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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The alluring yet enigmatic Indian consumer, to many marketers has been the epi-centre of many a controversial market research. Goaded by his aspirations for the optimal use of his resources due to constraints of a stringent budget, the varieties in his reactions to products and services, are mind boggling. At times being shrewd, while at other times being unmindful of his lavish spending, the consumer goes about his day in a nonchalant, ever grumbling and condescending way. The Indian consumers are characteristically present at all exhibitions and sales, which promise the earth, purchasing stupendous quantities of the goods and services made available to them. A fact that makes the Indian consumer as unique as they come.

Interestingly this consumer expects impeccable quality and reasonable service in the market. The choice exercised by this consumer depends on his awareness of the ever-changing and elusive aspects of the services offered to him. Constantly searching for the high levels of standards he sets for the goods and services, at times confident, while at other times he flounders. Frequently he is exploited, put to a lot of stress and needless inconveniences, making him grapple with his meagre resources and time. Often bombarded with mammoth advertising promises, he gets more and more baffled by the enticing messages made by the multinational companies, which augments the consumer’s frustration and feeling of being let down. Manufacturer’s appalling indifference, intolerance and callousness when dealing with consumer dissatisfaction in a volatile market is to say the least, pathetic.

Globalization and the so-called economic forays into the market like economic reforms and competition have unleashed various packages to the consumer to cover up the deficiencies and technological lapses in products and services.
Consumers have been forced to retaliate by complaining. Complaining from time immemorial is an integral characteristic of human beings. A silent non-participation in an event may also be construed as a form of complaint. This study attempts to differentiate the various characteristics of the more vociferous complainers. It must be well remembered that those who do not complain may have a complaint against a particular event, service or product, but have only chosen to remain silent on the issue. Even amongst those who venture to complain, this study attempts to point out the level they reach out to complain in terms of the three variables namely time, money and resources.

The word “complaint” means expression of dissatisfaction. To express dissatisfaction, it is also imperative that the level of dissatisfaction should reach beyond the tolerance level of the particular consumer, for it is inherent in all consumers to brush aside minor irritations present in everyday occurrences.

The human behaviour being near unfathomable, an attempt has been made to study the relative behaviour patterns among the complainers and non-complainers in the three service areas namely Banking, Insurance and Medical. This study further attempts to differentiate the personality and the buyer characteristics of consumers who complain.

“To protest against inaction is our fundamental duty. Nothing can be achieved without protest and demand,” says Shri. Jaspal Singh, Food and Civil Supplies Minister, Government of Gujarat (1995). There are some rights that a consumer is entitled to. One of them is the right to redress and recourse. When consumers do not get their money’s worth, they have to question the authorities and seek redressal. Consumers today make the wrong decisions due to the lack of information on choices. “Caveat Emptor”- buyer beware is a maxim that consumers must remember every
time they shop. There are so many products and services in the market with little or no
difference, thereby even, an educated consumer is prone to confusion.

Products and services are required everyday by consumers. The consumers
response to different products, different services are not the same and drastically vary.
The psychological reaction to a particular image has much to do with the type of
product/service the consumer chooses. Choice provides the consumer with the right to
choose from the array of products and services. The consumer develops characteristic
ways of evaluating products and services available to him. But what influences a
choice? Much of what the consumer purchases is not based solely on economic
values, like price, and utility of a product. Many of the purchasing decisions are made
by consumers strongly influenced by the non-economic factors such as
advertisements, discount offers, exchange offers and word-of mouth popularity. Most
of the time, it is a good advertisement that influences a purchase decision. Advertising
is a powerful tool which influences the buyer decision making process.

In the light of the above, the manufacturer/seller would find it necessary to
have more satisfied customers than to merely increase the market share of the market.
Consumer dissatisfaction could possibly result in their seeking redressal which in
effect would be a negative propaganda. It is possible the manufacturer /seller may
suffer financial losses or even legal action by dissatisfied consumers which would
result in possible recalls of the product by the concerned authorities.

Dissatisfaction occurs due to many reasons, but the root cause is not getting,
what was expected. This can happen when consumers are led to purchase a service
due to tall claims made by advertisements, unsafe products, fraudulent business
practices that limit competition. Thus dissatisfaction leads to complaint behaviour.
Dissatisfaction can be classified into Four types:

a) High Complaint: These are consumers who take legal action as a form of redressal.

b) Medium Complaint: These are consumers who just voice their dissatisfaction frequently.

c) Low Complaint: These are consumers who make a complaint rarely.

d) Non-Complainer: These are the silent sufferers, who never voice their dissatisfaction to the service provider.

There are many reasons to complain and many types of complaint behaviour, but they all depend on the service under consideration. Buyer behaviour may vary according to the service. Consumers undergo complex buying behaviour when they are highly involved and perceive significant differences among the services. They are highly involved when the services are risky, purchased infrequently and are highly self-expressive (Assael 1987).

**Definition of Consumer:**

According to the Indian Consumer Protection Act 1986, a consumer is any person who buys any goods for consideration which has been paid and partly promised or under any system of deferred payment which such use is made with the approval of such person, but does not include a person who obtains such goods for resale or for any commercial purpose.

**What is a Complaint?**

The Indian Consumer Protection Act, 1986 defines a complaint as a means of allegation in writing made by the complainant that:

1. an unfair trade practice or a restrictive trade practice has been adopted by any trader.
2. the goods bought suffer from one or more defects

3. the services hired or availed suffer from deficiency in any respect

4. trader has charged for the goods mentioned in the complaint a price in excess of
   the price fixed by or under any law for the time being in force or displayed on the
   goods or in any package containing such goods

5. goods, which will be hazardous to life and safety when used are being offered for
   sale to the public in contravention of the provisions of any law for the time being in
   force requiring traders to display information in regard to the contents, manner and
   effects of use of such goods.

**Definitions of Complaint behaviour:**

Consumer complaint is a confrontative coping style attached to an individual
(Arndt 1976). Landon (1980) noted that complaining behaviour is “any action taken
by an individual, which involves communicating something negative regarding a
product or service to either the firm manufacturing or marketing that product or
service or to some third-party organizational entity”. Request or demand for an
adjustment is one of consumer complaint (Jacoby and Jaccard 1981). Thus consumer
complaint behaviour has been conceptualized as a “multiple set of behavioural and
non-behavioural responses…. triggered by a dissatisfactory purchase episode” (Singh
1988).

**Complaining Behaviour:**

Reactions to dissatisfaction in terms of complaining behaviour and redress
seeking varies considerably. Frequently, consumers do not take action to alleviate
market place problems. Day and Bodur (1978) found that reported cases of extreme
dissatisfaction for which no action of any kind was taken, was 49.6% for non-durable
products, 29.4% for durable products and 23.2% for services. Similarly, Andreasen
and Best (1977) reported that over half of all the non price purchase difficulties uncovered precipitated no action.

These results are corroborated by the earlier national survey of Warland, Herrman and Willits (1975). Surveys of sources of consumer dissatisfaction and reports of complaint action after unsatisfactory purchase experiences have enhanced understanding of consumer problems and consumer efforts to seek redressal (Beardsen and Teel 1983).

Day's Model of Complaint Behaviour:

According to Day (1980) consumers complain to achieve specific objectives. The consumer can provide explanations for the complaint action taken by him. There are two major options available to consumers who are dissatisfied with a purchase. The primary decision is whether to take some form of action or not. By taking no action, the consumer in effect decides to tolerate the dissatisfaction or to rationalize it. The main reason for taking no action is that pursuing an active course of action requires time and effort that may exceed the perceived value of any likely result.

Action in response to a state of dissatisfaction which can be private in nature such as switching brands, products or services. Conversely, the action may be such as demanding redress from the firm involved, complaining to the firm or some other organization or taking legal action against the firm.

Consumer Dissatisfaction:

A complaint from a consumer is an overt manifestation of dissatisfaction (Resnik and Harmon 1983). Complaints also serve as a feedback about product or service to the consumer and to the marketer. The response of a service provider/marketer could vary from total callousness/guarded acceptance or viewed as a matter of suggestion for improvement. This attitude of callousness is more reflected
in service industries. For it is well understood that there is no tangible transaction when a consumer buys a service. The service provider in particular, in many an occasion is unable to retrieve the mistakes committed which results in greater consumer dissatisfaction.

**Definition of consumer satisfaction –dissatisfaction:**

The definition of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction involves comparison of what one expected with what one actually received (Oliver 1981). If one gets what one expected, then one is satisfied (Hunt 1991). If one does not get what one expected, the expectation is said to be disconfirmed. A negative disconfirmation, that is, when actual is not as good as expected, it results in dissatisfaction. A positive disconfirmation when actual is better than expected, has received no treatment in literature.

Numerous definitions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction have been developed in the literature. 1) the normative deficit definition compares actual outcomes to what is culturally acceptable. 2) the equity definition (Evans 1982; Swan and Mercer 1981) deals with the comparison of gains in a social exchange—if the gains are unequal, the loser is dissatisfied. 3) the normative standard definition (Cadotte, Woodroff and Jenkins 1982) assumes that consumers develop expectations from their experiences regarding the level of performance they should receive from a brand. Dissatisfaction occurs when the actual outcome is different from the standard expectation. 4) the fairness procedural fairness definition (Goodwin and Ross 1989) derives from conflict resulting in search, and holds that satisfaction is a function of the consumer perceiving that he has been treated fairly. 5) an attributional definition emphasizes whose fault a disconfirmation, is not just the existence of a disconfirmation (Hunt 1991).
The study of consumer satisfaction:

The set of consumerism issues concentrating on the dissatisfaction has become a national concern. There have been calls for true measures of satisfaction at the macro and micro levels (Howard and Hulbert 1973; McNeal 1969; Wind and Douglas 1968). The word "satisfaction" refers to the global concepts. Its subsets consist of positive satisfaction and negative satisfaction (dissatisfaction).

Consumer satisfaction is an attitude in the sense that it is an evaluative orientation which can be measured. It is a special kind of attitude because by definition it cannot exist prior to the purchase or consumption of the attitudinal object (Czepiel and Rosenberg 1975). In structural terms the attitude is based on actual purchase/consumption experience.

Perceptions of that experience are compared with the motivations which underlie the action and the expectations previously formed concerning the outcome of the experiences, and are further modified by standards concerning desirable and normative outcomes (Czepiel and Rosenberg 1975).

As a concept, dissatisfaction has a substantive meaning for exceeding satisfactions—dissatisfaction and implies many actions, protesting consumer advocates, and rule-making Government officials. Dissatisfaction is a fire, it demands to be put out (Czepiel and Rosenberg 1975). Studies by Bearden and Teel (1983) have indicated that consumer satisfaction have been found to be inversely related to complaint behaviour.

Yet dissatisfaction typically explains only 15% of the variation in consumer behaviour. Thus dissatisfaction is not a sufficient condition for complaining to occur. Some have argued that dissatisfaction may not even be a necessary condition. Not all dissatisfied consumers complain, nor are all complainers dissatisfied. A small number
of complaints may also follow from too low consumer expectations, lack of relevant information, skills, time and accessible channels for complaining (Olander, 1976).

Factors contributing to Dissatisfaction:

1. Satisfaction as a relative standard:

As Brickman and Campbell (1971) have pointed out that happiness or satisfaction appears to be distressingly transient. Satisfaction with a given level of accomplishment or a given state of environment easily fades away, and gives rise to a new and higher standard for gauging happiness/satisfaction. Helson’s (1964) Adaptation-Level theory of man’s perceptual functioning states that the subjective experience of a stimulus input, is a functioning not of the absolute level of that input, but of the discrepancy between the input and past levels. This principle often applies to the processing of symbolic rewards and qualitative pleasures. Brickman and Campbell (1971) point out that the adaptation level is not necessarily a function of an individual’s temporal history (past rewards), but what Brickman and Campbell (1971) call temporal comparison. It can also be dependant upon the individual achievements in other spheres of his life, example the adaptation level for occupational prestige may become related to his income level. This is spatial comparison by Brickman and Campbell (1971). Finally comparisons can be in groups, classes or nations similar to one’s own.

The question of how a person sets comparison standards in order to be able to decide how satisfied he is, is a very complicated one. Some authors, like Brickman and Campbell (1971) introduce both adaptation level and level of aspiration to explain satisfaction phenomena. Sherif and Sherif (1964) also entertain the deal of a minimum and a maximum acceptance level, whereas other authors seem to think that one comparison standard is sufficient to explain obtained results. In marketing
literature, the concept "expectation" has been recently introduced as a construct needed for explaining satisfaction with a purchase (Carduso 1965; Olshavsky and Miller 1972; Anderson 1963).

1. **Satisfaction is held to be in relation to a standard:**

   The crux of these theories is that satisfaction is believed to be judged relative to a criterion whose level differs among individuals and groups according to previous experience and achievements in other spheres of life. Pfaff (1972) conducted a study in which Whites were found to be significantly more dissatisfied with clothing and market goods than Blacks. Obviously the levels of aspiration and expectation held by Whites and Blacks respectively, must have had some influence on the results. It is hardly likely that Blacks buy clothing or goods in general of a higher quality than Whites do. Ratings of satisfaction, seem to be highly dependent upon comparisons with previous experiences and with peer groups. There is seldom a yardstick which is common to different groups or which stays put over time.

2. **Unawareness of alternative options:**

   Consumer ignorance of alternative options makes options restricted thus leading to changes in satisfaction. Satisfaction with many consumer products in broad strata of the population is mainly a function of the non-availability of radically different alternatives with respect to price, content, energy conservation, environment protection. When radically different alternatives appear on the market, satisfaction with the established options change. New comparison objects are made available.

   The consumers lack of information about the faults and virtues of alternative products and services has often been evidenced, but at times as knowledge increases, satisfaction decreases. Van Raaij (1976) found that subjects who collected more information before making their decision, and who considered more attributes in
making their choices are less satisfied with their choice. Subjects who collected more information were more prone to believe that they could not have possibly chosen the best alternative.

Further more, Hill and Klein (1973) found that preplanning of actions was negatively to consumer satisfaction. Not only do those families, which carry their plans into action, most frequently appear to be dissatisfied with the outcome of their decision, but families which have most frequently been impulsive in making residence moves or purchases without prior plans congregate in the high satisfaction categories. Many studies seem to indicate that giving a person product information, which means providing him with more comparison objects, makes him subjectively less satisfied.

3. Cognitive Dissonance effects on Satisfaction:

It is frequently observed that most consumers declare after the purchase that they are satisfied with the goods bought. This is partly explained as the result of rationalization (Markin and Narayanan 1975). More specifically the explanation is offered in terms of the theory of cognitive dissonance, at least in cases where the consumer has been aware of the possibility of negative consequences before the purchase (Carlsmith and Freedman 1968). Though there is no data to indicate that cognitive dissonance phenomena applies with equal strength to all types of purchases and consumers. On the contrary, one can assume that the tendency to rationalize becomes more tempting as purchases take more of the consumers economic resources or become more important to him in other ways.

