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ABSTRACT
The paper examines customer satisfaction and complaint responses towards Mobile telephony services. The study was a cross-sectional survey involving customers from two mobile telephony companies. Data were collected using a self-administered structured questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS (version 16.0). The study found that customer satisfaction rating differed according to the mobile networks, and previous dissatisfaction significantly influences complaining response. Again, dissatisfied customers tend to complain more than satisfied ones. Moreover, dissatisfaction may not necessarily induce complaining and some satisfied customers may still complain. Furthermore, previous dissatisfaction may not always negatively affect overall satisfaction if it is effectively managed. Finally, the study indicates that the highest rated complaining response is complaining in person to the customer service center and the least is complaining to the mass media. Implications and limitations are discussed. This paper contributes to providing empirical evidence on consumer complaining behavior in mobile telephony industry in developing country context.
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INTRODUCTION
Modern businesses operating with the customer-centric marketing philosophy are increasingly concerned about satisfying and retaining profitable customers (Kotler and Keller, 2006). Retaining customers requires a careful study into the behavior of customers in order to develop business strategies to meet customer requirements. One area of consumer behavior that has attracted considerable attention of practitioners and scholars alike is customer complaint behavior (CCB).

For the past two decades, previous studies on CCB focused on American, European, and Asian consumers (Bunker and Bradley, 2007; Heung and Lam, 2003; Lerman, 2006; Liu and McClure, 2001).
However, there is limited study in CCB in the African context in general and Ghana in particular. Therefore, a study on consumer complaining behavior in Ghana would increase the body of knowledge in consumer complaining behavior within the African and Ghanaian context.

In an emerging economy like Ghana, as a result of growing interest in education, more and more customers are becoming informed of their rights as consumers. Thus, consumers are able to complain through various channels about the services of mobile telephony companies. Two of the mobile telephony companies that have recently penetrated the Ghanaian mobile telephony industry are Vodafone Ghana and Airtel Ghana. Both companies are foreign multinational companies that have successful penetrated the Ghana market through takeovers and are currently taking market share of 18.06% and 9.74% market share respectively (National Communication Authority, 2011).

It has been found that it is typically unrealistic to have a perfect organization with no complaints from customers (Wysocki, Kepner, and Glasser, 2001). As a result, it is only prudent for organizations that hope to survive competition and grow to pay close attention to their customer complaint responses and delivery strategic measures to manage them. Neglecting customer complaints about service delivery could lead to customer switching to competitor service providers (Keaveney, 1995), which in turn could affect profitability and long-term survival of a business enterprise (Heskett, Sasser and Schlesinger, 1997). Therefore, it becomes critically important for mobile network companies to understand the nature of customer complaining responses and the strategies to adopt to manage them. Therefore, the objectives of the study are two-fold:

1. To examine customer satisfaction/dissatisfaction among complainers and non-complaints in Airtel Ghana and Vodafone Ghana mobile telephony companies.
2. To examine customer complaint channels in Airtel Ghana and Vodafone Ghana mobile telephony companies.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**The Nature of Customer Complaining Behavior (CCB)**

The concept of CCB has received considerable attention among scholars in literature. Jacoby and Jaccard (1981) were among the first to define CCB. They described CCB as an action taken by an individual that involves communicating something negative regarding a product or service either to the firm manufacturing or marketing that product or service or to some third-party organizational entity. Mowen (1993) also believes that complaint behavior is any one of a number of actions that is triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase episode. Again, according to Crie’ (2003 p. 62), CCB “constitutes a subset of all possible responses to perceived dissatisfaction around a purchase episode, during consumption or during possession of the goods or services.”

