STM JOURNALS

Journal of
Production Research & Management

ISSN: 2249-4766 (Online)
ISSN: 2347-9930 (Print)
Volume 15, Issue 3, 2025
September–December
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/JoPRM

https://journals.stmjournals.com/joprm/

Review JoPRM

A Survey on Quality Team Effectiveness in Modern Service Factories

Prashant Roy[1,*]

Abstract

In today's increasingly competitive environment, service-oriented factories—i.e., operations that deliver services rather than physical goods but use a factory-style process (such as outsourcing centres, shared service centres, processing hubs, digital service factories)—are under pressure to enhance both quality of output and team effectiveness. This survey paper explores the role of quality teams within modern service factories, and investigates the factors influencing their effectiveness, the mechanisms by which they contribute to service quality, and the challenges and opportunities of deploying them in service-factory contexts. We review extant literature on team effectiveness, quality management systems (QMS) and service operations, synthesise insights from manufacturing-based quality-team studies and service literature, and then apply these insights to the service-factory domain. Key themes identified include leadership commitment, team member skills and training, process clarity and standardisation, communication and feedback loops, customer-centric orientation, and use of performance metrics. The paper further examines how quality teams are applied in service factories—such as continuous improvement teams, cross-functional quality circles, service process improvement squads—and identifies the limitations of such applications, including issues of intangibility of service, high variability of demand, cultural and behavioural constraints, and difficulties in measurement. Based on the survey, we propose future research directions and practical scope for enhancing quality team effectiveness in modern service factories. The paper concludes that while quality teams offer a promising mechanism for improving service-factory performance, their success depends critically on organisational commitment, process alignment, and the adaptation of team practices to the peculiarities of service operations. Managers in service factory contexts should therefore adopt a holistic approach: establish the right culture, equip teams with data and customer feedback, define clear objectives, provide training, and integrate teams into the continuous improvement system. This survey thus contributes to both academic understanding and managerial practice of quality teams in service-factory settings.

Keywords: Quality teams, service factory, team effectiveness, continuous improvement, service operations, quality management systems, service quality, team leadership

INTRODUCTION

***Author for Correspondence**
Prashant Roy
E-mail: prashant.roy2312@gmail.com

[1]M.Tech. Department of Engineering, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India

Received Date: November 06, 2025
Accepted Date: November 11, 2025
Published Date: November 18, 2025

Citation: Prashant Roy. A Survey on Quality Team Effectiveness in Modern Service Factories. Journal of Production Research & Management. 2025; 15(3): 25–30p.

In recent years, the concept of a "factory" has extended beyond traditional manufacturing plants. Many organisations now operate what may be termed "service factories" – facilities or units where service delivery is executed at scale, often following process-flow, standardisation and output metrics akin to manufacturing. Examples include business process outsourcing (BPO) centres, shared services hubs, contact-centre networks, digital/transformation service units, and logistics/fulfilment service sites. These modern service factories face pressures of cost, speed,

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved

quality and customer satisfaction much like their manufacturing counterparts. However, the nature of service operations brings additional complexity: intangibility of output, high variability in demand, dependency on human interactions, and often less-rigid process control [1,2].

Against this backdrop, the role of teams dedicated to quality improvement – hereafter "quality teams" – is of growing interest. In manufacturing settings, quality improvement teams (e.g., quality circles, cross-functional improvement teams) have long been recognised as instrumental in driving continuous improvement, reducing defects, optimising processes and improving performance. The question arises: how do such teams translate into the context of service factories? What makes a quality team effective in such environments? What specific challenges and enablers apply when the "factory" produces services rather than goods?

This survey aims to address these questions by examining the literature on team effectiveness in quality management, focusing on service operations and service factories. We define "quality team effectiveness" as the extent to which these teams achieve their intended objectives (e.g., improving service quality, enhancing process reliability, increasing customer satisfaction, reducing waste) and contribute to organisational performance. We look at what factors influence effectiveness (leadership, team composition, process integration, metrics, customer focus etc.), how effectiveness is measured in service-factory settings, applications of quality teams, their limitations, and future scope. The objective is to provide both academics and practitioners with a consolidated view of the current state of knowledge, gaps, and actionable insights for modern service factories [3,4].

