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Abstract

The Internet service sector is characterized as highly competitive, so Internet service providers have to seek ways to offer high-quality services to customers. This study measured the impact of perceived service quality on the repurchase intention of customers with the mediating impact of customers' price perception. Data were gathered by surveying 405 customers of Internet service providers in Amman (Jordan) using the snowball sampling technique; the questionnaire was shared through social media. Data were analyzed using factor analysis, regression, path analysis, and structural equation modeling (SEM). The results indicate that service quality factors represented by perceived service quality significantly affect customers' repurchase intention and price perception (p-value is less than 0.05). Furthermore, price perception partially mediates the relationship between perceived service quality and customers' repurchase intention, with an estimated power of 0.136. Thus far, the mediating variable that explains and predicts the relationship between perceived service quality and customers' repurchase intention has been overlooked in the extant literature. Therefore, this study employs the role of price perception as a mediator variable. In addition, it provided an accurate assessment of customers' perceptions of service quality of Internet providers in Amman (Jordan).

INTRODUCTION

Internet service plays a crucial role in human existence and is necessary for meeting daily necessities. Undoubtedly, most individuals in the world use the Internet daily, not just for free time but also for business activities and achieving specific work duties; it has turned the world into a small town. According to Statista (2021), the number of Internet users worldwide is about 4.66 billion.

In today's competitive and changing business climate, expanding long-term relationships with consumers is crucial and necessary for producers' success and survival, where business power and customers' demand levels are constantly growing. Business institutions are able to retain their customers by providing convenient services that fulfill their expectations. High service quality satisfies customers and creates repurchase intention (Dimyati & Subagio, 2016). According to Kotler and Keller (2006), quality is something that customers experience to live up to their expectations. Quality also symbolizes the richness and qualities of a service significant to its capacity to fulfill promises. In the business world, quality is considered a helpful weap-
on when the organization tries to gain a competitive advantage through selling high-quality services (Bamert & Wehrli, 2005; Parasuraman et al., 1985). Many service quality studies focus on customer perception (Cho, 2014; Ye et al., 2014; Zeng et al., 2011). According to Grönroos et al. (2000), service quality perception encompasses both functional and technical characteristics. Customers can be retained if a company provides excellent service at the point of sale or afterward.

Service quality and repurchase intention are critical concepts that companies must grasp to stay focused on their business and grow. Organizations must learn how to evaluate these structures from their point of view to better understand and serve their customers’ demands. Service quality is critical since it increases customers’ repurchase intentions (Dlačić et al., 2014).

On the other hand, buying an Internet service often entails signing long-term contracts that bind clients. As a result, it is frequently a difficult selection influenced by various elements (Thaichon & Quach, 2015). Compared to other service industries, telecommunications clients, according to prior research, have low levels of loyalty and are usually price-conscious (Marketline, 2014). In addition, a decline in customer loyalty and a higher turnover rate are trends that are anticipated in the telecommunications industry (Marketline, 2014). As a result, this market has become increasingly complicated. According to Nasereddin (2011), Internet technology arrived in Jordan in 1995, and since that time, Internet usage has been prevalent across all segments of the population.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Both practitioners and academics have paid close attention to service quality. According to Parasuraman et al. (1988), service quality is a type of attitude resulting from a comparison between performance expectations and the actual performance. Customer feedback on the benefits or privileges of a product or service as a whole can also be defined as service quality (Zeithaml, 1988). The extent to which a particular service meets or surpasses customer expectations or wants is generally referred to as service quality (Lewis & Mitchell, 1990; Dotchin & Oakland, 1994). In response to a surge in scholarly interest in the 1980s, a project to improve service quality was initiated. When companies realized the importance of service quality, a mark of distinction and a safe haven for above-average performance, they began to invest in it (Gupta et al., 2005). The company’s proper and excellent service management is reflected in the high quality of its services. The term ‘quality of service’ refers to a method of providing a concrete action or performance from one party to another (Kotler & Keller, 2009).