Generally, many factors may cause customers to complain, such as unfulfilled expectations, defective product, poor product or service quality, or some unfulfilled promises given by service providers. Usually, customer complaints arise as a result of perceived dissatisfaction with a product or service characteristics (Huefner and Hunt, 2000). In mobile telephony context, customers may complain about such product or service quality issues as poor network quality, delayed services, or unrealized promises of service providers, among others.
Benefits of Customer Complaints

Many empirical studies confirm that one sure way to increase understanding of customer needs is by encouraging customers to complain (Plymire, 1991). Complaints offer the service providers a number of benefits. First of all, it has been noted that appropriate responses to complaints can prevent customers from switching to competitors (Fornell and Wernerfelt, 1987). Second, making complaints provide opportunity for dissatisfied consumers to express their unhappiness with a service provider (Aleong and Kolodinsky, 1990; Kowalski, 1996; Richins, 1983). Third, CCB allows the service provider to develop effective service recovery strategies towards retaining strategic customers whose continual relationship with service providers has far reaching effects on service providers’ business survival (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran, 1998). Fourth, complaints provide opportunity for service or product re-designs that are capable of meeting changing consumer taste and preferences. When complaints are handled effectively, it can affect customer satisfaction, loyalty and positive word-of-mouth (WOM) communication, and future re-purchases (Kau and Loh, 2006). Conversely, unresolved customer complaints could result in negative responses from customers such as mistrust, disloyalty, and negative WOM communication about the service provider to peer social groups (Blodgett, Wakefield and Barnes, 1995). It is instructive for companies not only to seek to resolve complaints but also make purposeful efforts to encourage consumers to express their complaints (Heung and Lam, 2003).

Relationship between Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior

Many previous studies have empirically established that CCB is strongly related to customer dissatisfaction and that dissatisfied customers are more likely to express their dissatisfaction by complaining (Liu, Kang, Bai, and Zhang, 2006; Williams, Drake and Moran, 1993). This view could be traced to the expectancy disconfirmation paradigm (Oliver, 1980). According to this paradigm, dissatisfaction results from a discrepancy between customer expectation and perceived product/service performance. Since consumers’ expectation is found to be a major factor affecting consumers’ evaluation of their purchase experiences (Day, 1977), it follows that, consumers become dissatisfied when their expectations are not met by the current performance of a product or service. They become disappointed and engage in complaining behavior. However, satisfaction could be transactional (one time, specific post-purchase evaluation) or cumulative (overall product evaluation based on previous consumption experience) (Oliver, 1993). Overall satisfaction/dissatisfaction could be influenced by a previous transactional satisfaction/dissatisfaction experience (Dacin and Davidow, 1997; Kau, Richmond and Han, 1995). Also, overall satisfaction could be influenced by the frequency of customer complaining. This paper examines previous transactional dissatisfaction experience among complainers and non-complainers.

Some previous studies have argued that dissatisfaction may not always result in complaining, and that even satisfied consumers may still complain, especially when such consumers perceive that complaining is beneficial to a service provider (Jacoby and Jaccard, 1981; Liu et al. 2006). The present paper examines customer satisfaction among non-complainers in Ghana’s Mobile Telephony industry, specifically in the two companies involved.

Classification of Customer Complaining Responses

Satisfied and dissatisfied customers may complain through both direct and indirect channels (Gursoy, McCleary and Lepsito, 2007; Singh, 1990). Previous studies have state that customers may chose to
complain or not to complain (Day and Landon, 1976; Singh, 1990). Customers who communicate their complaining behavior may be categorized into service segments. Day and Landon (1976) provided a useful framework for understanding the types of complaining responses or channels that customers may use when dissatisfied. According to the authors, the classification of Consumer Complaining Behavior (Figure 1) could be conceptualized into two taxonomies: private and public responses. Private responses refer to complaining behavior that involves using private channels directed at people inside the consumer’s group in informal ways, which includes changing the brand/supplier, ceasing to use the product or service, or warning family and friends. This group is also classified as “voicers” by Singh (1990). This group of complainers may not voice their complaints to the service provider but are likely to “engage in negative word of mouth (WOM) which is invisible to the service provider and not easily influenced” (Singh and Wilkes, 1996; p.362). Private complaining channels are usually used to convey negative WOM communication. According to Blodgett et al. (1995), 77% of all non-complainers engaged in negative WOM, whereas only 48% of complainers engaged in negative WOM, and dissatisfied customers may communicate negative WOM to more than five people.

