

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Introduction

The last chapter discusses about the conclusion of the research findings. Next, this chapter will discuss about the managerial implication to tell what management should do to overcome and avoid consumer confusion dimensions effect on word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction. Afterward, part of this chapter discusses about limitation of research during conducting the research. The last part discusses about the suggestions for the next research.

5.2. Conclusions

This present research has presented issue of how consumer confusion proneness effect word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction in Indonesia smartphone market. Then, form nine hypotheses, five hypotheses were supported. Afterward, the finding indicates that similarity and overload confusion have significant negative impact on word of mouth, trust, and consumer satisfaction. On the other hand, ambiguity confusion has insignificant impact on word of mouth, trust, and consumer satisfaction. Therefore, confusion dimensions that affect word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction are similarity confusion and overload confusion.

5.2.1. Similarity Confusion

Similarity confusion has significant negative impact on word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction. Similar Confusion can be happened when the consumers face me-too products or parity products or similar product. Whenever consumers deal with similarity confusion, they may find difficulty in differentiating the look-alike product and they cannot evaluate the products satisfactorily.

Additionally, when the consumers bought the wrong product, it could create negative consumption experience and it drove consumers dissatisfied with the bad experience. Then as the impact, it induces the decreasing of word of mouth activities since they feel reluctant or embarrassed to share their negative experience. Then, their trust decreases because they cannot make sure the right product. Therefore, the higher similarity confusion induces the lower consumers are involved in word of mouth activities, the lower consumers trust and the higher consumer dissatisfaction.

5.2.2. Overload Confusion

Overload confusion has significant negative impact on word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction. This situation caused by overload confusion is problem that comes from much Information accepted and processed by consumes. Consumers find difficulty to process all information, then, consumers decreased their activity to do word of mouth because they can be saturated to evaluate the information. Next, much information drives the consumers to not trust all information from the manufactures or sales person about the product that will be

bought. They do so because they get confused and do not know which the right information to be trusted. Hence, the higher overload confusion, the lower consumers are involved in word of mouth activities and also the lower consumer trust.

Subsequently, consumers can be dissatisfied from the overload information. Overload information leads them buying wrong product or postpone their purchasing as the impact. The impact of their dissatisfaction is caused by their capacity to hold the information is limited so that they can experience losing information and fading information. Thus, the higher overload confusion, the higher consumer dissatisfaction.

5.3. Managerial Implications

Consumer's confusion is an issue that should be concerned by manufactures. Sometimes manufactures only focus intensively on how to get the product sold and producing new products to compete the competitors without thinking about inter-brands different and product information in the market place. Thus, it seems manufactures do not think about the consumer interest, want and needs. They force their marketplace to receive their new products to compete other brands or other manufactures in order to attract the consumer attention. So, no wonder, there are product similarity, overload information and ambiguity information.

This research found that consumer's confusion gives negative consequences for the manufactures. The research result indicates that consumer

confusion drives decreasing of consumer word of mouth activity, trust and satisfaction decreasing. Hence, this research gives insights that consumer behavior should be understood by manufactures. Then, to overcome consumer confusions, marketers can assess their customer by using consumer confusion scale developed to make more informed their decisions. There some suggestions to help manufactures to overcome consumer confusion related to its behavioral consequences, they are:

a. Word of Mouth

In the business world word of mouth has strong impact on consumer purchase behavior (Mowen, 1994). Word of mouth can help to promote the products more effectively. Then, when consumers are involved in less word of mouth activities due to similar products and information overload, it means that the manufactures lose its medium to spread their product information.

Therefore, the manufactures should build positive word of mouth activities. One of the ways is by holding focus group discussion. Focus group is activity involving a trained moderator and 8-12 people to talk freely about their feelings and thoughts toward products or services (Mowen, 1995). Focus group is used to encourage the consumers to discuss their reactions to the product, services concept, new advertising or marketing communication campaigns (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2010). By doing so, it can stimulate word of mouth activities, give clear insight for the customers and measure consumer confusion on their products or services.

b. Trust

Smartphone products are continuous innovations because they change every time in line with the competitive environment and the products come from the improvement. Trust is the key to face rapid changing competitive environment that forced business marketing manufactures to be more creative and flexible to meet the competition (Doney and Canon, 1997). So, fierce competition environment has resulted in similar product (decreasing inter-brand difference), much information about the product flows everywhere, and ambiguous information is created in the market because of mazy information.

Therefore to overcome these impacts, the manufactures should keep good relation with the consumers by being honest and reliable in presenting their products to the consumers. Then, manufactures and also the sale person should manage customer relationship when doing product promotion by providing valuable information and reliable public speaker. Then valuable information and the consultation to members of the buying center can extent the consumer reliance (Doney and Canon, 1997).

c. Consumer Satisfaction

From the research found that consumer that get confused are dissatisfied because they cannot evaluate the product or the product information satisfactory. Based on the Mowen (1994), the most important to create consumers satisfaction is the level of the performance of the product, so the consumer will satisfy whenever the level of product quality is high. Then the manager should analyze the quality control and the brand promotion. By doing so the

manufactures can build brand loyalty to the consumers even though there are many similar product from others manufactures. Then, manufactures can build the positive word of mouth. Subsequently, good quality can overcome bad rumor that lead consumers get confused to the products. Whenever promoting the brands, the information delivered by using advertisement through some media should be clear. Beside that, product information should be proven by demonstrating the product performance so that it can attract the consumers and fulfill the expectation of the consumers to the product.

5.4. Limitations of Research

In this research there were some limitations. The limitation bordered the research because unconditional situation and the weaknesses during conducting the research. The limitations of this research as follows:

- 5.4.1. The research used convenience and purposive sampling so that the author should ask firstly to the students met whether they had experienced in purchasing smartphone or not and what kind of smartphone they had. The sampling method and the way to get the respondents seemed create inconvenience situation for respondents, as the impact many students rejected to fill the questionnaire and mostly they did not have any enthusiasm to fill the questionnaire. Then, 50 questionnaires could not be analyzed further because of incompleteness and inconsistency in answering the questionnaire. The usage of student samples and non-

probability sampling methods lead the results may have limited generalizability.

5.4.2. In the questionnaire, it would be better to ask the time when they bought their smarphone because it could straighten out their perceptions about purchasing a smartphone. From the average of the respondents answer they tended to use their present perception about their experience in purchasing smartphone in which different from their previous experience in purchasing smartphone. As the impact from the average of consumer confusion answer they tend to be neutral in answer the question.

5.4.3. This research was conducted in Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta and the product context (smartphones) may also limit its generalizability. Furthermore, non-probability sampling method and student samples usage may have limited generalizability.

5.4.4. Furthermore, this research drew 150 respondents. The number of respondents may not cover all university students in Yogyakarta. Because of the time limitation in collecting respondents led the author drew available respondents that met the qualification. Therefore the real condition might not fit with the result in this research and it can lead low response rate.

5.4.5. The previous research (Walsh and Mitchell, 2010) employed SEM as data analysis and the present study used multiple regressions. The present research used simpler analytical tool. Hence, this research might not cover some further analyses compared to the original one.

