

COGNITIVE DISSONANCE IN TELECOM SECTOR

ABHISHEK GAUTAM* AND S. K. KAUSHAL**

Abstract: *In the era of digitalization, customers are facing a lot of problem with their telecom operator. The present study attempts to measure the cognitive dissonance through the help of 32 dependent and independent variables. Eight new factors identified through the factor analysis which are influencing the telecom sector.*

Keywords: *Cognitive Dissonance, Emotional dissonance, Telecom sector, Satisfaction, Active loyalty, Wisdom of Purchase, Concern over the deal, etc.*

INTRODUCTION

We are living in an era of technology and everybody is carrying their phone to connect with the people by their Telecom Company. Telecom companies provide a lot of services like 2G, 3G, 4G internet, and voice calling. Customers have to decide which service he can afford according to their pocket and which telecom company is providing value for money services. Every telecom company promises to their customers that it is providing good services at the lowest price in the price segment. But after choosing their services customers have to face a lot of problem like slow speed of internet, call drop, network problem, extra billing etc. customers tried to complain about service on customer care number but they don't get a good solution. Customers have to face the problem related to the presently available tariff in the market. Indian customers are the very choosy type of people they compare tariff of every company before selecting any company because they want a lot on minimum expenditure. In India, there are eight companies in the market that are providing their services and nowadays cut-throat competition is on the peak. The Indian government is digitalizing every service like banking, life insurance purchase, bill payment, any complaint, ticket booking, etc. so Indian nationals are bound to take service from these companies. These problems are creating dissatisfaction and dissatisfaction creates the cognitive dissonance.

* Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, *E-mail:* writetoabk21@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, *E-mail:* kaushal_s@lkouniv.ac.in

LITERATURE REVIEW

Negi (2009) recommends that customer service quality has been given expanded consideration as of late, because of its particular commitment to business intensity and creating fulfilled customers. This makes service quality an imperative to be comprehended by firms by knowing how to quantify it and making essential changes in its measurements where proper particularly in zones where holes amongst desires and observations are wide. The importance of service quality to organizations is underlined here particularly the way that it offers an upper hand to organizations that endeavor to enhance it and subsequently bring consumer loyalty. Service quality has gotten a lot of consideration from the two academicians and specialists Negi (2009). Service quality is viewed as an essential instrument for an association's battle to separate itself from its rivals Ladhari (2008). Services' showcasing writing service quality is characterized as the general evaluation of a service by the customer Eshghi *et al.* (2008). Ghylin *et al.* (2008) bring up that, by characterizing service quality, organizations could convey services with higher quality level probably bringing about expanded consumer loyalty. Douglas and Connor (2003) accentuate that the purchaser who has created elevated impression of value has turned out to be additionally requesting and less tolerant of expected setbacks in service or item quality and recognize the elusive components (connection, heterogeneity, and perishability) of a service as the basic determinants of service quality seen by a customer. It is exceptionally imperative to note here that, service quality isn't just surveyed as the final products yet in addition on how it is conveyed amid service process and its definitive impact on customer's recognitions Douglas and Connor (2003). The customer's aggregate impression of a service depends on his/her view of the result and the procedure; the result is either esteem included or quality and the procedure is the part attempted by the customer Edvardsson, (1998). In this investigation, service quality can be characterized as the contrast between a customer's desire for service execution before the service experience and their impression of the service got. Customer's desire fills in as an establishment for assessing service quality since quality is high when execution surpasses desire and quality is low when execution does not meet their desire Asubonteng (1996). Desire is seen in service quality writing as wants or needs of shopper i.e., what they feel a specialist co-op should offer as opposed to would offer Parasuraman *et al.* (1988). Parasuraman *et al.* (1988) characterize apparent quality as a type of state of mind, related yet not equivalent to fulfillment, and results from utilization of desires with the impression of execution. Understanding service quality must include recognizing the attributes of service which are elusiveness, heterogeneity, and connection Parasuraman *et al.* (1985). In that way, service quality was effortlessly estimated. The seen service is the result of the shopper's perspective of the service measurements, which are both specialized and utilitarian in nature Gronroos (1984).