Consumers, who attach more importance to their consumption, or who find it difficult to give in to experienced dissonance in overt behaviour, for example do not know how, or do not dare to complain about a bad product or service or who have become disillusioned by earlier experiences of complaining, may be particularly prone
to reduce dissonance by increasing satisfaction with the chosen product (Raffee, Sauter and Silberer 1973).

4. **The Pollyanna Hypothesis:**

The Pollyanna Hypothesis, as formulated by Boucher and Osgood (1969) asserts that a universal human tendency in communicating with others is to use evaluative positive words more frequently and diversely than evaluative negative words. Man tends to look on the bright side of things. There seems to be much evidence that most persons exhibit such a tendency. It is likely that people tend to report more satisfaction than dissatisfaction when asked about their own situation (Olander 1977).

5. **Disregard for Long Range and Societal Considerations:**

Another issue concerns the extent to which respondents can be expected to pay attention to long range effects of their consumption patterns and purchasing habits, when reporting their consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction ratings. The next problem is the concentration on personal as opposed to collective satisfaction in most instruments which has been developed for satisfaction assessment. Feldman (1971) makes a distinction between social satisfaction which a consumer receives from the approval of his behaviour by “immediate others” such as family and friends. Societal satisfaction which is based on the consumer knowledge that his behaviour benefits the larger society.

6. **Expectancy Effects:**

Another drawback of subjective satisfaction measures is that they appear to be vulnerable to biases of the type psychologists refer to as expectancy effects. Interviewees give answers not indicative of their “true” satisfaction, but the answers they think the investigator wants, or because they believe it to be in their own interests
to misrepresent views. Similarly consumers abstain from complaining because they fear reprisals.

7. Level of Satisfaction /Dissatisfaction:

Renoux (1973) makes a distinction between macro-marketing system dissatisfaction and micro-marketing dissatisfaction. The first type refers to discontent that is associated with specific products, dealers and producers. The second type can be divided into three areas: (1) shopping system dissatisfaction deals with the availability of products and types of retail outlets; (2) buying system dissatisfaction deals with the problems involved in selecting and purchasing products for the retail outlets; and (3) consuming system dissatisfaction results from problems in using goods and services. Czepiel, Rosenberg and Akerele (1975) use a somewhat similar framework, distinguishing among three levels of consumer satisfactions: (a) system satisfaction, (b) enterprise satisfaction and (c) product/service dissatisfaction.

Dissatisfaction Outcomes:

When consumers get dissatisfied what happens? There are three responses possibilities. The first two are Hirschman's (1970) categories of voice and exit. The third is retaliation (Hunt, 1991). Voice means that the dissatisfied consumer in some way verbally communicates the dissatisfaction to the seller. Unless the dissatisfied consumer voices dissatisfaction, the seller will not know of the dissatisfaction or how to correct it.

Voice may be high, medium or low. High voice means the consumer tells the store manager and may also go further to write or call the manufacturer or the store division manager. Medium voice means the consumer tells the sales clerk or the check out person. Low voice means the consumer says nothing to anyone associated with the store or product (Hunt 1991).
Exit means the dissatisfied consumer stops using the brand or store. Unless the dissatisfied consumer in some way lets the seller know why the exit occurred, the seller will not know of the dissatisfaction or how to correct it. High exit means the consumer makes a conscious decision, mostly in anger never to go to that store again or never to buy that brand again. Medium exit means the consumer makes a conscious decision to try not to use that store or brand in the future. Low exit means the consumer will continue using the store or brand as usual (Hunt 1991).

Retaliation means the dissatisfied consumer intentionally does something to hurt the store or business. If the consumer’s dissatisfaction is of such intensity that there is an undeniable need to strike out and hurt the store, the dissatisfied consumer can do so by voicing never to shop there again, by making extensive efforts to tell many people how bad the store is, or by doing something to damage the store. High retaliation means physically damaging the store or its merchandise, causing loss to the store or deliberately going out of one’s way to tell negative things about the store or brand. Medium retaliation means causing some minor inconvenience to the store or telling a limited number of people an account of what made him mad. Low retaliation means doing nothing to hurt the store.

**Response Styles of Dissatisfied Consumers:**

The study of dissatisfaction response styles appears to be one of the central areas of research. Response style is defined as a unique set of responses that one or more consumers utilize to deal with a particular dissatisfying situation (Singh 1990). What distinct styles do consumers use to communicate their dissatisfaction with products and services?

Despite the large number of studies done, the question remains unanswered. First the researchers used a simplistic response style, complainers and non-
complainers. Then the finer distinctions were offered with notions of public and private actions followed by a preponderance of studies using demographic and personality variables only. Then Gronhaug and Zaltman (1981) described the styles. activists and passivists, as those who complained to some formal party or took no action. Singh (1990) bought four distinct response styles called passives, voicers, irates and activists.

1. **Passives**: represents dissatisfied consumers whose intentions to complain are below average on voicing complaints to seller of the dissatisfying service. In the face of dissatisfaction this group is likely to take any action. As such this group appears to be consistent with the non-complaint segment in past research.

2. **Voicers**: characterizes dissatisfied consumers who are below average on private and third party actions. In particular, these consumers have little desire to engage in negative word-of-mouth or switch patronage or go to third parties. Instead, they are highest on the voice factor, implying that these consumers actively complain to the service provider to obtain redress.

3. **Irates**: represents angry consumers who depict about average private responses that is negative word-of-mouth to friends/relatives, stop patronage of retailer and just about average tendency to complain directly to sellers. In other words, these consumers not only complain directly to the service provider but also switch patronage and engage in negative word-of-mouth. However, these consumers are less likely to take third party actions.

4. **Activists**: represents dissatisfied consumers who are characterized by above average complaint activity on all three dimensions especially for complaining to third parties.
(Better Business Bureau, court actions, newspaper). This bears a close resemblance to the notion of the consumer activist—one who belongs to a consumerist agency and actively utilizes all channels of complaining, not only to seek individual redress but for social good (Grikscheit and Granzin 1975).

Hirschmann (1970) considers three options that face a dissatisfied consumer. (a) exit (b) voice (c) loyalty. Exit is voluntary termination of an exchange relationship. Exit decisions are perceived as "painful" since they involve some effort, such as switching costs and searching for alternatives. The voice option is viewed from a proactive perspective as "any attempt at all to change rather than escape from objectionable state of affair". Mostly attempts are directed at the management, or anyone who cares to listen. Like the exit option, the voice response entails effort and motivation on the part of the consumer. By contrast, Hirschman (1970) views the loyalty option as a passive response. That is, loyal consumers neither exit nor voice. Rather, they continue to stick with the dissatisfying product/seller and "suffer in silence" confident that things will soon get better. This loyalty in Hirschman's (1970) model does not necessarily imply positive feelings towards the seller.

Other potential responses include (a) switching brands or refusing to repatronize the offending store (b) making a complaint to the seller or to a third party and (c) telling others about the unsatisfactory product or retailer (Richins 1983). One Nationwide study in the United States by Technical Assistance Research Program (1979) reported that depending on the nature of the dissatisfaction, from 30% to over 90% of dissatisfied respondents did not intend to repurchase the brand involved. Data reported by Diener and Greyer (1978) indicated that 34% of those dissatisfied with a personal care products told others about their dissatisfaction. If the number of
consumers experiencing dissatisfaction is high enough, such responses may have lasting effects in terms of negative image and reduced sales for the firm.

A few dissatisfied consumers do not cause concern to many firms. Managers tend to use complaint rates rather than the complaint itself as dissatisfaction indicators and assume that if complaint rates are low, overall dissatisfaction is low and thus negative effects are negligible.

**Definition of Consumer Service:**

The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 in Indian defines services as “any services for a consideration which has been paid or promised or partly paid and partly promised or under any system of deferred payment and includes any beneficiary of such services other that the person who hires or avails of the services for consideration paid or promised or partly paid and partly promised or under any system of deferred payment, when such services are availed of with the approval of the first mentioned person.” Service means performing duties of any description which is made available to potential users and include the provision of facilities in connection with banking, financing insurance, transport, processing, supply of electrical or other energy, board or lodging or both, entertainment, amusement or pursuing a news or other information, but does not include the rendering of any service free of charge or under a construct of personal service (The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as amended by Act No.50 of 1993).

**Perceived Quality of services:**

It is more difficult for consumers to evaluate the quality of services than the quality of products. This is true because of certain distinctive characteristics of services: their intangibility, their variability, the fact that services are simultaneously produced and consumed, and their perishability. To overcome the fact that consumers
are unable to compare services side by side as they do with products. consumers rely on surrogate clues to evaluate service quality. Since the actual quality of the service can vary from day to day, from one service provider to another, from customer to customer, marketers try to standardize their services in order to provide consistency of quality (Prathiba 1995).

**Service Concept:**

A service concept is a detailed description of a service offering that matches the chosen consumers needs and expectations. The most frequently quoted statement from the book, ”Service America! Doing Business In The New Economy” is,” if you are not serving the customer, your job is to serve somebody who is”. Everybody in the organization has customers either external “paying” customers or internal “working” customers. All organizations need to adapt in order to survive and prosper. Service organizations exist to survive as a function of their customer service quality, this is the primary survival strategy. To achieve service quality there needs to be a climate for service (Schneider and Chung 1993).

**Importance of the study:**

Why do consumers complain, when do they complain and how, are intriguing questions which this study attempts to investigate. In the Indian scenario, the consumer known for his patience and tolerance of defective products and sloppy services, frequently attributing these deficiencies to his fate or the planetary position in his horoscope (Srinivasan 1999). These signal a burning need for a systematic and organized consumer awareness program to usher in consumer consciousness or responsibility. With a view that at least in the new millennium consumers will assume an active role in changing the vagaries existing in the market.
From the managerial perspective, eliminating service defects will increase profits and maintain continuous consumer patronage. The existence of a large middle income consumers in the Indian market has inevitably ushered in the multinational companies with their exotic and extravagant promises in their media campaign and sales approaches. Thus unleashing sales campaigns and enticements on the unsuspecting consumer, who is woefully inadequate in evaluating service conditions, thus triggering dissatisfaction. This study is an attempt to awaken this slumbering consumer to act purposefully and effectively.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Purchase and Complaints:-

Consumers engage in market transactions to satisfy needs. Dissatisfaction in such transactions reflects negative discrepancy between performance expectations of the product or service bought and actual outcome of the purchase. Thus dissatisfaction can be conceived as the buyers cognitive state of being “inadequately rewarded in a buying situation he has undergone” (Howard and Sheth 1969, p.145).

Gronhaug and Kvitastein (1991) hypothesized that household resources and perceived product importance will be positively related to the probability of making overt complaint for a given purchase. A logit model analysis based on 1640 purchases supported the resource and supply system hypotheses. This study was conducted on a sample of Norwegian consumers. The findings show that unequally distributed consumer resources are important for their ability to take action, that complaint actions are related to perceived product importance and potential loss and that the responsiveness of delivery systems may influence the amount of negative feedback from consumers of importance to adjust to consumers wants and needs.

Why would dissatisfied buyers fail to respond actively and constructively to an attractive service alternative when an under performing seller creates a similar threat to their interests? Is a seller responsible for a severe dissatisfaction problem? In part, the explanation may be that buyers are concerned with protecting different kinds of interests in these two situations. Maute and Forrester’s (1993) study suggest that buyers dissatisfied with an under performing seller protected their interests by reducing loyalty or severing existing exchange relationships. But passive and
destructive responses may do little to assuage the convictions of highly dissatisfied buyers that they have been cheated and that the seller owes them something. Buyer's psychological interests in achieving redress may necessitate active and constructive responses to dissatisfaction which take precedence over even the need to protect economic interests. On the other hand, Sellers who are under performing relative to a more attractive service alternative may not arouse the psychological needs of buyers to achieve redress. These buyers can respond to dissatisfaction passively and destructively without concern for achieving redress with voice.

Magnitude of the dissatisfaction:-

Studies have reported (Granbois, Summers and Frazier, 1977) that Complaints vary directly with the magnitude of the loss associated with the problem. Thus the tendency to complain is related to the cost, in monetary terms. As dissatisfaction problems become more severe, the threat to the interest of the buyer increases. Severe dissatisfaction should prompt greater exit among buyers prepared to seek a more dangerous relationship with another seller. To the extent that buyers are intent on maintaining their exchange relationship with the current seller, they should respond with voice to inform the seller of their dissatisfaction and facilitate the development of remedies or solutions. Unlike exit and voice, loyalty is a passive response to dissatisfaction that involves little if any effort or direct cost to the consumer (Singh 1988). Nevertheless, Hirschman (1970) noted that loyalty involved "reasoned calculation" (1970 p.38) because a passive response to dissatisfaction was based on the expectation that the situation will improve. By undermining the buyers' confidence that things will improve without intervention, a more severe dissatisfaction problem should result in decreases in loyalty.
Research on marketplace, interpersonal and employment relationship provides support for these predictions. In a study of durable goods purchases, Kasper (1988) noted that dissatisfied consumers were less likely to repurchase the same brand than satisfied consumers. Other studies (Kraft, 1977; Granbois, Summers and Frazier 1977; Richins 1987; Bolfing 1989) found that problem severity was positively related to Consumer Complaint Behaviour responses such as complaining and word of mouth was negatively related to repurchase intentions. Increasing dissatisfaction thus led to reductions in loyalty and commitment (Rusbult, Johnson and Morrow, 1986; Rusbult, Farrell, Roger and Mainous, 1988). Maute and Forrester (1993) in their study found that exit and voice increased and loyalty decreased when the dissatisfaction problem was more severe. The threat that buyers will terminate the current exchange relationship creates a powerful incentive for sellers to perform effectively and to redress dissatisfaction quickly and equitably. To make this threat credible, more than one seller must be competing for the buyer's patronage and the buyer must possess the knowledge to make informed choices among sellers. Direct first hand experience represents the most dependable source of information about seller performance. However, this information is acquired only by risking dissatisfaction and remains unavailable to inexperienced buyers, who need it most. In addition to consulting friends and acquaintances, buyers can acquire information about the incidence, magnitude and redress of consumer dissatisfaction problems from industry, government and consumer organization, that track and report seller performance, to consumer. In this manner, "even inexperienced buyers can make informed decisions, about sellers that enhance their potential for satisfactory exchanges and create incentives for sellers to perform effectively" (Maute and Forrester 1993, p.230).
In order to maximize the potential for satisfactory exchange relationships, a buyer's further obligation and one that grows with the magnitude of the dissatisfaction problems, is to communicate dissatisfaction to the seller. While prior satisfaction with a seller may warrant a constructive rather than destructive response to a current dissatisfaction problem, neither buyers nor sellers long-term interests are served by passive responses to dissatisfaction that fail to achieve redress for the buyer and do not provide the seller with an opportunity to rectify the dissatisfaction problem.