5.5. Suggestions

Ambiguity Confusion has insignificant result and it does not influence word of mouth activities, trust and consumer satisfaction. Therefore, for further research, it might need deeper research to measure ambiguity confusion in Indonesia. By doing so it can help to approve that ambiguity confusion affect on word of mouth, trust and consumer satisfaction in Indonesia.

This research found different result caused by different culture between German and Indonesian. So, Leek and Kun (2006), Walsh *et al.* (2007), and Walsh and Mitchell (2010) recommended similar research in a different cultural context. Moreover, it is interesting and necessary to examine consumer confusion by using different research context such as cultural setting, product choice (or services), and sample composition (i.e. age and gender) to find distinct empirical result.

Then, for the next research is expected to relate other effects or behavioral consequences (i.e. dissonance, shopping fatigue, brand loyalty, product misuse and consumer self confidence) to enrich consumer dimensions measurement. Hence, to improve the understanding of consumer confusion dimensions and their behavioral consequence, it needs more studies.

REFERENCES

- “RIM Launches New OS, Handsets”, *The Jakarta Post*, 18 August 2011, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>, accessed on 15 September 2011.
- “Definition of a Smartphone”, *PDX Web Pross*, accessed from www.smartphonebasics.com, accessed on 12 January 2012.
- “Smartphone”, *WebFinance, Inc.*, <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/smartphone.html>, accessed on 12 January 2012.
- “What Makes a Smartphone Smart?”, *TechTarget*, <http://searchmobilecomputing.techtarget.com>, accessed on 12 January 2012.
- Galih, B. and Ngazis A. N., (2012), “Penetrasi Internet Mobile RI dalam Angka”, *Vivanews*, 22 Maret 2012, <http://teknologi.vivanews.com>, accessed on 30 April 2012.
- Beer, E.J., (2003), “High and Low Context”, *Communicating Across Cultures*, accessed from <http://www.culture-at-work.com/highlow.html>, on 11 January 2012.
- Cassavoy, L., (2012), “What Makes a Smartphone Smart?”, *About.com*, <http://cellphones.about.com>, accessed on 12 January 2012.
- Communicaid Group Ltd, (2010), “Cross-Cultural Communication Styles: High and Low Context”, *Communicaid Blog*, <http://blog.communicaid.com>, accessed on 23 January 2012.

- Darmawan, I. and Abbdinna, F., (2011), "Mayoritas Netter Indonesia Akses via Ponsel", *Vivanews*, 2 April 2011, vivanews.com, accessed on 10 December 2011.
- Devereaux, M.O. and Johansen, R., (1994), "Transcending Cultural Barriers: Context, Relationships, and Time", *Citation from A Multicultural Perspective: Transcending the Barriers of Behavior and Language, in Globalwork: Bridging Distance, Culture, and Time (Jossey-Bass) that downloaded from Tomorrow's Professor listserv*, <http://www.csub.edu>, accessed on 23 January 2012.
- Doney, P.M. and Cannon, J.P., (1997), "An Examination of the Nature of Trust in Buyer-seller Relationships", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 61 No. 2, pp. 35-51.
- Engel, J. F., Blackwell, R. D., and Miniard, P. W., (1990), *Consumer Behavior, 6th Edition*, The Dryden Press, Orlando, FL.
- Fabiano, R., (2009), "Tough Competition in Smartphone Business", *The Jakarta Post*, 20 October 2009, thejakartapost.com, accessed on 15 September 2011.
- Feick, L.F. and Price, L.L., (1987), "The Market Maven: A Diffuser of Marketplace Information", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, January, pp. 83-97.
- Firman, M., (2010), "UPH Aplikasikan Mobile Campus", *Vivanews*, 5 Augusts 2011, <http://teknologi.vivanews.com>, accessed on 10 October 2011.

- Foxman, E.R., Berger, P.W. and Cote, J.A. (1992), "Consumer Brand Confusion: A Conceptual Framework", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 9, March-April, pp. 123-40.
- Gliem, J. A. and Gliem, R. R., (2003), "Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales", *Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8-10, 2003.
- Greenleaf, E.A. and Lehmann, D.R., (1995), "Reasons for Substantial Delay in Consumer Decision Making", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 22, pp. 186-99.
- Hendry, (2011), "Tabel Distribusi R (Two Tail)", *TEORI-ONLINE*, 12 February 2011, <http://teorionline.wordpress.com/>, accessed on 12 October 2011.
- Hofstede, G., (2012), "National Cultures and Countries", *Itim International*, <http://geert-hofstede.com>, accessed on 11 January 2012.
- Huffman, C. and Kahn, B. E. (1998), "Variety for Sale: Mass Customization or Mass Confusion?", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.74 No. 4, pp. 491-513.
- Karina, S., (2011), "Nokia Masih Kuasai 41% Pasar Smartphone di Indonesia", *Okezone*, 15 November 2011, *Okezone.com*, accessed on 4 January 2012.
- Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G., (2008), *Principles of Marketing, 12th Edition*, Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

- Lau, Geok Theng and Sook, Han Lee, (1999), "Consumers' Trust in a Brand and the Link to Brand Loyalty", *Journal of Market Focused Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 341 -370.
- Leek, S. and Kun, D., (2006), "Consumer Confusion in the Chinese Personal Computer Market", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp.184-193.
- Levine, D. M., Stephan, D. F., Krehbiel, Timothy C., and Berenson, Mark L., (2008), *Statistics for Managers Using Microsoft® Excel, 5th Edition*, Prentice-Hall International, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Masna, A., (2011), "Ekosistem Adalah Kunci Dalam Industri Mobile dan Nokia Memiliki Elemen yang Tepat untuk Mengambil Peran", *Indonesian Tech-Startup Media*, 26 November 2011, Tech-Startup.com, accessed on 5 January 2012.
- Miller, G. A., (1955), "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information", *Psychological Review* © by the American Psychological Association, Vol. 101, No. 2, pp. 343-352.
- Miller, L., Kilian, T., Mitchell, V.W. and Walsh, G., (2010), "Measuring Consumer Vulnerability to Perceived Product-Similarity Problems and its Consequences", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 26 Nos. 1-2, pp. 146-162.

- Mo, Y., Walsh, G. and Mitchell, V. W., (2005), "Towards a Conceptual Model of Consumer Confusion", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 32 No 1, pp.143-150.
- Mowen, J.C., (1987), *Consumer Behavior*, Macmillan Publishing Company, a division of Macmillan, Inc., New York, NY.
- Mowen, J. C., (1995), *Consumer Behavior, 4th Edition*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Rulistia, N. D., (2011), Young people ditch dailies for online news, *The Jakarta Post*, 12 June 2011, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>, accessed on 20 September 2011.
- Schiffman, L.G and Kanuk, L. L., (2010), *Consumer Behavior, 10th Edition*. Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, N J.
- Schweizer, M., Kotouc, A. J. and Wagner, T., (2006), "Scale Development for Consumer Confusion", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 33, pp. 184-190.
- Sekaran, U., (1992), *Research Methods For Business A Skill Building Approach, Second Edition*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Canada.
- Spreng, R.A. and Mackoy, R.D., (1996), "An Empirical Examination of A Model of Perceived Service Quality and Satisfaction", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 201-14.
- Suling, Y., (2010), "Cheap and Complete", *The Jakarta Post*, 20 July 2010, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>, accessed on 15 September 2011.

