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ABSTRACT

Customer focus strategy has shifted the way the businesses shape their customer satisfaction. Service oriented companies in general have been given a great emphasis and a significance care to both customer satisfaction and customer delight lately. However, the management decision of what to offer to gain customer happiness is still a challenge issue. To test such issue, this study develops and tests a set of new factors which shapes both customer satisfaction and delight within the UAE setting. The factors include perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived price fairness in addition to perceived service recovery. Data were collected through survey using a structured questionnaire distributed to 420 customers over all 28 branches of Etisalat Company in Dubai. 350 valid questionnaires were analyzed using factor analysis along with correlation and regression. The results of the study indicate that perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived price fairness and perceived service recovery could be considered as the critical success factors that can be used to shape and measure customer satisfaction and delight. The findings can be used as guidelines to retain customers and to enhance the business value especially when organizations service providers focusing more on what customer perceive rather than focusing on what to offer from products and/or services. Moreover, some managerial implications and a set of theoretical recommendations are suggested in the final part of this study.

1. Introduction

Organizations are interested in achieving high customer satisfaction and happiness in order to encourage them to repeat the purchase and to encourage others to do so (Famiyeh et al., 2018). Although customer satisfaction is not an ultimate goal for the organization, but it is one of the methods used to measure customer loyalty (Zameer et al., 2019) or to measure customer delight (Torres & Kline, 2006; Hensher, 2014). Initially it is important to discuss what customer satisfaction and customer happiness mean and declare if both concepts differ. Customer satisfaction has been defined by Schiffman and Kanuk (2004) as the “individual's perception of the performance of the product or service in relation to his or her expectations” while Patterson (1997) declared that “customer delight involves going beyond satisfaction to delivering what can be best described as a pleasurable experience for the client”. Accordingly, it can be elicited that customer delight and happiness express a stronger emotional status and denote a differ of a high psychological status than satisfaction and go beyond to include surprise and joy (Nadler, 1970; Kumar et al., 2001; Kangogo et al., 2013; Ahmed et al., 2016).
It has been observed that the main benefit of satisfied customers is to spread a good and positive word of mouth about the organization and its products and/or services (Abdul Rehman, 2012; Alzoubi, et al., 2019) and practically increase the repeat purchase behavior (Alshurideh et al., 2012). Meanwhile, improving the customer satisfaction would improve the company image and the brand name image as well (Phi et al., 2018) as well as many scholars denoted that customer happiness tend to increase customer loyalty (Plassmann et al., 2007; Suki, 2014) and retaining a happy customer costs five time less than attracting a new customer (Albarq, 2013). However, a large number of satisfied customers is expected to improve the profitability in terms of increasing sales, and influence the overall growth of the company (Yallapragada, 2017). Lately, customers delight and happiness start to appear in the emerging economies and legally some countries (for example, UAE) start adapting such concept heavily not only in delivering their governmental services but also in evaluating the quality of such services delivered. According to Torres and Kline (2006), during the last few years, the customer delight concept has been used recently in literature while it takes precedence over other concepts such as customer satisfaction. Both scholars mentioned that little number of studies have tackled the customer delight in different business topics such as hospitality industry. Thus. This study adds value to the knowledge by addressing the main factors affecting customer delight from service value perception, service quality perception, and service price fairness perception in addition to service recovery perception in the telecommunication industry. Organizations have used to measure customer satisfaction because it helps them determine whether their products/services meet the customer expectation or not, or whether the customers have better experience than their expectations do. Within the meanwhile, measuring customer delight helps firms know whether they are doing well or not, and to adjust their performance with the required improvement, which shift to meet customer expectations. This might help companies decide where they want to look ahead in terms of their both strategy and polices then monitoring their performance accordingly otherwise, they might end up losing the customers to the other competitors on the market (Alkalha et al., 2012; Shannak et al., 2012; Odunlami, et al., 2013).

UAE Etisalat Company started providing telecommunication services in 1963 in the UAE. While International Etisalat have operations in other 19 countries include East African and the Middle East, with over 135 million customers, and it is the 12th largest voice carrier in the world. Etisalat serve around 11.6 million customers in UAE. This study has come to assess the effect of four proposed factors including perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived service recovery and perceived price fairness on both customer satisfaction and customer happiness at Etisalat Company in UAE.