On the other hand, complaining channels may take some form of public actions. Public actions involve people and organizations outside the consumer’s group in more formal ways, which includes registering a complaint with the seller or manufacturer, a government agency or public consumer protection agency, or a private consumer organization (Dacin and Davidow, 1997). The main purpose of these complaints is to “recover economic loss by getting an exchange or a refund and rebuild self-image” (Krapfel, 1985; p. 2). These voice complainers, according to Singh (1990), are classified as “irates.”

Consumers may choose to voice their complaints to service providers and, where they are not satisfied, may seek legal action against the firm or choose to boycott sellers and manufacturers by ceasing to use their products or services. They also might bad-mouth the existing service provider to other social groups close to the consumer or even discourage potential consumers from patronizing the services of the firm (Singh and Wilkes, 1996). This last group is classified as “activists” (Singh, 1990).

Consumers who take public actions offer more benefits to companies than those who take private actions since public actions not only make companies aware of the problems they face, but also provide an opportunity for them to retain their customers (Davidow and Dacin, 1997). They also stressed that retaining current customers is important for companies as they are likely to show their loyalty by using a variety of the companies’ products or services. In view of the above, this paper attempts to describe the various channels and/or responses that complainers and non-complainers use to demonstrate their complaint behavior.
Mobile Telephony Industry in Ghana

Brief Historical Overview of the Industry

Ghana’s telephony industry was monopolized by Ghana Post, Telephone and Telegraph (PTT) (Frempong and Henten, 2004), which was government owned enterprise until 1994. The PTT was transformed by an Act of Parliament to Ghana Post and Telecommunication (GP&T) services, and in 1995 it was separated into two companies: Ghana Post and Ghana Telecom (GT). Ghana Telecom was privatized and a second network operator Western Telesystems (Westel) Ltd was licensed. A licence was also issued to Capital Telecom Ltd, a private indigenous telecommunication company, to provide rural telephony to some villages and towns in the southern parts of Ghana. Between 1994 and 2000, as a result of the deregulation of the sector in 1994 under the Accelerated Development Programme (ADP) 1994-2000 (Addy-Nayo, 2001), Ghana moved from a government controlled PTT to a privatized telecom era in which service providers were permitted to provide private internet and mobile telecom network. The number of operators increased to four in 2007, namely: Millicom Ghana Ltd, Onetouch - Ghana Telecom, MTN Ghana – Scancom Ghana Ltd and Kasapa Telecom Limited. On July 3, 2008, the Ghana government announced the sale of Ghana Telecom and its mobile telephony wing, Onetouch to Vodafone. Zain Ghana and Globacom Ghana have added to the number of cellular network operators in Ghana to increase the number to six by 2010. Vodafone and Zain are two new foreign-based mobile operators in Ghana’s telecommunication industry used in this study.
Vodafone Ghana

Vodafone in Ghana is one of the latest additions to Vodafone Group PLC, the world's leading mobile telecommunications company. Vodafone International PLC successfully acquired 70% of shares in Ghana Telecommunications Company (GT) for $900 million dollars on July 23, 2008 (Vodafone-Ghana, 2008).

Zain Ghana

Zain Group is a mobile telecommunications company established in 1983 in Kuwait as Mobile Telecommunications Company and was later rebranded to Zain in 2007. Zain has commercial presence in 25 countries across Africa and the Middle East with an estimated workforce of 13,000 with about 60% of its customers in Africa as of February 2010. In Ghana, Zain took over an existing telecom firm, Westel, which was not into mobile telephony until Zain took over and started operating in the fourth quarter of 2008. Zain was taken over by Airtel Ghana in 2011.