Sunny, J., (2011), "Top 10 Best SmartPhones", *Top 10 of All*, top10ofall.com, accessed on 12 January 2012.

SURVEYMONKEY, (2009), Response Rates & Surveying Techniques, Tips to Enhance Survey Respondent Participation.

Tavakol, M. and Dennick, R., (2011), "Making sense of Cronbach's alpha", *International Journal of Medical Education*, Vol.2, pp 53-55.

Turnbull, P. W., Leek, S., and Ying, G., (2000), "Customer Confusion: The Mobile Phone Market", *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol.16, pp. 143-163.

Walsh, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., and Mitchell, V.W., (2007), "Consumer Confusion Proneness: Scale Development, Validation, and Application", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 23 No. 7-8, pp. 697-721.

Walsh, G. and Mitchell, V. W., (2010), "The Effect of Consumer Confusion Proneness on Word of Mouth, Trust, and Customer Satisfaction", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 44 No. 6, pp. 838-859

Wilkie, W. L., (1994), *Consumer Behavior*, 3rd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Canada

Yahoo! and TNS, (2010), "Digital Indonesia 2010", *Yahoo!- TNS Net Index Highlights*, Jakarta, Indonesia: Yahoo! Southeast Asia Pte. Ltd and TNS Indonesia.

Yudiman, M., (2011), "Bob McDougall : Partnering With Microsoft to Build 'Ecosystem'", *The Jakarta Post*, 4 June 2011 <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>, accessed on 15 September 2011.



APPENDICES

9.	In general, I trust the store personnel that sell me Smartphone products.					
10.	Overall, I am satisfied with the Smartphone products I buy.					



8.	Produk Smartphone memiliki begitu banyak fitur sehingga tidak mungkin membandingkan antar merek.					
9.	Informasi yang saya dapatkan dari iklan sering samar atau tidak jelas sehingga sulit bagi saya untuk mengetahui produk Smartphone apa yang benar-benar dapat bekerja dengan baik.					
10.	Ketika membeli produk Smartphone saya jarang merasa mendapatkan informasi yang memadai.					
11.	Saya merasa sulit memastikan fitur produk yang benar-benar penting bagi saya.					
12.	Ketika membeli produk Smartphone tertentu, saya membutuhkan bantuan wiraniaga untuk memahami perbedaan antar produk.					

Berikutnya, Anda akan diminta untuk memberikan tanda centang (√) pada kolom yang diberikan ke salah satu skala pernyataan. 10 (sepuluh) pernyataan ini digunakan untuk mengukur kata konsumen dari mulut ke mulut (Word of Mouth), kepercayaan dan kepuasan sebagai variabel akibat. Skala untuk setiap pernyataan:

1 = sangat tidak setuju

2 = tidak setuju

3 = netral

4 = setuju

5 = sangat setuju

No.	Pernyataan	Skala				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Saya suka memperkenalkan merek Smartphone dan produk Smartphone baru kepada teman-teman saya					
2.	Saya suka membantu orang dengan menyediakan informasi tentang berbagai jenis produk Smartphone.					
3.	Orang-orang meminta informasi kepada saya tentang produk, tempat belanja, dan toko yang menjual smartphone.					
4.	Jika seseorang menanyakan tempat terbaik untuk membeli berbagai jenis produk smartphone saya bisa memberitahukan mereka.					
5.	Teman-teman menganggap saya sebagai sumber informasi yang baik tentang produk atau penjualan Smartphone baru.					
6.	Coba anda bayangkan seseorang yang memiliki informasi tentang berbagai macam produk smartphone dan ingin berbagi info tersebut dengan orang lain, orang tersebut memahami produk, penjualan, dan toko smartphone, namun dia belum tentu menganggap dirinya pakar tentang produk tertentu. Apakah diskripsi di atas menggambarkan diri anda?					

7.	Secara umum, saya mempercayai produk Smartphone yang saya beli.					
8.	Secara umum, saya mempercayai produsen dari produk Smartphone yang saya beli.					
9.	Secara umum, saya mempercayai karyawan toko yang menjual produk Smartphone kepada saya.					
10.	Secara keseluruhan, saya puas dengan produk Smartphone yang saya beli.					



Appendix2: Data Collection

Demographic Data

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
1	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Iphone 3GS
2	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Curve 8520
3	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Torch
4	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2009	Samsung Galaxy Ace
5	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2009	Nokia E72
6	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Sony Ericsson Xperia X8
7	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Sony Ericsson Xperia X10
8	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Samsung Galaxy Gio
9	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2009	Iphone 3GS
10	15-19	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2010	Nokia N97
11	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Gemini
12	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Torch
13	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Javelin
14	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Gemini
15	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2008	Iphone 3GS
16	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2008	Blackberry Bold
17	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2009	Iphone 4

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
18	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	LG Optimus 2X
19	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2010	Blackberry Storm
20	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2008	Blackberry Javelin
21	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2010	Nokia 5800 Xpress Music
22	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2010	Blackberry Onyx II
23	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2010	Nokia N8
24	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2009	Blackberry Javelin
25	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy Mini
26	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy Fit
27	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Nokia E71
28	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy SII
29	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2011	Blackberry Bold
30	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2010	Blackberry Storm
31	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Torch
32	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2009	Nokia X5
33	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2010	Blackberry Storm
34	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2011	Blackberry Torch
35	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2011	Blackberry Storm
36	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2011	Blackberry Torch
37	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Industrial	2006	HTC Desire

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
38	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2009	Blackberry Gemini
39	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Samsung Galaxy Ace
40	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Blackberry Bold
41	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Samsung Galaxy S
42	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Blackberry Storm
43	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Samsung Galaxy Mini

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
44	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2007	Blackberry 9530
45	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2007	Nokia E63
46	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Architecture	2009	Samsung Galaxy Ace
47	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2007	Nokia E71
48	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Architecture	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
49	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
50	30-34	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2005	Nokia E72
51	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2011	Blackberry Bold
52	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Torch
53	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
54	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy Ace
55	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2009	Blackberry 8520
56	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Blackberry Storm
57	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
58	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2008	Blackberry Bold
59	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Industrial	2008	Blackberry Gemini

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
60	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2010	Nokia E72
61	15-19	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Information systems	2010	Blackberry Bold
62	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Industrial Engineering	2009	Blackberry 9300
63	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
64	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Engineering	Industrial Engineering	2008	Blackberry curve 8520
65	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Nokia C6
66	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Storm
67	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Iphone 3GS
68	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2005	Nokia 5230
69	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Dakota
70	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
71	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Economics	2011	Beyond B828
72	15-19	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Economics	2011	LG Optimus Black P970
73	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2009	Blackberry Gemini Curve 3G
74	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2008	Blackberry Gemini

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
75	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2009	Blackberry Apolo
76	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2009	Blackberry Javelin
77	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2009	Blackberry Onyx II
78	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Torch
79	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry Gemini
80	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry 9700
81	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy II
82	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Storm
83	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2009	Blackberry Torch
84	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IFAP	2009	Iphone 3GS
85	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Biotechnology	Biology	2011	Blackberry Gemini
86	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Javelin
87	20-24	Female	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Gemini
88	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Torch
89	20-24	Male	Atmajaya	S1	Economy	IBMP	2008	Blackberry 8520
90	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2006	Iphone 4
91	15-19	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2011	Nokia C3
92	15-19	Female	Duta Wacana	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2010	Iphone 3GS
93	20-24	Female	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2010	Blackberry Gemini
94	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Samsung Galaxy Y

