Table of Contents

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results and discussion of primary research based on survey questionnaire. The chapter begins with survey results followed by regression and correlation analysis. Finally the chapter ends with a discussion if aims and objectives of the study and how they have been achieved using primary and secondary research.

4.2 Survey Questionnaire Results

The questionnaire asked customers to opine if their airline company offers competitive prices. 14% of the customers marked Highly disagree, 19% of the customers marked Disagree, 25% of the customers marked Neutral, 23% of the customers marked Agree , and 19% of the customers marked Highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	disagree	19	19.0	19.0	33.0
	Neutral	25	25.0	25.0	58.0
	agree	23	23.0	23.0	81.0
	highly agree	19	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think that their airline company provides competitive and comparable services. In response 14% of respondent opined highly disagree, 14% of respondent opined disagree, 34% of respondent remained neutral, 16% of respondent opined agree, and 22% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	disagree	14	14.0	14.0	28.0
	Neutral	34	34.0	34.0	62.0
	agree	16	16.0	16.0	78.0
	highly agree	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine whether their airline company uses cutting edge technology. 14% of the customers marked Highly disagree, 12% of the customers marked Disagree, 34% of the customers marked Neutral, 24% of the customers marked Agree, and 16% of the customers marked Highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	26.0
	Neutral	34	34.0	34.0	60.0
	agree	24	24.0	24.0	84.0
	highly agree	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think that their airline company ensures passengers safety. In response 13% of respondent opined highly disagree, 14% of respondent opined disagree, 25% of respondent remained neutral, 18% of respondent opined agree, and 30% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	13	13.0	13.0	13.0
	disagree	14	14.0	14.0	27.0
	Neutral	25	25.0	25.0	52.0
	agree	18	18.0	18.0	70.0
	highly agree	30	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine whether their airline service provides high level of security for passengers. 16% of the customers marked highly disagree, 12% of the customers marked Disagree, 30% of the customers marked Neutral, 15% of the customers marked Agree, and 27% of the customers marked Highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	16	16.0	16.0	16.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	28.0
	Neutral	30	30.0	30.0	58.0
	agree	15	15.0	15.0	73.0
	highly agree	27	27.0	27.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think that their airline companies are punctual in terms of flight timings. In response 13% of respondent opined highly disagree, 13% of respondent opined disagree, 31% of respondent remained neutral, 23% of respondent opined agree, and 20% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	13	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Disagree	13	13.0	13.0	26.0
	Neutral	31	31.0	31.0	57.0
	Agree	23	23.0	23.0	80.0
	highly agree	20	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine about fluent check-in service of respective airline. 8% of the customers marked Highly disagree, 17% of the customers marked Disagree, 32% of the customers marked Neutral, 17% of the customers marked Agree, and 36% of the customers marked Highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	disagree	17	17.0	17.0	25.0
	Neutral	32	32.0	32.0	57.0
	agree	17	17.0	17.0	74.0
	highly agree	26	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think all staff were friendly. In response 12% of respondent opined highly disagree, 10% of respondent opined disagree, 39% of respondent remained neutral, 18% of respondent opined agree, and 21% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	12	12.0	12.0	12.0
	disagree	10	10.0	10.0	22.0
	Neutral	39	39.0	39.0	61.0
	agree	18	18.0	18.0	79.0
	highly agree	21	21.0	21.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine about the quality of food and beverages. 17% of the customers marked highly disagree, 8% of the customers marked Disagree, 31% of the customers marked Neutral, 22% of the customers marked Agree, and 22% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	17	17.0	17.0	17.0
	disagree	8	8.0	8.0	25.0
	Neutral	31	31.0	31.0	56.0
	agree	22	22.0	22.0	78.0
	highly agree	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think the seat were comfortable. In response 9% of respondent opined highly disagree, 21% of respondent opined disagree, 22% of respondent remained neutral, 23% of respondent opined agree, and 25% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	disagree	21	21.0	21.0	30.0
	Neutral	22	22.0	22.0	52.0
	agree	23	23.0	23.0	75.0