METHODS

Population and Sampling

The study population consisted of individual mobile telecom customers across two networks in Ghana: Vodafone Ghana and Zain Ghana (now Airtel, Ghana). These companies were chosen because they were the two more recent entrants in the mobile telephony industry in Ghana. The choice of these two companies as case studies was particularly motivated by the fact that both took over existing companies that had peculiar challenges. For example, Vodafone took over OneTouch of Ghana Telecom that massively lost customers and had management problems (Joy News). For Zain, it appeared the company struggled to gain substantial market share in the industry. This study was intended to examine the complaining behavior of customers of these companies and provide useful findings for management strategy.

A convenient sampling technique was adopted to select 120 customers from each company, totalling a sample of 240 customers. In selecting 240 respondents, conscious effort was made to include only subscribers/customers who have used the services of the companies for the past twelve months. Students at the University of Education, Winneba, Kumasi campus were used as respondents since they represent mobile subscribers with varied backgrounds across Ghana and beyond.

Data Collection Instrument

A self-administered, structured questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. The questionnaire had only closed-ended question items and consisted of sections for customer satisfaction and complaining attitudes, complaining channels, and the respondents characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they have ever complained or not, whether they have ever been dissatisfied with the services of their companies or not using “Yes” and “No” responses. Satisfaction was measured on a five-point Likert scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied (1-5).

Again, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement to statements about the channels for complaining and non-complaining behavior. The items were adopted from Heung and Lam (2003) and modified to suit the research context. The complaining responses had seven items that
yielded a Cronbach alpha reliability value of 0.765, which shows good reliability of the instrument (Straub, Boudreau and Gefen, 2004). The questionnaire was pre-tested, refined and finally administered to the target sample through personal contact by the researcher. Informed Consent information was attached to each questionnaire. A response rate of 97.5% (117) and 79.2% (95) were obtained for Vodafone (VDF) and Zain (now Airtel) networks respectively. Data were analyzed using SPSS 16.0 and involved descriptive statistics, cross tabulation, and Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for analyzing differences between sub-groups involving categorical dependent variables.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents’ Characteristics

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the respondents for each sub-group of the population. Generally, it shows that, in terms of gender, there were more males than females. Most of them were below the ages of 36, followed by those in the ages between 36 and 45 years and few were above 45 years. For education, most respondents had college education and some had high-school education. In terms of income, most of the respondents earned up to GH₵500, followed by those who earned between GH₵500 and GH₵1000, 5% earned above GH₵1,500, while 7% were non-income earners. In term of marital status, about 62% of them were single, about 38% were married while the rest were in other marital categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vodafone n = 117</th>
<th>Zain (Airtel) n = 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65  55.6</td>
<td>60  63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52  44.4</td>
<td>35  36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>39  33.3</td>
<td>21  22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>45  38.5</td>
<td>51  53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>24  20.5</td>
<td>13  13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>9   7.7</td>
<td>10  10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>18  15.4</td>
<td>10  10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post SHS</td>
<td>21  17.9</td>
<td>5   5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>78  66.7</td>
<td>77  81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-    -</td>
<td>3   3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (GH₵)</td>
<td>Below 100</td>
<td>34  29.1</td>
<td>10  10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-500</td>
<td>59  50.4</td>
<td>48  50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>18  15.4</td>
<td>22  23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>3   2.6</td>
<td>6   6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 1501</td>
<td>3   2.6</td>
<td>2   2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-income earners</td>
<td>-  -</td>
<td>7   7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>45  38.5</td>
<td>37  38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>72  61.5</td>
<td>54  56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-    -</td>
<td>4   4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Respondents’ characteristics
Previous Satisfaction among Complainers and Non-Complainers within Networks