For the first time, Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988) introduced a service quality model, asserting that service quality could be measured using a service quality dimension with five factors:

1. Tangibility, which includes all tools, physical facilities, workers, and contact materials that enhance the service.

2. Reliability, which is the ability to deliver on promises accurately and persuasively. Customers want a firm that can deliver on its promises, so businesses must be prepared to fulfill their commitments on the aspects of the services that will be offered to them.

3. Responsiveness, which is the desire to offer consumers assistance and services in a timely and effective manner. This relates to how to keep clients informed, such as how long they will have to wait, ready to respond to their needs, and willing to respond to questions they may have.

4. Assurance, which is when in order to acquire clients’ trust in the service firm, staff must have the knowledge and capacity to assist them.

5. Empathy, which is individual attention to each client, demonstrating regard for the customer’s wants or aspirations. Since each consumer is unique and varied, they have distinct requirements. As a result, organizations should deliver personalized services to customers based on their specific requirements.
This approach identifies the service organization’s service quality gap, which is the fifth gap of Parasuraman et al.’s (1985, 1988) model, from the initial service expectation to the actual service delivery. In this study, service quality is evaluated by considering the actual experience of customer perceptions.

Kotler (2008) asserted that the price equals the total of all the benefits offered by the consumer to possess or utilize a product or service. Furthermore, the price might be understood as the amount of money (plus a few optional goods) needed to obtain the specified quantity of items, a mix of products and services (Swastha & Irawan, 2005). Price perception refers to consumers’ estimations of the value of money (monetary) and other costs incurred to obtain a good (Petrick, 2004). Price acts as a crucial component of consumers’ “monetary value perception” and serves as their external cue. Additionally, a customer’s emotional response to getting a product might be a positive or negative indicator of how they should behave, and this is referred to as pricing perception (Lichtenstein et al., 1993). Due to how simple it is to utilize the Internet or mobile devices to find out how much anything costs, more and more consumers are becoming price aware (Kim et al., 2020). For example, many customers on a tight budget are attracted by affordable prices (Chua et al., 2015).

Repurchase intention refers to a person’s decision to repurchase a good or service after using it (Hellier et al., 2003). Consumers who opt to employ the same company’s services after purchasing, have a repurchase intention (McDougall & Levesque, 2000; William, 2002). Conceptually, repurchases are actual acts, whereas repurchase intentions are a customer’s decision to purchase from the same store or supplier in the future (Hume et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2011). The consumers’ intentions to repurchase are determined by their assessment of the service quality obtained (Zhang et al., 2011; Liu & Lee, 2016). Consumers will repurchase services if the evaluation of service quality surpasses their expectations; conversely, if the evaluation of service quality falls short of their expectations, the result will be the opposite (Laroche et al., 2004). Customers’ repurchase intentions have also received much attention from researchers. Researchers have talked about the significant returns of consumers’ repurchase intentions. Ahmed et al. (2011) identified customers’ repurchase intentions as a source of cost savings and market share expansion.

The study aims to determine the effect of perceived service quality (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and network quality) on customers’ repurchase intention. In addition, it assesses the customers’ price perception of the internet service and its impact on their repurchase intention.

1.1. Perceived service quality, price perception, and customers’ repurchase intention

Perceived service quality is a predictor of intention to repurchase (Dlai et al., 2014). Many studies measured service quality and its effect on customers’ repurchase intention. For example, I. Mensah and R. Mensah (2018) analyzed the University of Cape Coast Campus restaurants in Ghana. The results revealed that perceived service quality directly affects customers’ repurchase intention. Dlačić et al. (2014) reported the same results assessing undergraduate students in two countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia). In addition, a high service quality level leads customers to repurchase intentions (Srivastava & Sharma, 2013). Phuong and Trang (2018) focused on the smartphone-based ride-hailing service in Vietnam. According to the study, perceived service quality significantly increases the chances of repurchasing.