There is no doubt that all organizations are interested in seeking to satisfy their customers and investigate the factors that make them happy. This study comes to serve the literature and practitioners by studying new factors that are used to test customer satisfaction and happiness, which are perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived service recovery and perceived price fairness. However, a large number of studies have been done to investigate customer satisfaction and loyalty such as Alshurideh (2010). Nevertheless, this study used a set of new happiness determinants (e.g. perceived price fairness and perceived service recovery) within the telecommunication industry in one of the promising industries in the Middle East region. The study importance is clear despite the fact that not only many researches were found tackling the critical success factors of customer satisfaction and customer loyalty, but also there are only few focused on customer delight in telecommunication industry, especially in UAE (Yallapragada, 2017). That is because many scholars such as Patterson (1997) see customer delight as the most effective business indicator that increase customer retention rate. The next part introduces the literature that discussed each independent variable in more details.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

2.1 Perceived service value influence on both customer satisfaction and customer delight

Many researchers have investigated the factors affecting customer satisfaction from different angles and a set of other studies provided empirical studies and frameworks to examine the satisfaction’ determinants (Alshurideh et al., 2012; Alshurideh, 2014; Ammari et al., 2017; Al-dweeri et al., 2017). However, few studies were conducted to measure the impact of perceived service value on both customer satisfaction and customer delight. Marketing function is one of the core functions of any organization these days. Based on that, marketing can be considered as an important function since it has the most business-to-customer contact dimension. The core of successful marketing strategy and best business practice is to survey, understand, build, convey, and add value to customer that lead to customer satisfaction (Husnain & Akhtar, 2015). Service oriented organizations should know the best ways to market their services/products and find the effective ways to communicate their differential values to customers, in order to deliver their services in a way to satisfy their needs (Tjipthon, 2002). Many scholars such as Nguyen, et al. (2018) claimed that marketing efforts and employees’ training had great effects on customer satisfaction (Nguyen et al., 2018). Some of studies carried out found that service innovativeness, service reliability, service competitiveness and service consistency had significant impacts on customer satisfaction, whereas factors like operator’s network/signal coverage, pricing, offering, fulfilment of customer demand, value added service, brand value and operators’ contribution to society had more significant influence on the level of customer perceived value and satisfaction. Moreover, Rahman (2014) conducted a study in the telecommunications industry and assumed that customer satisfaction can be considered as one of the measures and indicators of service innovativeness, service reliability, service competitiveness, service consistency, signal coverage, reasonable price, quality of offering, customer demand fulfilment; value added service, brand value and operator’s contribution to society. Moreover, a unique factor that was considered in Rahman’s study was the operator’s contribution to society and this factor was being considered important because at point
of time, the image of the company is also associated with the accumulated benefits or value that the company deliver to the society level not just to customer level. Based on previous explanation, the proposed relationships between perceived value and both customer satisfaction and delight can be assumed as:

**H1**: Perceived service value positively influences customer satisfaction.

**H4**: Perceived service value positively influences customer delight.

### 2.2 Perceived service quality influence on customer satisfaction and customer delight

Some researchers such as Obeidat et al. (2012) and Alshurideh et al. (2017) developed a linkage between service quality and both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. According to them, both factors have a significant effect on customer satisfaction and customer delight. Arora and Narula (2018), for example, confirmed the impact of service quality on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. In addition, Lai and Nguyen (2017) examined the factors affecting customer satisfaction and customer loyalty at telecommunications industries. Both scholars found that service quality, assurance, responsiveness, reliability, empathy and tangibility have some effects on and have positive relationships with both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. A study has been conducted by Herington and Weaven (2007) about how to improve business-to-customer relations when providing high quality online banking services. The study denoted that providing high quality services to customers and making such customers perceived such quality leads to have high-satisfied customers, which in turn creates high level of loyalty, and such loyalty brings customers delight and happiness. This tends to increase the purchase volume per visit and escalate the purchase frequency as well. Accordingly, companies need to understand in which way the customer will perceive the quality of its products and services (Al-Dmour & Al-Shraideh, 2008; Castaneda, 2011; Obeidat et al., 2012). Based on previous explanation, the proposed relationships between perceived service quality and both customer satisfaction and delight can be assumed as:

**H5**: Perceived service quality positively influences customer satisfaction.

**H6**: Perceived service quality positively influences customer delight.

### 2.3 Perceived service recovery influences on customer satisfaction and customer delight

Ampomah (2012) conducted a study in the telecommunications industry in Ghana. The scholar pointed out the fact that the level of customer satisfaction is affected by five main factors, which includes service quality, price fairness, service recovery, brand image and customer orientation toward the company and its employees. Form such founding; service recovery is an important element of customer satisfaction and delight that need to be discussed in details. Maxham (2001) defined Service failure as “any service-related mishaps or problems (real and/or perceived) that occur during a consumer’s experience with the firm”. While service recovery is defined by Grönroos (1988) as, “the service provider’s action when something goes wrong”. It is mentioned in different situations that it is important to give more lights on how service failure recovery affect customer satisfaction and delight. Duffy et al. (2006) provide an initial study about the relationship between customer satisfaction and service recovery strategies in retail banks in USA. The scholars addressed hundreds of customers with respect to their demographical characteristics and levels of satisfaction in addition to using different types of recovery strategies and service recovery employees. The study found that there are no significant differences in satisfaction and recovery strategy linked to customers’ gender and age or customer relationship longevity with bank. However, the study found that customer satisfaction level differs and strongly affected by the type of the recovery strategy used. The study indicated that the recovery efforts exerted by employees are best to be used toward empathic listening to customers’ problems then fixing their problem better than using apologizing or atonement procedures. Regarding service recovery influence and customer delight. Not that much studies found linking such terms together. Barnes et al. (2011) declared that service failure recovery is important and, in most cases, take greater importance from customer perspectives than the delivered services itself. Buttle and Burton (2002) declared that when service failures happen, the recovery procedures and process has greater effect on customer loyalty better than the original service provided. Both scholars mentioned that customers’ perception of fairness occurs when an organization has success recovery strategies and programs. According to Hart et al. (1990), “a good recovery can turn angry, frustrated customers into loyal ones. It can, in fact, create more goodwill than if things had gone smoothly in the first place” (Hart et al., 1990, p. 148). Accordingly, service recovery can influence customers’ emotions and psychological status according to Obeidat et al. (2019). Based on the above explanation, the proposed relationships between perceived service recovery influence and both customer satisfaction and delight can be assumed as:

**H7**: Perceived service recovery positively influences customer satisfaction.

**H8**: Perceived service recovery positively influences customer delight.

### 2.4 Perceived service price fairness influences on customer satisfaction and customer delight

A study takes up by Khan and Afsheen (2012) who investigated the factors that influence customer satisfaction in the telecommunications industry setting declared that satisfaction is shaped by a number of influencers which are which are customer service, price fairness, sales promotion, coverage, signal strength and promotion. The results indicated that customers are more concerned with price fairness and signal strength. Signal strength can be referred to one of the service
quality technical determinants because customer expects the company to provide both strong signals and wide coverages (Neupane, 2014). However, perceived service price fairness influences has not taken much interests from scholars and can be considered one of the service ethical dimensions that need more practical tests (Alshurideh et al., 2017; Alshurideh et al., 2016; Salloum & Al-Emran, 2018). Some studies (e.g., Romdonny & Rosmadi, 2019) focused on the importance of the relationship between service quality and price to be part of the factors that lead to customer satisfaction. Keep in mind that it is not easy for customers to be convinced whether the value taken equal to the price given, simply because customers always compare the prices charged with similar competitors’ products or services (Ilieska, 2013; Alshurideh, 2016; Salloum et al., 2018). However, customers became more and more concern about the effectivity of the marketing mix efforts, especially for the services and its unique characteristics, which require enhancing the way of communicating with customers, and updating them with right information in the right time and truthfully (John, 2003). In the service oriented organizations, it has been confirmed in different situations that price of the service is considered to be one of the main two elements that affect heavily the customers purchasing decision which are quality and price. Moreover, price, in a way or another, thought to be a determinant of the service quality (Kaura, et al., 2014). Nevertheless, generally, it can be assumed that the service price, which should add a perceived value to customer, has an effect on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty positively (Toncar et al., 2010). To add more, price has a significant impact on customer’s judgment on the service and customer’s purchase decision, so price structure would be from the main marketing decision that need to be considered with care while it affects customer satisfaction (Salvador et al., 2006; Alshurideh et al., 2018). Based on the above explanation, the proposed relationships between perceived service price fairness and both customer satisfaction and delight can be assumed as:

H₆: Perceived service price fairness positively influences customer satisfaction.
H₈: Perceived service price fairness positively influences customer delight.