Complaint Responses:-

Resnik and Harmon (1983) investigated managerial response to complaint letters to a manufacturer. Examination of representative advice on complaining reveals an emphasis on complaint letters, more than face to face situation (Knauer 1982; Federal Trade Commission 1983). Usually consumers are told to use the proper complaint chain of command, to document purchase and usage history, to be aware of their rights and to turn to appropriate government agencies when needed.

Krapfel (1988) studied a face to face complaint response model, with department store employees. Two principal approaches to compliance gaining are, behavioural influence methods (Reingen 1978) and persuasive communication. While behavioural influence methods such as foot-in-the door and door-in-the-face (Cann, Sherman and Elkes 1975; Scot 1977) may also apply but Krapfel (1988) studied the persuasive communication framework. This study found that interaction style and dress variables are customer controllable and can be used to influence outcomes. Well-dressed customers engender a more positive response. Further a customer whose argument is weak may fare better simply by dressing in the hope that the sales personnel will be more attentive to such sources. Perceived similarity also
enhances communication effectiveness. That is customers perceived to be more similar to the employee are judged to have requests that are more legitimate.

Richins (1983) described two consumer interaction styles, assertion and aggression. Assertive behaviour was described as involving a comfortable expression of self interest, without infringement on others. While aggression entails delivery of unpleasant stimuli, commonly referred to as being rude or obnoxious. Studies on impact of relative aggressiveness on persuasion have emphasized eye contact, vocal loudness and vocal fluency as well as message intensity (Burgoon and Stewart 1975; Hull and Schroeder 1979 and Norton-Ford and Hogan 1980).

Appearance is another salient source factor. Studies on source credibility have found attractiveness more important in some situations. Debevec and Kernan (1984) report that both male and female message receivers responded more favourably to attractive as opposed to average sources. Although a customer cannot alter inherent physical attractiveness, style of dress, use of cosmetics, grooming aids and wearing of jewels can significantly alter perceptions. Solomon (1981) reports that dress could influence job interviewer decisions. Forsythe, Drake and Cox (1985) observed that style of dress could influence job interviewer selection decisions. Sales people may perceive, Fussell (1983) notes, that people dressed in a business like fashion as more desirable customers.

More than a complaint letter, non-verbal elements of the face-to-face encounter may dominate verbal elements, especially where the customers tone is very strident or hostile. That there was a significant differences in responses to handwritten and typed complaints about guaranteed products, with typed complaints receiving better responses.
Gronhaug (1976) found that Norwegian housewives complained more often to the local consumer agency. These families were also more satisfied with the resolution of complaints to the Seller. Even in those cases, where complaints eventually were made to the consumer agency, the household had nearly always approached the seller first in an attempt to get a settlement; thus Gronhaug (1976) finds evidence for a stepwise complaint procedure.

Owing to a need to protect themselves from unscrupulous consumer, retailers often require substantiation of purchase and sometimes evidence of product failure before entertaining a merchandise return request. In general such evidence contributes to the perceived legitimacy of the request. Resnik and Harmon (1983) found perceived legitimacy to be an important factor in response to complaint letters to a manufacturer.

In addition, numerous investigators have looked into the role of perceived similarity in communication effectiveness (Padgett and Wolosin 1980). Overall social and psychological similarities between source and receiver are believed to improve communications. A consumer interaction style and appearance can influence store employees willingness to comply with a complaint request. Similarly, well dressed customers engender a more positive response to complaints (Krapfel 1988).

According to several psychological theories, such as attribution theory (Bem 1972), dissonance theory (Aronson 1968), and equity theory (Walster, Berscheid and Walster 1973), the tendency will be to fault the manufacturer or service provider.

Responses to Complaint letters by managers:

Resnik and Harmon (1983) made an exploratory study of managers and consumers perceptions of appropriate responses to complaint letters. The study was
conducted in two phases. In the first, consumers in geographically dispersed areas were asked to examine complaint letters and to play the role of the complaint writer. Subjects were then asked to suggest a response to the complaint and describe who should respond, what the response should be and how the subject evaluated legitimacy of the complaint.

The second phase investigated responses to the same complaints by branch managers from the company to which the responses were directed. The manager was asked to provide information about company objectives and policies, the employee designated to respond, perceived complaint motivations and the legitimacy of the complaint. By asking similar questions of consumers and managers consumer expectations and desires could be compared with the responses of branch managers.

Consumers in the study were more likely than managers to view complaints as legitimate. It appeared that some consumers, when confronted with an ambiguous situation, were willing to give the benefit of the doubt to the complainant. The manager's skepticism was based on their perceptions that consumers wanted something for nothing were confused or incorrectly evaluated the merits of the complaint. Managers preferred personal contact rather than the contact by letter that consumers expected. They were also more likely to offer an explanation, apology or a replacement than consumers who were likely to demand such actions. The managers desire to satisfy consumer's is supported by the comparative data. In all but 10% of the cases, the response emphasis was appropriate and managers gave at least what was required in a majority of the cases. This finding was especially significant for the letters that had obvious solutions and high perceived legitimacy. In addition, the overall attitude was decidedly liberal. Manager's perceptions that their actions would
indeed result in satisfaction apparently led to the commitment of more resources to complaint resolution.

Source of Complaints :-

Consumer complaints come from a variety of sources. Many complaints come from dissatisfied users of the product 1. Consumers who are satisfied users of the product. 2. Non-users of the product 3. Non purchasers of the product (Jacoby and Jaccard 1981).

One main reason for complaints to occur is the aggressive advertising by the market to catch the attention of the consumer at any cost. Tall claims are made. Sometimes even vague and ambiguous assertions, which leave the consumer totally at a loss.

Buying and selling are undertaken on trust. There is a certain amount of tall claims that are legitimately accepted all over the world. This is termed as puffery. Puffery refers to that amount of exaggeration in advertisements that consumers are willing to accept and is also legally accepted. For example, detergents which claim "whiter than white" are relative concepts which may work for some, while it may not work for some others.

Misleading advertisements do sometimes influence a consumer to pay more or opt for a bad service/ bad quality or even making consumer buy a product, which he does not really require. Advertisements sometime contain half- truth or even untruths, which bring about a change in attitude of the consumer. Skillful advertisements has been known to dupe even a resourceful consumer into buying a product/ service that has no established standards or tested parameters.

Complaints may be due to different aspects of the buying process. For instance the product, service, the manufacturer or institution, retailer, sales person or even the advertisement. Considering only the product the complaint may be focussed on a
totally remote aspect of the product or service. Many complaints may not have any relevance to the functional aspect of the product or service. For example a consumer may complain that a doctor has overcharged them for a particular service rendered.

At times when the attention of the consumer is concentrated in the performance of product or service, wherein he feels that he has been duped in being dumped with a low performance product event though there is no reasonable clause for such assumption. The consumer’s unreasonable expectation, about the product and sometimes his inability to pinpoint the functional defect could also lead to complaining behaviour. On the other hand, when in reality a functional defect does exist in a product or service and the consumer is unable to put his finger on the definite problem, complaint behaviour may result. Sometimes the cause is due to the manufacturer, or the consumer himself, or due to other factors beyond the consumers or the manufacturers’ control. Hence the consumer attributes the cause to something other than personal negligence (Krishnan and Valle 1979).

**Attitudes towards Complaining:**

Richin’s (1981) reported that a consumer’s complaint action is related to a consumers general attitude towards (a) whether complaining is worthwhile or the cost of complaining (b) Consumers norms of complaining or whether he should complain and (c) Consumers perceptions of societal benefits likely to result from complaining. In Richin’s (1981), study the American subjects, norms of complaining were the best attitudinal predictor of complaint behaviour; whereas perceived cost of complaining was the poorest predictor. Some people complain frequently while some rarely voice their discontent. The demographic and attitudinal factors remain fairly stable so the reason why a consumer complains in one situation and does not complain in another situation is still to be understood.
An explanation could be that the former deals with the propensity to complain and latter consumer action. The former is the likelihood that consumers would register a complaint in a generalized complaint situation with a given level of dissatisfaction (Day and Landon 1976). The latter is an expression of consumer discontent with a particular product in a specific situation. Complaint action is preceded by a series of decision points in which the consumer has to make a choice among different alternatives (Day 1977). Hansen (1976) argued that intrapersonal and interpersonal variables have to be included in explaining consumer choice behaviour. However even if a consumer is strongly predisposed to take complaint action, the complaint situation may deter him from doing so, when the channels and registering a complaint would incur high cost to the consumer (Chiu, Tsang and Yan, 1987).

Importance of Affective responses to Complaint Behaviour:-

Affective processes are those involving subjective feeling (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982). As an illustration, an unfavourable consumption experience, such as a major engine failure soon after expiry of an automobile warranty may be considered. If causal reason is assigned to the automobile or to its manufacturer, that is, if the consumer believes the problem is due to defective design or manufacture – affects of anger, disgust and contempt are likely to be aroused, possibly motivating demands for free repair or replacement. If instead, the cause is assigned to oneself – that is, if the consumer believes he failed to maintain the engine properly nor heeded its operating instructions – affects of guilt and shame are likely to be aroused, perhaps stimulating further cognition about how the problem could have been aborted. Finally, if cause is attributed to situational factors such as earlier unavoidable accident that damaged the engine and led to the present failure, affects of fear and sadness
would tend to be aroused, possibly stimulating withdrawal behaviour such as disposing of the vehicle.

The post purchase period comprises of product ownership and usage, both of which might be expected to provide opportunities for varied affective response of considerable personal significance to consumers (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982). Affective variables might be expected to contribute substantially to the explanation and prediction of post purchase behaviour which in addition to product usage includes satisfaction appraisal, seller-directed complaint actions, word of mouth transmission, disposition behaviour, and repurchase planning.

Westbrook (1987) examines consumer affective responses to product/consumption experiences and their relationship to selected aspects of post purchase processes. In separate field studies of automobile owners and cable television subscribers, subjects reported the nature and frequency of emotional experiences in connection with product ownership and usage. Analysis confirmed the existence of independent dimensions of positive and negative affect. Both dimensions of affective responses are found directly related to the favourable aspects of consumer satisfaction judgements, to the extent of seller directed complaint behaviour and extent of word-of-mouth transmission.

Research has shown that complaint behaviour to be chiefly the result of judged dissatisfaction with the products and its consumption, (Bearden and Teel, 1983; Richins 1983), that is to be related inversely to satisfaction appraisal. Day (1984) has proposed that the actual source of complaint motivation is not the judgement of (dis)satisfaction person, but rather the antecedent negative emotional state produced by the appraisal of unfavourable product/consumption outcomes. Positive affective responses being independent of their negative counterparts, do not reduce or offset
any subsequent negative affects during consumption thus complaint behaviour theoretically is unrelated to positive product/ consumption based affective responses.

These notions suggest that (dis) satisfaction mediates the influence of negative affect on complaint behaviour. However negative affect also seems likely to influence complaint actions directly because overall dissatisfaction with a product is not a requisite for voicing complaints, even satisfied consumers complain to note minor concerns or problems (Jacoby and Jaccard, 1981). Thus "product outcomes can prompt negative affect, triggering complaining, though the net effect of such negative affect on satisfaction may be outweighed by other occurrences of positive affect, high levels of expectations or positive disconfirmation beliefs." (West Brook 1987, p.261).

Findings in consumer complaint literature are consistent with this theoretical model. External product based attributions of causal agency for unfavourable product outcomes are related directly to increased complaint activity (Krishnan and Valle, 1979; Richins 1983) and such attributions also increase the likelihood of feelings of anger in consumers (Folkes, 1984).

Non-Fulfillment of Consumer Promotion as Cause of Complaints:-

Consumer promotions are generally used to obtain brand loyalty or introductory trial for brands, not to create dissatisfaction and negative attitudes towards the manufacturers. Diener (1974) conducted two research studies that were conducted within the toiletries industry. The first study brought out the importance of promotional fulfillment complaints. It involved a field examination of the correspondence handling processes and redress mechanism of seven companies in the personal care products. Results indicated that complaints accounted for as little as 30% of all correspondence to personal care manufacturers. Complaints observed in the study included (a) promotional fulfillment – free samples not reaching consumers...
disappointment with product performance (c) unusual look/ smell/ feel (e) irritation/ rash/ allergy to have occurred with product use.

Complaints about promotional fulfillment were surprisingly common among the companies studied who had run mail fulfilled promotions. Often the manufacturers were very sensitive to product, packaging or injury problems as evidenced by their internal monthly complaint reporting system. But these same manufacturers rarely even listed fulfillment complaints on those reports. In addition each of the companies thought that such problems were perhaps unique to them and were not aware of what appeared to be an industry wide problem area. In three of the largest companies studies. (Diener 1975) where promotional offers were run on each of their major brands annually, fulfillment problems over half the total complaints, were uncovered.

One company estimated that at least 10% of all promotional orders were fulfilled because of some combination of the above reasons. A good promotional offer could pull over 2,50,000 responses in the cosmetic industry, the number of potentially unhappy consumers becomes apparent. This problem is magnified by the fact that most dissatisfied consumers do not bother to write to the manufacturers, so that manufacturers are unable to make redress for the problem.

Factors in Consumer Complaint Behaviour:-

Consumer's perception of product defect cannot be taken as an estimate of actual defect in the product or service. The reason being that consumer's complaint behaviour is complex and intricately intertwined with many factors. Jacoby and Jaccard (1981) included 3 distinct and independent types of consumer behaviours. They are (a) decision-making (b) purchase and (c) usage. To illustrate, the wife may decide to buy a toothpaste for her children. She then asks her husband to buy a
particular brand for them. Here the decision-maker is the wife, the purchaser is the husband, while the children are the users.

Purchasers and non-purchasers both complain about a product while most purchasers use the product they buy. Some never use the product personally. Conversely non-purchasers may use a product that they have not bought (like borrowing a neighbour's cycle) and complain about it, specifically if a defect has occurred during usage of the product.

Hence users of the product includes both purchasers and non-purchasers of that product. But the purchasing user complains more frequently than the just user. This concept of user gives a clear demarcation from where complaints arise. Thus non-purchasing users complaints will also have to be analyzed and studied as purchasing users complaints.

Next factor relates to product usage which generally stimulate evaluation of this experience. An outcome of this leads to the consumer satisfaction, indifference (neutral) or dissatisfaction. When one can understand why a dissatisfied consumer complains it is interesting to note that those consumers who are satisfied also complain. Hence satisfaction and dissatisfaction is taken to be representing the end points of one continuum.