COGNITIVE DISSONANCE THEORY (CDT)

Leon Festinger in 1957, proposed Cognitive Dissonance theory (CDT) that characterizes a disharmony between comprehension of something and its existence.

Seen disharmony causes to change a man's thought regarding a particular insight Bhattacherjee&Premkumar(2004). This change has mental reason, since feeling the discord between whatever a man has educated about capability of something and what he/she understand from genuine execution is displeased and influence inconvenience face to face's mind and this awkward feel to urge the individual to change her/his thought regarding insight Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones (2012). Festinger (1957) named this distress to feel as discord.

A man for direct the disharmony's repulsive feel, endeavor to diminish the cacophony which is happened from the contrast between two sorts of discernment as introductory cognizance of something and what is occurred in true. Mentally, a man endeavors to improve the noteworthiness of consonant insight and lessen the importance of conflicting perceptions in his/her brain, it implies summation of consonant comprehensions and subtraction of cacophonous discernments Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones (2012).

Then again, typically people safe in versus change. They will change their mentality exactly when they have minimal protection to modify their thought. This sort of obstruction is the volunteer to change and can diminish discord feel of discernment Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones (2012). Decreasing discord of comprehensions by mindful, urge the people to change their residual thought regarding cacophony. For advancing a man's fulfillment feel about something or an execution, diminishing the disharmony feel of discernment has huge significance Hausknecht, D., Sweeney, et al. (1998).

In outline, CDT is a hypothesis for coordinating the individual's desire for something or execution with what he/she encounter about this thing or this execution in certifiable. Disharmony between the desire and experience cause an unsavory feel that as per human's brain research, the people show minimal obstruction for lessening discord feel and will adjust their desire and experience if the distinction or cacophony between their desire and experience don't be principal (Staples, Wong *et al.* (2002).

OBJECTIVES

To determine the Factors which decide the cognitive dissonance among customers of Telecom Companies?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research depends on primary and secondary data. The primary data have collected through the convenience sampling from the students of Post-Graduation from the university in India during March to June 2018 and other mobile phone users segment by questionnaire due to the cost and time available for conducting this research. However, the present research depends on the Youngers because they tend to be the major customers of the mobile phone operator/ industry. So, the sample in this research is well fitted for the research and could contribute interesting results to the research community. The data were collected from MBA

classes. The students were either in the first or second year of study at the university. And the secondary from the books, TRAI report 26 June 2018, and research papers, etc.

DATA ANALYSIS

Factor Analysis was performed to determine the Factors which decide the cognitive dissonance among customers of Telecom companies in U.P., India.

Table 1
KMO and Bartlett's Test

<i>KMO and Bartlett's Test</i>		
<i>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</i>		<i>.807</i>
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1164.417
	df	406
	Sig.	.000

Adequacy of the info is tested on the premise of results the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of rotundity (homogeneity of Variance) provided in Table 1 The KMO live of sampling adequacy is 0.807, that indicates the current information is appropriate for factor analysis. Similarly, Bartlett's take a look at of rotundity is critical ($p < 0.001$); that explains the existence of enough correlation between variables to proceed with the analysis.

The KMO data point varies between 0 and 1. Worth of 0 indicates that the addition of partial correlations is massive relative to the add of correlations, indicating diffusion within the pattern of correlations (hence, factor analysis worth about to 1 indicates that comparatively compact so factor analysis ought to yield distinct and reliable factors. Kaiser (1974) recommends accepted values greater than 0.5 as acceptable (values below this could lead you to either collect additional information or rethink that variables to include). moreover, values between 0.5 and 0.7 square measure mediocre, values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 square measure nice, and values on top of 0.9 square measure excellent. For this information the worth is 0.807, that falls into the vary of being great: thus, we must always be assured that factor analysis is suitable for this information. Bartlett's measure tests the null hypothesis that the first matrix is a scalar matrix. For factor analysis to figure we'd like some relationships between variables, and if the R -matrix were a scalar matrix, then all correlation coefficients would be 0. Therefore, we wish this take a look at to be important (i.e., have a significance worth but 0.05). A significant test tells that the R -matrix isn't an identity matrix; thus, their square measure some relationships between the variables, we have a tendency to hope to incorporate within the analysis. So, Bartlett's take a look at of rotundity is critical ($p < 0.000$); that explains the existence of enough correlation between variables to proceed with the factor analysis.

