlocutors.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Enforcement office employees never report that they are busy when they need to do their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
19	The behavior of the employees of the enforcement office raises confidence in the interlocutors.	1	2	3	4	5
20	The interlocutors feel confident about the transactions carried out in the enforcement offices.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Enforcement office employees are always courteous to interlocutors	1	2	3	4	5
22	The employees of the enforcement office have enough knowledge to answer the questions of the interlocutors.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Enforcement office employees take care of each interlocutor one by one.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Employees in the enforcement office obey the working hours.	1	2	3	4	5
25	There are employees who take special care of the interlocutors in the enforcement offices.	1	2	3	4	5
26	In executive offices, the benefits of interlocutors are kept above all else.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Enforcement office employees understand the specific needs of the interlocutors.	1	2	3	4	5
28	There are units in enforcement offices which information can be obtained.	1	2	3	4	5
29	Employees of the enforcement office provide necessary information about the operation of the process prior to the application.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Enforcement office personnel provide sufficient information on the status of ongoing transactions.	1	2	3	4	5
31	The sources of information about the operations of the enforcement offices are sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5