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ABSTRACT
The mobile industry is characterised by strong competition and continuous promotions from service providers who compete to offer better services than their competitors. This results to customers switching between mobile service providers. This paper seeks to uncover the reason customers switching their mobile network service providers. The relevant data to this study was obtained through the review of literature for secondary data, as well as primary data gathered through questionnaires in Gaborone city. A sample size of 154 of 250 targeted. Result showed that the propensity to switch is influenced by a variety of factors; some are customer service satisfaction factors while others are market related factors. Service performance factors such as network rollout, quality service, cost of calling, among other have an effect on propensity to switch. At the same time the market factors such as completion, network failures and policy on cross network number mobility do influence the switching. The propensity to switch and the determining factors are different between male and female for switching between mobile network service providers.
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INTRODUCTION
Customer satisfaction factors play a big role in the retention, profit and growth. Research has shown that the customer switching cost is organisational a lot in terms of profit. Zauberman, (2003), Oyeniyi., Abiodun., (2010), and Reichheld and Sasser, (1990) noted that reducing customer defections by five per cent has potential of increasing profit by seventy five per cent and reduce negative impact on profitability. Africa has the highest cell phone growth of over 50% (Singh, 2009) with a larger number of new entrants in the market and thus high Cell phone mobile switching behaviour is common. The growth of mobile telephony has increased tremendously in the last ten years (about 650 million subscribers) and more than 50% per year, the highest in the world.

The need to ensure customer satisfaction emanates from understanding and improving customer service, which leads to loyalty, retention and profitability. The motivation for understanding and improving loyalty stems from the empirically validated links between loyalty, retention and profitability (Reich, Held and Sasser, 1990, and Serenko, 2006). Lack of customer satisfaction leads to switching. Studies carried out have looked into brandswitching looking at the various factors such as price and quality of services or products, which lead to customer switching behaviour. However studies on mobile phone network service provider switching looking at the unique characteristics of the industry are not yet well explored especially in the African context and non-carried out in Botswana. This paper therefore looks at the unique market and customer satisfaction factors that can lead into the service provider switching behaviour.

Botswana cell phone industry
Botswana rapidly developing and fast growing mobile phone network industry, it has three competitive service providers. The success of the first two providers Mascom and Orange later on led to the Botswana telecommunications deciding to enter into the mobile phone industry by setting up the be-Mobile network. The arrival of be-Mobile as a mobile network services heightened the intense competition in the small mobile phone industry. The intense competition has resulted into customers either having additional mobile network line or switching from Orange and Mascom to be-Mobile and vice versa.

It is therefore necessary for the industry to understand the factors behind brand switching, since as noted by Omotayo . & Abiodun, (2008), the customer satisfaction alone does not guarantee the loyalty and as such try to understand why an individual who has been using a particular service providersuddenly switch to the other one. Unlike most countries, Botswana mobile phone industry have not yet adopted a policy on cross network number mobility, which may have an effect on customer lock-ins.

Objective of the paper
Botswana market has limited population of 2.03 million (Majelantle, 2011), this limits the number of cell phones that can be sold as well as the service volume provided. The number of customers divided amongst three services provider means limited profit. For the organisations to survive they have to be aggressive in marketing activities especially advertising and sales promotion, this has resulted in customer switching from one provider to another resulting into reduced profitability. The main objective of this paper therefore was to looks into the factors behind brand switching, the propensity to switch looking at the demographics. The specific objectives are

• To find out the propensity to switch mobile network service provider in Botswana
• To find factors behind switching a mobile network service provider
• To find out switching behaviour by demographics

**Background Information**

In 1966 Botswana’s government established a single post and telecommunication thus combining the regulatory functions and decision making functions. However this created as state of monopoly as indicated by Lekaukau, (1997) that there was little competition in providing services, limited participation by private sectors, no transparency in decision-making and lack of opportunity for consumers to voice their concerns. In 1980 parliament act established Botswana Telecommunication Corporations splitting it from the postal services. Datapro, (1998) reported that when BTC was formed it inherited a customer base of 6500 subscriber’s lines, no pay phones and 175 telex subscribers. The BTC amendment act of 1996 allowed the introduction of competition thus abolishing the monopoly. The implementation gave birth to the formation of Botswana Telecommunication Authority which subsequently issued two licences two mobile network operators; Mascom wireless and Orange Botswana (previously Vista). Mascom was the first mobile network to be licenced in 1998 with a simply strategy to achieve rapid market penetration, its emphasis was being a first move. They believed this could provide them with lasting market share advantage. According to Couceiro (2008), Mascom had penetration of 82% with a market share leader of more than 60% and offering 2.5G country wide as well as an intention to launch 3G/HSPDA in Gaborone (which they are offering currently).