The output of the factor analysis is obtained by requesting Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and specifying the rotation (Here we have a tendency to used varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. There square measure two stages within the factor analysis. Step one is the issue extraction method whereby the objective is to spot what number factors square measure to be extracted from the info. The foremost well-liked methodology for this purpose is Principal Component Analysis (PCA). There's conjointly a rule of thumb supported a calculation of an Eigenvalue to see what number of factors to extract. The upper the Eigenvalue of a factor, the upper is that the quantity of variance explains by the factor.

Table 2
Communalities

<i>Communalities</i>		
	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Extraction</i>
Period of availing services	1.000	.737
Influence of other people's opinions	1.000	.652
Service technology experience like the internet, voice calling etc.	1.000	.676
Difficulty in finding information about services from customer care and on the website etc.	1.000	.434
Adequacy of information about service	1.000	.697
Service involvement	1.000	.616
Satisfaction with the mobile phone operator	1.000	.663
I was in despair.	1.000	.763
I resented it.	1.000	.705
I felt disappointed in myself.	1.000	.692
I felt scared	1.000	.672
I felt hollow.	1.000	.676
I felt angry.	1.000	.658
I felt uneasy.	1.000	.810
I felt I'd let myself down.	1.000	.775
I felt annoyed.	1.000	.675
I felt frustrated.	1.000	.699
I was in pain	1.000	.828
I felt depressed.	1.000	.810
I felt furious with myself.	1.000	.827
I felt sick	1.000	.740
I was in agony.	1.000	.697
I wonder if I really need this service.	1.000	.747
I wonder whether I should have bought anything at all.	1.000	.611
I wonder if I have made the right choice.	1.000	.813
I wonder if I have done the right thing in buying this service.	1.000	.699
After I bought this service I wondered if I'd been fooled.	1.000	.735
After I bought this service I wondered if they had spun me a line.	1.000	.786
After I bought this service I wondered whether there was something wrong with the deal I got.	1.000	.685

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3
Total Variance

Component	<i>Total Variance Explained</i>								
	<i>Initial Eigenvalues</i>			<i>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</i>			<i>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
1	8.993	31.012	31.012	8.993	31.012	31.012	4.766	16.433	16.433
2	2.941	10.140	41.152	2.941	10.140	41.152	3.131	10.797	27.230
3	1.935	6.674	47.826	1.935	6.674	47.826	2.847	9.817	37.047
4	1.744	6.015	53.841	1.744	6.015	53.841	2.627	9.060	46.108
5	1.546	5.330	59.171	1.546	5.330	59.171	2.354	8.119	54.227
6	1.293	4.459	63.630	1.293	4.459	63.630	2.129	7.343	61.569
7	1.109	3.823	67.454	1.109	3.823	67.454	1.559	5.375	66.945
8	1.016	3.502	70.956	1.016	3.502	70.956	1.163	4.011	70.956
9	.893	3.080	74.035						
10	.844	2.912	76.947						
11	.831	2.866	79.813						
12	.703	2.425	82.238						
13	.590	2.035	84.273						
14	.534	1.842	86.115						
15	.523	1.803	87.918						
16	.476	1.640	89.559						
17	.427	1.473	91.032						
18	.377	1.300	92.332						
19	.352	1.213	93.545						
20	.305	1.053	94.599						
21	.282	.974	95.573						
22	.270	.932	96.504						
23	.247	.853	97.358						
24	.188	.647	98.005						
25	.146	.504	98.509						
26	.127	.437	98.946						
27	.115	.396	99.342						
28	.108	.373	99.715						
29	.083	.285	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