Understanding consumer price perceptions of products and services is critical for company management, especially when drawing customers’ attention and influencing purchasing decisions (Juhaeri, 2018). Institutions must use a price that fits the quality perceived by customers; also, evaluating the price every period is needed. Mirza and Ali (2017) sought to determine the relationship between service quality and price perception; the results showed a positive relationship between the two. Moreover, Liu and Lee (2016) analyzed the airline sector and revealed that service quality has a positive direct impact on customers’ price perception (monetary price and behavior price).
When a customer has a favorable price perception, it benefits his or her repurchase intentions (Alford & Biswas, 2002). According to Liu and Lee (2016), price perceptions can enhance repurchase intentions. Juhaeri (2018), Rohwiyati and Prapiestrinri (2019), Mirza and Ali (2017), Munnukka (2008), Liu and Lee (2015), Yasri et al. (2020), Petrick (2004), and Ladhari et al. (2019) agreed that price perception plays a significant role and affects customers’ repurchase intention.

Therefore, the hypotheses of the study are formulated as follows:

H1: Perceived service quality (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and network quality) has a positive direct impact on customers’ repurchase intention.

H2: Perceived service quality (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and network quality) has a positive direct impact on price perception.

H3: Price perception has a positive direct impact on customers’ repurchase intention.

H4: Price perception mediates the relationship between perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention.

This study aims to measure the service quality of the internet service providers in Jordan, and evaluate the impact of perceived service quality on consumers’ intention to make additional purchases, as well as the function of price perception as a mediator variable.

2. METHODOLOGY

In order to achieve the aim of the current study, a quantitative technique using a questionnaire as a research tool was used. The population in this study were customers that have Internet contracts with different Internet service providers in Amman, the capital of Jordan, using a sample of 405 customers. The paper used a snowball sampling technique (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). The data were collected using a Google Forms questionnaire on social media platforms. The tool of the current study uses 3 scales to measure the relationships between the variables. The service quality scale is adapted from Parasuraman et al. (1988) and Harfoush et al. (2018); it contains a 7-point Likert scale. The scale of repurchase intention is adapted from Tarofder et al. (2016), and the price perception scale uses Yasri et al. (2020), also employing a Likert scale.

The questionnaire is divided into six parts. The first part includes a brief introduction of the questionnaire, the second part contains questions about perceived service quality (27 items), the third part is relevant to the price perception of customers (3 items), the fourth part represents customers’ repurchase intention (4 items), while the last part is demographic questions. The items of the model applied in the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A, Table A1.

3. RESULTS

Utilizing factor analysis, tolerance, and the variance inflation factor (VIF), the data were examined to assess the hypotheses (Hair et al., 2006) as the two most popular measures for analyzing multicollinearity, correlation, regression analysis, and path analysis. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 and Amos v25 were used to analyze and interpret the data.

Table 1 describes the respondents’ demographic data; it includes gender, age, Internet service provider, educational level, occupation, and period of subscription.

The service quality construct contains seven variables: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and network quality. The service quality construct was measured using a total of 27 items. In the current study, the values of VIF are more than 5, and for most items, they are more than 10. This indicates high multicollinearity; the study used factor analysis to solve this issue. Reducing dimensionality, or factor analysis, is the process of reducing a large number of measured and observable variables to a smaller number of unobservable latent varia-
bles that share a common variance (Bartholomew et al., 2011). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test measures whether the construct is suitable for EFA (Yong & Pearce, 2013). The KMO rate must be greater than 0.50. The better the data set for factor analysis, the higher the rate (Kalaycı, 2005). The analysis shows the results of the Bartlett test and the KMO test on the service quality scale. The data set might be suitable for factor analysis because the KMO value (0.979) is higher than 0.50.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis

| Demographic profile | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| **Gender**          |           |            |
| Male                | 166       | 41%        |
| Female              | 239       | 59%        |
| Total               | 405       | 100%       |
| **Age**             |           |            |
| 18-25 years         | 42        | 10.4%      |
| 26-33 years         | 72        | 17.8%      |
| 34-40 years         | 145       | 35.8%      |
| More than 40        | 146       | 36.0%      |
| Total               | 405       | 100%       |
| **Educational level** |         |            |
| Secondary school and less | 18   | 4.4%     |
| Diploma¹             | 43        | 10.6%      |
| Bachelor             | 255       | 63%        |
| Postgraduate²        | 89        | 22%        |
| Total                | 405       | 100%       |
| **Occupation**       |           |            |
| Public sector employee | 73  | 18%       |
| Private sector employee | 201 | 49%      |
| Day laborer          | 9         | 2.2%       |
| Self-employment      | 40        | 9.9%       |
| Unemployed           | 82        | 20.2%      |
| Total                | 405       | 100%       |
| **Internet service provider** | | |
| Zain                 | 133       | 32.8%      |
| Orange               | 152       | 37.5%      |
| Umniyah              | 80        | 19.8%      |
| AlMutakamila         | 8         | 2.0%       |
| Mada                 | 10        | 2.5%       |
| Almawared            | 10        | 2.5%       |
| Etisalat             | 5         | 1.2%       |
| Damamax              | 7         | 1.7%       |
| Total                | 405       | 100%       |
| **Period of subscription** | | |
| Less than 1 year     | 35        | 8.6%       |
| 1-5 years            | 211       | 52.1%      |
| More than 5 years    | 159       | 39.3%      |
| Total                | 405       | 100%       |

Note: 1 – In Middle Eastern Arab countries, a diploma degree means studying two years before studying for a bachelor’s degree; those who got low marks in secondary school apply for this degree. 2 – Master’s and Ph.D. degrees together.

To support the strength of the factors, factor analysis was performed with 1 as the Eigenvalue. To determine the scale’s factor structure, EFA is carried out using a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with the Varimax rotation approach. One factor was removed when the rotation converged during their rounds. The extracted factor was the perceived quality of the service. In addition, the measure is significant, equal to 0.000.

Table 2. Rotated component matrix

| No.  | Item                | Factor loadings |
|------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 1    | Responsiveness 3    | 0.943           |
| 2    | Responsiveness 2    | 0.940           |
| 3    | Empathy 4           | 0.935           |
| 4    | Reliability 3       | 0.932           |
| 5    | Empathy 5           | 0.931           |
| 6    | Responsiveness 4    | 0.930           |
| 7    | Empathy 2           | 0.930           |
| 8    | Reliability 4       | 0.928           |
| 9    | Responsiveness 1    | 0.928           |
| 10   | Reliability 2       | 0.923           |
| 11   | Assurance 3         | 0.918           |
| 12   | Assurance 4         | 0.918           |
| 13   | Tangibility 2       | 0.917           |
| 14   | Communication 3      | 0.914           |
| 15   | Empathy 3           | 0.914           |
| 16   | Reliability 1       | 0.911           |
| 17   | Tangibility 1       | 0.908           |
| 18   | Network quality 1   | 0.902           |
| 19   | Tangibility 4       | 0.894           |
| 20   | Communication 1      | 0.892           |
| 21   | Assurance 1         | 0.882           |
| 22   | Tangibility 3       | 0.876           |
| 23   | Empathy 1           | 0.876           |
| 24   | Assurance 2         | 0.872           |
| 25   | Reliability 5       | 0.868           |
| 26   | Communication 2      | 0.867           |
| 27   | Network quality 2   | 0.812           |

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 2 illustrates the rotated component matrix, the analysis extracted a one-factor solution, with Eigenvalues above one, which explains 82.167% of the total variance. It is observed that all items have high loading above 0.30, the lowest loading value is 0.812, and the highest one is 0.943. This result emphasizes what the literature review mentioned about the importance of the service quality model created by Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988).

The reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha test. According to Hair et al. (2007), reliability
is sufficient if a Cronbach’s alpha value is between 0.60 and 0.70. A Cronbach’s alpha value between 0.70 and 0.80 indicates strong reliability. Table 3 shows the constructs’ reliability values, ranging from 0.853 for price perception to 0.991 for perceived service quality, which means the questionnaire is highly reliable.

Table 3. Reliability test

| Constructs            | Cronbach’s alpha | Number of items |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Perceived service quality | 0.991            | 27              |
| Price perception      | 0.853            | 3               |
| Customers’ repurchase intention | 0.942            | 4               |

The correlation coefficients between the variables are shown in Table 4. The relationships between the independent, mediated, and dependent variables were ascertained with correlation analysis. The direction, magnitude, and significance were shown using Pearson’s correlation coefficient. Based on the results, the Pearson’s correlations of the variables are positive, perceived service quality has a moderate positive correlation with price perception ($r = 0.612, p < 0.01$) and with customers’ repurchase intention ($r = 0.545, p < 0.01$). Moreover, price perception has a strong positive correlation with customers’ repurchase intention ($r = 0.747, p < 0.01$).