From Table 2, an examination of complainers and non-complainers and their previous dissatisfaction shows that 73.1% of VDF customers complained and 26.9% did not complain when dissatisfied. Further analysis using Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA confirmed that complainers and non-complainers differed significantly on their previous dissatisfaction within VDF network ($X^2 = 10.483$, df=1, $p = 0.001$); specifically, non-complainers were more previously dissatisfied (mean = 66.80) than complainers (mean = 49.25). In the case of Zain Ghana, 60% of customers complained when they were previously dissatisfied and 40% did not complain. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA reveals that complainers and non-complainers significantly differ on their previous dissatisfaction ($X^2 = 16.219$, df=1, $p = 0.000$); specifically, non-complainers were more dissatisfied previously (mean = 54.23) than complainers (mean = 34.50). Generally, this result seems to be similar within the networks. This result is supported by further analysis in Table 2 indicating that, irrespective of network, complainers and non-complainers differ on their previous dissatisfaction ($X^2 = 28.439$, df=1, $p = 0.000$), and specifically, non-complainers were previously more dissatisfied (mean = 121.88) than complainers (mean = 82.11).

Thus, dissatisfaction causes customer complaint. This conclusion is consistent with many previous studies such as Heung and Lam (2003), Kau, Richmond and Han (1995) and Maute and Forreter (1993). In the same vein, since some satisfied customers still complained, it implies that dissatisfaction may not necessarily account for customer complaint (Jacoby and Jaccard, 1998; Mowen, 1993). Satisfied customers may still complain in order to demonstrate their loyalty to their service provider, help provide consistently better services, or at least provide feedback to management for service improvement.

It is also found that when customers are dissatisfied they may not always complain. Non-complaining behavior does not always mean absence of dissatisfaction. Previous studies (e.g. Blodgett et al., 1995; Singh and Wilkes, 1996) have found that dissatisfied customers who do not complain are more likely to engage in negative WOM communication to their immediate social groups and switch over to competitors.

Overall Satisfaction among Complainers and Non-Complainers within Networks

Table 2 shows that overall satisfaction differs among complainers and non-complainers of Vodafone Ghana ($X^2 = 6.643$, df=1, $p = 0.010$), and that non-complainers appear to be more satisfied (mean = 65.78) than complainers (mean = 50.53). In the case of Zain Ghana, overall satisfaction did not significantly differ among complainers and non-complainers ($X^2 = 2.597$, df=1, $p = 0.107$), though non-complainers appear to be more satisfied (mean = 50.86) than complainers (mean = 41.80). Generally, overall satisfaction appears to be different among complainers and non-complainers. This result is supported by the analysis in Table 2 indicating that complainers and non-complainers differ in overall satisfaction irrespective of network ($X^2 = 11.347$, df=1, $p = 0.001$). Complaining behaviour could be influenced by overall satisfaction of customers, and customers who are overall satisfied are more unlikely to complain than dissatisfied ones. This conclusion is well documented in marketing literature (Heung and Lam, 2003; Singh, 1988).

Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction of Complainers and Non-Complainers between Networks

In Table 2, comparing overall satisfaction among complainers and non-complainers between the two networks, overall satisfaction was significantly different between the two networks ($X^2 = 15.584$, df=1, $p = 0.000$). Specifically, customers of Zain network were more satisfied (mean = 123.77) than customers
of Vodafone network (mean = 92.48). Since overall satisfaction differed among the networks, it is not useful to compare complainers and non-complainer of the two networks based on their overall satisfaction. Again, between the networks, there is significant difference between previous dissatisfaction ($X^2 = 12.986, df=1, p = 0.000$), and specifically, Zain network customers were more previously dissatisfied (mean = 94.71) than Vodafone customers (mean = 121.03). But since customers differ on their previous dissatisfaction, it is not useful to compare complainers and non-complainers of the two companies based on their previous dissatisfaction.

It is worth noting, however, that comparing the overall satisfaction and previous dissatisfaction ratings, the analysis shows that though customers of Zain network were more dissatisfied than Vodafone customers, their customers rated their overall satisfaction higher than their Vodafone counterparts. This discrepancy implies that Zain network might have been able to resolve and manage their customer previous dissatisfaction and complaints better than their Vodafone competitors. Thus, it could be deduced that though previous dissatisfaction could affect customer overall satisfaction of a service provider, it may not always negatively affect overall satisfaction when it is properly managed by the service provider.