2.5 Customer satisfaction influences customer delight

Torres and Kline (2006) studied how effective management of customer relation can affect customer satisfaction, delight, and their interrelated antecedents. The study declared that customer delight could be considered one of the better concepts that can be used to measure customer relationship management even better than customer satisfaction while it tends to generate positive general feeling about the organization performance especially when such organizations tend to have better acknowledgments of customer relationship process. Delight found to produce more word-of-moth communications, which in turn influence loyalty and increase customer loyalty at last. Some scholars pointed out that customer satisfaction, delight should be planned strategically, and management should offer all possible means to achieve them. In addition, Marketing mix strategy which be implemented by any organization should first going through customer satisfaction. Which means that organization should discover the customer needs before they prepare and set their marketing mix strategy. Solimun and Fernandes (2018) found that marketing mix strategy has a significant impact on customer satisfaction. That means the marketing mix strategy is an indicator and would be the customer satisfaction determination (Caruana, 2002). Based on the above explanation, the proposed relationships between customer satisfaction and customer delight can be assumed as:

H₈: Customer satisfaction positively influences customer delight.

The study model gives a brief view of the proposed relationships between the study factors as seen in Fig.1 as follows,
Table 1
Descriptive analysis for factors affecting customer satisfaction and customer loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study variables</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Recovery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Price Fairness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Delight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the descriptive analysis that rank the importance of study variables. Respondents’ perceptions indicate the importance and rank given toward study variables. The “Perceived Service Price” got the highest importance rank with mean (3.01) and Std. (0.923), followed by “Perceived Service Quality” with mean of (2.91) and Std. of (0.967). After that comes, “Customer Satisfaction and Customer delight” with means of (2.63: 2.78) and Std(s) of (0.954: 0.962) respectively. The last two variables in importance rank are “Perceived Service Recovery and Perceived Service Value” with means of (2.48: 2.54) and Std(s) of (0.891: 0.883) respectively. The factor analysis CFA/MSE have been used to assess the construct validity of the measurement’s study, as it shows the extent to which a set of measured items actually reflect the theoretical latent construct in which they are designed to measure as leaded by Al Kurdi (2016); S A Salloum & Shaalan, 2018; Salloum et al. 2019; and Alshurideh et al. (2019). Table 2 shows results of measurement model Convergent validity. It shows and combine the values of the factor loading, and Composite reliability (CR) with Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and all values of the study model are significant.

Table 2
Model Convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Price Fairness (PPF)</td>
<td>PPF1</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPF2</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPF3</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Quality (PSQ)</td>
<td>PSQ1</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSQ2</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSQ3</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Recovery (PSR)</td>
<td>PSR1</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSR2</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSR3</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Service Value (PSV)</td>
<td>PSV1</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSV2</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSV3</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction (CS)</td>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Delight (CD)</td>
<td>CD1</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD2</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD3</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All AVE values of the latent variable are higher than the squared correlation between the latent variable and all other variables which means that our latent variable explain better the variance of their own indicators than the variance of other latent variables, so the study model is valid (Chin, 2010; Alshurideh. 2019).

Table 3
Latent Variable Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPF</th>
<th>PSQ</th>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPF</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSQ</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boldface values are Variable correlation - Root square of AVE

Table 3 shows the Correlation Cross loading is the loading of an indicator on its assigned latent variable and should be higher than its loadings on all other latent variables. It shows that load more strongly on their own constructs in the model, which indicates a positive and strong relationship between the study variables.