Table 4. Correlations

| Variables              | Perceived service quality | Price perception | Customers’ repurchase intention |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Perceived service quality |                           |                  |                                 |
| Pearson Correlation    | 1                         | 0.612***         | 0.545***                        |
| Sig. (2-tailed)        |                           | 0.000            | 0.000                           |
| N                      | 405                       | 405              | 405                             |
| Price perception       |                           |                  |                                 |
| Pearson Correlation    | 0.612***                  | 1                | 0.747***                        |
| Sig. (2-tailed)        | 0.000                     | 0.000            |                                |
| N                      | 405                       | 405              | 405                             |
| Customers’ repurchase intention |                 |                  |                                 |
| Pearson Correlation    | 0.545***                  | 0.747***         | 1                               |
| Sig. (2-tailed)        | 0.000                     | 0.000            |                                |
| N                      | 405                       | 405              | 405                             |

Note: *** significant at 0.001 level.

Table 5. Regression results (perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention)

| Model                     | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|
| (Constant)                | 3.584                       | 0.040                      | 88.844| 0.000|                         |
| Perceived service quality | 0.527                       | 0.040                      | 13.051| 0.000| Tolerance: 1.000        |

Note: a. Dependent variable: Customers’ repurchase intention.
of pricing considerably affect their intention to repurchase. Furthermore, the p-value is less than 0.05, suggesting that customers’ perception of pricing predicts their propensity to repurchase. Thus, the third hypothesis is verified.

The present study employed the computer program AMOS (v.25) to evaluate the mediation hypothesis (H4). In addition, the paper used path analysis to examine the impact of price perception as a mediator variable on perceived service quality and consumers’ intent to repurchase.

The study model, which relates to perceived service quality, perceived pricing, and customers’ intention to make more purchases, is explained in Figure 1.

Table 8 illustrates the regression weights and mediation effect of the study variables.

The research model’s overall fit indices were acceptable (NFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.660). According to Hooper et al. (2008), values of NFI and CFI greater than 0.95 are acceptable and indicate a good model fit.

The SEM results support the study hypotheses, which are presented in Table 8. The results support the hypothesis that perceived service quality has a positive and significant impact on price perception (p <= 0.001). The estimation value is 0.597, which means that for every unit increase in perceived service quality, there is a 0.597 increase in price perception. Additionally, customers’ propensity to make another purchase is influenced by perceived service quality (p <= 0.001, 0.136). Moreover, with an estimated value of 0.655 and a p-value of significant at 0.001, price perception considerably impacts customers’ intention to re-
purchase, serving as a significant predictor of such intention. Also, the results revealed that price perception has a partial mediation impact on the relationship between perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention. The SEM findings thus support the four hypotheses.

The goals of the current study were to pinpoint the effect of perceived service quality on consumers’ repurchase intentions, as well as to assess customers’ price perceptions of Internet services and their impact on repurchase intentions. In addition, it determined whether price perception mediates the influence of perceived service quality on repurchase intention.

The study findings revealed that perceived service quality significantly affects customers’ repurchase intention; the p-value of perceived service quality is 0.000, which means perceived service quality predicts the customers’ repurchase intention. Additionally, according to the findings, perceived service quality impacts perceived price, and perceived pricing is a powerful predictor of customers’ propensity to make additional purchases.

In the context of the Internet service sector in Amman, H4 postulates that pricing perception mediates the relationship between perceived service quality and customers’ propensity to repurchase. Results show that the parameter estimate of the relationship between perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention after adding price perception as mediating variable is reduced (estimation = 0.136, p < 0.001). This means that price perception partially mediates perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention. These results align with Dimyati and Subagio (2016), Leonnard et al. (2017), Rohwiyati and Prahastiningrin (2019), Bao (2015), Mirza and Ali (2017), and Dlačić et al. (2014).