	highly agree	25	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine about the cleanliness of cabin. 14% of the customers marked highly disagree, 17% of the customers marked Disagree, 22% of the customers marked Neutral, 19% of the customers marked Agree, and 28% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	disagree	17	17.0	17.0	31.0
	Neutral	22	22.0	22.0	53.0
	agree	19	19.0	19.0	72.0
	highly agree	28	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think that whether luggage services were adequate to meet their needs. In response 11% of respondent opined highly disagree, 12% of respondent opined disagree, 35% of respondent remained neutral, 21% of respondent opined agree, and 21% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	11	11.0	11.0	11.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	23.0
	Neutral	35	35.0	35.0	58.0
	agree	21	21.0	21.0	79.0
	highly agree	21	21.0	21.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine whether their airline service meets their expectations. 18% of the customers marked Highly disagree, 9% of the customers marked Disagree, 40% of the customers marked Neutral, 20% of the customers marked Agree , and 13% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	18	18.0	18.0	18.0
	disagree	9	9.0	9.0	27.0
	Neutral	40	40.0	40.0	67.0
	agree	20	20.0	20.0	87.0
	highly agree	13	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers think that their airline company meets their travelling needs. In response 15% of respondent opined highly disagree, 13% of respondent opined disagree, 30% of respondent remained neutral, 20% of respondent opined agree, and 22% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	15	15.0	15.0	15.0
	disagree	13	13.0	13.0	28.0
	Neutral	30	30.0	30.0	58.0
	agree	20	20.0	20.0	78.0
	highly agree	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine whether their airline company provides better services as compared to competitors. 10% of the customers marked highly disagree, 15% of the customers marked Disagree, 29% of the customers marked Neutral, 23% of the customers marked Agree, and 23% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	10	10.0	10.0	10.0
	disagree	15	15.0	15.0	25.0
	Neutral	29	29.0	29.0	54.0
	agree	23	23.0	23.0	77.0
	highly agree	23	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether pricing policy of their airline service is better than competitors. In response 14% of respondent opined highly disagree, 12% of respondent opined disagree, 32% of respondent remained neutral, 19% of respondent opined agree, and 23% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	26.0
	Neutral	32	32.0	32.0	58.0
	agree	19	19.0	19.0	77.0
	highly agree	23	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to opine whether they had better flight experience in their airline service as compared to their experience in other airline company. 8% of the customers marked highly disagree, 13% of the customers marked Disagree, 42% of the customers marked Neutral, 19% of the customers marked Agree, and 18% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	disagree	13	13.0	13.0	21.0
	Neutral	42	42.0	42.0	63.0
	agree	19	19.0	19.0	82.0
	highly agree	18	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers were searching for another airline service or thinking to switch. In response 13% of respondent opined highly disagree, 12% of respondent opined disagree, 35% of respondent remained neutral, 21% of respondent opined agree, and 19% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	13	13.0	13.0	13.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	25.0
	Neutral	35	35.0	35.0	60.0
	agree	21	21.0	21.0	81.0
	highly agree	19	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers to rate the overall performance of their airline service on a scale of 1 star to 5 stars. 16% of the customers marked 1 star, 8% of the customers marked 2 star, 35% of the customers marked 3 star, 16% of the customers marked r star, and 25% of the customers marked 5 star.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	16	16.0	16.0	16.0
	disagree	8	8.0	8.0	24.0
	Neutral	35	35.0	35.0	59.0
	agree	16	16.0	16.0	75.0
	highly agree	25	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether customers give ratings on the basis of price and service quality. In response 9% of respondent opined highly disagree, 12% of respondent opined disagree, 40% of respondent remained neutral, 20% of respondent opined agree, and 19% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	disagree	12	12.0	12.0	21.0
	Neutral	40	40.0	40.0	61.0
	agree	20	20.0	20.0	81.0
	highly agree	19	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers if they make repeat selection of airline on the basis of ratings. 11% of the customers marked highly disagree, 10% of the customers marked Disagree, 41% of the customers marked Neutral, 20% of the customers marked Agree, and 18% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	11	11.0	11.0	11.0
	disagree	10	10.0	10.0	21.0
	Neutral	41	41.0	41.0	62.0
	agree	20	20.0	20.0	82.0
	highly agree	18	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