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
95	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	LG T 310i
96	20-24	Female	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Bold
97	20-24	Female	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Nokia E72
98	15-19	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2010	Blackberry Storm
99	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Sony Ericsson Xperia Active
100	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Samsung Galaxy SL
101	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Storm
102	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Iphone 3GS
103	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry curve
104	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Blackberry Storm
105	20-24	Female	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Accounting	2008	Samsung Galaxy Mini
106	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2009	Blackberry Gemini
107	20-24	Male	Duta Wacana	S1	Economy	Management	2008	Blackberry Storm
108	15-19	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Teacher Training and Science Education	Indonesia Education	2011	Nokia C3
109	15-19	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Science and Technology	Engineering Mesin	2011	Blackberry Bold
110	20-24	Female	Sanata Dharma	S1	Psychology	Psychology	2002	Samsung Galaxy Fit

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
111	20-24	Female	Sanata Dharma	S1	Teacher Training and Science Education	English Education	2007	Sony Ericsson Xperia X10 Mini
112	20-24	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Literature	English Literature	2009	Samsung Galaxy Mini
113	20-24	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Economy	Management	2010	Blackberry Torch
114	15-19	Female	Sanata Dharma	S1	Teacher Training and Science Education	Education of Primary School Teacher	2010	Nokia N90
115	20-24	Female	Sanata Dharma	S1	Teacher Training and Science Education	English Education	2008	Nokia C3
116	20-24	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Literature	English Literature	2008	Motorola Moto Q
117	15-19	Female	Sanata Dharma	S1	Economy	Management	2011	Samsung Champ Duo S
118	20-24	Male	Sanata Dharma	S1	Pharmacy	Pharmacy	2008	Blackberry storm

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
119	15-19	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2010	Nokia C6
120	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2007	Blackberry 9300
121	15-19	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2010	Blackberry Gemini
122	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Onyx II
123	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2010	Blackberry Bold
124	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	LG P500
125	15-19	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Gemini
126	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Javelin
127	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Samsung Galaxy Mini
128	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Bold

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
129	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Storm
130	15-19	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2010	Blackberry 9550
131	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Gemini
132	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Pearl 8200
133	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Iphone 3GS
134	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Nokia N97
135	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Gemini
136	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Samsung Galaxy Y
137	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Bold
138	15-19	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Torch

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
139	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Storm
140	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Torch
141	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Iphone 3GS
142	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Nokia E72
143	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Sony Ericsson Xperia
144	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Nokia C3
145	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry 8220
146	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Samsung Galaxy Gio
147	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2009	Blackberry Bold
148	20-24	Male	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Mineral technology	Petroleum Engineering	2008	Blackberry Onyx II

Respondents	Age	Gender	Universities	Level of Study	Faculty	Course Major	Batch	Smartphones
149	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Engineering	Informatics	2006	Blackberry Gemini
150	20-24	Female	Pembangunan Nasional	S1	Social Sciences and Political Science	Communication	2007	Blackberry Bold

Appendix2: Data Collection

Questionnaires Data

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust				Satisfaction										
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7		Q8	Q9	Q10	average (4)	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
1	2	2	2	2,00	4	2	1	2	2,25	2	4	2	5	4	3,40	2	3	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4,67	5	4	4	4	4	4	4,67	5
2	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	3	2	2,25	2	2	2	1	1	1,60	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3,00	3	3	3	3	3	3,00	3
3	4	3	5	4,00	4	5	5	3	4,25	1	4	4	5	4	3,60	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	3
4	4	4	4	4,00	3	5	4	4	4,00	2	4	4	3	5	3,60	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	2,67	3	2	2	2	2	2,67	3
5	4	4	4	4,00	2	5	5	5	4,25	4	4	4	2	2	3,20	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3,00	3	3	3	3	3	3,00	3
6	4	4	3	3,67	5	4	5	3	4,25	3	5	4	4	3	3,80	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	3,33	3	3	3	3	3	3,33	3
7	3	2	2	2,33	3	2	2	2	2,25	2	2	2	4	4	2,80	2	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3,67	4	4	3	3	3,67	4	
8	5	5	4	4,67	4	5	5	5	4,75	4	3	3	5	2	3,40	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	3	3,33	3	3	3	3	3,33	3	
9	2	3	2	2,33	3	1	2	2	2,00	4	3	3	2	3	3,00	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3,67	4	4	3	3	3,67	4	
10	4	3	5	4,00	4	5	4	4	4,25	4	3	3	4	3	3,40	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	4	3	3,33	3	3	3	3	3,33	3	
11	3	2	2	2,33	5	2	1	1	2,25	3	3	2	2	5	3,00	2	4	3	5	4	3	4	3	5	4	4,67	5	4	4	4	4,67	5	
12	4	3	3	3,33	4	5	5	2	4,00	4	3	2	4	3	3,20	4	2	1	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3,00	3	4	1	1	3,00	3	
13	2	5	4	3,67	4	4	4	4	3,50	3	4	4	3	3	3,40	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	3	3,33	3	3	3	3	3,33	3	
14	5	4	2	3,67	4	4	2	4	3,50	3	4	4	4	4	3,80	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	3,33	3	4	2	2	3,33	3	
15	4	4	5	4,33	5	4	4	4	4,25	4	4	4	4	5	4,20	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	
16	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	4	2	2,50	2	4	2	2	4	2,80	3	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6		average (4)	Q7	Q8	Q9	average (5)
17	3	2	2	2,33	2	3	4	4	3,25	3	4	3	2	1	2,60	3	4	4	4	3	3	3,50	5	4	3	4,00	5
18	5	2	4	3,67	3	2	2	4	2,75	2	5	5	1	5	3,60	5	4	5	4	3	3	4,17	5	4	3	4,00	5
19	2	3	1	2,00	3	2	3	1	2,25	3	4	4	3	4	3,60	2	3	2	3	3	3	2,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
20	4	3	4	3,67	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	3	3	3	3,50	4	3	3	3,33	3
21	4	5	4	4,33	3	4	4	2	3,25	4	5	3	4	5	4,20	3	4	2	4	1	2	2,67	4	2	2	2,67	3
22	4	4	4	4,00	4	3	4	3	3,75	2	4	4	4	4	3,60	1	2	2	2	2	2	1,83	4	3	3	3,33	3
23	2	2	5	3,00	4	5	4	4	4,25	4	4	2	3	4	3,40	1	1	2	4	1	1	1,67	2	2	2	2,00	2
24	2	2	4	2,67	2	2	2	2	2,00	3	2	2	4	4	3,00	2	4	2	3	4	4	3,17	4	4	2	3,33	4
25	2	2	2	2,00	2	1	3	2	2,00	2	3	3	3	2	2,60	3	3	3	2	3	2	2,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
26	3	4	3	3,33	4	4	4	2	3,50	2	4	4	3	4	3,40	2	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	3	3	2	2,67	3
27	4	4	2	3,33	2	3	4	3	3,00	3	2	3	3	4	3,00	4	4	4	4	3	3	3,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
28	2	2	2	2,00	1	2	4	2	2,25	2	2	2	2	1	1,80	5	5	5	5	4	4	4,67	5	4	3	4,00	5
29	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	4	2	2,50	3	2	2	2	4	2,60	3	4	4	4	3	3	3,50	4	4	4	4,00	4
30	3	4	4	3,67	4	4	4	3	3,75	3	3	3	4	4	3,40	4	3	3	3	3	3	3,17	3	3	3	3,00	3
31	3	3	2	2,67	2	1	4	2	2,25	2	4	4	4	4	3,60	4	4	4	4	3	4	3,83	4	4	4	4,00	4
32	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	2	4	3,50	4	4	4	2	4	3,60	2	4	2	4	2	2	2,67	4	3	2	3,00	3
33	4	4	3	3,67	5	5	5	1	4,00	4	5	2	5	5	4,20	2	3	5	2	3	5	3,33	5	3	2	3,33	3
34	4	5	5	4,67	5	5	4	5	4,75	4	4	4	5	5	4,40	4	4	2	2	1	1	2,33	4	4	3	3,67	4
35	3	4	4	3,67	4	4	5	3	4,00	2	5	4	4	2	3,40	2	2	4	4	1	2	2,50	4	4	2	3,33	3