Orange Botswana was the second to be licenced which BTC offer in 1998, it was known as Vista cellular (pty) ltd; which at the time faced management and promotional difficulties. However Harry ward (2000) estimated the customer base to be at more than 50 000. In March of 2008 BTC/BTA launched cellular network be-Mobile which is based on the support of the BTC/BTA. It has since grown into a competitive player in the mobile industry, with its unique offerings such as be-free where subscribers use a certain amount of airtime and get reward by earning very minutes over the weekend.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Researchers have taken various approaches to customer brand switching with various reason being attributed for switching. According to Bass, (1974), Brand switching phenomenon has long been of interest to marketing researchers at modelling brand switching behaviour and providing a useful representation of the influence past purchase on current purchase. The interest in brand switching has continued to evolve over the years with different researchers explaining various reasons. In recent years studies continued to be carried out in relation to brand switching looking at the various factors such as demographics especially age and brand switching, see Karani, & Fraccastoro, (2010), Lee (2011) looked into the dynamic pricing and brand switching, while Serenko, (2006) and Omotayo & Abiodun, (2010), looked into the customer satisfaction as a factor in the brand switching.

While Oyeniyi, Abiodun (2010) noted that the barriers to switching such as the lack of crossing over with numbers and the cost involved in the possibility of loosing and informing the contacts in the process of switching played a major role in switching mobile phone networks in Nigeria, Sathish et al (2011) noted that call rates play the most important role in switching the service provider followed by network coverage, value added service, while consumer care and advertisement plays the least important role in India. They also noted that there is a relation between switching the service provider and the factors (Customer service, service problem, usage cost, etc.). This indicated that the market environment factors play a role in the mobile network switching factors.

Researcher identified several factors that lead to brand switching in the mobile network. Among the factors are the customer satisfaction factors and the market factors. The market factors will affect the customer and drive the possibility of switching, irrespective of the service quality and satisfaction while the satisfactions may dissuade the customer from switching. (Karani, and Fraccastoro, 2010, Lee, 2011, Serenko, 2006 and Omotayo and Abiodun, 2010). Thus the propensity to switch is dependent on the interplay of the two set of factors and not one or two particular factors. At the same time the satisfaction factors are subject to the market factors, while organisations pray a role in influencing the market factors.

**Switching Model**

- **Propensity to switch**
  - **Satisfaction factors**
    - Company ethics,
    - services
    - performance and quality
    - price
    - network rollout(coverage)
    - empathy
    - freebees and bonuses
  - **Market factors**
    - Sales promotion
    - Advertising
    - Customer dissatisfaction
    - Switching cost
    - No of networks
    - No customers in market leader
    - Competition
    - Regulation framework
SATISFACTION FACTORS

Service Quality and Performance
The standard of quality and performance of the service can be instrumental in switching; subscribers need to be able to call customer lines and get adequate help. They do want to be put on an eternal hold. Customer’s assistance help lines need to provide subscribers swift assistance, they need to be guaranteed that should problems arise with their accounts, they will find assistance. A service provided ought to meet customers’ needs and expectations in order for it to lead to satisfaction. If a service falls below customer expectations this is deemed to be a product failure, this involves mistakes, billing errors and services misfortunes such as network failures and signal interruptions. Lee, R., (2011) attributed switching to technical service quality and functionality of service quality.

Company Ethics
A code of conduct that defines what is right or wrong in business practices. This states the way a mobile network service provider handles subscriber’s accounts, confidential information about customers among other privileged information. If the code of conduct of a network provider does not match those the customers this conflict in ethics can lead to switching. Keaveney, (1995) indicated that customers prefer companies that they deem to be involved in ethical practices and tend to find satisfaction in dealing with such companies. However, sometimes the customer and the provider can have a clash in relation to ethics, the provider can behave in a way the customer deems an unethical hence prompting them to switch to a more ethical provider. Unethical problems include unethical behaviour such selling or sharing confidential information including telephone numbers without their permissions, hiking the price and unsolicited marketing. Unhealthy practices and conflicts may result in switching.