In addition, surveyor also inquired whether their service provides good inflight services as they promised. In response 11% of respondent opined highly disagree, 14% of respondent opined disagree, 37% of respondent remained neutral, 22% of respondent opined agree, and 16% of respondent opined highly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	11	11.0	11.0	11.0
	disagree	14	14.0	14.0	25.0
	Neutral	37	37.0	37.0	62.0
	agree	22	22.0	22.0	84.0
	highly agree	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire asked customers whether their ratings about airline are affected by staff behaviour. 16% of the customers marked highly disagree, 14% of the customers marked Disagree, 30% of the customers marked Neutral, 16% of the customers marked Agree, and 24% of the customers marked highly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	highly disagree	16	16.0	16.0	16.0
	disagree	14	14.0	14.0	30.0
	Neutral	30	30.0	30.0	60.0
	agree	16	16.0	16.0	76.0
	highly agree	24	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

4.3 Correlation

The table below shows that the Pearson's correlation coefficient between pre-flight expectations and ratings is .655 or 65.5% with a positive sign. A positive sign shows that there is positive relationship and therefore an increase score of pre-flight expectations is likely to cause an increase in ratings. Furthermore, since the coefficient is greater than 50% therefore it is categorised as strong positive relationship. Finally the significance level of correlation between

pre-flight expectations and ratings is 0.000 (less than 0.05) and thus the correlation is statistically significant. Similarly, the Pearson's correlation coefficient between flight experience and ratings is .645or 64.5% with a positive sign. A positive sign shows that there is positive relationship and therefore an increase score of flight experience is likely to cause an increase in ratings. Furthermore, since the coefficient is greater than 50% therefore it is categorised as strong positive relationship. Finally the significance level of correlation between flight experience and ratings is 0.000 (less than 0.05) and thus the correlation is statistically significant. Finally, the Pearson's correlation coefficient between satisfaction and ratings is .645or 64.5% with a positive sign. A positive sign shows that there is positive relationship and therefore an increase score of satisfaction is likely to cause an increase in ratings. Furthermore, since the coefficient is greater than 50% therefore it is categorised as strong positive relationship. Finally the significance level of correlation between satisfaction and ratings is 0.000 (less than 0.05) and thus the correlation is statistically significant.

		Pre-flight expectation	Flight experience	Satisfaction	Ratings
Pre-flight expectation	Pearson Correlation	1	.622**	.589**	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Flight experience	Pearson Correlation	.622**	1	.554**	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.589**	.554**	1	.638**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	100	100	100	100
Ratings	Pearson Correlation	.655**	.645**	.638**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	100	100	100	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.4 Regression Analysis

The SPSS output for regression between pre-flight expectations and ratings shows that the coefficient of determination i.e. R-squared value is .429 or 42.9% which implies that the model explains 42.9% of variability in dependent variable i.e. ratings. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 which implies that the relationship between pre-flight expectations and ratings is statistically significant. Finally the beta value is .665 or 65.5% which implies that given a unit increase in the score of pre-flight expectations, it is likely that there will be a 65.5% increase in ratings. The model is statistically significant.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.655[a]	.429	.424	.97038

a. Predictors: (Constant), Pre-flight expectation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	69.429	1	69.429	73.731	.000[b]
	Residual	92.281	98	.942		
	Total	161.710	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Ratings

b. Predictors: (Constant), Pre-flight expectation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.155	.260		4.438	.000
	Pre-flight expectation	.654	.076	.655	8.587	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Ratings

Similarly, the results for regression between flight experience and ratings shows that the coefficient of determination i.e. R-squared value is .416 or 41.6% which implies that the model

explains 41.6% of variability in dependent variable i.e. ratings. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 which implies that the relationship between flight experience and ratings is statistically significant. Finally the beta value is .665 or 65.5% which implies that given a unit increase in the score of flight experience, it is likely that there will be a 65.5% increase in ratings. The model is statistically significant.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.645[a]	.416	.410	.98135

a. Predictors: (Constant), Flight experience

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	67.332	1	67.332	69.916	.000[b]
	Residual	94.378	98	.963		
	Total	161.710	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Ratings

b. Predictors: (Constant), Flight experience

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.326	.248		5.347	.000
	Flight experience	.624	.075	.645	8.362	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Ratings

Finally the results of regression analysis between satisfaction and ratings indicate that the coefficient of determination i.e. r-squared value is .408 or 40.8% which implies that the model explains 40.8% of variability in dependent variable i.e. ratings. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 which implies that the relationship between satisfaction and

ratings is statistically significant. Finally the beta value is .638 or 63.8% which implies that given a unit increase in the score of satisfaction, it is likely that there will be a 63.8% increase in ratings. The model is statistically significant.