In Table 3 this output lists the eigenvalues related to every linear part (factor) before extraction, when extraction, and when rotation. Before extraction, Output has known 29 linear elements among the dataset (we grasp that there ought to be as several eigenvectors as there square measure variables and then there'll be as several factors as variables). The Eigenvalues related to every issue represent the variance explained by that specific linear part and output additionally displays the Eigenvalue in terms of the proportion of variance explained. Before rotation, some factors accounted for significantly a lot of variances, and a few factors accounted for significantly less variance. It ought to be clear that the primary few issues

make a case for comparatively massive amounts of variance (especially factor 1) whereas ulterior factors make a case for solely tiny amounts of variance. Then all factors with Eigenvalues bigger than 1 square measure extracted, that leaves us with 4 factors. In line with Kaiser Criterion, solely initial 8 factors ought to be used as a result of ulterior eigenvalues square measure but 1. But after extraction and rotation, all the 8 factors explain the following percentage of total variance. The total factors explain the 70% of the variations.

As evident from the Table 3 (Total Variations Explained) we find out that from the total 29 components (play role in Service Quality of Telecom companies), 8 factors are extracted and these 8 factors together account for only 70.956% of the total variance (Information contained in original 32 variables) hence we have reduced the number of variable from 29 to 8 underlying factors. Thereby sacrificing around 29.044 percent of the total variation or Information that is sacrificed.

Table 4
Component Matrix

	<i>Component Matrix^a</i>							
	<i>Component</i>							
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>
Period of availing services	.088	-.069	.326	.027	.323	.196	.381	.575
Influence of other people's opinions	.050	.585	.149	.149	.051	.225	.454	.067
Service technology experience like the internet, voice calling etc.	-.261	.734	.080	.026	.205	-.031	.062	.126
Difficulty in finding information about services from customer care and on the website etc.	.225	-.071	-.174	-.069	.566	-.094	-.115	.016
Adequacy of information about service	-.164	.533	.348	-.075	.357	-.083	-.077	-.345
Service involvement	-.228	.687	.233	-.006	.089	-.037	-.123	-.118
Satisfaction with the mobile phone operator	-.330	.676	.229	.051	-.118	.137	-.093	-.022
I was in despair.	.652	.195	-.292	-.062	.190	.404	.002	.109
I resented it.	.552	.261	-.303	-.197	.338	.252	-.149	-.030
I felt disappointed in myself.	.647	-.157	-.071	-.286	.211	-.192	-.114	.261
I felt scared	.463	.199	-.144	-.438	-.065	.152	-.331	.261
I felt hollow.	.685	.105	.174	-.222	-.047	-.273	.196	-.035
I felt angry.	.710	.112	.292	.008	-.032	-.226	-.024	.061
I felt uneasy.	.782	.133	.327	-.039	-.051	-.180	-.176	-.079
I felt I'd let myself down.	.806	.059	.290	.088	-.072	-.146	.037	-.055
I felt annoyed.	.731	-.047	.207	.138	.127	-.191	-.089	.127
I felt frustrated.	.656	-.044	.298	.056	.055	-.208	-.325	.152
I was in pain	.730	.086	-.273	-.321	.016	-.070	.272	-.178

contd. table 4

<i>Component Matrix^a</i>								
	<i>Component</i>							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I felt depressed.	.713	.157	-.236	-.282	.056	-.116	.338	-.107
I felt furious with myself.	.766	.113	-.030	-.141	-.422	.076	.026	-.148
I felt sick	.656	-.042	.058	-.329	-.294	.257	.179	-.105
I was in agony.	.604	.116	.178	.087	-.364	.334	-.182	.053
I wonder if I really need this service.	.411	.067	-.343	.419	.077	-.456	.246	-.075
I wonder whether I should have bought anything at all.	.477	.100	-.081	.453	-.229	-.045	.024	.327
I wonder if I have made the right choice.	.513	.319	-.418	.462	.075	.065	-.223	-.011
I wonder if I have done the right thing in buying this service.	.398	.349	-.451	.417	-.202	-.009	-.025	.004
After I bought this service I wondered if I'd been fooled.	.509	-.313	.448	.322	.004	.225	.111	-.102
After I bought this service I wondered if they had spun me a line.	.590	-.359	.025	.246	.324	.281	-.055	-.247
After I bought this service I wondered whether there was something wrong with the deal I got.	.517	-.308	.180	.245	.295	.277	.026	-.257

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 8 components extracted.