CONCLUSION

The current study was conducted to assess the service quality of the Internet service providers in Jordan and its relationship with the customers’ repurchase intention and price perception. The statistical results confirmed the four hypotheses proposed in the model. In addition, the results indicated that perceived service quality with its seven dimensions (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and network quality) and price perception were the key determinants affecting customers’ repurchase intention.

Furthermore, price perception was a significant mediator between perceived service quality and customers’ repurchase intention. In other words, tools, physical facilities, workers, contact materials that enhance the service and the capacity to give promised services accurately and convincingly, assisting and giving services to customers in a timely and efficient manner are vital. Moreover, having the knowledge and capacity to assist customers, giving individual attention to each client, demonstrating regard for the customer’s wants or aspirations, good communication with customers, and the quality of Internet service are points that can predict the price perception and repurchase intention of customers.

While the study focuses on the Internet service sector in Jordan, some limitations should be pointed out. First, the sample of the study is people who live in Amman. Future studies can take into consideration other cities within and outside the country. In addition, future studies can compare Internet service providers because customers may have different opinions depending on the company.
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### Table A1. The questionnaire items

| Item code | Item |
|-----------|------|
| **Tangibility** | |
| Tangibility 1 | The company has advanced and modern facilities (including IT). |
| Tangibility 2 | The company’s headquarters is attractive, clean, and comfortable for customers. |
| Tangibility 3 | The company’s employees have a decent and good appearance. |
| Tangibility 4 | Materials related to provided services (phone bills, publications, company website, etc.) are visually appealing, understandable, and accessible. |
| **Reliability** | |
| Reliability 1 | The company’s employees promise to do something and do so. |
| Reliability 2 | The company’s employees show sincere intention to solve your problems. |
| Reliability 3 | The company’s employees perform service right the first time. |
| Reliability 4 | The company’s employees do their job at the time promised. |
| Reliability 5 | The company’s employees perform their duties with limited mistakes and maintain error-free records. |
| **Responsiveness** | |
| Responsiveness 1 | The company’s employees tell exactly when services will be done. |
| Responsiveness 2 | The company’s employees give prompt service to you without delay. |
| Responsiveness 3 | The company’s employees are willing to help. |
| Responsiveness 4 | The company’s employees respond to the student’s requests all the time. |
| **Assurance** | |
| Assurance 1 | The company maintains the confidentiality of customer information. |
| Assurance 2 | The company’s employees are consistently polite to you. |
| Assurance 3 | I feel safe and confident when dealing with the company. |
| Assurance 4 | I feel that employees are fully supported by their management to perform their work in the best way. |
| **Empathy** | |
| Empathy 1 | The company’s operating hours are convenient. |
| Empathy 2 | The company’s employees give you individual attention. |
| Empathy 3 | The company’s employees have your best interests at heart. |
| Empathy 4 | The company’s employees understand your specific needs. |
| Empathy 5 | The interests of customers are at the forefront of the company’s priorities. |
| **Communication** | |
| Communication 1 | The company’s employees answer your inquiries over the phone or via social media. |
| Communication 2 | The company constantly informs its customers about the service offers provided. |
| Communication 3 | The company inquires and follows up on complaints submitted. |
| **Network quality** | |
| Network quality 1 | The internet service provided by the company is of good quality and speed. |
| Network quality 2 | The company compensates when the internet service is interrupted. |
| **Price perception** | |
| Price perception 1 | For me, the price of the company’s Internet service is low. |
| Price perception 2 | The benefits I get from the Internet service are equivalent to or even better than the money I pay. |
| Price perception 3 | The price of the Internet service reflects its quality. |
| **Customers’ repurchase intention** | |
| Repurchase intention 1 | I will continue buying Internet services from the same company over the next few years. |
| Repurchase intention 2 | In the near future, I will buy the Internet service from the same company again. |
| Repurchase intention 3 | If I had a choice, I would choose the same internet service provider. |
| Repurchase intention 4 | In the future, I intend to use services from the same internet service provider. |