4.5 Discussion

The first aim of the study was to study the concept of high and low rating of airline services. This objective was achieved through secondary research in which this study explored the concepts in detail. According to secondary research findings lower rated airline companies could be regarded as low cost airline on the basis of their charging cost and provided services. Low cost airlines often have low budget as they have fixed priced on tickets and charging low fares for their services and provide less comfort to their customers and charge extra for providing complementary services like allocation of seats, boarding, and food priority (Graham, 2013). As mentioned in the study conducted by Liou et al (2011:1381), all these factors play essential role in making those airlines lower rated. Lower rated airlines are low cost carriers are competing on the basis of low price and use smaller and secondary airports, providingminimum services and have low seating capacity in the aircraft (Pearson 2016). Although, lower rated airline company's charges low fares for their services, customers usually prefer highly rated airlines over lower rated airlines as they perceived that highly rated airlines provides all necessary and comfortable services to their customers.

To study the relationship between rating and customer's expectation, perceived performance, and satisfaction. The Pearson's correlation coefficient between pre-flight expectations and ratings is .655 or 65.5%. The Pearson's correlation coefficient between flight experience and ratings is .645or 64.5%. The Pearson's correlation coefficient between

satisfaction and ratings is .645or 64.5%. The correlation analysis clearly indicates that there are string positive relationship between dependent and independent variables. Furthermore, the regression analysis shows that a unit increase in the score of pre-flight expectations, it is likely that there will be a 65.5% increase in ratings. Furthermore, implies that given a unit increase in the score of flight experience, it is likely that there will be a 65.5% increase in ratings. Finally, a unit increase in the score of satisfaction, it is likely that there will be a 63.8% increase in ratings. The last objective of the study was to provide recommendation to the managers for increasing their service quality in order to achieve customers' retention and satisfaction. a set of recommendations have been provide in the next chapter.

References

Aleksieva, N. M. (2011). Service quality perception analysis to define loyalty in the airline industry.

Baker, D. M. A. (2013). Service quality and customer satisfaction in the airline industry: a comparison between legacy airlines and low-cost airlines. *American Journal of Tourism Research*, *2*(1), 67-77.

Baker, D. M. A. (2013). Service quality and customer satisfaction in the airline industry: a comparison between legacy airlines and low-cost airlines. *American Journal of Tourism Research*, *2*(1), 67-77.

Baker, R., Brick, J. M., Bates, N. A., Battaglia, M., Couper, M. P., Dever, J. A., ...andTourangeau, R. (2013). Summary report of the AAPOR task force on non-probability sampling. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*, smt008.

Baltar, F., and Brunet, I. (2012). Social research 2.0: virtual snowball sampling method using Facebook. *internet Research*, *22*(1), 57-74.

Basfirinci, C., andMitra, A. (2015).A cross cultural investigation of airlines service quality through integration of Servqual and the Kano model. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, *42*, 239-248.

Belobaba, P., Odoni, A., and Barnhart, C. (2015). *The global airline industry*.John Wiley and Sons.

Bogicevic, V., Yang, W., Bilgihan, A., andBujisic, M. (2013).Airport service quality drivers of passenger satisfaction. Tourism Review, 68(4), 3-18.

Bölke, S. (2014).*Strategic Marketing Approaches Within Airline Management: How the Passenger Market Causes the Business Concepts of Full Service Network Carriers, Low*

Cost Carriers, Regional Carriers and Leisure Carriers to Overlap. Anchor Academic Publishing (aap_verlag).

Chen, C. F., and Chen, F. S. (2010).Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism management*, *31*(1), 29-35.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dabholkar, P. A., and Sheng, X. (2012). Consumer participation in using online recommendation agents: effects on satisfaction, trust, and purchase intentions. *The Service Industries Journal*, *32*(9), 1433-1449.

Diaconu, L. (2012). The Evolution of the European Low-cost Airlines 'Business Models.Ryanair Case Study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *62*, 342-346.

Easton, G. (2010). Critical realism in case study research. *Industrial marketing management*, *39*(1), 118-128.

Erdil, S. T., andYıldız, O. (2011).Measuring service quality and a comparative analysis in the passenger carriage of airline industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *24*, 1232-1242.

Ernst, H., Hoyer, W. D., Krafft, M., and Krieger, K. (2011).Customer relationship management and company performance—the mediating role of new product performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *39*(2), 290-306.

Evans, N., Stonehouse, G., and Campbell, D. (2012). *Strategic management for travel and tourism*.Taylor and Francis.

Freathy, P., and O'Connell, F. (2012).Spending time, spending money: passenger segmentation in an international airport. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, *22*(4), 397-416.

Gnanlet, A., andYayla-Kullu, H. M. (2013).Impact of International Presence on Service Supply Chain Quality. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *2*(3).