**Complaining Response and Channels**

Table 3 shows the responses/channels by which customers demonstrate their complaining behavior. On the one hand, within network, the highest rated complaining response by customers of Vodafone network is complaining in person to the customer service center, which is a voice response (Singh, 1990). This response is followed by refraining from using the company’s services, by warning family and friends from using the company’s services, by writing complaint on a card, complaining to a consumer group, writing letters to management and sending the complaint to the mass media.

On the other hand, within Zain Ghana network, the highest rated complaining response was complaining in person to the customer service center, which is a voice response (Singh, 1990). This response is followed by warning family and friends from using the company’s services, refraining from using the company’s services, complaining to a consumer group, by writing complaint on a card, writing letters to management, and sending the complaint to the mass media.

Comparing the two networks, we found that the highest and the least rated responses were the same. Thus, customers of the two networks are more likely to stop using the services of the companies when they are dissatisfied as the most likely complaining response. The least likely response they would exhibit is to make complaint to the mass media.

Between the two networks (Table 3), the rankings of complaining responses slightly differ, but not significant for the first, second, fourth and sixth ranked complaining responses. However, the results (Table 3) showed that customers of the two networks differed significantly in their rating of three complaining responses/channels. Specifically, customers of Zain Ghana are significantly more eager to warn family and friends from using the services ($X^2 = 5.977, df=1, p = 0.014$; means: Zain = 97.43, Vodafone = 117.67), send the complaint to the mass media ($X^2 = 4.097, df=1, p = 0.043$; means: Zain = 117.67, Vodafone = 97.43) and complain to a consumer group or association ($X^2 = 5.977, df=1, p = 0.043$; means: Zain = 115.74; Vodafone = 99.00) than that of their counterparts in Vodafone Ghana. This result implies that typically, the customers’ exhibit different characteristics in the use of the above three mentioned complaining responses/channels. One explanation could be that since Vodafone Ghana took over from a government owned corporation, customers might feel reluctant to take the company on in
the mass media and consumer associations but are willing to report Zain Ghana to the mass media and consumer protection groups. It could also be inferred that customers of Zain Ghana are more willing to use both private and public responses than customers of Vodafone Ghana. Moreover, irrespective of network, taken together the highest ranked complaining response is refraining from using company’s mobile network services with a mean of 3.48 and SD of 1.22; this response is private (Day and Landon, 1976). It is followed by complaining in person to company’s customer service center (mean: 3.19, SD of 1.22), a voice response (Singh, 1990). The next most likely response is discouraging family and friends from using the services of the network, also a private response (Day and Landon, 1976). The fourth is complaining by writing on a complaint card. The fifth ranked is complaining to consumer group and associations, which is a third-party type of channel. The sixth is writing complaint letters to the management of the company; the fifth and sixth are voiced responses (Singh, 1990). The least ranked is complaining to the mass media, which is a public response (Day and Landon, 1976) and, specifically, a third party response (Singh, 1990).

Generally, it could be deduced that customers will complain in person to the customer service center, and if this is not possible, they are likely to stop using the company's mobile network services as the next option. If for any reason they could not switch to a competitor service provider, then the next likely complaining response will be to warn or discourage family and friends from using the services or to complain by writing complaint on a card. If all these fail, then the customers are more likely to complain to a consumer group or association as the next option or complain by writing complaint letters to management or send the complaint to the mass media. Thus, they are likely to try a voice response (Singh, 1990), then a private response, followed by a voice response in writing on a card or letter to management, and finally adopt a public response to the mass media.