In the following section we review the relevant literature, then discuss applications in service-factory contexts. We subsequently examine limitations and outline future directions and scope, before concluding with managerial implications.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review draws from three intersecting domains: (i) team effectiveness theory (particularly in organisational behaviour and operations); (ii) quality management systems (QMS) in services; and (iii) application of quality or improvement teams in both manufacturing and service settings.

Team Effectiveness

Teams have been studied extensively in organisational research. A team is typically defined as a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, common performance goals, and an approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Key predictors of team effectiveness include role clarity, leadership, communication, cohesiveness, skills of team members, rewards/reinforcement, and supportive environment. A study in the service sector found that supportive environment, team reward, team skills, role clarity, leadership, and cohesiveness all had significant positive effects on employees' performance. Karmakar & Paneerselvam (2014) discuss "tips of high-performance team building" linking team structure and leadership to organisational effectiveness. Thus, effectiveness of teams is influenced by both internal team dynamics and external organisational support [5,6].

Quality Management Systems in Service Organisations

Quality management in service organisations has its distinct features: the output is intangible, customer contact is high, variability in service processes is often greater, and employee behaviour plays a more central role. W.M.T. et al. (2018) in a study of service organisations found that customer focus and leadership were key drivers of QMS components (process approach, engagement of people, relationship management) and thereby improvement. The study emphasised that leadership underpins the successful application of quality management in services [7,8].

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved

The broader quality literature also covers TQM (Total Quality Management) in service sectors. Talib, Rahman & Qureshi (2012) provide a literature review of TQM in services, noting that implementation success depends on factors like top management commitment, employee empowerment, process orientation, training, continuous improvement, and customer focus.

Quality / Improvement Teams in Manufacturing and Service Contexts

Much of the literature on quality teams originates from manufacturing. For example, a study by the implementation of work teams in manufacturing found that after adoption of work teams, quality and labour productivity improved over time. A systematic literature review focusing on work teams during continuous improvement in manufacturing identified 60 factors impacting team effectiveness; the most frequently mentioned included leadership, communication, and participation from senior management. In service contexts, research is comparatively fewer but growing. One mini-review focusing on work effectiveness and service quality found that service efficiency and service quality can be compatible and that improvements in efficiency did not necessarily degrade quality. Another service-sector study (Pakistan) found that teamwork as part of quality management practices had a positive impact on organisational effectiveness. Further, teamwork communication strategies have been shown to enhance TQM implementation in manufacturing organisations, which may have parallels in service factories [9,10].

Synthesis for Service Factory Context

Bringing the above threads together, we can infer several key insights relevant for quality team effectiveness in modern service factories:

- Leadership and organisational commitment: Without strong backing from top management, quality teams tend to be ineffective. The QMS study in services emphasised leadership as foundational.
- Customer-centric orientation: In service factories, the "customer" may be internal (next process stage) or external, so quality teams must explicitly adopt customer focus.
- Team composition, skills and training: Team members must have relevant skills (quality mindset, service process knowledge, data analysis capability, customer orientation) and training.
- Process clarity and standardisation: Even in service settings, standardising workflows, defining clear process steps, and metrics enable quality teams to identify improvements.
- Communication and feedback loops: Ongoing communication within teams and across process boundaries helps maintain alignment, identify issues early, empower team members.
- Measurement and metrics: Service factories still require metrics (defect rates, error rates, turnaround times, customer complaints, rework) so that quality teams have targets and can track performance.
- Culture of continuous improvement: Quality teams are vehicles for continuous improvement; service factories need to embed improvement culture (Kaizen, Lean, Six Sigma adapted).
- Adaptability and variability: Unique to service factories are high variability of demand, intangible outputs, and human-centric interactions; quality teams must adapt methodologies accordingly.

In sum, the literature suggests that quality teams can play an important role in service factories, but success depends on adapting to service-specific characteristics.