Services
This is what the mobile network provider offers its subscribers; it includes service offerings such as quick recharge, -free-bes, where subscribers get free minutes during the weekend. They is newly introduced my Mascom my Zaka and Orange money- these two allows subscribers transfer money via their mobile phones. As well as the internet connections mobile phones. Services would include all the promises that a mobile network provider offers to its subscribers.

Price
Cost of acquiring a service, this include the cost of obtaining a Simcard, call rates-the amount charge for a call per minute, messaging rates- the cost of sending a text message, multimedia messages, internet charges. All these costs play a role in switching, if the cost of replacing a lost Simcard is high in one particular provider the subscriber may switch if they can find a cheaper Simcard elsewhere. Subscribers compare the charges made during a call, the rates affect they staying decision (Karani, & Fracassoto, 2010 and Lee, 2011) Customers are continually looking for lower call rates and messaging charges. Research has shown that the cost of using a service measured in monetary terms, time or effort the customer has to put is essentially to customer satisfaction. Customers are satisfied if they perceive the price as being equivalent/below the benefits they obtain from the service. This has been the most common factor behind switching amongst researchers. The linear learning model by Lilien, (1974) pointed price as a determinant of brand switching; the model implies that price is an integral part in brand switching. Keaveney, (1995) stated that price is one of the top reasons for customers to switch a brand. Customers were shown to switch when price exceeding internal price references. If customers perceive prices to be unfair or greatly exceeding the quota prices they are likely to switch. This is to say they compare new increased price with prior prices thus switching if the switching cost is lower. In terms of a mobile phone network provider this includes call rates, peak rates as well as Simcard prices. In moving from the general to the specific Lee, (2011) investigated the determinants that cause mobile phone customers to transit from being loyal to switching. They found out that there is a variety of reasons/ factors which cause customers to switch, their findings were complementary to those found in Keaveney, (1995). They stated that price is the most prominent factor behind switching.

Network Rollout
This is the network coverage that is how far in terms of places is the network accessible. Subscribers need to be able to still have network access in the rural areas and home villages. If subscriber has no network coverage in the rural areas and home villages they are likely to switch to a competing provider if it has coverage.

MARKET ORIENTED FACTORS
The other set factors are the market factors that lead to brand switching. Jackson, (1985) termed this factors as the switching factors. This include the

Switching Cost
Jackson, (1985) defined switching cost as the psychological, physical and economic costs a customer faces in changing a supplier. Jackson’s definition shows that switching costs are multi-faceted especially in the mobile network industry. For instance when switching to another service provider the customer has to incur the cost of informing the previous contacts of a change in number and acquiring new numbers. Furthermore there is the cost of breaking long established relationships with the provider that the customer is leaving as well as familiarising oneself with the new provider to whom the switch was made and learning all the procedures. For example Mascom, Orange and be-mobile all have different recharging and balancing checking procedures therefore switching to either one of them requires learning something new which is a cost.

Marketing Efforts
Marketing Efforts of the competitors, especially the sales promotions has been one of the areas of interest to researchers in its influence on brand switching. Sales promotion has a positive influence on customers’ behaviours such as brand switching, stock-piling, purchase acceleration, product trial and spending large amounts (Shi, Cheung, & Prendergast, 2005) Other findings indicated that majority of sales promotion elasticity (approximately 74%) is linked to brand switching as pointed out by van Heedel (2003). The promotional activities of the three mobile network operators affect one
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another. For instance Mascom has the call-more promotion, where they sell Simcards preloaded with airtime and special offer for calling more. These offers can tempt non-Mascom users to switch. Subscribers are drawn to special offers and seek offers that are better and suit them most.

**Competition**

In their findings Morgan, (1994) stated that there is a strong impact of the special deal on customers brand switching; when customers are made a special offer of another brand that is better that is better than what they are getting currently this can trigger switching. This implied that often times customers switch because the competition/competing brand offers a better package if the competing provider offers more than what the subscriber is currently getting this is likely to trigger switching.