One possible explanation for the respondents complaining to the mass media could be explained by the Ghanaian culture. Liu and McClure (2001) found that cultural difference may account for different complaining behavior. It appears that Ghanaian customers are more reserved when it comes to making their complaints public. Consumers in Ghana appear to be characterized by a reserved attitude and let-me-keep-quiet attitude. They tend to be reluctant to complain to the mass media probably because they do not want their names to be mentioned in the public media for having reported a provider on service quality issues.
Overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall satisfaction</th>
<th>VDF (overall mean = 50.53)</th>
<th>Complainers</th>
<th>Non-complainers</th>
<th>Zain (overall mean = 65.78)</th>
<th>Complainers</th>
<th>Non-complainers</th>
<th>Significant difference between networks (*p&lt;0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Complainers (mean = 49.25)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-complainers (mean = 66.80)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Overall satisfaction (OS) among complainers and non-complainers, VDF) 6.643 1 0.010*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Overall satisfaction among complainers and non-complainers, Zain) 2.597 1 0.107
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Previous dissatisfaction (PD) among complainers and non-complainers, VDF) 10.483 1 0.001*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Previous dissatisfaction among complainers and non-complainers, Zain) 16.219 1 0.000*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Satisfaction between VDF and Zain; Means – VDF =90.92, Zain = 151.68) 19.203 1 0.000*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (Previous dissatisfaction between VDF and Zain; Means – VDF =94.71, Zain = 121.03) 12.986 1 0.000*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (OS among complainers (mean = 89.77 and non-complainers (mean = 117.05); both networks 11.347 1 0.001*
Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (PD among complainers (mean = 82.11) and non-complainers(mean = 121.88); both networks 28.439 1 0.000*

Table 2. Customer Satisfaction among Complainers and Non-Complainers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaining responses/Channels</th>
<th>All respondents n = 212</th>
<th>Vodafone (VDF) n = 117</th>
<th>Zain n = 95</th>
<th>Differences among Network</th>
<th>VDF</th>
<th>Zain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will complain in person to the customer service centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will stop using the company's mobile network services.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will warn family and friends from using the services.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will complain by writing my complaint on a card.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will complain to a consumer group or association.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will complain by writing complaint letters to management.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will send the complaint to the mass media.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R - Rankings, $\overline{X}$ – mean, sd – standard deviation, scale: 1- strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

Table 3 Complaining Behavior Responses
IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

This paper offers some implications for marketing theory and mobile telecommunication industry. First, it found that customer satisfaction in the two networks was significantly different, and that customers of Zain network were more satisfied than Vodafone customers. The ability to satisfy customers could be used as a source of competitive advantage for a firm. Consistent with previous studies, this idea suggests that companies no longer compete on cost but on their ability to satisfy customers (Kotler and Keller, 2006). This concept implies that the management of Vodafone network has to improve upon delivery of service quality to customers. The management of Zain network needs to continuously improve upon their service not only to satisfy their customers but also delight them to increase customer loyalty. Thus, the ability of Zain to satisfy their customers better than Vodafone in the research context could be a great source of competitive advantage.

Also, this study found that dissatisfaction causes complaints. This conclusion is supported by similar findings in previous work (Heung and Lam, 2003; Maute and Forreter, 1993). Thus, complaining behavior is often a result of customer dissatisfaction. The study also found that dissatisfaction may not automatically result in complaining since not all previously dissatisfied consumers complained. The study showed that 26.9% and 40% of Vodafone and Zain customers, respectively, did not complain when dissatisfied. These findings are consistent with the work of Jacoby and Jaccard (1981) that dissatisfaction is not a necessary condition for complaining. These customers have been described by Singh (1990) as “passives” since they seem to be non-complainers who may walk away and never complain when dissatisfied. Such dissatisfied non-complainers may have several reasons for not complaining, among which are late realization of the failure, consumer loyalty, firm’s quality reputation, internal attributions, social factors – busyness, presence of friends, among others, alternative action of brand switching, and reduced tip/other compensation (Voorhees, Brady and Horowitz, 2006). Other reasons are it is not worth the time and effort, they do not know where or how to complain, and they believe that nothing will be done even if they do complain (Day, et al., 1981; Gursoy, et al., 2007). Dissatisfied non-complainers mostly engage in negative WOM activities according to Halstead (2002).