Table 5
Rotated Component Matrix

<i>Rotated Component Matrix</i>								
	<i>Component</i>							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Period of availing services	.108	-.042	-.008	-.126	.101	.027	.076	.831
Influence of other people's opinions	-.084	.253	.563	.209	.063	-.036	-.197	.420
Service technology experience like the internet, voice calling etc.	-.103	-.054	.727	.112	-.276	.029	.091	.191
Difficulty in finding information about services from customer care and on the website etc.	.089	.064	-.041	.035	.147	.150	.611	.033
Adequacy of information about service	.065	-.002	.756	-.211	.076	-.098	.203	-.140
Service involvement	.017	-.097	.757	-.015	-.160	.018	-.023	-.082
Satisfaction with the mobile phone operator	-.106	-.181	.709	.016	-.187	.067	-.275	-.011
I was in despair.	.108	.373	.000	.346	.292	.602	.122	.173

contd. table 5

<i>Rotated Component Matrix</i>								
	<i>Component</i>							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I resented it.	.111	.349	.121	.222	.212	.592	.332	-.024
I felt disappointed in myself.	.523	.276	-.309	.020	-.023	.329	.354	.114
I felt scared	.300	.195	-.039	.014	-.174	.714	.024	-.031
I felt hollow.	.606	.552	-.005	.024	.021	.018	.016	.056
I felt angry.	.739	.263	.031	.134	.120	.065	-.014	.069
I felt uneasy.	.804	.264	.076	.091	.206	.160	-.034	-.103
I felt I'd let myself down.	.732	.337	-.008	.189	.282	.033	-.087	.037
I felt annoyed.	.707	.138	-.109	.214	.237	.083	.146	.119
I felt frustrated.	.784	-.030	-.090	.096	.151	.181	.100	-.003
I was in pain	.264	.800	-.122	.167	.090	.217	.131	-.056
I felt depressed.	.285	.795	-.054	.200	.045	.164	.153	.043
I felt furious with myself.	.454	.541	-.115	.224	.136	.297	-.358	-.173
I felt sick	.298	.588	-.177	-.057	.222	.334	-.330	.015
I was in agony.	.430	.100	-.019	.218	.275	.411	-.459	-.005
I wonder if I really need this service.	.215	.299	-.108	.639	.010	-.346	.265	-.031
I wonder whether I should have bought anything at all.	.362	-.012	-.135	.611	.030	.050	-.193	.218
I wonder if I have made the right choice.	.159	.048	.091	.789	.201	.277	.142	-.131
I wonder if I have done the right thing in buying this service.	.068	.165	.052	.791	.001	.132	-.090	-.115
After I bought this service I wondered if I'd been fooled.	.415	.026	-.163	.015	.665	-.099	-.216	.192
After I bought this service I wondered if they had spun me a line.	.220	.116	-.249	.141	.765	.130	.201	-.014
After I bought this service I wondered whether there was something wrong with the deal I got.	.234	.106	-.146	.052	.760	.036	.115	.050

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

Table 7
Variables Extraction and their Categorisation

	<i>Rotated Component Matrix</i>		
	<i>Component</i>		
	<i>FACTOR</i>	<i>FACTOR LOADING</i>	<i>NAME OF FACTOR</i>
I felt disappointed in myself.	FACTOR 1	.523	Emotional Dissonance
I felt scared	FACTOR 1	.300	
I felt hollow.	FACTOR 1	.606	
I felt angry.	FACTOR 1	.739	
I felt uneasy.	FACTOR 1	.804	
I felt I'd let myself down.	FACTOR 1	.732	
I felt annoyed.	FACTOR 1	.707	
I felt frustrated.	FACTOR 1	.784	
I was in agony.	FACTOR 1	.430	
I wonder whether I should have bought anything at all.	FACTOR 1	.362	Stress
I was in pain	FACTOR 2	.800	
I felt depressed.	FACTOR 2	.795	
I felt furious with myself.	FACTOR 2	.541	Active loyalty
I felt sick	FACTOR 2	.588	
Influence of other people's opinions	FACTOR 3	.563	
Service technology experience like the internet, voice calling etc.	FACTOR 3	.727	
Service involvement	FACTOR 3	.757	
Satisfaction with the mobile phone operator	FACTOR 3	.709	
I wonder if I have made the right choice.	FACTOR 4	.789	Wisdom of Purchase
I wonder if I have done the right thing in buying this service.	FACTOR 4	.791	
Adequacy of information about service	FACTOR 5	.076	Concern over deal
After I bought this service I wondered if I'd been fooled.	FACTOR 5	.665	
After I bought this service I wondered if they had spun me a line.	FACTOR 5	.765	
After I bought this service I wondered whether there was something wrong with the deal I got.	FACTOR 5	.760	
I was in despair.	FACTOR 6	.602	Disappointment
I resented it.	FACTOR 6	.592	
Difficulty in finding information about services from customer care and on the website etc.	FACTOR 7	.611	Information
I wonder if I really need this service.	FACTOR 7	.265	
Period of availing services	FACTOR 8	.831	Duration