Worthwhileness of Complaint:-

Hirschman (1970) envisioned this variable to constitute some form of cost/benefit analysis. For voice behaviours, direct costs are incurred, "as buyers of a product spend time and money" in order to achieve desired consequences (p.39). Benefits include redress of problems, refund, feeling of influence and the possibility of better service in the future. Although costs and benefits can be treated
Independently Hirschman (1970) proposed on overall subjective assessment of “worthwhile” — which combines costs and benefits from an individual's perspective, that is consumers assessments about questions along the lines of. “Would I take the time and effort (costs) to complain even if I was sure to get a refund (benefits)?”

Furthermore Hirschman (1970) contended that in most cases consequences of exit actions are reasonably certain (for example availability of alternatives). By contrast, consequences of voice actions are significantly less certain because of their dependence upon the seller's reactions. For this reason, consumer expectations about the worth-whileness of voice actions play a key role. Specifically, if voice is perceived as significantly worthwhile, then dissatisfied consumers may tend to use the voice option and not exit even though alternative products/services may be available. Likewise negative word-of-mouth may be a less desirable option in the face of the positive worth-whileness of voice (Hirschman, 1970, p.38).

Within the Consumer Complaining Behaviour, literature Landon (1977) introduced the notion of the “benefit” of complaining as a predictor of Consumer Complaint Behaviour. Landon (1977) conceptualizes benefits as perceptions of payoffs minus the cost of complaining. He posits that this concept is “quite complex” including payoffs such as preventing the cause of their dissatisfaction from occurring to other customers.

Few empirical studies have examined the relationship directly. Instead indirect evidence by Day and Bodur (1977) show that a significant proportion of respondents, for example 28 – 52% in Bloomington studies, did not use the voice response because they perceived it was not worth the time and effort.

Failure to express dissatisfaction prevents the consumer from achieving redress from an unpleasant market place experience. Next, limited action on the part
of consumer may mask marketplace problems, which the firm could and should correct. Further widespread failure to express complaints limits the usefulness of complaint data as a basis for policy. For example, complaint data have been suggested as being useful for analysis of consumer discontent overtime and across products (Gronhaug and Arndt, 1980). Munns (1978) has advocated providing of complaint data to consumers as pre-purchase information.

Richins (1979) provides an operationalization for the costs and benefits of the complaining constructs. Bagozzis (1982) measures the cost involved in voice actions, given that some particular benefits (for example refund) was sure to occur. Some consumer may choose not to voice even if the benefits were sure to occur, merely due to the prohibitive costs (for example, time/effort) involved.

The expectation of complaining consumers is important and often not met. Kendall and Russ (1975) found considerable variation in organizational responses to complaints even within a single industry. Resnik, Gnauck and Aldrich (1977) concluded that corporate responses to complainers resulted in a disturbingly low rate of satisfaction with the response given. Other writers have implicitly recognized a gap between what organizations do and what their complainants expect; they have offered suggestions to bring the two, closer together (Brock 1974; Fenvessy, 1972).

Some make the assumption that marketing consequences may flow from consumer's reactions to the way their complaints are handled. Such an assumption fits into consumer behaviour models (example, Engel, Blackwell and Kollat 1978; Howard Sheth 1969; Nicosia, 1966) which show post purchase behaviour as one factor affecting subsequent repurchase.

Literature on satisfaction concerned with the comparison process involving expectations and actual results (Anderson, 1963; Andreasen, 1976, Gilly 1979; Oliver
Those consumers who complain about losing money know what they expect and communicate it. They want their money back. Consumers complaining about non-monetary loss problems presumably have expectations which because they are less definite, will be less likely to be matched by results. Landon (1977) suggests that the seriousness of the complaint is one factor the dissatisfied consumer considers when deciding to complain. The amount of loss claimed offers one objective measure of the problems seriousness. It is assumed that a higher loss will set the complainants expectation level higher therefore there would be a lower probability that the expectation would be met.

Speed is an important aspect of the company's response (Brock, 1974; Fervessy 1972) in handling complaints. Prompt response is the "desired" expectation and thus its comparison to actual outcome is expected to be associated with degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

Literature also suggests that the expectations of consumers who complain about losing money, such as a purchase or repair may be different from those consumers who complain about problems that did not cost them money, such as an insolent clerk in a bank. It is possible that the latter group, not expecting a personal "payback" after their complaint, would not complain without an extremely high level of annoyance. If so, these are extremely annoyed people with presumably less precise expectations of what they will accomplish by complaint. Their relative lack of satisfaction with organizational response is thus no surprise, but represents opportunity for creative corporate thinking. For example, it is possible that consumers expect copies of letters from headquarters to the site of the unsatisfactory experience or copies of follow up reports on whether or not the condition was corrected (Gilly and Gelb, 1982).
Profile of the Complainer:

There is a sea change going on in consumer attitudes, and with a new emerging era, a whole new definition of what constitutes lifestyles is the urgent need of the hour. With the collapse of confidence in virtually every institution, the consumer has turned out to be a "vigilante consumer", who perceives the market as an enemy. Consumers involvement with media and their responses to and skills on getting information are important prediction of their wants (Heath, 1996).

Complainers are evenly split between men and women, but they are also likely to be older, frequent shoppers. Burke Customer Satisfaction Associates (1996) unearthed insights about complaining customers. A telephone survey of 1179 randomly selected department store shoppers indicated that half of the respondents would definitely report a problem to store management and the likelihood of doing so increases with age. 61% of the 55 and older set would complain, compared with 39% of those under age 35. Older people are also more likely to expect results, which may be part of the reason why they are willing to make the effort in the first place. Nearly half of older complainers but just one in five younger complainers expect store to resolve problems satisfactorily.

Many of the people who say they would complain might not carry through. Some do not want to spend the time and others feel the time will be wasted. This makes the actual complaining customer a rare and special person indeed.

J.C. Penny, a large departmental store in the United States, tries hard to accommodate the complaining customer and to learn from such customers. In any of its 1250 stores, "only the store manager has the final authority to say "no" to a customer request for satisfaction. Penny's has also discovered that its efforts in patching up disagreements go a long way towards strengthening customer loyalty.
(Speer, 1996). The Burke Study (1996) confirms this notion. Shoppers, who encounter problems and get stores to resolve them feel even better about the store than if things always go smoothly. It is as if a consumer is served a lousy meal at a restaurant and the chef cooked a whole new meal. That is what the consumer will remember and talk about.

Retailers and service providers of all magnitude should think hard about how to handle mail contents, because they may see more of them in the future. Customers expectations are on the rise and today’s shoppers compare the treatment they receive not only from department store to department store, but from dentist to drug store to dry cleaner (Speer, 1996).

The role of face situation and Complaint Behaviour:-

In a recent review of the literature on the Chinese concept of face, Ho (1980) conducted, there has been unanimous agreement among social scientists that Chinese attach great importance to face. Thus the concern for face will lead to the avoidance of confrontation, leaving the underlying conflicts unresolved. With regard to consumer complaints, Chiu, Tsang and Yang (1987) felt that it was likely that in a situation in which redress seeking involved direct confrontation with the responsible party, Hong Kong Chinese would be less likely to complain. When the complaint situation did not involve direct confrontation, however, there is a higher probability that discontented consumers would complain.

Chun, Tsang and Yang (1987) conducted a field experiment with an automatic cold drink delivery machine in the Sports Center at the University of Hong Kong. Before the experiment commenced, the opening levers were removed so that, students who bought damaged products could hardly open the cans. This was designed to induce discontent among the consumers. Two experimental conditions, non- face
condition and the face - condition was applied. In the non-face condition, the students who bought the damaged products could complain without the necessity of confronting the proprietor of the shop. In the face condition, the discontented students had to complain face to face with the responsible party.

Fifty nine College students took part in the study. Results indicated that when complaint action involved direct personal confrontation. Chinese students tended not to complain. The demoralizing aspect or repercussions of losing face place high costs on complaining.

Situational factors of Complaint Behavior:

The situational factors can be organized into two groups (1) the importance of the situation (2) the prevailing social climate (both general and specific)

1. Importance of the Situation:

Landon (1977) observed that, “to predict complaining behaviour, the importance of the dissatisfaction should be included. If a consumer purchases a ball point pen.... and the product does not perform as expected, the consumer may very well not complain even if dissatisfied. It is important to note that the level of dissatisfaction may be the same as with on expensive product, but the importance of that level of dissatisfaction is different”( p.32).

According to Granbois, Summers and Frazier (1977) Complaints vary directly with the magnitude of the loss associated with the problem. Thus “importance” may be defined in several ways, not only in monetary terms. Particularly the relevance is on how essential an item is for daily living and thus its importance (Day and Landon, 1977). Cars, including the tires they ride on are considered essential in America (Jacoby and Jaccard 1981). Hence there is the possibility of more complaints about automotive products.
2. Social Climate

The social climate comprises of two aspects, the general and the specific. In general, social norms change. It is more acceptable now for consumers to complain. Hence complaint behaviour is increasing. (Landon, 1977).

On a specific level, the degree to which public consciousness has been raised with respect to the product under consideration. "The encouragement of the consumer advocates or spokesmen or governmental consumer protection agencies can also lead to more complaint activity than might occur otherwise" (Day and Landon, 1977, p 435). When there is a highly publicized news about a major manufacturer in the press and calls for action from Government and Consumer activist Organizations. The result is that it easily stimulates consumer complaints.

Complaints by satisfied Users:-

Generally satisfied users will not complain about a product. The reason, why these consumers complain are many.

1. Though satisfied the consumer may perceive a gain from complaining. As an example the moment, a satisfied consumer complains they may receive a new set of products and therefore be tempted to complain. Landon, (1977), describes the growth in professional complaining. Some consumers complain because they can profit from it.

2. The consumer may become concerned regarding future performance of the product. Inspite of satisfactory experiences, external influences as word-of-mouth communication or media coverage may stimulate concern over future problems. Thus causing the owner to complain. To justify the complaint, the consumer may imagine complaints about product defects.
3. When a doubt arises in the consumer's mind because of an external source the consumer feels discontent and cause concern for the welfare of others, this situation may lead to complaint behaviour.

4. The consumer may have an anti business attitude (anti- firm attitude) backed by a climate of complaint by media, which eventually triggers off complaint behaviour.

5. Though satisfied, the consumer's personality may be characterized by a predisposition to complain. When there is a climate of complaint, this predisposition manifests itself.

**Complaints from dissatisfied users:**

When a consumer comes across first hand experience with a product or service, it gives the consumer, the input to evaluate other inputs including the consumer's prior expectations, personality and outside informational inputs (word-of-mouth communication). Use of a product may, either match, exceed or fall below one's expectations. Dissatisfaction occurs if the performance of the product falls below one's expectation. (Day and Landon, 1977; Granbois, Summers and Frazier 1977; Howard and Sheth, 1969).

Two aspects have to be highlighted (a) that consumer expectation may be unreasonable. (b) Consumers do not have the requisite skills to evaluate product performance, because of their technical complexity.

At times dissatisfaction does not lead to complaint behaviour. Not all dissatisfied consumers complain. Other variables that could lead to complaint behaviour are the marketing channel, the individual consumer and the situation.

**Complaints by non users who are purchasers:**

In some situation, consumers often purchase products, which they may not use. These products are some times given away as gift. Sometimes, these products are
used by someone else in the family, example teenager using father's shirt. In the eventuality of the person complaining about the product to the purchaser, the purchaser may then complain to the concerned authority.

There are occasions when a consumer who has purchased a product may never use the product for a number of reasons. For example, the consumer may buy a book but not have time to read it. Or the purchaser feels the product is defective and does not use it. But purchasers may still complain about products that were never used by them. These complaints from purchasers may have little to do with the actual performance of the product.

Complaints by Non Users who are non purchasers:-

Day to day, instances indicate that some individuals who never purchase a product may complain about that product. For example, non-users of airlines complain about the noise pollution caused by commercial aircraft or non-smokers complaining about the cigarette fumes of smokers. The reasons they complain are many (1) The usage of the product may affect them adversely (2) They may be socially concerned individuals for the welfare of others (3) Concern for the environment (4) They may influenced by media (5) Or may have a negative attitude towards company or product.

Frequency of complaints:-

Complaints to the firm or governmental agencies are not very common. Non-complaint rates are as high as 86% for problems experienced by consumers of low-cost, frequently purchased items (Andreasen and Best, 1977). For personal care products 89% of the consumers experiencing problems take no complaint action (Diener, 1975). However, this percentage is cut almost in half for most durables as the percentage of non complaints for consumers experiencing a problem with household
durables is about 50%, and 44% for cars (Mason and Hines. 1973). This percentage is reduced even lower for clothing purchases as only 25% of those experiencing a problem do not take any form of complaint action. There appears to be a difference in complaint behaviour that is related to both the cost and social importance of the product.

In terms of individual consumer complaint efforts. analysis of complaint files show that ¼ of the complainers account of nearly 50% of all the complaints (Robinson, 1978). For example, a sample of 2400 households revealed the frequency of complaints indicated that a little over 50% of the consumers voiced complaints and of these, 47.9% did it only once, while 3.2% complained 6 or more items (Andreasen and Best, 1977). It is not only how much a consumer complaint that brings action but also the manner in which they express their complaints.

Complaint studies in Denmark (Klant en Klacht, 1969) found one-sixth of Dutch households per year was found to have a complaint about a recently bought electrical appliance. Two thirds of these complaints took place within the guarantee period, so that yearly about one out of ten households did have complaints in that period.

In a British study (Lilleker, Mapes and Riley, 1969) of dissatisfaction with durables, it was also found that most people 87% claimed they have complained when dissatisfied. 85% of the purchases were found satisfactory and 15% unsatisfactory. In a study of Norwegian housewives, Gronhaug (1976), found that only a small fraction of dissatisfied buyers took action and complained, although the fraction varied among product groups.
Factors contributing to Complaint Behavior in India

Shah (1994), studied 3 factors that contributed to the Indian consumers’ Complaint Behavior. They are:

1. Indians are largely fatalist and believe that present sufferings are the result of sins and misdeed in the earlier births.
2. The second inhibiting factor is that nothing is going to come out of complaining.
3. Indians are basically lazy people – why complain?

Another important aspect of the Indian Complaint Behavior is the attitude as given in the Carvaka Philosophy (Mahadevan, 1974) where in the Indian consumer lives for the present day, a highly materialistic approach highlighted by the fact that they do not believe in the future and live for the present moment alone. They are easily satisfied with the compensation given by the service institutions, with the basic view that today’s pigeon is better than tomorrow’s peacock.

Individual variation in Complaint Behavior:

Every study of dissatisfied consumers found that a significant percentage do not complain. What individual characteristics differentiate those who complain from those who do not? Non Complainers are often unaware of available avenues for complaints, feel powerless to act, or do not feel that complaining is worth the trouble. Compared to complainers, they tend to have lower incomes and less education (Warland, Hermann and Willits, 1975).