Again the present study found that some customers may still complain even though they are satisfied. Such satisfied customers may still complain because they want better services or to provide feedback for service improvement, among others (Blodgett et al., 1995; Singh and Wilkes, 1996).

Also, it is found that complaining behavior is more prevalent among dissatisfied customers than satisfied ones. This result implies that service providers need to develop effective marketing strategies that are customer-centric that can improve service quality and reduce customer dissatisfaction and complaints. Service providers also need to design effective service improvement systems to identify problematic areas in the service encounter and delivery processes in order to improve upon them.

Moreover, the study found that previous dissatisfaction, though it may cause complaining behavior, does not necessarily lead to overall dissatisfaction if it is handled effectively. This result implies that management need to focus attention on developing and implementing strategies to manage dissatisfaction and complaints so that they do not in turn lead to overall customer dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, the study provides empirical support for the framework of Singh (1990) and Day and Landon (1976) that complaining response could be private and public. The findings indicate that the highest rated complaining response is complain in person to the customer service center and the least is complaining to the mass media that constitutes a public response. Since the study found that customers
are likely to refrain from using the company’s service, warn family and friends from using the company’s services when dissatisfied, it is important for management to develop effective complaint management system within the organization to detect, encourage, and handle customer complaints. In this regard, some of the complaining management strategies could include encouraging customers to freely complain, establishing complaint procedures, training employees in handling actual and potential complaints, and providing solutions to complaints such as compensating consumers, taking corrective actions, providing adequate explanations to complaints issues, apologizing to customers for service failures, and suggesting alternates to consumers, among other things. Effective complaint resolution could prevent consumer switching (Keaveney, 1995).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study was a cross-sectional case survey that employed the use of structured questionnaire. This method has its limitations including presence of many missing data, wrong responses, and other biases (Copper and Schindler, 2006). It is recommended that future research should examine the phenomenon using qualitative approach like interviews, focus group discussions and other projective techniques, and then compare the results. Another limitation is the fact that only two mobile firms in the Ghana’s telecommunication industry were involved, and that the sample included only literate respondents and not illiterates. The inclusion of illiterate may significantly alter the results. Future research should include respondents with varied background and extend the study to include other industry players in the Ghana’s mobile telecom industry (GMTI) as well as examine the phenomenon of CCB in other industry contexts. The results could be compared in future studies for all the industry players in GMTI to provide more empirical support to the findings in this study. Moreover, this study did not examine the demographic, cultural and religious factors that may influence the consumer complaining responses. Thus, future research is needed to examine the influence of customer characteristics on complaining response/channel. Finally, more research is needed to unearth the reasons why satisfied customers may still complain in developing country context, and in particular mobile telecommunication services contexts.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study was a cross-sectional survey that examined satisfaction/dissatisfaction among complainers and non-complainers. It found that complainers and non-complainers differ in their satisfaction and previous dissatisfaction. The most highly rated complaining response was complaining in person to the service provider’s customer service center, followed by refraining from using the network services of the service provider, and the least rated was complaining to the mass media. The study is relevant to marketing theory and practices and it offers suggestions to management and marketing practitioners, especially in the mobile telecommunication industry. It contributes to the body of knowledge on consumer complaining behavior and customer satisfaction. It, specifically, contributes to the debate on what causes complaining behavior and provides empirical support to the fact that dissatisfaction does not necessarily cause complaining but even satisfied customer complain. It also provides empirical evidence on complaining responses of customers and the influence of customer demographic variables on complaining responses. The findings and generalizations of this study are limited to the research context and caution should be exercised in generalizing its findings in other industry contexts. The study recommends that, among other things, future research should examine the impact of customer characteristics on consumer complaining responses.
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