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18		Q19	average (4)	Q20	Q21
36	4	5	2	3,67	2	5	4	3	3,50	3	4	3	3	4	3,40	1	4	4	1	2	2,17	4	3	3	3,33	3
37	1	2	2	1,67	4	2	4	5	3,75	1	5	1	2	4	2,60	4	2	3	4	4	3,33	4	5	3	4,00	5
38	3	4	3	3,33	3	5	5	3	4,00	4	4	4	4	3	3,80	1	2	1	1	3	1,50	2	3	1	2,00	3
39	4	4	2	3,33	2	3	4	4	3,25	3	5	2	2	4	3,20	5	4	2	3	2	3,50	5	5	4	4,67	5
40	4	2	2	2,67	4	2	4	3	3,25	4	3	2	2	4	3,00	3	4	3	4	4	3,50	4	3	3	3,33	4
41	5	2	5	4,00	5	4	3	5	4,25	4	5	2	4	5	4,00	3	3	3	3	2	2,83	4	4	3	3,67	3
42	2	4	2	2,67	4	4	4	2	3,50	2	3	4	4	4	3,40	4	4	4	3	4	3,83	4	4	4	4,00	4
43	4	4	3	3,67	4	5	5	3	4,25	2	5	4	4	4	3,80	4	2	2	4	2	2,67	4	3	3	3,33	3
44	2	2	1	1,67	1	4	4	1	2,50	5	1	1	4	1	2,40	1	5	5	3	4	3,83	5	5	4	4,67	5
45	2	4	2	2,67	2	2	3	4	2,75	4	3	3	4	2	3,20	4	4	3	3	4	3,50	5	5	4	4,67	5
46	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	2	2	2,00	2	3	2	2	4	2,60	4	4	2	3	4	3,33	4	4	4	4,00	4
47	2	3	2	2,33	2	2	2	1	1,75	1	3	1	1	2	1,60	3	4	4	3	4	3,50	4	4	3	3,67	4
48	4	5	4	4,33	4	4	3	2	3,25	3	4	2	3	4	3,20	2	3	3	4	2	2,67	3	3	2	2,67	3
49	2	4	4	3,33	4	4	5	4	4,25	4	5	4	5	4	4,40	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	3	3	2	2,67	2
50	5	5	4	4,67	4	5	5	4	4,50	3	4	4	4	5	4,00	1	1	1	1	1	1,00	4	3	2	3,00	3
51	4	4	4	4,00	5	4	4	3	4,00	3	4	3	4	5	3,80	1	1	2	1	2	1,33	1	2	2	1,67	2
52	2	4	4	3,33	4	4	4	3	3,75	4	2	2	2	4	2,80	4	5	4	4	4	4,17	5	4	4	4,33	4
53	2	2	2	2,00	2	3	4	2	2,75	3	2	2	2	4	2,60	4	5	4	4	3	4,00	5	5	4	4,67	5
54	4	5	5	4,67	2	4	4	4	3,50	4	4	2	3	4	3,40	3	4	3	4	3	3,33	3	3	3	3,00	3

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6		average (4)	Q7	Q8	Q9	average (5)
55	4	4	3	3,67	3	4	4	4	3,75	4	4	3	4	4	3,80	2	2	4	4	2	2	2,67	2	2	2	2,00	2
56	4	4	3	3,67	3	5	2	3,75	3	4	2	3	4	3,20	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	1,83	3	3	3	3,00	3
57	5	5	5	5,00	4	5	4	4,50	4	4	4	4	4	4,20	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3,17	3	3	3	3,00	4
58	2	2	2	2,00	1	2	1	1,50	2	2	2	4	4	3,40	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4,50	4	4	5	4,33	5
59	1	2	2	1,67	3	2	4	2,75	2	4	2	2	4	2,80	4	4	2	2	4	3	3	3,17	4	3	3	3,33	4
60	4	3	3	3,33	3	2	4	2,75	4	4	3	2	3	3,20	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3,50	5	5	3	4,33	5
61	4	4	2	3,33	2	4	4	3,00	3	2	2	2	3	2,40	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3,50	4	4	4	4,00	4
62	4	3	2	3,00	3	3	4	3,00	3	4	2	4	4	3,40	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3,50	4	4	3	3,67	4
63	4	4	3	3,67	4	3	5	3,75	4	5	2	3	4	3,60	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3,83	5	4	3	4,00	4
64	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	3	2,75	2	3	2	2	4	2,60	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3,33	4	4	4	4,00	4
65	2	2	3	2,33	3	2	2	2,25	2	2	2	2	3	2,20	2	4	2	2	2	3	3	2,67	4	3	3	3,33	4
66	4	4	4	4,00	4	5	3	4,00	3	4	3	4	4	3,60	2	4	3	3	4	3	4	3,17	4	3	3	3,33	3
67	4	4	4	4,00	4	3	4	3,75	2	4	4	4	4	2,80	2	4	4	2	1	2	2	2,50	4	3	2	3,00	3
68	5	3	4	4,00	4	3	5	3,75	4	4	2	4	4	3,60	3	2	3	5	3	4	3,33	4	3	2	3,00	3	
69	2	2	2	2,00	3	2	4	2,75	2	3	2	3	3	2,60	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3,33	4	3	2	3,00	3
70	2	2	2	2,00	3	3	4	3,25	4	4	2	2	2	2,80	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3,50	5	4	2	3,67	5
71	4	5	3	4,00	5	4	4	4,25	4	3	2	4	5	3,60	2	2	3	4	2	3	4	2,67	4	3	2	3,00	3
72	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	3	3,75	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3,00	3	3	3	3,00	3
73	3	2	2	2,33	1	1	4	1,75	2	2	3	1	4	2,40	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2,67	5	4	3	4,00	5