A number of personality characteristics also serve to differentiate complainers from non-complainers. Close minded, (Dogmatism) .Self confident , Assertive consumers have a higher propensity to complain ( Wall, Dickey and Talarzyk 1977). Greater generalized self confidence corresponds with greater amount of complaint
behavior. The more powerless a consumer feels, the less likely he or she is to take a complaint action. Consumers who believe in the political system to resolve problems, (that is, high political efficacy) the more likely he will attempt to resolve a problem by engaging in a complaint behavior (Hill and Garner, 1974).

Marketing Channel Factors:-

There are four factors that could influence a consumer to complain. They are the manufacturers/ retailer’s reputation, the accessibility of the firm for lodging a complaint, the perceived willingness of the firm to provide redress and the perceived intentions of the firm.

(a) Reputations

Landon (1977) says “…… If a firm has a strong image for quality and a well-known reputation for making adjustments, consumers are more likely to complain when they are dissatisfied. In effect, a firm with a good image will stimulate complaining behavior. Retailers particularly must be aware that a sizeable cost may be involved in maintaining liberal return policies”(p.33).

(b) Ease of access

The easy access to the marketing channel will effect whether complaints are made to the marketing channel or to some third party for instance, the consumer fora. The consumer is more likely to complain if that can be done at a conveniently located store/ branch/ consulting room. (Day and Landon, 1977) “On the other hand, if the source of the goods or services is physically distant or otherwise difficult to contact then the complaint may be initiated through the local Better Business Bureau or other agencies”(Day and Landon, 1967, p.264).
Willingness to provide redress:-

Granbois, Summers and Frazier, (1977) have gleaned the following from their research. Perceptions of a store's willingness to provide a remedy (more so than any psychological or socio-demographic factor) is clearly the most significant correlate of complaining behaviour. Consumers appear to complain largely when they believe their efforts are likely to meet with success.

"Some consumers seek redress or complain only when they are reasonably confident of obtaining a favourable outcome" (Day and Ash, 1979 p.439). Similarly a company with a liberal warranty policy is likely to stimulate more complaints than one having a stringent warranty and adjustment policy.

(d) Perception of firms intentions with respect to the problem:-

Kraft (1977) feels that, consumers who believe that a firm intentionally deceived them or acted to dissatisfy them would be more likely to complain than those without this perception.

Complaints in Services:-

The yawning gap in the perception of products and the perception of service brings out the nuances existing in consumer complaints in the service sectors. The intricate differences in service options available in complicate the issue further. Shoddy Service and callous treatment of consumers will not be tolerated any longer (Saklani and Singh, 1997). Half the complaints pending in consumer courts are against sloppy service in public utilities like water, telephone and electricity (Saklani and Singh, 1997).

Viewing the problem from the managers' perspective, high quality customer service means up to 40% of the profits (Gale, 1994). The need to achieve this quality customer service is the issue raised in the present study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the problem chosen for study, its objectives and the selection of sample, description of the instruments used and the statistical techniques adopted to establish the reliability and validity of the tools and to analyze the results obtained in this study.

This study is a descriptive research using the nomothetic approach. The main aim is an attempt to establish broad generalization and "universal laws" that apply to a wide population of consumers. As a consequence, this research considers the study of behavioural characteristics of complainers with the purpose of determining the average or typical Indian Consumers responses to dissatisfaction with the service provider.

Multidimensional Attribute Analysis:

Attempts have been made to study the consumer Complaint behavior at three levels. First major type: - personality, buying lifestyles measures; namely Appendix I and II , Cognitive : - preference by implication choice namely Appendix III ; Affective: - the reaction of consumers to dissatisfaction namely, Appendix IV and V.

The Criterion Variable is Complaint Behaviour.

Consumer complaint behavior is a function of personality and buyer characteristics.

Consumer Complaint Behaviour is a function of predictor variables like age, income, occupation, gender, years of experience, geographical location, marital status and size of family.
Objectives of the Study

1. To study the differences in the personality of complainers and non-complainers.
2. To relate buying behaviour of the consumer to their type of complaint behaviour.
3. To find out the relationship between age, occupation and gender, income, size of family, years of experience, educational qualification, geographical location and marital status of complainers and non-complainers.
4. To observe the different methods of complaints preferred by complainers and non-complainers.
5. To examine the frequency of complaints among complainers.
6. To bring out the tendency of consumers to complain.
7. To differentiate the differences in the three levels of complaint behavior namely mild, moderate and severe complainers.
8. To observe the differences in complaint behavior across three service areas, namely Medical, Banking and Insurance.

The literature on consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaint behavior has primarily evolved after 1970. Past research (Andreasen and Best 1977) have demonstrated that consumers often perceive dissatisfaction with their purchases in one out of five purchases. Bearden and Teel (1983) have demonstrated that dissatisfaction is a necessary condition for overt complaints.

Hypotheses

1. There will be a significant difference in the personality patterns of complainers and non-complainers.
2. There will be a significant difference in the methods of complaining among the complainers.

3. There will be a significant difference in the frequency of complaints among complainers.

4. There will be a significant difference in the propensity to complain among consumers.

5. There will be a significant difference in the buying behaviour of complainers and non-complainers.

6. There will be a significant difference between the mild, moderate and severe groups of complainers.

7. There will be a significant difference in the gender of complainers and non-complainers.

8. There will be a significant difference in the income of complainers and non-complainers.

9. There will be a significant difference in the occupations of complainers and non-complainers.

10. There will be significant difference in the age of the complainers and non-complainers.

11. There will be a significant difference between educational qualification of complainers and non-complainers.

12. There will be a significant difference between the rural and urban complainers and non-complainers.

13. There will be a significant difference between the professionals and non-professionals on complaint behaviour.
14. There will be a significant difference between the size of family of complainers and non-complainers.

15. There will be a significant difference between the personality of mild, moderate and severe complainers.

16. There will be a significant difference in the marital status of complainers and non-complainers.

17. There will be significant differences in the complaint behaviour of consumers across services, namely Banking, Insurance and Medical.

The hypotheses formulated for the present study were based on the past research literature. Review of literature has shown that dissatisfaction and overt complaints are found to vary across products and services (Andreasen and Best, 1977, Technical Assistance Research Programme, 1979, 1986). Gronhaug and Zaltman (1981) on examining a variety of factors related to resources, learning and personality found market place activities to be most powerful criteria in discriminating between dissatisfied complainers and non-complainers respectively. Most research on complaint behavior has focused primarily on various aspects of the complainers, such as their strategies, characteristics and satisfaction with complaint outcome. (Gilly, 1987, Robinson, 1978; Singh 1988)

Consumers are assumed to exhibit purposeful behavior and may react in various ways when perceiving dissatisfaction, such as complaining to seller, contact consumer agency, seek advice from friends or do nothing. (Day and Landon, 1977; Singh, 1988). The intensity and contents of complaints raise sensitive problems. While a substantial volume of complaints normally would suggest deficiencies in the
market system (Andreasen, 1977), the opposite need not be true (Gronhaug and Kritastein, 1991).

In the present study:-

1. An individual consumer is the basic unit of analysis
2. The analysis is cross-sectional
3. The purpose is to predict complaint behaviour and to evaluate the importance of one or more independent variables as determinants (Causes) of variation in a given dependent variable.

Segmentation Studies: (Frank, Massy and Wind 1972)

I. Dependent Variables
   (a) Accuracy – Mild, Moderate and Severe
   (b) Aggregation – Consumer Complaint Intentions, complaint Activity, Tendency to complaint
   (c) Specification – Complainer, Non complainer
      (Morganosky and Buckley, 1986)

II. Independent Variables
   (a) Personality Characteristics
   (b) Demographic characteristics: age, income, years of experience, gender, educational qualification, occupation, professional and non-professional, marital status, and nuclear/extended families.

III Customer Characteristics:- Buyer Characteristics, namely Thrifty, Risk-taker, Impulsive, Optimist, and Conservative.

Analysis of Personality of consumers

Several consumer researchers conceive consumer complaint as a confrontative copying style attached to an individual, Efforts have been made to ascertain who will
complain and who would not complain. Studies of personality characteristics including dogmatism, locus of control and self confidence have been linked with complaint behavior (Settle and Golden, 1974, Zaichkowsky and Liefeld, 1977).

A growing body of research has been directed towards psychological profiles of consumers in order to predict or understand consumer’s responses to their experiences in the market place. Several researchers have correlated measures of assertiveness and aggression with individual differences in the way in which consumers interact in dyadic exchanges in the market place (Swanson and McIntryre, 1998).

There are many studies relating personality of consumers who complain to the variables of Consumer Complaint Behavior. The consumer complaint behavior could be considered a function of personality as well as reflection of the quality of services in the market place and perceptions of the actions taken to redress problems.

The internal–external control dimension is derived from the social learning theory of Rotter (1954). Based on past experiences, some individuals acquire the view that locus of causality for personality relevant events or reinforcements is external. Others view events as product of their own actions. Thus the internal–external construct is a stable uni-dimensional personality variable.

Extending these studies, it was hypothesized that consumer complaint behavior would be a function of personality and the variables of complaint behavior namely frequency of complaint, method of complaints and tendency to complain.

Instruments used in the study:

**Rotter’s Locus of control**

Locus of Control refers to the extent to which one believes either that reinforcement occurs primarily as a function of ones own behavior (internal control)
or due to external forces such as luck, chance, powerful others (external control) (Rotter, 1966).

Rotter's Internal – External scale was used to measure external and internal locus of control orientation of the consumers. This scale comprises of 29 items including 6 filler items, each of which, requires the consumers to choose one of the two statements with which he agrees more. These statements make reference to matters of social and political as well as personal relevance.

**Internals:**

According to Rotter (1966), internals are those who believe that their rewards and punishments are controlled by what they do.

**Externals**

Externals are people who believe that forces outside themselves are responsible for their rewards and punishments. Factors such as luck, chance and powerful people control their consequences, sometimes the outcomes are appropriate and the externals feel that they are not related to what he does.

To test hypothesis I, Rotter's Locus of Control test was used. Consumers were classified into externals and internals based on their scores on the E-I scale. The consumer's whose scores were 0-11 were classified as internals and those scoring 12 and above were grouped as externals. Analysis indicated that there were 81 externals and 219 internals in the sample of 300. They have been further grouped on the basis of their complaints in the three service areas, namely Banking, Insurance and Medical.

**Reliability**

Reliability coefficient was calculated using the test – retest method on 50 consumers after an interval of one month and it was found to be 0.89.
Instruments to measure Complaint Behavior

Consumer complaints are now considered indispensable as indicators of unsatisfactory performance of the economic system (Fornell and Didow, 1980). They provide a feedback to business and play a major role in assisting the planning of major consumer programs and activities (Best and Andreasen, 1977; Day, 1977; Hunt, 1977).

Potential responses include (a) switching brands or refusing to re-patronize the offending store (b) making a complaint to the seller or to a third party, and (c) telling others about the unsatisfactory product or service or retailer. While estimates of the incidence of complaints in response to dissatisfaction vary, it is accepted that the incidence is lower than the incidence of other responses, namely the repeat purchase behavior and word-of-mouth behavior.

Consumers discontent, which manifests itself with consumerism and other forms of consumer resistance may grow out of concern, both with particular business practices and with the broader societal impact of business behavior (Herman, 1992). A variety of responses are available to consumers concerned about lapses in business, for example, boycott and creation of alternative providers of goods and services. Evaluation of services before, during and after the purchase along with evaluations of quality and satisfaction is absolutely imperative. (Pratibha, 1995).

Cognitive Measures:-

Can satisfaction be subdivided into several cognitive components? Fitting in with trends, sense of accomplishment in solving a complex task, length of usefulness of chosen alternative, given uncertainty ,(Srinivasan 1995 ). Classification of consumer buyer characteristics occupies a central role in the systematic understanding and prediction of complaint behavior. The consumer complaint behavior literature lacks a
logically developed scheme for the classification of dissatisfied consumer's buyer styles. Hence identifying consumer groups with unique buyer styles was felt.

b. Instruments to measure Buying Behavior

This instrument was constructed on the basis of the economic classification of man. In the construction of this instrument, ten statements each about five consumer buyer life styles were selected. A pretest with a convenience sample of college staff and faculty indicated that some of the items are repetitions and appeared to reduce the consumer's interest. On the basis of pretest result, a revised scale of 20 items was developed for the five buying patterns. A subsequent pretest with the revised scale appeared to provide adequate face validity.

The instrument identifies and classifies five buying behavior categories of consumers. The buyer life styles given by Sunil Mehrotra and Well's (1977) has also influenced the classification of buyers. This instrument, comprised of 4 statements relating to five buying behavior patterns. Adhering to this analysis, the psychographic categories taken up for this study are Thrifty, Risk taker, Impulsive Buyer, Optimist, and Conservative.

The statements thus selected were given to a panel of 10 judges, who were asked to classify the buying behavior. The categories that emerged were Thrifty, Risk Taker, Impulsive Buyer, Optimist and Conservative. These statements were given to a group of 20 consumers and the reliability of the instrument was calculated using test – retest method. The reliability coefficient is 0.91

Lifestyles is a widely used and very familiar construct to market researchers. A lifestyles marketing perspective predicts that people sort themselves into groups on the basis of the things they like to do, how they spend their leisure time and how they
choose their disposable incomes. The identification and targeting of these categories has become the imperative for many practitioners.

Operational definitions of the psychographic buyer lifestyles used in this study


2. Risk Taker is one who is aware of the consequences or dangers associated with some future happening that may occur and is prepared to take the risk.

3. Impulse Purchasing is unplanned purchasing, a type of consumer buying pattern. Most of the buying decisions in supermarkets are unplanned. Acting on impulse rather than thought. The buying of items and merchandise on an impulse.

4. Optimist: the belief that good will win over evil, that things will end well. A doctrine, which emphasizes that everything is for the best. The condition producing the most favourable result.

5. Conservative: Favouring the established order of Society. They believe that this order of society should be kept, as it is, for as long as possible and then changed only slowly.

Scoring

This instrument was given to consumers with the instruction to read the statements and to respond by marking "Yes" or "No" to each of the statements. Thus a total score was obtained on a dichotomous (Yes/ No) scale of 20 items. Responses marked "Yes" were scored as 1 and responses marked as "No" scored as 0. The final classification was made on the basis of the consumer getting a maximum score of 4 on any one of the five buying behavior patterns.
This questionnaire is also based on the instrument used by Chattopadhyya and Alba (1988). Studies have indicated that consumers are flexible processors, who adapt their decision making to different situations (Mattila, 1998).

The questionnaire error, as indicated in the effect of evoked set is controlled because the set of alternatives is fairly small (Farley and Howard, 1975).

Validity of the instrument

Face Validity

Face validity was established by using 10 experts, 5 academic and 5 non-academics. Eight experts identified the five groups of buying characteristics. Sometimes the validity of the measuring instrument is self-evident. It can happen when the investigator bases the measuring instrument directly on the behavior of the respondent. A variety of information such as how they buy, when they choose a service provider has been drawn from the consumers during the data collection to show that the scores on these related scales are reasonable and are related to the respondents behavior.