3. Hypothesis Testing and Discussion

Based on the results obtained from the respondents for the study variables, Correlation, Regression and ANOVA analysis used to test the hypotheses. Table 4 and 5 illustrate a positive relationship between perceived service value (PSV) on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by (r=0.604 and r=0.608), respectively.
Hypotheses testing results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hy number</th>
<th>Effect Direction</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Hy number</th>
<th>Effect Direction</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>PSV effect on CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>H6</td>
<td>PSR effect on CD</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>PSV effect on CD</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>PPF effect on CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>PSQ effect on CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>H8</td>
<td>PPF effect on CD</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>PSQ effect on CD</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>H9</td>
<td>CS effect on CD</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>PSR effect on CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $r^2$ for both factors were 0.367 and 0.341, which means that (0.367) of changes in customer satisfaction can be associated to changes in PSV and (0.341) change in customer delight can be associated to change in changes in PSV. Moreover, it has been found out that F-value for both factors were (9.824 and 9.803) and both were significant at level of significance of (0.05). In addition, both statistics of t values were 3.123 and 3.030 and both were significant at level of significance of (0.001). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number three and four, which confirm the impact of PSQ on both CS and CD. About the relationship between perceived service recovery (PSR) effect on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), results shown in Table 4 illustrate positive relationships between perceived service quality (PSQ) and both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by r values of 0.514 and 0.512 in order. The r values for both factors were 0.584 and 0.581, which both were significant at (0.05). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number three and four, which confirm the impact of PSQ on both CS and CD. About the relationship between perceived price fairness (PPF) effect on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), results shown in Table 4 illustrate positive relationships between perceived service recovery (PSR) and both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by r values of 0.463 and 0.460 in order. The r values for both factors were 0.584 and 0.581, which both were significant at (0.05). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number three and four, which confirm the impact of PSQ on both CS and CD. About the relationship between perceived service recovery (PSR) effect on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), results shown in Table 4 illustrate positive relationships between perceived service quality (PSQ) and both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by r values of 0.514 and 0.512 in order. The r values for both factors were 0.584 and 0.581, which both were significant at (0.05). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number three and four, which confirm the impact of PSQ on both CS and CD. About the relationship between perceived price fairness (PPF) effect on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), results shown in Table 4 illustrate positive relationships between perceived service recovery (PSR) and both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by r values of 0.463 and 0.460 in order. The r values for both factors were 0.584 and 0.581, which both were significant at (0.05). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number three and four, which confirm the impact of PSQ on both CS and CD. About the relationship between perceived service recovery (PSR) effect on both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), results shown in Table 4 illustrate positive relationships between perceived service quality (PSQ) and both customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by r values of 0.514 and 0.512 in order. The r values for both factors were 0.584 and 0.581, which both were significant at (0.05).
0.480 and 0.298, and \( \beta \) values were 0.480 and 0.106, which both were significant at (0.05). Therefore, the results support both hypotheses number seven and eight, which confirm the impact of both PPF on both CS and, CD. On the same regard, a positive relationship between customer satisfaction (CS) and customer delight (CD), indicated by \( r \) value of 0.584 while the \( r^2 \) value was 0.341, which means that 0.341 of changes in CD can be associated to changes in CD. In addition, it has been found out that \( F \) value was (31.903) and it was significant at level of significance of (0.05). Additionally, the statistic t value was 3.123 and \( \beta \) value was 0.498, which was significant at (0.05). Therefore, it can be assumed that the hypothesis number nine is confirmed, which prove the impact of customer satisfaction on customer delight.