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction							
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18		Q19	average (4)	Q20	Q21	Q22	average (5)	
74	2	4	2	2,67	1	2	2	2	1,75	2	4	3	2	4	3,00	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4,33	5	3	4,33	5	
75	4	4	5	4,33	4	5	5	5	4,75	4	5	3	4	5	4,20	4	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2,67	3	3	3,00	3	
76	2	2	2	2,00	4	2	2	2	2,50	2	4	3	4	2	3,00	2	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	3,17	4	4	3	3,67	4
77	2	2	2	2,00	4	2	2	2	2,50	2	4	4	4	2	2,80	2	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	2,83	4	4	4	4,00	4
78	4	4	4	4,00	3	5	4	5	4,25	4	4	3	4	4	3,80	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3,50	4	2	3,33	3	
79	4	3	4	3,67	4	4	5	3	4,00	3	4	3	4	4	3,60	2	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3,00	3	4	2	3,00	3
80	4	4	5	4,33	5	5	5	2	4,25	3	4	4	5	5	4,20	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3,67	5	4	2	3,67	4
81	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	3	4	3,75	3	4	4	4	4	3,60	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	2,17	4	4	2	3,33	3
82	4	4	4	4,00	4	5	5	4	4,50	4	3	3	4	3	3,40	2	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3,17	3	4	2	3,00	3
83	4	4	3	3,67	3	5	4	4	4,00	3	4	4	2	3	3,20	2	3	3	4	2	2	3	3	2,67	3	3	3	3,00	3
84	5	4	5	4,67	5	5	5	4	4,75	3	5	5	5	4	4,40	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2,50	2	2	2	2,00	3
85	4	4	3	3,67	4	4	5	5	4,50	3	4	4	3	5	3,80	2	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	2,67	4	3	3	3,33	3
86	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	5	4,20	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	2,00	4	4	3	3,67	3
87	4	4	3	3,67	4	4	3	4	3,75	4	3	4	4	4	3,80	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	3	1,67	3	3	3	3,00	3
88	2	2	2	2,00	4	4	5	2	3,75	3	4	3	2	4	3,20	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4,00	5	4	3	4,00	5
89	2	2	1	1,67	1	2	2	2	1,75	1	2	1	1	1	1,20	1	3	2	2	3	1	3	1	2,00	3	3	3	3,00	3
90	1	2	2	1,67	2	1	2	2	1,75	2	4	4	2	2	2,80	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4,17	5	5	4	4,67	5
91	4	3	2	3,00	1	1	2	2	1,50	5	3	3	4	4	3,80	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3,83	4	4	5	4,33	5
92	2	2	2	2,00	3	3	3	3	3,00	2	3	3	4	3	3,00	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3,17	5	4	3	4,00	4

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6		average (4)	Q7	Q8	Q9	average (5)
93	3	2	2	2,33	3	2	2	2	2,50	3	2	2	2	2	2,20	3	4	2	2	4	3	3,00	4	4	4	4,00	4
94	4	3	3	3,33	1	3	3	3	2,50	2	2	1	2	1,80	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4,17	5	5	4	4,67	4
95	2	2	3	2,33	4	3	2	2	2,75	4	3	2	4	3,40	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3,50	3	4	4	3,67	4
96	1	2	3	2,00	3	2	3	2	2,75	2	3	2	3	2,80	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3,50	4	4	4	4,00	4
97	4	5	3	4,00	2	5	5	4	4,00	3	4	3	4	3,60	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	2,00	4	3	3	3,33	3
98	4	2	4	3,33	1	3	5	2	2,75	4	5	5	2	1	3,40	3	4	2	4	4	4	3,50	4	4	4	4,00	4
99	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	2	3	2,25	3	2	2	3	2,60	3	4	2	3	4	2	4	3,00	4	4	3	3,67	3
100	2	4	2	2,67	1	2	2	2	1,75	2	4	4	2	4	3,20	2	5	5	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	2	3,33	4
101	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	4	2	3,00	2	2	4	4	4	3,20	4	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4,00	4
102	4	2	2	2,67	1	2	5	2	2,50	4	4	4	2	2	3,20	4	4	4	4	2	3	3,50	5	5	3	4,33	5
103	5	4	4	4,33	3	4	5	4	4,00	4	5	4	4	5	4,40	3	4	4	4	4	3	3,50	3	3	3	3,00	3
104	2	2	4	2,67	2	4	4	2	3,00	1	5	4	2	2	2,80	5	4	4	4	3	2	3,50	4	4	3	3,67	4
105	2	3	2	2,33	2	2	2	2	2,00	4	3	2	2	4	3,00	4	3	2	2	2	2	2,50	4	4	3	3,67	4
106	3	2	2	2,33	2	2	4	2	2,50	2	3	1	2	1	1,80	2	4	4	4	4	3	3,50	3	3	2	2,67	5
107	4	2	4	3,33	2	2	2	2	2,00	4	4	2	2	4	3,20	4	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	5	4,33	4
108	4	5	1	3,33	5	1	4	5	3,75	1	3	4	4	5	3,40	1	4	2	1	1	3	2,00	2	3	4	3,00	3
109	3	3	2	2,67	2	1	2	1	1,50	3	3	2	3	4	3,00	2	4	3	3	4	3	3,17	4	4	4	4,00	5
110	4	2	4	3,33	2	5	4	2	3,25	5	5	5	2	5	4,40	2	3	4	4	3	2	3,00	2	1	3	2,00	2
111	4	5	3	4,00	3	4	4	4	3,75	3	2	4	4	4	3,40	2	3	3	4	2	3	2,83	4	3	3	3,33	3

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6		average (4)	Q7	Q8	Q9	average (5)
112	4	4	3	3,67	4	4	3	4	3,75	4	3	3	4	4	3,60	2	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	4	3	3	3,33	3
113	3	3	2	2,67	2	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	4	2	4	2,80	2	4	4	3	4	3	3,33	4	3	3	3,33	4
114	4	4	3	3,67	4	4	4	4	4,00	3	4	4	4	4	3,80	2	2	1	2	2	2	1,83	4	3	2	3,00	3
115	4	4	4	4,00	5	4	3	4	4,00	4	5	3	4	5	4,20	3	3	3	4	2	3	3,00	4	4	2	3,33	3
116	4	5	3	4,00	4	5	3	4	4,00	4	4	3	3	4	3,60	2	2	1	2	1	2	1,67	4	3	3	3,33	3
117	2	4	2	2,67	2	1	2	3	2,00	4	2	4	2	2	2,80	2	4	4	4	4	4	3,67	4	4	4	4,00	4
118	4	4	4	4,00	3	4	4	4	3,75	3	3	3	4	4	3,40	2	3	2	3	2	2	2,33	4	3	2	3,00	3
119	2	2	2	2,00	3	4	2	2	2,75	3	4	2	2	4	3,00	2	4	3	4	3	4	3,33	4	4	4	4,00	4
120	2	4	2	2,67	2	4	4	2	3,00	2	4	3	2	4	3,00	3	3	3	3	3	4	3,17	5	4	4	4,33	4
121	2	1	1	1,33	2	3	3	2	2,50	2	1	2	2	2	1,80	3	3	4	3	3	5	3,50	3	4	3	3,33	4
122	2	4	1	2,33	2	2	4	2	2,50	3	3	4	4	1	3,00	3	4	4	4	3	4	3,67	5	5	3	4,33	4
123	4	2	2	2,67	4	2	4	4	3,50	4	4	2	2	2	2,80	2	4	3	4	4	2	3,17	4	4	3	3,67	4
124	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	3	2	2,25	2	3	3	3	2	2,60	3	4	2	3	2	4	3,00	4	4	3	3,67	4
125	1	2	2	1,67	2	2	4	2	2,50	2	2	4	3	4	3,00	2	4	2	3	4	4	3,17	4	4	3	3,67	4
126	4	4	5	4,33	4	5	5	4	4,50	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	2	3	4	4	3	3	3,17	4	4	3	3,67	3
127	3	4	2	3,00	2	4	3	3	3,00	2	3	3	2	5	3,00	2	4	2	4	4	3	3,17	5	5	3	4,33	5
128	5	5	4	4,67	3	5	3	5	4,00	4	5	3	2	3	3,40	2	3	3	3	1	3	2,50	4	3	2	3,00	3
129	4	4	4	4,00	3	3	4	3	3,25	3	3	4	4	4	3,60	2	3	3	3	3	3	2,83	3	3	3	3,00	3
130	2	4	2	2,67	2	2	3	2	2,25	3	2	4	2	2	2,60	2	3	4	4	2	4	3,17	4	4	3	3,67	3