**Number of Customers in Market Leader**

Subscribers in the market leader can switch seeking to experience what the other networks have to offer. Some switch because their contacts are in a particular provider.

**Advertising**

Brand switching being a wide concept researcher have also been interested in how advertising plays into customer brand switching, studies on advertising and brand switching dates back to 1961 when Lavidge & Steiner, (1961) investigated the purpose of advertising relating it to the switching behaviour of customer. The study revealed that the purpose can be classified into either short-term- where the aim is attract more customers and boost sales or Long-term- where the aim was to provide information and distinguish brands. However they could not provide a define answers as to where did the increment in sales come from but they had paved a way forward for other researchers. McAlister & Pessemier, (1982) stated that several factors in influencing brand switching: "marketing variables such as price, product design, promotion and distribution" and "situational variables". Carpenter & Lehmann,(1985) designed a model aimed at analyzing the relation between the marketing mix, brand switching and competition. Their model investigated how the marketing mix elements function and how they work in influencing brand switching; the findings indicated that price, promotion and advertising have both a negative and positive impacts in brand switching. They argued that Advertising can stimulate customers to buy products whilst also passing information of price consciousness which may increase brand switching. Deighton, Henderson, & Neslin, (1994), revealed that the increment in sales volume came largely from brand switching rather than repeat purchase. They stated that advertising impacts more on new customers or potentials than it does on those who already bought the product, the basis of their argument was that potentials are more responsive to an advertisement than the current users of a product who already have their service encounters and had already formed an opinion based on their interaction with the provider. Many other researchers that had been carried out before collaborated Henderson, & Neslin, (1994)'s findings, Raj, (1982) and McDonald (1970) all had found a positive relationship between advertising and brand switching. Their results indicated that a higher switching rate existed if a customer had more chances of seeing an advertisement that promoted an alternative brand. However some researchers hold contrary views to the above researchers’ findings. Ehrenberg, (2000), stated that advertising’s main role is to reinforce feelings of satisfaction with brands already bought. Ehrenberg was not alone as not alone on these views researchers such as Simon, (1980); Tellis, (1988) had previously implied that advertising only reinforces repeat purchase behaviour and does not create brand switching. They viewed advertising messages as having a stronger impact on customer who are already using the product and are familiar with it.

**Regulatory framework**

That allows the crossing over with the numbers (Oyeniyi, Abiodun,2010) facilitate the switching . At the same time the facilitation of banking services may either open or lock customers to network provider depending on the type of services and the sensitivity to security issues. However for this to happened government policies and regulations need to be put in place. It is thus evident from the literature that the switching propensity is dependent of the two set of factors.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

In the past six months subscribers have switched mobile network providers and this research design allowed for the formulation of hypothesis which attempted to show the relation between variables being measured. Furthermore the study measured Perceptions of Mobile network users thus an experience survey was more suitable to understand why the subscribers switched providers. The experience survey allowed me to obtain information from key informants, which are the subscribers themselves who are more knowledgeable on the area of switching. The link that subscribers have with the network providers as well as being in position to switch makes them a great source.

The study was based in Gaborone; mobile users were randomly sampled as the respondents. For as long as an individual had working cellular-phone they qualified to respond to the questionnaire, regardless of gender, age or any other demographic this on its own broadened the scope and number of potential respondents. The sample size was 150, this number was selected based on the time constraint that i had to gather data and analyze it. Primary data was gathered using a structured-undisguised questionnaire with a Likert scale. The number of respondents that returned questionnaire were 154 of 200 expected of which male respondent was about 51% is greater than females 49%. 60.8% the respondents are between the ages of 18-25 while 33.8% were above 25 whilst only 5.4% were below the age of 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Demographic Information
Propensity to Switch Looking At the Satisfaction Factors

When coding1 represented a high score whilst 5 the lowest score thus a score closer to one indicated a higher score was allocated to a variable whilst a high score indicated the variable was rated lower. Most respondents agreed that they use their current network provider due to the quality and performance of service offered, thus quality and performance of the service are indicated as the main satisfaction factors that keep subscribers in a network provider with the lowest mean of 2.11.