Goedeking, P. (2010). Networks in aviation: strategies and structures. Springer Science and Business Media.

Goldkuhl, G. (2012). Pragmatism vs interpretivism in qualitative information systems research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *21*(2), 135-146.

Graham, A. (2013). Understanding the low cost carrier and airport relationship: A critical analysis of the salient issues. *Tourism Management*, *36*, 66-76.

Hsu, C. L., and Wu, C. C. (2011). Understanding users' continuance of Facebook: An integrated model with the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology, Expectation disconfirmation model, and flow theory. *International Journal of virtual communities and social networking (IJVCSN)*, *3*(2), 1-16.

Jahn, D. (2011). Conceptualizing Left and Right in comparative politics: Towards a deductive approach. *Party Politics*, *17*(6), 745-765.

Kärnä, S. (2014).Analysing customer satisfaction and quality in construction–the case of public and private customers. *Nordic journal of surveying and real estate research*, *2*.

Kassim, N., andAsiah Abdullah, N. (2010). The effect of perceived service quality dimensions on customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty in e-commerce settings: A cross cultural analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *22*(3), 351-371.

Kim, D. J. (2012).An investigation of the effect of online consumer trust on expectation, satisfaction, and post-expectation. *Information Systems and E-Business Management*, *10*(2), 219-240.

Kim, Y. K., and Lee, H. R. (2011).Customer satisfaction using low cost carriers. *Tourism Management*, *32*(2), 235-243.

Krippendorff, K. (2012). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage

Loïc, P. L. É., Lecocq, X., andAngot, J. (2010). Customer-integrated business models: a theoretical framework. *M@ n@ gement*, *13*(4), 226-265.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (Vol. 41). Sage publications.

Meng, S. M., Liang, G. S., and Yang, S. H. (2011). The relationships of cruise image, perceived value, satisfaction, and post-purchase behavioral intention on Taiwanese tourists. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(1), 19.

Monroe, C. (2012). Challenging in Delivering Quality Services: Balancing Customer Expectations and Perceptions in Airline Industry.

Oliver, R. L. (2014). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. Routledge.

Orlikowski, W. J. (2010). Practice in research: phenomenon, perspective and philosophy. *Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice*, 23-33.

Pearson, J. (2016). *The competitive strength of Asian network airlines in competing with low-cost carriers and the use of low-cost subsidiaries* (Doctoral dissertation, © James Pearson).

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *11*(1), 25-41.

Romani, S., Grappi, S., andDalli, D. (2012). Emotions that drive consumers away from brands: Measuring negative emotions toward brands and their behavioral effects. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *29*(1), 55-67.

Sadler, G. R., Lee, H. C., Lim, R. S. H., and Fullerton, J. (2010).Recruitment of hard-to-reach population subgroups via adaptations of the snowball sampling strategy. *Business Research*, *12*(3), 369-374.

Saeidi, S. P., Sofian, S., Saeidi, P., Saeidi, S. P., andSaaeidi, S. A. (2015). How does corporate social responsibility contribute to firm financial performance? The mediating role of competitive advantage, reputation, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, *68*(2), 341-350.

Saunders, M. N. (2011). *Research methods for business students, 5/e*. Pearson Education.

Siddiqi, K. O. (2011). Interrelations between service quality attributes, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty in the retail banking sector in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *6*(3), 12.

Smith, J. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Sage.

Tam, J. L. M. (2011). The moderating effects of purchase importance in customer satisfaction process: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *10*(4), 205-215.

Taylor, P. C., and Medina, M. N. D. (2013). Educational research paradigms: From positivism to multiparadigmatic. *The Journal of Meaning-Centered Education*, *1*(2), 1-13.

Thanasupsin, K., Chaichana, S., andPliankarom, S. (2010). Factors influencing mode selections of low-cost carriers and a full-service airline in Thailand. *Transportation Journal*, 35-47.

Tolpa, E. (2012). Measuring customer expectations of service quality: Case airline industry.

Turner III, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The qualitative report*, *15*(3), 754.

Udo, G. J., Bagchi, K. K., andKirs, P. J. (2010).An assessment of customers'e-service quality perception, satisfaction and intention. *International Journal of Information Management*, *30*(6), 481-492.

Williams, C. (2011). Research methods. *Journal of Business and Economics Research (JBER)*, *5*(3).

Yee, R. W., Yeung, A. C., and Cheng, T. E. (2010).An empirical study of employee loyalty, service quality and firm performance in the service industry. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *124*(1), 109-120.