The phi coefficients (Aggarwal, 1988) for the 20 items of Appendix II was calculated. They ranged from 0.45 to 0.63.

Construct Validity

The emphasis is constructing these scales was to put together related behavior items, such that each scale is focused on content area, and the items reflect this focus. For example, item 1 goes as follows:

“I usually look for the lowest possible price when I shop” – belongs to thrifty set of buying behavior.

Affective measures of complaint behavior

Recently satisfaction researchers have been broadening the scope of post consumption processes to include affective responses to complaints (Srinivasan 1995; Spring 1995).
Post purchase evaluations are made naturally, based on the retrieval of relevant constructs from memory. Prior satisfaction judgements are easily retrievable because they initially require both direct experience and systematic integration of information (Mattila, 1998). The post consumption satisfaction evaluation of consumers may be heavily biased by that of prior judgement stored in memory.

In consumer research, ranking are often used to determine preference especially when de-compositional models of preference are employed (Schibrowsky and Peltier, 1995). This instrument measures the preference data of consumer complaint methods. Preference implies that stimuli be judged in terms of dominance relationships, that is the stimuli are ordered in terms of preference for some property, namely methods of complaining.

c. Instrument to measure methods of complaining or Dissatisfaction Outcomes

Ranking – Discrete Dimensional Structure:

Rank order makes discrimination among alternative options. Rank order scaling is more sensitive in measuring differences that consumers can detect. In general rank order is preferred because it gives the relative preference of options or alternatives (Shaughnessy and Zeichmeister, 1997). Direct ranking is used where each respondent ranks the object from the most preferred to the least preferred. Items to be ranked are placed in a random order to facilitate non-biased ranking by the consumer. These approaches to obtaining preference data are typical although not exhaustive. An ordinal scale, where the consumer ranks the list of options that he would choose from, when he experiences dissatisfaction was developed. The aim of this tool was to measure the methods of complaining that the consumer prefers. This instrument is intended to explore how consumers put their thoughts into action and also indicates
the degree or the severity of action he intends to opt for. Ranking procedures are most useful for deriving importance weights for a set of attributes.

The consumers were asked to give their preferences for the complaint methods listed in the questionnaire. A multidimensional ranking procedure was followed for each of the discrete ranking characters. Rank 1 for the most preferred one, Rank 2 for the next preferred and so on till all 10 ranks have been assigned to each method of complaint.

Based on the ranking given to each option, the consumers were classified into mild, moderate and severe complainers. The mild complainers being those who indulge in, indirect methods of complaining. The moderate complainers are those resort who resort to more direct action. While the severe complainers are the action oriented group, who go all out to take extreme measures to punish the main cause of their dissatisfaction – be it an individual or an institution. The grouping was done on the following basis:-

(a) Consumers who preferred items 1, 3, and 8 were classified as mild complainers, indirect in their approach - indirect complainers.

(b) Consumers who opted for 4, 7, and 9 items were grouped as moderate complainers, more active in their expression of dissatisfaction - active complainers.

(c) Consumers who selected items 2, 5, 6, 10 as the “go-getters”, the ones who complain severely and go to court. These consumers could be persistent, insisting on justice and who want to accomplish what they set their mind do - persistent complainers.
Table 1 showing the distribution of complainers on the basis of degree of complaint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mild Complainers</th>
<th>Moderate Complainers</th>
<th>Severe Complainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This method of classifying consumer dissatisfaction outcomes is similar to Hirschman’s (1970) categories of Voice, exit and retaliation. The ten characteristics or methods of complaints were selected on the basis of Maute and Forrester (1993) study of Consumer Complaint responses to dissatisfaction in the market. A group of five experts were asked to classify the ten items in Appendix III into mild, moderate and severe groups of complainers. Based on a consensus given by them, the groups of consumers were allotted and classified.

Table 2 showing the “t” values for the three groups of complainers on Appendix IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mild and Moderate</th>
<th>Moderate and Severe</th>
<th>Severe and Mild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t_{0.05} = 2.06$

The “t” values given above indicate that there is a significant difference between the three pairs of groups of complainers at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus indicating that the instrument did differentiate between the three groups of complainers. The initial list was developed using 15 items, which were selected from the list of methods or procedures for handling complaints given by Consumer Confrontation (1997). This was given to 10 academicians for evaluation of the inventory. From their assessment, ten methods were selected for the study.

Reliability

Reliability was established using the test retest method, where the reliability coefficient was 0.92 on a sample of 50.
Table 2. (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t value</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t value</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Mild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t value</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 showing the Percentage of Complainers preference for the various methods of complaints:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mild Complainer</th>
<th>Moderate Complainer</th>
<th>Severe Complainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>26.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the Consumers responses to Appendix III, their preferences for the various methods were obtained and percentages calculated for the three groups of mild, moderate and severe complainers. An interesting fact is that while only 2.22% of the mild complainers opted for Rank 10, 26.88% of the severe complainer group opted for Rank 10, which is taking legal action against the service provider. Similarly the severe complainer groups prefer to meet the dissatisfying situation directly by taking the retaliatory option. They prefer a face to face confrontation than the other two groups avoid.

Validity:

Concurrent validity with Maute and Forrester’s (1993) instrument was found to be 0.67. The correlation coefficient between the mild, moderate and severe complainers (Appendix III) and the frequency of complaint as measured by Appendix IV was found to be 0.68. This coefficient indicates that the classification of complainers into mild, moderate and severe is justified.
Table 4(a) showing the mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean for the ranks preferred by complainers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.E.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in the above table indicate that as the number of independent observations increases, the error involved in generalizing from sample values to population values decrease and accuracy of prediction increases (Best and Kahn, 1992). Based on the mean and standard error of mean of a sample, the confidence interval, within which the "true" mean of the population would be was determined. This analysis indicated that the 95% confidence interval would be appropriate for this study.

Table 4(b) showing the Mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean for the ranks preferred by non-complainers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.E.m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the sampling error in the above table is less, the error involved in generalizing from the sample value to population values decreases and accuracy of prediction increases (Best and Kahn, 1992).

**Instrument to measure the frequency of Complaints:**

A rating scale was developed to measure the time spent on the specific complaint activities of the consumer. The intention was to find out the frequency of complaints by the consumer in the last one year. Studies on consumer complaint behavior have made use of such measures. For example, Richins (1981) study used the recollection of complaint as a measure of complaint behaviour. Consumers who had complained earlier were selected and pre-screened. Only those who had experienced a dissatisfaction within the last 12 months were selected. Based on their experiences, the initial scale was constructed. It comprised of 15 statements, which were given to 10 judges for evaluation given on the basis of the clarity and discrimination items. Out of these, 15 statements, 10 Statements were selected for the final study.

Each statement has four options in terms of the number of times the consumer has indulged in complaining. The more frequent the complaint, the more severe the action. This instrument indicates the time spent on specific complaint activity by each consumer. Similar rating scales have also been used by Singh (1990) in his study of consumer Complaint Behavior in the case of Western University, U.S.A.

**Scoring:**

The scoring weights extended from ‘0’ for ‘nil’ responses to three points for “11 or more times”. The higher the score, the greater the time spent on complaining, while a score of 0 would indicate a non-complainer.
Reliability

The split half reliability coefficient for the test items was found to be 0.87.

Validity

Face Validity was established using three experts who judged the questionnaire independently. Content validity was established on the basis of the ratings by experts. Inter-rater correlation was 0.69.

A sample of known complainers, numbering 10 from a consumer Activity Group in Chennai scored significantly higher than a sample of non-complainers. This established predictive validity of the instrument. The 't' values for the complainer and non complainers on Appendix IV are given in the table below:

Table 5 showing the 't' value for Complainer and non-complainer on Appendix IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>Significant at .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus a significant difference exists between the score of consumers on Appendix IV in terms of the complaint activity. While non-complainers have not made any overt action to reduce their dissatisfaction, complainers have chosen to act forcefully and effectively.

Fatigue error in this instrument is reduced by shortening the questionnaire to maintain the consumer's unabated interest (Halbert and Lehman, 1975). Findings also indicate that when a minor dissatisfaction is experienced, consumer's responses often are minimal. Most often consumers neither complain nor spread negative reports of the product or service involved. When dissatisfaction is serious enough, consumers tend to complain, regardless of other factors in the situation, (Richins, 1983).
Instrument to measure the Propensity to complain:

Richin's (1983) study provided the basis for this measure. A summated rating Scale associated with Likert (1932) type model was constructed. Likert-type scale was used because they normally yield a higher reliability coefficient with fewer items (Beri 1993).

Hence its obvious selection in the present study. First a large number of statements on tendency of consumers to complain was screened and 15 Statements were selected. The statements were given to 5 experts, who evaluated the scale and deleted those statements, which were ambiguous, irrelevant or otherwise deficient. The statements thus selected by them were pooled and the final rating scale comprised of 8 statements. Care was taken to see that the statements were worded in a simple way.

After the selection of statements, the scale was given to a group of consumers, who were asked to indicate their reaction to the statements using a five point rating system; always, frequently, undecided, rarely, never. These categories were assigned values of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The maximum score that was possible in this scale was 25.

This scale is also based on the study by Gronhaug and Kvitastein (1991) on the probability of making overt complaint for a dissatisfaction faced for a given product. Day and Landon (1976), termed this as a personality trait of “propensity to complain”. They observed that some consumers have a higher propensity to complain than do others, regardless or product, service or situation and that such a tendency would be function of personality.

The correlation coefficient between the personality of consumers (Appendix I) and their propensity to complain (Appendix V) was calculated.
Table 6 showing the correlation coefficient between the personality of Consumers and their propensity to complain

Correlation coefficient

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{Correlation coefficient} & r & 0.7941 \\
\end{array}
\]

Appendix V measures the course of action the consumer may take while making a decision. The decision-maker, according to the Bayes theorem, uses prior probabilities on the basis of information available of any point in time. At times, it is simple to assign probabilities in some situations. Thus the concept of probability as the basis of decision making under conditions of uncertainty is quite common. The more the consumer thinks a particular event is expected to occur, the greater will be the probability he assigns and vice versa.

Table 7 showing the number and percentage of complainers and non-complainers and their responses on Appendix V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Character</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainer</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Complainer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glance at the above table it can be noted that complainers have opted for favourable attitude towards future complaints. Nearly 58% of complainers are definite that they will complain in future. These results concur with the personal data sheet of consumers in that those who had complained earlier were the ones to complain more frequently than the non complainers. 31% of complainers have remained neutral and only 8% have opted for the unfavourable responses. This indicates that many complainers would prefer to take definite steps towards redressal.

The non -complainers on the other hand have exactly the reverse preference. Only 11% favour the active complaining response. With 57% of non-complainers not even contemplating future complaining. Most of these consumers feel that it is
"not worth the effort" to complain against Banks, Insurance companies or about the medical services. These results concur with Landon's (1977) study.

In the consumer complaint behavior studies similar findings have been reported by Shah (1994) who reported that Indian consumer prefer to remain silent because complaining against Governmental and Quasi Government utilities is a long drawn out procedures, cumbersome needing enormous efforts on the part of the individual consumer.

Both the groups (complainers and non-complainers) have approximately the same percentage of neutral responses. 30% of respondents preferring to sit on the fence and remain undecided or neutral. This characteristic is common among the Indian Consumer (Saklani and Singh, 1997). These results also indicate the predictive validity of questionnaire

Validity

Inter item correlations and item total correlation between all possible pairs of items were generated and found to be 0.50 to 0.71. The scales were constructed gathering together those items with inter-correlations of 0.50 and above. It was interesting to note that the consumers grouped under risk takers in Appendix II were found to be scoring high on Appendix V too. Validity was established by checking the responses of consumers and comparing occupations of these consumers to their scores. It was found that 60% of the consumers who scored high in this questionnaire were in occupations that involved quick decision – making behavior, like Lawyers, General Managers, Bank Officials. While consumers in unrelated occupations scored only average levels or lower on these scales as not related to their occupations. There was considerable agreement between the scores earned by the respondents and their occupations. Convergent validity of this scale was thus established for Appendix V.
Follow-up of 30\% of the consumers complaint behavior evaluating the type of action they had taken indicated relevant action prone behaviour. Complaint letters, their intensity and frequency, the visits to the concerned institution were also checked and found to be appropriate to their scores on Appendix V. Thus the scores of consumers on Appendix V is related to the respondents behavior regarding complaining.

Reliability

Here again test – retest reliability coefficient was calculated and found to be 0.81, on a sample of 50 consumers.

Table 8 showing the items and factor coefficients for the five Statements in Appendix V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>What are the chances that you would complain about a product/service when you are dissatisfied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Are you likely to complain when dissatisfaction occurs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>What are the chances that you will complain to the Store Manager on your next trip?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>What are the chances that you will go back to the shop immediately and find a solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>If an approximate answer is not given what are the chances that you will persist till the matter is settled?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concurrent Validity with Singh (1988) Consumer Complaint Behavior Intention Questionnaire was found to be 0.51

The correlation coefficient between the scores of consumers on frequency of complaints and the propensity to complain was determined and found be 0.72. This indicates that there is a strong relationship between frequency of complaints and the propensity to complain obtained from scores of consumers on Appendix IV and V. Such results show that there exists concurrent validity of Appendix V.
Stratified Random Sampling

The main objective of stratification is to give a better cross section of the population so far as to gain a higher degree of relative precision (Singh and Chaudhary, 1986). Stratification by natural characteristics helps in improving the sampling design. Stratification also ensures adequate representation to various groups of the population, which may be of importance. Finally it also ensures a better cross section of the population than that under non-stratified population. The allocation of sample sizes to different strata was done by proportional allocation.

Calculations of means and sampling variances were done for years of experience, and income with specific relevance to the 3 services, namely Banking, Insurance and Medical.

Biases in Research

Biases can be more important than random errors and are not susceptible to statistical analysis. Biases are of three types:

1. Those arising from systematic differences
2. Those concerned with procedures for measurement of response and other variables
3. Those concerned with implementation of treatment (Cox, 1982)

Randomization is intended to ensure that absence of the first kind of bias. Thus in the present study the stratified random sampling technique has been used to remove this error. The second kind of bias has been avoided by using limited observers. Care has been taken to use only qualified experts to evaluate the questionnaire. While the third kind of error has been evened out by the follow up study of consumer complaints of 30% of the sample involved in this study.
Stratification Analysis

In any sample study, one normally encounters a heterogeneous group. To remove this heterogeneity and to make the sample units more homogeneous the stratification technique is used. In the present study, the sample units are consumers who are highly heterogeneous in income, age, and occupation. The stratification variable considered in this study is service. The three stratification areas made are namely (1) Banking, (2) Insurance and (3) Medical. The total number of respondents in this study is 300. The proportional allocation technique is used for selecting samples from each stratum.