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that eight factors affect the cognitive dissonance in Telecom sectors. Emotional Dissonance, Stress related, Active loyalty, Wisdom of purchase, Concern over the deal, Information related, and Duration is having a key role in making Cognitive Dissonance for the telecom sector. The telecom companies should work on these factors to reduce cognitive Dissonance. Subscribers are not satisfied by their telecom operator. There is a gap for the operators to fulfill the needs and demands of customers. Potential subscribers will compare the Operator on the basis of that factor to make a new relationship with the telecom operator. Cognitive dissonance influences the buying behavior of potential customers/new subscribers. They can postpone new buying until they get better information with the risk of being unsatisfied. The findings provide the information to mobile phone operator/ companies and marketers in adjusting their marketing strategies. What information do they want to know? Etc.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study is exploratory. There is some limitation have noted. First, the sample size mostly collected from the university student from Lucknow. And the sample size is enough for the study but in the future it can be increased to collect from other cities of the country generalize the data size. Second, the convenience sampling technique was used which is not representing the whole country/another country.

References

- Asubonteng, P., McCleary, K. J., & Swan, J. E. (1996), SERVQUAL revisited: a critical review of service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 10(6), 62-81.
- Bhattacharjee, A., & Premkumar, G. (2004), Understanding changes in belief and attitude toward information technology usage: A theoretical model and longitudinal test. *MIS Quarterly*, 229-254.
- Douglas, L., & Connor, R. (2003), Attitudes to service quality—the expectation gap. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 33(4), 165-172.
- Edvardsson, B. (1998), Service quality improvement. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 8(2), 142-149.
- Eshghi, A., Roy, S. K., & Ganguli, S. (2008), Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction: An Empirical Investigation in Indian Mobile Telecommunications Services. *Marketing Management Journal*, 18(2).
- Ghylin, K. M., Green, B. D., Drury, C. G., Chen, J., Schultz, J. L., Uggirala, A., ...& Lawson, T. A. (2008), Clarifying the dimensions of four concepts of quality. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 9(1), 73-94.
- Grönroos, C. (1984), A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2012), Cognitive dissonance theory. *Handbook of motivation science*, 71-83.

- Hausknecht, D., Sweeney, J., Soutar, G., & Johnson, L. (1998), "After I Had Made the Decision, I..." Toward a Scale to Measure Cognitive Dissonance. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 11.
- Ladhari, R. (2009), A review of twenty years of SERVQUAL research. *International journal of quality and service sciences*, 1(2), 172-198.
- Leon, F. (1957), *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, Il: Row, Peterson.
- Negi, R. (2009), Determining Customer Satisfaction through Perceived Service Quality: A Study of Ethiopian Mobile Users. *International Journal of Mobile Marketing*, 4(1).
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985), A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *the Journal of Marketing*, 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988), Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perc. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12.
- Staples, D. S., Wong, I., & Seddon, P. B. (2002), Having expectations of information systems benefits that match received benefits: does it really matter?. *Information & Management*, 40(2), 115-131.
- Sweeney, J. C., Hausknecht, D., & Soutar, G. N. (2000), Cognitive dissonance after purchase: A multidimensional scale. *Psychology & Marketing*, 17(5), 369-385.