4. Results discussion

Results of this study have found a positive and strong relationship between the study variables. Moreover, hypotheses testing results confirm the impact of perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived service recovery and perceived service price fairness on both customer satisfaction and customer delight, and results also assure the positive impact of customer satisfaction in turn on customer delight. Tam (2004) confirmed the effect of perceived service value on customer satisfaction and noted that much studies found giving deep lights on the effect of customer perceived serve value on customer delight while this study confirms such relation. To add more, the results of this study comes in line with other studies such as that conducted by Romdonny and Rosmadi (2019) who found a positive effect of service quality on customer satisfaction. Also, Herington and Weaven (2007) found that delight customers were found having high level of perceived service quality. Such results come in line with what Hume and Sullivan (2010) and Jhandir (2012) who uncovered statistical proofs of the effect of both perceived service value and perceived service quality on customer satisfaction. Based on this, it can be declared that most of study sample were satisfied with the quality of services that provided by Etisalat and perceive it is value right and some of them even stated the fact that Etisalat and its staff is quite hospitable due to which they have been contracted with the company for long time and renew their contracts accordingly. This issue has been confirmed and aligned with other study found (e.g. Alshurideh. 2010; Alshurideh. 2016; Alshurideh. 2017; Nguyen, et al., 2018; Alshurideh. 2019; Salloum et al., 2018). Moreover, this study declared and confirmed the positive effect of perceived service recovery on both customer satisfaction and customer delight. Komunda and Osarenkhoe (2012) who mentioned that perceived service recovery makes customers express positive world-of-mouth and affect positively both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty have discovered this matter. However, not that many studies were found testing the relationship between perceived service recovery and customer delight. Such relationship was tested and confirmed practically in this study. Other studies come close to study such issue such as that done by Duffy et al. (2006) who found that perceived service recovery was perceived to be effective on loyal customers in addition to Andreassen (2001) who declared that excellent service recovery help in minimizing customers’ complaints and restore their image and intent. Thus, studying the effect of perceived service recovery on customer delight is one of the unique contributions of this study. Another major issue in this study is tackling the effect of perceived price fairness on both customer satisfaction and customer delight. There is a large number of studies that investigate the effect of service price on customer satisfaction (e.g. Kaura, et al., 2014). However, studying the effect of perceived service price on both customer satisfaction and customer delight does not get much interest from scholars. Jin et al. (2016) studied if there is a relationship between price fairness, image and loyalty in the hospitality setting. The study found that there is a positive effect of image on customer loyalty with the intervening effect for customer delight, price fairness and service quality. Accordingly, price fairness can be considered as one of the ethical dimensions that companies need to be considered with care when planning their products/services offerings and such elements needs more investigation specially the fairness of the promotional price (Alshurideh et al., 2016; Alshurideh et al., 2017; Alshurideh et al., 2018; Salloum & Shaalan, 2018a). Respondents agreed that perceived price fineness is an important factor for them because they feel that value for the service provided should be met with faire price to make their customers satisfy and delight. On the other hand, the study respondents do not feel that the company is overcharging them for the mobile service provided but it is important to make them feel that such price is coming within their expectation and fit the level of delivered service quality (Toncar et al., 2010). To add more, Khuong and Dai (2016) investigated a set factors that affecting customer satisfaction at telecommunications industry including reliability, comfort, information, responsiveness, dignity, tangibility and price, and they found that customer satisfaction was positively related with price and comfort level of the customer, and rest of the factors could be overlooked if these were as per the expectations of the customer. Some studies have reviewed and confirmed the linkage between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty, as customer satisfaction influence and lead customer loyalty (Arora & Narula, 2018; Nguyen, et al., 2018; Phi, et al., 2018).

In addition, Shafei and Tabaa (2016) investigated the same linkage in the telecommunications industry and found that there is a positive effect of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty. Many other studies proposed the same assumption regarding the positive effect of customer satisfaction and how it leads and contribute to customer loyalty (Dutta et al., 2017; Keshavarz & Jamshidi, 2018). However, not that many studies investigated the effect of customer satisfaction on customer delight as this study did. This study checked the effect of customer satisfaction on customer delight and confirmed such relation positively. Such relation has been confirmed as many other scholars found such as Torres and Kline (2013) who provided proofs about the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and customer delight.

5. Conclusion

The main purpose behind conducting this study was to explore factors affecting customer satisfaction and customer delight toward the products and services offered within the mobile phone setting. This study is important because it tackled one of
the main problems than mobile service providers face these days which is the high level of customer attrition rate as declared by Al Dmour et al. (2014), Alshurideh (2014), Alshurideh et al. (2015), Alshurideh (2016). It is important to keep the customers satisfied since this is one of the main reasons to support the company existence (Alshurideh, 2016a, 2016b; Muhammad Alshurideh et al., 2019). The study investigated what if perceived service value, perceived service quality, perceived service recovery and perceived price fairness can be considered as critical success factors to customer satisfaction and customer delight. Based on results found, all proposed relations were confirmed and proofed positively. This study has been taken up to have better picture about both customer satisfaction and delight and data collected from customers at all 28 main branches of Ettisalat mobile service provider in Dubai-UAE. This study may help organizations who operate on the telecommunications industry make certain improvements in their services to enhance and improve customer satisfaction and their delight especially when the study investigates new delight and satisfaction drivers for the first time such as perceived price fairness, perceived service recovery and perceived service value. Such factors need more investigation specially when connecting price fairness perception with other internal service quality dimension such as empathy, reliability and assurance (Elsamen & Alshurideh, 2012) or E-service quality dimensions those discussed by Al-dweeri et al. (2017) and customer commitment (Ammari et al., 2017)
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