Stratified Sampling at a Glance

Table 9 showing the break up of stratification, service-wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum No.</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total Sample Size</th>
<th>Proportional Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula adopted is given by:

\[ \frac{N_i}{n_i} = \frac{N}{n} \]

- \( n_i \) = Sample to be chosen from the ith stratum
- \( N_i \) = Size of the Stratum
- \( N \) = Total Size
- \( n \) = Number of samples considered

Sample selection has been done using the simple random sampling for each stratum. This is known as Stratified random sampling. Estimation Aspects with Stratified Random Sampling

For Stratification analysis, the mean and variance have been computed. The stratified mean is computed using the formula
The variance is computed using the formula
\[ \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( \bar{y}_{it} - \bar{y}_{it} \right)^2 \]

For Stratification Analysis, the Age, Experience and income of respondents have been considered. These demographic variables play an important role in determining the behavioral characteristics of a respondent. The computation made are presented in the tables given below.

Table 10 showing the mean age of consumers across services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>40.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>42.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>41.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>41.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{y}_{st} \]

\[ SE = 1.24 \]

Table 11 showing the mean and S.D. of the income of Consumer, across Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ SE = 1.61 \]

Table 12 showing the mean and S.D. of the years of Occupational experience of consumers across service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{y}_{st} \]

\[ SE = 1.06 \]
Summary of Stratification Analysis

1. **The average age** of the respondents is found to be approximately 42 years
2. **The average experience** of the respondents work out to 17 years approximately
3. **The average monthly income** of a respondent is approximately Rs.16,200/-

Sample Size

At times, it is the proportion of the population with a particular attribute that becomes more relevant to the researcher than the mean value (Beri, 1993). In this study, the focus is on studying consumer complaint behavior. Hence the sample size decision have been based on estimating proportions of the standard error, which indicates the sample size to be drawn. Thus by estimating the size of standard error, the size of the population is determined. That is, if a small standard error is to be preferred, then a relatively large sample size is required. With an estimated standard error of 2 and a confidence internal of 95 percent where $z = 1.96$, sample size of 300 was selected.

Consumers who have experienced dissatisfaction with any one of the three services, namely Banking, Insurance and Medical were selected. Amongst them the ones who had been dissatisfied with these services but not responded to it at all were taken as the control or the non-complaining group. These are the “silent sufferers” (Hirschman, 1970) or loyal consumers who wait patiently, whose perceived control of their situation is to endure all sorts of discomfort and avoid unpleasantness (Bryant, 1989).

In the sample of 300, 237 were complainers and 63 were non-complainers. They were identified from in and around Chennai city. Both male and female consumers were selected based on the operational definition of 'Consumer' in the
present study. The rural consumers who participated in the study were from Karaikudi, Tanjore, Kancheepuram and Erode.

Test for proportions

To test for the difference between sample proportion and population proportion. The formula used is

$$z = \frac{P - p}{\sqrt{\frac{P \cdot p}{n}}}$$

where $P = \text{sample Proportion}$

$p = \text{Population proportion}$

$n = \text{number of samples}$

The aim is to find out whether the sample proportion of complainers is significant or not. The calculated $Z_0$ value is 39.50, while the table value $Z_0 = 1.96$. The data thus reveal that the sample proportion of complainers is significant.

Demographic Variables

Demographic research is concerned with gathering statistics about consumers. The consumer most likely to voice a complaint differs from the non-complainer on a number of demographic characteristics (Diamond, Ward and Faber, 1974; Mason and Hines, 1973; Warland, Hermann and Willits, 1975). These findings served as a basis for sample selection. Informative measure of Education, Income, Occupation was utilized. Each of these demographic characteristics were collected and statistically analyzed. These characteristics describe accurately and specifically certain consumer variables.

Main Study : Research Design

A multivariate research design, cross sectional in nature was used with personality, buying behavior, complaint frequency, complaint methods and proneness
to complain were taken up for this study of Consumer Complaint Behavior in the three service areas namely, Banking, Insurance and Medical Services.

Consumer Complaint Behavior variables include:- Frequency of Complaints, Tendency to Complain, Methods of Complaints.

**Independent Variable – Predictor Variable:** Age, Occupation – Professional and Non-professional, Gender Differences, Geographical location – Urban and Rural, Years of experience, Monthly Income, Size of family, Type of occupation, educational qualification, Personality – External or Internal (Locus of Control), Buying Behavior – Thrifty, Risk Taker, Impulsive, Optimist and Conservative.

**Selection of Service Areas:**

Due to response variation across product/service categories, it was important to focus on some specific categories (Singh, 1990). Three services were selected for the study, namely Banking, Insurance and Medicine. The selection of services rather than products was guided by two factors: several studies report that services entail greater dissatisfaction than products (Best and Andreasen, 1977); and (b) few studies have investigated service dissatisfaction. These service categories were purposely selected in order to obtain complaint data over a range of dissatisfaction. All organizations need to adapt in order to survive and prosper. Service organizations must adapt. Service organizations exist as a function of their customer’s service quality, which is their primary survival strategy. To achieve service quality, there needs to be a climate for service (Schneider and Chung, 1993). High quality customer service means profits. Customer service represented more than 40% of the importance weight of quality in customer service, (Somasundaram, 1992). Customer
need should always drive a company. Service areas chosen in this study are: Banking, Insurance and Medical.

Table 13 showing the break-up of Complainers and non-complainers, their personality across the three service areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complainer</td>
<td>Non-complainer</td>
<td>Complainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 79 Complainers in the Banking sector, 55 belonged to the internal group and 24 believed in the external factors. 18 Non complainers believe in internal factors and only 1 believed in external factors. 22 complainers in the Insurance sector were believed to be externals and 60 were internals. 15 Non complainers were internals and 10 externals. Under the Medical sector, 19 complainers and 5 non-complainers belonged to the external group whereas 57 complainers and 14 non-complainers belonged to the internal group.

Internals, believe in their own capacity to handle situations on their own. Hence more complainers belonged to this category. However in the Indian Scenario consumers tend to believe more on luck, chance and fate. When consumers believe they are in the lucky phase as per their horoscopes, their perceived control over external environment increases appreciably (Bryant, 1989).

The Final study

With the reliability and Validity of the instruments established, the final study was conducted.
Selection of Sample

This study was conducted on a sample of 300 consumers. The operational definition of the consumer for the present study specifies that a consumer:

(a) must be between the age group of 30 and 55 years
(b) must be college educated, that is a graduate
(c) must be earning an income of Rs.10,000/- and above
(d) must have been working for a minimum period of 5 years

The operational definition of complaint behavior included a consumer who had experienced dissatisfaction with a service.

40% of this sample comprised of women. One-third the sample was selected from the rural areas of Karur, Arakonam, Karaikudi, Erode and Tanjore, in Tamilnadu. The urban sample was selected from Chennai. Special efforts were taken to include consumers from all parts of Chennai. Consumers from different occupations were included in this sample.

Since the Ex Post Facto Research method was followed, sample selection was absolutely incidental. Consumers with dissatisfaction in any one of the service areas were included in the research. Post Purchase behavior is viewed in this study as a series of steps in which consumers compare their expectations to perceived reality, experience satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and then act in a way influenced by that satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Andreasen, 1976; Gilly, 1979)

Selection of respondents for this study was done on the non-probability sampling. Non probability samples are used frequently in marketing research (Beri, 1993).

Data Analysis

The data collected have been analyzed using several statistical techniques.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Chapter IV deals with a brief explanation of the major findings and the incidental findings observed in this study. With the hypotheses formulated and presented in the earlier chapter the results were statistically analyzed. Based on this analysis, the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable is discussed.

This study, investigates consumer complaint behavior as a response to dissatisfaction with the three service sectors taken up in this study. Of the many variables showing a relationship to complaining, the variables chosen for this investigation are:- Severity of Complaint behavior, Propensity to complain and Methods of complaints. The effect of demographic variables on complaint behavior is also analyzed.

The investigation was carried out in two stages. In the initial stages, the consumers were selected and questionnaires were administered. All respondents were prescreened and only those who had experienced dissatisfaction with any one of the above services were selected for this study. The nature of the service involved in the dissatisfaction undoubtedly affects consumers expectations of remedy and the forms of remedy.

During the second stage, consumer’s complaint intentions were obtained through interviews. One – third of the consumers placed the blame on external factors, for example, quality. While the next one – third of the consumers indicated internal attributions, example dissatisfaction occurred because the respondent did not adequately check the service conditions. Finally the others placed the blame on the
situation. For example, not wanting to fight in a public place like a Bank or Insurance Company.

**Analysis of Personality Characteristics**

The personality model hypothesizes that a consumer's pre-dispositional nature influences his complaint behavior (Landon, 1977; Richins, 1983). Studies indicate that self confidence (Gronhaug and Zaltman, 1981), and assertiveness (Bearden and Mason, 1984) are linked to complaint behavior. Singh (1990) postulates that in general complainers, who tend to have more experience in complaining, have more positive attitudes towards complaining and are more self confident and more assertive.

To establish the relationship between personality and complaint behavior, the two-way analysis of variance was done.

**Table 14 showing the Summary of the two-way Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Personality)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>181.93</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Service)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>1064.50</td>
<td>278.66</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group(error)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3977</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F = 0.05 level

This analysis permits the simultaneous study of two variables. The first variable (Personality) Factor A has two levels; namely externals and internals. The second variable "Services", i.e. Factor B has three levels namely, Banking, Insurance and Medical. The 'F' ratio in respect of factor A has been found to be 181.93. Since the critical value in the table is 3.86 at 0.05 and the observed value exceeds the critical value at 0.05 level. The hypothesis that the two groups of internals and externals are
significantly different as indicated in Table 18 in their complaint behavior is accepted. Internals tend to complain when the situation reflects his individual capacity to undo a wrong done to him, while externals, complain when they feel that their luck is holding and that anything they do will be successful.

Further the F ratio in respect of factor B is found to be 3.66. The critical value is 3.03 at 0.05 level. Table 19 indicates that complaint behavior across the three services differ significantly. In certain service sectors the complaints are more prevalent, for example medical sector, whereas in the Insurance and Banking the complaints are comparatively less. Some service situations are more complicated to handle than others. The hypothesis that there is a significant difference in complaints across services is accepted.

The AB interaction is found to be 278.66. The critical value is 3.03 at 0.05 level. Since the observed value of F far exceeds this critical value, the 'F' associated with the interaction of factors A and B is significant at 0.05 level.

Analysis using tests of Significance

Statistical methods for analysis of data can be descriptive or probabilistic. Probability enters statistical analysis in various ways. The most obvious is that one recognizes explicitly that conclusions drawn from limited data are uncertain and therefore it is a good thing to measure and control probabilities of drawing the wrong conclusion. The statistical significance test is the most widely known device concerned with such probabilities (Cox, 1982). Significance test aims to summarize what the data tell about consistency with a hypothesis or about the direction of an effect. The 'Z' test for equality between proportions (Binomial Distribution) investigates the equality between proportions $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ of elements from two
populations, based on two samples, one from each population. Under the null hypothesis \( I_1 = I_2 \), \( Z \) is approximately distributed as a standard normal deviate.

**Table 15 (a) showing the test of proportion of internals and externals in the complainer group on Appendix V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Proportion of</th>
<th>( Z_o )</th>
<th>( Z_e )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values of \( z \) indicates that there was a significant difference in the proportion of internals and externals from the complaining group on items 1, 3 and 4 of Appendix V. While on items 2 and 5 of Appendix V, there was no significant difference between them. This instrument measures the propensity of consumers to complain. Generally consumers who believe that their fate is controlled by external factors complain less, than those who believe that they are responsible for their own behaviour (Landon 1977).

**Table 15(b) showing the test of proportions of internals and externals in the non-complaining group on Appendix V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Proportion of</th>
<th>( Z_o )</th>
<th>( Z_e )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>181.81</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculated values of 'Z' revealed that the proportion of externals and internals from the non-complaining group were found to be significant on items 1, 2, and 4. While on items 3 and 5, there was no significant difference between them.

**Summary:**

The data clearly reveals that there seems to be significant difference between the two groups of respondent namely complainers and non complainers with respect to their personality.

**Latin Square Analysis**

Latin Square is one of the experimental designs, which has a balanced two way classification scheme. Latin Square is a balanced arrangement of data, it must have the same number of columns and rows. A Latin Square of, say k order, must possess 'k' rows and 'k' columns in such a way that each symbol or letter occurs just one in each row and in each column. The following 5x5 arrangement has been used in the present study.

**Table 16 showing the 5x5 Latin Square arrangement with age, personality and buyer behavior.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>35-40</th>
<th>40-45</th>
<th>45-50</th>
<th>50-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Personality (E-I)*

The alphabets a, b, c, d, and e refers to the five types of buyer behavior used in the study. The balanced arrangement achieved in a Latin Square is its main strength.
In a Latin Square experimental design, comparisons among treatment will be free from both differences between rows and between column. Latin Square removes two sources of extraneous variation, that is those associated with rows and columns. In a Latin Square experiment, the magnitude of the experimental error is smaller than it would have been otherwise.

The 5x5 Latin Square eliminates two sources of variation called the row and column effect. There are 5 types of buying styles in each block and 5 age-wise classification of consumers in the row and the personality scores grouped into 5 were taken column wise. Then the rows and columns are randomized independently. This randomization procedure generates a Latin square of a suitable dimension.

Table 17 showing 5x5 Latin square Analysis for buyer characteristics, personality and Age of consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr. S.S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>279.75</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>26.622</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R S S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>180.25</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>17.170</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1042.42</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>9.730</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5234.13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Fo > Fe the above analysis clearly indicates the effects between age, personality and buyer characteristics as being significant. Thus the hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the buyer characteristics is accepted. Buyer lifestyles are dependent on the optimum stimulation levels of consumers. Those who are high on optimum stimulation levels take risks, are innovative, seek purchase related information and try out new options (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1980). So if the provocation is immense in situations of service failures then they react immediately.
Similarly with age, the younger consumers may have little experience with service failures (Olander 1976), but they may still indulge in more complaining than the older consumers (Day and Landon 1976) than the middle or older groups. Van Westendrop and knecht (1974) found similar results. Burke Customer Satisfaction Association (1996) indicated that complainers tended to be aged 45, and regular shoppers, with 50% reporting that they would report a complaint to the manager. The hypothesis that significant age differences exist between complainers and non-complainers is accepted. Stratification analysis done in this study also indicated similar results. The average age in this study being 41 years.