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth						trust			Satisfaction					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	average (1)	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	average (2)	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	average (3)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6		average (4)	Q7	Q8	Q9	average (5)
131	2	4	4	3,33	4	4	5	4	4,25	4	5	2	4	4	3,80	3	2	3	3	3	4	3,00	3	3	3	3,00	3
132	2	2	2	2,00	4	4	3	2	3,25	4	3	2	4	4	3,40	4	4	2	4	4	4	3,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
133	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	4	2	3,00	3	2	2	2	2	2,20	4	4	3	4	3	4	3,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
134	4	4	4	4,00	3	5	5	4	4,25	4	5	3	4	3	3,80	2	3	2	2	3	2	2,33	4	4	2	3,33	3
135	2	2	2	2,00	2	3	3	2	2,50	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	2	2	4	3	2,83	4	3	3	3,33	4
136	4	3	2	3,00	2	4	2	2	2,50	2	4	2	4	2	2,80	4	4	3	3	4	2	3,33	4	4	3	3,67	4
137	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	2	2	2,00	2	2	3	2	3	2,40	4	3	3	4	4	4	3,67	4	4	2	3,33	3
138	2	4	4	3,33	2	2	2	4	2,50	2	4	2	2	4	2,80	4	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4,00	4
139	2	1	2	1,67	4	2	4	2	3,00	2	2	2	4	3	2,60	4	3	4	4	3	2	3,33	4	4	4	4,00	4
140	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	3	3	3	3	3	3	3,00	3	3	3	3,00	3
141	2	2	3	2,33	1	2	2	2	1,75	3	3	2	2	3	2,60	4	3	4	3	3	4	3,50	4	4	2	3,33	5
142	4	4	4	4,00	4	4	3	3	3,50	4	4	2	4	3	3,40	2	2	3	3	3	3	2,67	4	3	3	3,33	3
143	3	2	2	2,33	4	4	4	2	3,50	3	5	3	2	4	3,40	4	4	4	4	3	4	3,67	4	4	3	3,67	4
144	3	4	3	3,33	4	4	4	3	3,75	4	4	4	4	4	4,00	3	3	3	2	1	1	2,17	3	3	3	3,00	3
145	4	4	3	3,67	1	1	1	4	1,75	3	4	3	1	3	2,80	4	4	4	4	3	4	3,83	4	4	4	4,00	4
146	3	4	2	3,00	2	3	4	2	2,75	2	2	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	3	3	4	3	3,17	3	4	3	3,33	4
147	2	2	2	2,00	2	4	2	4	2,50	4	4	2	2	2	2,80	2	4	2	4	4	3	3,17	4	4	2	3,33	4
148	4	3	2	3,00	2	4	2	4	3,00	4	3	4	2	3	3,20	3	4	2	4	4	4	3,50	4	4	4	4,00	4
149	4	4	3	3,67	4	5	5	4	4,50	4	5	3	4	3	3,80	3	4	4	4	4	3	3,50	4	3	2	3,00	3

Respondents	Similarity confusion				Overload confusion				Ambiguity Confusion				Word of Mouth					trust			Satisfaction								
	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	average (1)	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	average (2)	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	average (3)	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5		Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	average (5)			
150	4	5	5	4,67	4	5	5	4	4,50	4	4	5	4	4	4,20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1,17	4	3	3,67	4

Appendix3: Reliability and Validity

Reliability and Validity

Scale: Similarity Confusion

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	150	100,0
	Excluded ^a	0	,0
	Total	150	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,772	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SC1	3,1600	1,08114	150
SC2	3,2333	1,08940	150
SC3	2,9333	1,09708	150

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
SC1	6,1667	3,509	,656	,638
SC2	6,0933	3,696	,586	,716
SC3	6,3933	3,690	,579	,723

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
9,3267	7,336	2,70842	3

Reliability and Validity
Scale: Overload Confusion

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	150	100,0
	Excluded ^a	0	,0
	Total	150	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,750	4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OC4	3,0400	1,15206	150
OC5	3,3267	1,25584	150
OC6	3,5333	1,12128	150
OC7	2,9267	1,08743	150

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
OC4	9,7867	7,592	,521	,706
OC5	9,5000	6,359	,677	,611
OC6	9,2933	7,833	,499	,717
OC7	9,9000	8,010	,493	,721

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
12,8267	12,225	3,49640	4

Reliability and Validity
Scale: Ambiguity Confusion

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	150	100,0
	Excluded ^a	0	,0
	Total	150	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,627	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
AC8	3,0333	,95127	150
AC9	3,5067	1,00833	150
AC10	2,9800	,97945	150
AC11	3,0933	1,07658	150
AC12	3,5000	1,09759	150

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
AC8	13,0800	8,061	,287	,615
AC9	12,6067	7,140	,438	,544
AC10	13,1333	7,740	,333	,595
AC11	13,0200	6,906	,433	,544
AC12	12,6133	6,950	,408	,558

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
16,1133	10,517	3,24303	5

Reliability and Validity
Scale: Word of mouth

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	150	100,0
	Excluded ^a	0	,0
	Total	150	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,797	5

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
WOM1	2,7600	1,03418	150
WOM2	3,2867	,98537	150
WOM3	3,0267	,98271	150
WOM4	3,1933	,96723	150
WOM5	2,8733	1,01199	150

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
WOM1	12,3800	9,499	,490	,786
WOM2	11,8533	8,824	,666	,730
WOM3	12,1133	9,282	,575	,759
WOM4	11,9467	9,380	,570	,760
WOM5	12,2667	9,056	,593	,753

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
15,1400	13,692	3,70023	5

Reliability and Validity
Scale: Trust

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	150	100,0
	Excluded ^a	0	,0
	Total	150	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,726	3

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
T7	3,8800	,75902	150
T8	3,6333	,73655	150
T9	2,9800	,77260	150

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
T7	6,6133	1,621	,584	,594
T8	6,8600	1,517	,698	,454
T9	7,5133	1,903	,388	,824