Applications in Modern Service Factories

Modern service factories can apply quality teams in a variety of ways. Below are some illustrative applications:

- *Continuous improvement squads:* A service factory (e.g., a large call centre) forms a cross-functional squad tasked with reducing first-call resolution errors, improving agent adherence to scripts, reducing customer complaints. The squad meets weekly, reviews metrics, identifies root-causes (e.g., insufficient training, system interface delays), proposes improvement actions, monitors results.

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved

- *Quality circles in service processes:* Small voluntary groups of service staff periodically meet to discuss process issues (for example, in an invoice-processing shared service centre). The circle identifies bottlenecks, suggests standardised templates, redesigns workflow, tracks metrics (cycle time, error rate) and reports to management.
- *Lean-Six Sigma quality teams for service variant:* A service factory may adapt Lean or Six Sigma approaches – for instance, a team applying DMAIC (Define, Measure, Analyse, Improve, Control) to reduce errors in insurance-claims processing. The team trains members, maps the process, identifies defects (e.g., mis-entered data, delays), applies solutions (automation, checklists), and controls improvements.
- *Service excellence teams:* In a digital service-factory environment (e.g., IT support services), a quality team monitors service-level agreements (SLAs), customer satisfaction scores, internal escalation metrics, and uses dashboards to drive continuous improvement. They hold monthly review meetings, involve stakeholders (service engineers, support staff, customers), and propose service design changes.

Each of these applications demonstrates how quality teams enhance service-factory performance by focusing on process standardisation, measurement, root-cause analysis, team empowerment, feedback management, and continuous improvement. The team effectiveness elements described earlier (leadership, training, communication etc.) are key enablers.

LIMITATIONS

While quality teams are promising, there are several limitations and challenges particularly in the context of service factories:

- *Intangibility and variability of service output:* Unlike manufacturing, service outputs are often intangible, and variability (customer behaviour, custom requests, human interactions) is high. This makes defining metrics and standardising processes more challenging.
- *Measurement difficulties:* Service factories may lack clean metrics or may face difficulty isolating "defects" or errors (e.g., customer dissatisfaction due to subjective reasons). Without reliable measurement, quality teams may struggle to target improvements.
- *Human-centric processes and culture:* Service factories rely heavily on human staff, their motivation, training, and behaviour. Changing culture and encouraging participation can be more difficult than adjusting mechanical processes.
- *Team sustainability and empowerment:* Maintaining team momentum over time is a challenge. Quality teams may become less effective if not supported by management, without regular recognition, or if improvements yield diminishing returns.
- *Resource constraints:* Service factories may hesitate to allocate dedicated resources (time, tools, training) to quality teams, given competing demands (cost, productivity, client deadlines).
- *Organisational structure and silos:* Many service operations are organised in functional silos (e.g., operations, customer service, IT). Quality teams that cross these boundaries may face resistance, lack of authority, or communication barriers.
- *Transferability from manufacturing models:* Many quality team models derive from manufacturing contexts; direct transfer to service factories may overlook service-specific factors (customer interaction, intangible value, service variability).

These limitations suggest that while quality teams can be beneficial, success is far from guaranteed and requires careful adaptation and supportive infrastructure.

FUTURE SCOPE AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Based on the survey of literature and applications, several areas merit further research and development in the domain of quality team effectiveness in modern service factories:

- *Empirical studies in service-factory settings:* There is a need for more empirical research (quantitative, qualitative, case studies) into how quality teams perform specifically in service factories, their success factors and barriers.