The respondents indicated that the reason why they stick with the current service network provider is due to the satisfaction they derive from the services with a mean of 1.11. This implied that respondents were satisfied with the current network providers' and that the performance and quality of the network providers matches or exceeds their expectations. The level of sales promotion has the second lowest mean of 2.32, and the freebie 2.57 which was indicate that the customers were more willing to stick with the current network as a result of sales promotions and the freebies given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer satisfaction factors</th>
<th>N 154</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I stick with the current Mobile Services provider due to , quality and performance</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of calling influences which service provider i use</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service provider’s offers do tempt me to switch</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising is influenced me to choose my current service provider</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotions plays role in the service provider a use</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A service provider i use has to engage in behaviour i deem appropriate</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When choosing a network provider i look at Business offers</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available services those providers’ offers (internet/ business packages/ mobile money etc.) are influential in my usage of my current provider</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to switch but it’s too costly</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my friends are using the current service provider</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my current provider due to the reputation of the company</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current Network provider offers me the kind of Coverage i desire</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freebie or bonus are the reason i use my current network provider</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.358</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my service provider because it’s a Market leader</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just like the company Ethics</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of Promotions(sms promoting competition and special) are why i use , my current provider</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Customer satisfaction factors on propensity to switch

Another important element that influence the propensity to switch or not was cost of making a call and sending a message, network coverage and the services provided; with means 1.33, 1.44, and 2.45 respectively. Cost of calling is shown to have more influence over the choice of network, when deciding between the mobile phone networks by the respondents.

The subscriber also focused on the network coverage. Respondents indicated that they are using their current provider due the network coverage rollout 1.44. Cost of switching had the highest mean of 3.46 thus showing the general consensus amongst respondents that switching cost are not a barrier to switching in Botswana, this could perhaps be to the fact that it is easy to obtain a Simcard for any of the three network providers that exist in the industry, the cost is considered to be reasonable.

Respondents also indicated that they do use their current provider due to their friends and family using that same provider at the mean of 2.46 which indicated that the switching could be affected by the family members. It also means that while selecting the network, most of the respondents first looked at who are the friends and family member network provider. This could be due to the implication on the cost of calling as in Botswana the networks offer differential rates for cross network calling.

At the same time the most of the network providers on-net freebies which become useless if the business partners and friends and families on the different network.

The popularity of the organisation and the fact that a provider is perceived to be a market leader as well as the business offers from a provider are indicated to be of little significance to respondents, 3.23, 3.86 respectively. Respondent’s indicated that the behaviour of their current provider, advertising, provider ethics, as well as sms’s promoting all have an influence though it’s not that major.
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MARKET FACTORS ON PROPENSITY TO SWITCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propensity to switch in % N 154 (Factors resulting from market environment)</th>
<th>Guaranteed</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network rollout failure</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call and sms costs increase</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business buyout or mergers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Offers by Competitive network</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Entrants</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and friends switching</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of policy allowing number transfer</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Market factors on propensity to switch

The respondents were likely switch when looking into the factors individually, it is quite clear that network rollout and cost of calling are essential to customers; respondents indicated that switching is guaranteed if network rollout failure occurs and when the competition offers better than what they are currently getting thus is proven true.

Respondents indicated that they are mostly likely to switch when they perceive the cost of making a call or sms as being too high or the network rollout failure due to economic or other factors in the market. Furthermore it is evident that respondents are likely to switch when their business contacts switch, however the switching of family and friends is not likely to push a subscriber to switch network provider. In addition respondents also indicated that they are not likely to switch to a new entrant into the market. However it is shown that subscribers would

Gender Switching Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Network rollout failure</th>
<th>Sms cost and calls</th>
<th>Contacts Switching of</th>
<th>Competitive offers</th>
<th>New entrant</th>
<th>Friends &amp; family switch</th>
<th>Use more than 1 provider</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males have a high propensity to switch than females when there are better competitive offers with 61.3% of males guaranteeing to switch as compared to 38.7% of female. Moreover 54.2% of males guarantee switching when the calling costs are perceived to be high. However both males and females have an equivalent propensity to switch with their major business contacts.

Females have shown to have the highest propensity to using more than one network provider at a time than males, with 71.4% and 28.6% respectively. In addition the table indicated that more females that they are definite to switch than males when network rollout failure occurs, and when family and friends switch. Furthermore females are shown to have a high propensity to switch when a new network provider enters the market with 58.3% guaranteeing switching.

DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS

Research has shown that subscribers to mobile network provider switch based n a variety of reasons depending on what provider they use. Respondents indicated that network rollout failure or its possibility has a major influence on switching; network rollout/coverage equates to quality and performance of the service delivered. This is in line with what (Lee R, 2011) said about quality and performance that if a service falls below customer expectations this is deemed to be a PRODUCT FAILURE, this involves mistakes, billing errors and services misfortunes such as network failures and signal interruptions. Product failures therefore results in customers who are dissatisfied with a high propensity to switch. The cost using the service has also been shown to be a significant factor in subscribers’ switching behaviour, the cost of making a call is vital. Respondents indicated that they have a high propensity to switch when they perceive the price of using a provider as be higher than the benefits of using the provider. Price of using is thus essential as Keaveney, (1995)and Lilien, (1974) indicated in the literature. In was evident that the subscribers can be prompted to switch by what competitors offer, if the competition offers services better that the subscribers current provider subscriber are likely to switch. As Morgan & Dev, (1993) indicated
customer can switch when special offers are made by the competitor that are better than the current provider service customers are have a propensity in pursuit of this better offering. Another switching factor that subscribers look into is the switching of major business contacts, that is if their business contacts switch subscribers pointed out that this increases the likelihood to switch.  

By demographics the analysis shows that females have a high propensity to switch than males, females have shown that they have a high propensity to switch with their friends than males that is females are easily swayed to switch when their friends switch to other providers. Furthermore analysis has shown that females are mostly likely to switch due to network rollout failures than males and have a higher propensity to switch when new network provider enters the market. This could perhaps explain why a high number of females use more than one provider at a time than males do because one could safely assume that with the entrance of a new network females are likely to switch to it en masse.

Family and friends have strong effect in the first selection of network but have lower influence on switching behaviour of subscribers, lower propensity to switch due to family and friends. Although the two set of factors have influence on the consumer network switching behaviour, the market factors seem to have more influence than the customer satisfaction factors. This is looking the likelihood of switching due to network failure, increase in cost of calling and the change of government policy

CONCLUSION
It is conclusive from the research that mobile network providers like any other market is characterized by consumer switching; subscribers are continually moving from one network provider the other. Furthermore this behaviour is influenced by a variety of factors; some are customer satisfaction factors which keep a subscriber loyal to their current provider.

Market factors however do push subscribers to switch. As with every service provided customers interested in the quality and performance of the service. The respondents shown that they have a high likelihood to switch when network rollout failure occurs; it is thus evident that the service quality delivery is essential to subscribers. If the network coverage fails to cover areas that subscribers had anticipated it then the subscribers is likely to find another provider that will meet their needs.

Price is an influential factor to the switching behaviour of subscribers. Subscribers compare the cost against the benefits obtained from the usage of the network provider in terms of the service provided. For a subscriber to continue with their current provider they must perceive the benefits to outweigh the cost that are involved. The subscriber must perceive the benefits of using a network provider to be outweighing the cost of making a call and the general use of the network provider. The freebies and bonuses have shown to be of little effect to guaranteeing loyalty and as such, as long as the perceived benefits are lower than the cost they are likely to have a very low effect on propensity to switch.

Females have a high propensity to switch than males; a higher average percentage of females have shown the intention to switch. Moreover female have shown greater sensitivity to network rollout failure and the switching of friends than males. More females than males are likely to switch when network rollout failure occurs or when their friends switch. In addition females are the one who are drawn more to a new entrant into the market.

It can be concluded that satisfaction is a crucial factor to subscriber’s propensity to switch but at the same time the mobile network providers need to study the market factors for adaptation. It is also clear from the study that the ultimate goal of subscriber is satisfaction and convenient.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY
The study was carried out in Gaborone only and it would have been more conclusive to target the wider area if possible a whole country. The respondents were from the city environment which exposes them to more marketing activities. A study should be accrued out to compare the switching behaviour for both rural and town environments. The mobilebanking inBotswana had just Bennintroduced and this may result to lock-in. A study looking at the switching after the M-banking has been diffused into the market may be necessary as this will have effect of switching propensity.
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