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
10,4933	3,325	1,82358	3

Appendix4: Table Distribution

Table r Product Moment
Sig.0.05 (Two Tail)

N	r	N	r	N	r	N	r	N	r	N	r
1	0.997	41	0.301	81	0.216	121	0.177	161	0.154	201	0.138
2	0.95	42	0.297	82	0.215	122	0.176	162	0.153	202	0.137
3	0.878	43	0.294	83	0.213	123	0.176	163	0.153	203	0.137
4	0.811	44	0.291	84	0.212	124	0.175	164	0.152	204	0.137
5	0.754	45	0.288	85	0.211	125	0.174	165	0.152	205	0.136
6	0.707	46	0.285	86	0.21	126	0.174	166	0.151	206	0.136
7	0.666	47	0.282	87	0.208	127	0.173	167	0.151	207	0.136
8	0.632	48	0.279	88	0.207	128	0.172	168	0.151	208	0.135
9	0.602	49	0.276	89	0.206	129	0.172	169	0.15	209	0.135
10	0.576	50	0.273	90	0.205	130	0.171	170	0.15	210	0.135
11	0.553	51	0.271	91	0.204	131	0.17	171	0.149	211	0.134
12	0.532	52	0.268	92	0.203	132	0.17	172	0.149	212	0.134
13	0.514	53	0.266	93	0.202	133	0.169	173	0.148	213	0.134
14	0.497	54	0.263	94	0.201	134	0.168	174	0.148	214	0.134
15	0.482	55	0.261	95	0.2	135	0.168	175	0.148	215	0.133
16	0.468	56	0.259	96	0.199	136	0.167	176	0.147	216	0.133
17	0.456	57	0.256	97	0.198	137	0.167	177	0.147	217	0.133
18	0.444	58	0.254	98	0.197	138	0.166	178	0.146	218	0.132
19	0.433	59	0.252	99	0.196	139	0.165	179	0.146	219	0.132
20	0.423	60	0.25	100	0.195	140	0.165	180	0.146	220	0.132
21	0.413	61	0.248	101	0.194	141	0.164	181	0.145	221	0.131
22	0.404	62	0.246	102	0.193	142	0.164	182	0.145	222	0.131
23	0.396	63	0.244	103	0.192	143	0.163	183	0.144	223	0.131
24	0.388	64	0.242	104	0.191	144	0.163	184	0.144	224	0.131
25	0.381	65	0.24	105	0.19	145	0.162	185	0.144	225	0.13
26	0.374	66	0.239	106	0.189	146	0.161	186	0.143	226	0.13
27	0.367	67	0.237	107	0.188	147	0.161	187	0.143	227	0.13
28	0.361	68	0.235	108	0.187	148	0.16	188	0.142	228	0.129
29	0.355	69	0.234	109	0.187	149	0.16	189	0.142	229	0.129
30	0.349	70	0.232	110	0.186	150	0.159	190	0.142	230	0.129
31	0.344	71	0.23	111	0.185	151	0.159	191	0.141	231	0.129
32	0.339	72	0.229	112	0.184	152	0.158	192	0.141	232	0.128
33	0.334	73	0.227	113	0.183	153	0.158	193	0.141	233	0.128
34	0.329	74	0.226	114	0.182	154	0.157	194	0.14	234	0.128
35	0.325	75	0.224	115	0.182	155	0.157	195	0.14	235	0.127
36	0.32	76	0.223	116	0.181	156	0.156	196	0.139	236	0.127
37	0.316	77	0.221	117	0.18	157	0.156	197	0.139	237	0.127
38	0.312	78	0.22	118	0.179	158	0.155	198	0.139	238	0.127
39	0.308	79	0.219	119	0.179	159	0.155	199	0.138	239	0.126
40	0.304	80	0.217	120	0.178	160	0.154	200	0.138	240	0.126

Sumber :

- <http://teorionline.wordpress.com/>

Appendix5: Regression

Regression for Word of Mouth

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: Word of Mouth

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			Durbin-Watson		
					R Square Change	F Change	df1		df2	Sig. F Change
1	,498 ^a	,248	,233	,63216	,248	16,047	3	146	,000	2,026

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion

b. Dependent Variable: Word of Mouth

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3	6,413	16,047	,000 ^a
	Residual	146	,400		
	Total	149			

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B			Beta			
1							
(Constant)	4,277		,264			16,202	,000
Similarity confusion	-,174		,096	-,218		-1,820	,071
Overload Confusion	-,302		,095	-,366		-3,192	,002
Ambiguity Confusion	,079		,121	,071		,655	,514

a. Dependent Variable: Word of Mouth

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2,2988	3,7452	3,0227	,35933	150
Residual	-1,68044	1,38336	,00000	,62576	150
Std. Predicted Value	-2,014	2,011	,000	1,000	150
Std. Residual	-2,658	2,188	,000	,990	150

a. Dependent Variable: Word of Mouth

Appendix5: Regression

Regression for Trust

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: Trust

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			Durbin-Watson	
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change		
1	,533 ^a	,284	,269	,51972	,284	19,312	146	,000	2,032

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion

b. Dependent Variable: Trust

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3	5,216	19,312	,000 ^a
	Residual	146	,270		
	Total	149			

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		Beta			
1 (Constant)	4,619	,217			21,281	,000	
Similarity confusion	-,154	,079	-,229		-1,956	,052	
Overload Confusion	-,279	,078	-,401		-3,583	,000	
Ambiguity Confusion	,078	,100	,083		,783	,435	

a. Dependent Variable: Trust

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2,8412	4,1579	3,4977	,32408	150
Residual	-1,54342	1,22011	,00000	,51446	150
Std. Predicted Value	-2,026	2,037	,000	1,000	150
Std. Residual	-2,970	2,348	,000	,990	150

a. Dependent Variable: Trust

Appendix5: Regression

Regression for Consumer Satisfaction

Variables Entered/Removed ^b			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion	.	Enter

- a. All requested variables entered.
 b. Dependent Variable: Consumer Satisfaction

Model Summary ^b							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	,638 ^a	,407	,395	,60323	,407	33,464	,000
						146	2,120

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Ambiguity Confusion, Overload Confusion, Similarity confusion
 b. Dependent Variable: Consumer Satisfaction

ANOVA ^b				
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Sig.
1	36,532	3	12,177	,000 ^a
Residual	53,128	146	,364	
Total	89,660	149		

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B			Beta			
1 (Constant)	5,490		,252			21,793	,000
Similarity confusion	-,242		,091	-,282		-2,650	,009
Overload Confusion	-,378		,090	-,426		-4,187	,000
Ambiguity Confusion	,042		,116	,035		,362	,718

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Satisfaction

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2,7063	4,5809	3,6600	,49516	150
Residual	-1,63940	1,41079	,00000	,59713	150
Std. Predicted Value	-1,926	1,860	,000	1,000	150
Std. Residual	-2,718	2,339	,000	,990	150

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Satisfaction

Appendix6: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean
Similarity confusion	150	3,1091
Overload Confusion	150	3,2067
Ambiguity Confusion	150	3,2227
Word of Mouth	150	3,0227
Trust	150	3,4977
Consumer Satisfaction	150	3,6600
Valid N (listwise)	150	