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved

- *Development of service-factory-specific team effectiveness frameworks:* Adapt or develop frameworks that account for service characteristic (intangibility, customer contact, variability) when assessing quality team effectiveness.
- *Metrics and measurement models for service quality teams:* Research to define appropriate metrics for service factories (e.g., process cycle time, customer satisfaction, error rate, rework rate, employee engagement) and link them to team effectiveness.
- *Role of digital & IT tools in quality teams:* Explore how digital dashboards, analytics, process-mining, AI tools support quality teams in monitoring and improving service processes.
- *Behavioural and cultural aspects:* Investigate how team culture, empowerment, psychological safety, cross-functional communication impact quality team outcomes in service factories.
- *Longitudinal studies of team sustainability:* Many studies are cross-sectional; longitudinal research is needed to understand how quality teams evolve over time, sustain improvement, and continue to deliver value.
- *Impact of external service-factory factors:* Examine how external factors (customer demand variability, service outsourcing, remote workforce) influence quality team effectiveness.
- *Benchmarking and best-practice repositories:* Develop repositories of case studies, best practices, lessons learned from service factories implementing quality teams.

In practical terms, service-factory managers have scope to integrate quality teams into their operations strategy, invest in training, digital tools, and foster a continuous-improvement culture tailored to service processes.

CONCLUSION

In sum, this survey has examined the role of quality teams in enhancing effectiveness within modern service factories. Drawing on literature from team effectiveness, quality management systems in services and manufacturing experiences, we find that quality teams can be powerful agents for improvement in service-factory settings—provided the right enablers are in place. Critical success factors include strong leadership, customer orientation, team skills and training, process clarity, effective communication and measurement. At the same time, unique challenges of service factories—intangible outputs, high variability, human-centred processes, measurement difficulties and organisational silos—mean that quality teams require adaptation to context, not mere borrowing of manufacturing models.

For practitioners, the message is clear: integrate quality teams into the service-factory operations strategy, provide them with data, support, training and authority, and embed them in a continuous improvement culture. For researchers, there remains much to explore regarding metrics, frameworks and longitudinal studies in this domain. Ultimately, well-functioning quality teams are likely to contribute to improved service quality, higher customer satisfaction, reduced error/rework, and better overall performance in service factories.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurachman Alkaf, Mohd Yusoff Yusliza, Jumadil Saputra, Zikri Muhammad & Abdul Talib Bon. “A Review of Work Effectiveness and Efficiency, Service Quality and Organisational Performance Literature: A Mini-Review Approach.” 11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management (IEOM), Singapore, March 7-11 2021.
2. Namita Karmakar & S. Paneerselvam. “Tips of High-Performance Team Building for Organisational Effectiveness.” i-manager’s Journal on Management 8(4), 2014.
3. W. M., Yu, B. T. W., & Lee, P. K. C. (2018). How Quality Management System Components Lead to Improvement in Service Organizations: A System Practitioner Perspective. Administrative Sciences, 8(4), 73.
4. Faisal Talib, Zillur Rahman, Mohamed Rafik Qureshi. “Total Quality Management in Service Sector: A Literature Review.” International Journal of Business Innovation and Research, Vol. 6 No. 3, 2012.

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved

5. Ramírez-Zavala, M., López-Guerrero, A., Olivares-Fong, L. C., Velázquez-Victorica, K. I., & Montoya-Alcaraz, M. (2024). Factors That Impact the Dynamics and Effectiveness of Work Teams during the Implementation of Continuous Improvement Tools in the Manufacturing Industry: A Systematic Literature Review. Applied Sciences, 14(3), 1017.
6. Fryer, K. J., Antony, J., & Douglas, A. (Year unknown). Critical Success Factors of Continuous Improvement in the Public Sector: A Literature Review and Some Key Findings. Glasgow Caledonian University Research Online.
7. Verma, S. (2021). Service Quality Measures: Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Directions. International Journal of Management Practice, 15(1).
8. Albritton, J. A., Fried, B., Singh, K., et al. (2019). The role of psychological safety and learning behavior in the development of effective quality improvement teams in Ghana: an observational study. BMC Health Services Research, 19, 385.
9. Kim, S. Y., & Ko, Y. (2023). Influence of the Team Effectiveness of Nursing Units on Nursing Care Left Undone and Nurse-Reported Quality of Care. Healthcare, 11(10), 1380.
10. Jevanesan, T., Antony, J., & Rodgers, B. (2018). Towards Continuous Improvement (CI) in Professional Service Delivery: A Systematic Literature Review. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence.

© STM Journals 2025. All Rights Reserved