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Abstract

This paper is an extension of the work presented in April at the ICEP 2006 conference [1]* An opinion survey on the response time and quality of corrective actions provided to the customers versus quality of the description of the issues raised by customers were conducted. It is important that the technical issues raised by mobile terminals users are resolved in time and that the corrective actions are of good quality. On the other hand, in order to help speed up the corrective actions, description of the technical issue needs to be as clear as possible from the first time the issue is raised. A partially or completely poorly described issue will result in a ping pong situation and leading to a high open time for the issue. Randomly, a batch of issues which had already been resolved, from the years 2004 to 2006 were collected from an in-built tool knowledge database known as GENIUS and were sent to customers to give their opinion on the time spent providing a solution and its quality. At the same time the same batch of issues had were also sent to the issue resolvers to obtain their opinion on the quality of the description of the issues raised by the same customers. The survey results has been analysed using suitable statistical methods, that has helped to establish a mathematical correlation and association between perceived quality of corrective action (OUTPUT) and quality of description and time spent to provide the solution (INPUTS). Based on the test statistic calculation results, conclusion of the survey was made.

1. Introduction

In this work 8 different customers were asked to evaluate the quality of the corrective actions to them and also the time spent on providing the corrective actions by upper levels (see figure 1 for levels). At the same time the same issues were sent to 8 different corresponding resolvers to evaluate the quality of the description provided by the customers. It is perceived that the better the description of the issues, the better is the quality of the provided corrective. In this paper this it has been shown statistically, that yes indeed good quality description of the issues corresponds to better quality of the corrective actions. It has also been established that Quality of the corrective actions can still be good despite of the long resolution time.

2. Current state analysis

Fig. 1 A simplified issues escalation path Diagram
ANALYSIS:

**Correlation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation: Solution Qualit</th>
<th>Quality of Descri</th>
<th>Solution Time</th>
<th>Time asked for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Descri</td>
<td>-0.5673</td>
<td>-0.5673</td>
<td>-0.5673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Time</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time asked for</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RST</td>
<td>0.5673</td>
<td>0.5673</td>
<td>0.5673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** Statistically significant correlation between Solution Qualit, Quality of Descri, and Solution Time.

**Regression Analysis: Solution Qualit versus Quality of Description**

The regression equation is:

\[ \text{Solution Qualit} = 0.4463 + 0.7006 \text{ Quality of Descri} \]

\[ R^2 = 0.7602, R^2(Adj) = 26.9\% \]

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2352</td>
<td>7.2352</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.6407</td>
<td>1.2352</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fitted Line Plot**

Solution Qualit = 0.4463 + 0.7006 Quality of Descri

**Fig. 2 Scatter of Corrective actions Quality Time Vs Solution time; quality of description**

**Regression Analysis: Solution Time versus Quality of Description**

The regression equation is:

\[ \text{Solution Time} = 1.977 + 0.2599 \text{ Quality of Descri} \]

\[ R^2 = 0.7584, R^2(Adj) = 4.8\% \]

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2352</td>
<td>7.2352</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.6407</td>
<td>1.2352</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fitted Line Plot**

Solution Time = 1.977 + 0.2599 Quality of Descri

**Fig. 3 Regression Analysis: Solution Quality versus Quality of Description**

**Fig. 4 Regression Analysis: Solution Time versus Quality of Description**
In Principal Component Analysis, first two components explain 66% of total variation in survey data. Eigenvalue of third component less than 1, so no additional components calculated.

Conclusion: Quality of Description is associated most with Solution Quality.

In Multiple Correspondence Analysis, first two components explain 52% of total variation in survey data.

Conclusions:
- Quality of Description is associated most with perceived Solution Quality.
- Resolution time is associated with perceived Solution Quality.
- 1 time of asking more information is tolerated without effecting perceived Solution Quality.

Final words: In this work different statistical methods were used, correlation, regression, Principal Component Analysis and Multiple Correspondence Analysis. All led to the same conclusion: Quality of Description is associated most with perceived Solution Quality. All mentioned, good descriptions in issues provides faster solution times and better solution quality.
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