Table 18 showing Summary of ANOVA for the 2x2x2 Factorial Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Gender)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Personality)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>48.83</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Complaint Behavior)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1508.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2248.91</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of the complete analysis is presented in the above table. The factorial experiment has three factors, the first factor A is gender, the second factor B is Personality and the third factor C is Consumer Complaint Behavior.
Main effects:

To evaluate the 'F' ratios presented in the above table, the observed values of 'F' far exceed the critical value of 6.64. Thus the main effects of A, that is gender is significant. Hence there are significant differences between males and females with respect to their complaint behavior.

The main effect of B that is Personality namely internals and externals is to be significant, at the 0.05 level. Similarly the main effect of C, represents Complaint behavior Thus complainers and non-complainers differ on complaint behaviour significantly. The surmise is that they are different in their approaches to dissatisfaction.

From the table of 'F', and 293 df a value of F is equal to 6.64. For the main effect, A, B and C and 'F' ratios are significant.

The main level for the first level of A is equal to 8.17. The mean level for the second level of A is 10.06. The fact that a mean square is significant leads to the conclusion that these two means differ significantly. The males and females in the society certainly differ in their complaining behavior. The ambiguity existing in the service markets (Youjae 1992) brings about wide differences in the perceptions, expectations and roles of males and females. Thus bringing about astounding variations in their complaint behaviour.

Similarly the main effect of B represent the personality aspect of externals and internals. The mean for B₁ can be obtained and is 7.35 and the mean for B₂ is 12.80. Since the mean for B is significant in the analysis of variance, the conclusion is that the means for B₁ and B₂ differ significantly indicating that internals and externals differ. The studies on personality indicate that a consumer's predisposition influences his complaining behaviour.
The main effect of C represents the means of complainers and non-complainers. The mean to C1 is equal to 6.79 and the mean for C2 is 16.46. Since the C mean square of the analysis if variance is significant, the conclusion is that these two means differ significantly.

**Interaction Effects**

The AXB interaction mean square is not significant, indicative that the difference between the means A1 and A2 for the first level of B is not significantly different from the difference between the means of A1 & A2 for the second level of B. The conclusion is that the A effect is the same for the different levels of B, that therefore a-c and b-d do not differ significantly.

The AXC mean square, which is highly significant, which means that the A effect is not independent of the C factor. In other words, the magnitude of the difference between A1 & A2 is not the same, within the limits of random variation, for C1 & C2.

The BXC interaction mean square is also significant meaning that the B effect is not the same for different levels of C.

**The three factor Interaction**

The AxBxC interaction mean square is not significant. The inaction effect of personality and gender of the consumer on their complaining behavior is not established. Many dissatisfaction outcomes are an overall aggregation of consumer situations, stimuli (Johnson 1995) and responses from manufacturers (Gale 1994). These may influence a consumer who has limited resources and options at his disposal (Foxall 1997). The theory of reasoned action implicates that the self reported consequence of behaving in a given way ascertains a consumers learning history of how to handle complaints (Scheuing and Christopher 1993).
Consumers are also influenced by the impact of influentials, who are, trend setting opinion leaders. For example, more than 1/3 women feel that they are the kind of person to whom people turn for advice for doctors and hair-stylists, while 47% say they are asked about restaurants (American Demographics 1995). 40% men feel that people come to them for advice on car mechanics and 33% say they are approached for cars.

At times some sophisticated consumers may engage in complaint behaviour because such behaviour serve the larger interest of consumer welfare by making sellers correct for quality declines (Laver 1976). Thus on summarizing the results, it can be inferred that gender, personality and complaint behaviour interact differently for various reasons.

**Consumer Responses to service Failures**

A specific service encounter can yield negative consumer reactions even in the most careful organization (Goodwin and Ross, 1992). The consumer who experiences unacceptable quality of service delivery may feel that he has been wronged while purchasing or consuming the service. From an equity theory perspective, the consumer may be seen as a “victim” who has been “harmed” by the marketer and in now seeking reparation.

The incidence of dissatisfaction responses to service failures across services have been investigated by Singh (1990). Given this situation (a) what mode of action was taken by complainers in the different services (b) Do incidence of dissatisfaction responses differ across services? A study conducted in the U.S. (Singh, 1990) indicated conflicting results in that in certain service areas there was no significant relationship while in others these were significant differences. An attempt was made in this study to clear this position.
Service areas like Medical, Insurance and Banking undertaken in this study showed significant differences in complaining characteristics.

Table 18 proves the results of comparisons of consumer personality in the three service areas. There appeared to be significant differences in the personality of consumers, in all service areas. The calculated value of ‘t’ was significant for all the service areas. The table value was 1.68 at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 19 showing the ‘t’ test of significance of (a) difference between externals and internals in the three service areas , (b) difference between complainers across services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Measure</th>
<th>Banking</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Medical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) ‘t’</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance &amp; Medical</td>
<td>Medical &amp; Banking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) ‘t’</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis that variations in the personality of complainers across services is accepted. The personality of consumers in Banking, Insurance and Medical services differ significantly. For example, the variations in the Medical service was expected because many consumers do not voice their dissatisfaction with their physician, (Krishnaswamy 1998 )whereas in Banks, consumers are more free and frequent in voicing their dissatisfaction. Andreasen (1985) found 65% of dissatisfied patients changed their physician and exit rates were higher than for grocery and shopping related problems. Hence consumer complaint behavior varies significantly across service categories.

Goodwin and Ross (1992) found variations among dissatisfaction responses across services. A situation that could have been brought on by the feeling that “there is nothing they can do”. Further investigation in the differences in effects across services may be due to chance or to unique characteristic of these services. Research
into that aspect of service encounter, which account for the differences in responses is needed. Solomon et al (1985) noted that role of service providers differ in service quality, suggesting that psychological aspects of service encounters like perceived service value might account for variations in consumer response to marketing stimuli (Roundtree, 1997). Therefore future research seem to be warranted to identify those aspects of dyadic interactions that may vary from one service to another with corresponding influences on consumer behavior.

**Buyer Characteristics**

This study examines two questions (a) what type of distinct buyer profiles communicate their dissatisfaction more (b) Do these buyer groups use different responses to a particular dissatisfaction. A large number of studies have been conducted to observe these elusive responses (Mason and Hines, 1973; Warland, Hermann and Willits, 1975; Wall, Dickey and Talarzyk, 1977, Moyer, 1984). Despite the large number of studies a clear understanding of these questions remain elusive. Further studies profiling consumers using different buyer styles have utilized only demographic and personality variables. Since consumers often engage in multiple responses, it is likely that the styles differ due to the specific combination of responses utilized in the buying scenario, for example, complaint to retailer or negative word-of-mouth. The aim of this research was to address some of the preceding gaps in consumer behaviour.

Data obtained from administering Appendix II, brought-forth significant results in that all five buyer characteristics where significant differences in their complaint handling responses was noticed.
Table 20 showing the buyer characteristics of complainers and non-complainers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Complainers</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complainers are those who made some overt efforts to complain, while the non-complainer are the control group who have not taken any action whatsoever. Obtaining their responses on Appendix IV, the consumers were grouped into complainers and non-complainers. Basically consumers can and often do engage in multiple responses, it is important to correlate their buyer characteristics and complaint response styles.

Table 21 showing the association between buyer characteristics and Complaint behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>11.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of these data, using the Chi-Square Technique indicated that there was a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of complainers and non-complainers. Results showed that complainers are thrifty and conservative, while non-complainers seem to be more conservative. However it comes as a surprise to find that the risk takers are not so much of a complainer. This fact could be due to the consumer’s perception of market place problems. While consumers may take a lot of risk in the choice of services, complaining is often considered to be a different matter altogether (Singh, 1990). So they tend to perceive more "risk" and embarrassment in complaining. Further, factors such as worthwhileness of complaint outcomes, situational variables affect the judgement of dissatisfaction (Hunt, 1991).
Comparative analysis of table reveals that both complainers and non-complainers were more inclined towards the thrifty and conservative categories. While the other three buyer characteristics are distributed unevenly. The consumer still makes the judgement of dissatisfaction based on his wishes and not on the technological realities of the situation. Thus buyer characteristics are bound to affect a consumer's perception of the complaint situation. The hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of complainers and non-complainers is accepted.

Table 22 showing the Association between Buyer Characteristics and Severity of Complaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer Characteristics</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 17.12 \quad \text{and} \quad X^2_{0.05} = 15.50
\]

This table shows that there is an association between buyer characteristics and severity of complaining among the mild, moderate and severe complainers. Results indicate that the optimist, impulsive and risk taking group are similar in the complaint behavior. The thrifty and conservative groups are the two buyer characteristics found more commonly in the mild, moderate and severe complainers.
The mild complainers here are the dissatisfied ones who say nothing more than just voicing an innocuous complaint to the store. While the moderate one's are those who take up the issue with the concerned authority. Finally, the severe complainers are perpetual complainers, who retaliate against the service provider and cause a lot of damage legally and through the media.

**Consumer Complaint Behavior Responses**

As a next step, the 10 consumer complaint behavior items were analyzed. Consumers, when faced with dissatisfaction, tend to make use of different approaches or methods to express their disapproval to the service provider. These can be in the form of a mild protest to a legal notice to the concerned service provider. Consumer's choice of their options depend on various aspects. Some of them have been analyzed in the following tables.

**Table 23 showing the Percentage of externals and internals in the mild, moderate and severe complaining group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of complaint</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>58.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>30.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table given above clearly indicates that the mild complainers are internals (58.04%). While the moderate group is distributed with 30% internals and 44% externals. The severe complaining group, tend to be more external (22%). This result falls in line with Richins (1983) study. The hypothesis that there was a significant difference between the personality variables, that is between internality – externality, and complaint behaviour, is accepted.
Moderate complainers on the other hand persist till a favourable solution is offered by the service providers. They are more painstaking, more involved in their effort to deal with service failure. Research indicates consumers who are more involved are likely to be motivated to engage in remedial actions. (Somasundaram, 1993).

Research on information – processing efficiency postulates that consumer expertise is not unidimensional (Alba and Hutchinson, 1987) and that it includes two separate dimensions (a) familiarity with service quality (b) service domain – specific expertise. Moderate complainers seem to get into the complaining process in a more systematic way than the mild complainers.

Severe complainers as the table indicates prefer drastic action to complaint situations. Their choice of legal action (22%) indicates their propensity to clash head-on with service providers till their needs are satisfied. These consumers want to do something intentionally to hurt the business.

There seems to be a strong association between complaining tendency of internals and externals. Internals being more prone to complain tend to fight for their rights and react to dissatisfaction overtly and find a solution. The externals on the other hand, tend to ignore dissatisfaction, as they believe the root cause of their problems to be factors beyond their control due to insidious external reasons like fate, their horoscope and chance.

Similar findings were also obtained when the complainers were grouped into mild, moderate and severe complainers. On Appendix V, the test for proportion among the internals and externals and their complaint behavior indicated, significant differences between them. The externals were found, as is common, to blame factors such as luck, chance and fate, whereas the internals believe that consequences of a complaint situation is the outcome of ineffectual market efforts.
Table 24 showing the Association between personality of consumers and Nature of Complaint Behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality/</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 11.83 \]
\[ \chi 0.05 \text{ level} = 5.991 \]

Table 25 showing the Means and Standard Deviations of Consumer Complaint Intentions of Complainers and Non-Complainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complainers</th>
<th>Non complainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ank</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various researchers have recognised that consumer dissatisfaction involves emotion (Hunt, 1997, Westbrook, 1987). When consumers are dissatisfied they communicate such feelings in some way. This instrument (Appendix III) helps classify the three response possibilities. This classification of mild, moderate and severe complainers is similar to Hirschman (1970) categories of Voice, exit and retaliation. The voice category verbally communicates its dissatisfaction, which is
similar to the mild complainer group in this study. Exit refers to the dissatisfied consumer stop using the service, that is change the service provider. Medium complainers in this research are the ones who persist and go about highlighting the dissatisfaction. The third category indulges in retaliation, meaning, the dissatisfied consumer, who takes legal action.

Table 26 means and standard deviation of the consumer complaint methods for the three service areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Banking Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Insurance Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Medical Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of values in the Table shows considerable similarities in the dissatisfaction experienced in the three services. Previous research finding suggest that specific situations considered afford substantial variation in the extent of dissatisfaction as well as in Consumer Complaint Behavior Response (Best and Andreasen, 1977, Day and Bodur, 1977). One possibility for variation in the present study could be the fact the complaining is still considered unpleasant, unbecoming and ungentlemanly in India. Consumers are still submissive and feel "How can I change anything?" These feelings reverse the complaint behavior to one of pliant
thoughts. Many a time, they feel inadequate when making complaints to Banks and Insurance Companies. Consumer responses to Service failures are also influenced by perceived fairness and procedural considerations (Goodwin and Ross, 1992)

Tremendous differences in the consumer responses to service failures may be due to fact that the availability of proper cues for consumer services are quite limited (Feldman and Spencer, 1993). Consumer information cues vary substantially between specific types of consumer services. For example, home repair TV services can generate cues by advertising such qualities as promptness, location, price and brands of component materials. But for professional personal services like physicians, consumer information is limited. Lack of technological sophistication especially in the medical services can deter many consumers from complaining (Hunt, 1991). With health care services, the basis for understanding or judging its correctness are highly unsatisfactory. While for Banking and Insurance, the situation is even more intricately complicated.

Analysis of frequency of complaints

The need to study the number occasions a complainer complains in order to arrive at a more reliable empirical generalization has been felt many a time (Johnson, 1995). The frequency of reported complaints have an enormous significance especially at the manufacturers level, because it is an indication of the firms vulnerability to negative word-of-mouth and brand switching (Richins, 1983). Little research has been done in the responses to dissatisfaction directly. These behavioral responses to dissatisfaction are defined by Landon (1980) “to encompass all actions that convey an expression of dissatisfaction”. Direct, first hand experience represents the most dependable source of information about seller performance (Maute and Forrester, 1993).
Consumer complaint activity will help resolve complaints and render quality service. This customer information is needed to establish if a consumer is a habitual customer or a refund seeker and to also help follow-up action to resolve the problem.

The customer complaint questionnaire will have an additional impact in that the report serves to point out whether complaints are taken seriously by the company after repeated complaining (Mahfood, 1993).

Table 27 showing the complaint activity of complainers in the three service areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>X at 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>2.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square analysis reveals that there is a significant difference between complainers and non complainers only on 5 questions (1, 5, 6, 8 & 9) on Appendix IV, while there is no significant difference between these groups on the other questions namely 2, 3, 4, 7 and 10. Indian consumers, if they take complaint action, prefer to choose the milder versions of complaining and refrain from taking the more intense redressal responses.
Such behavior is consistent with the findings that consumers evaluate whether it is worthwhile complaining in terms of time and effort. Further if complaint action is taken, whether it would lead to effective outcomes. These variables determine a consumer's complaint behavior. In the Indian scenario taking up problems to the Insurance companies may involve a lot of time and effort on the part of the consumer. Being a public utility service provider, redressal often takes up enormous effort and procedures, which can deter even as well educated consumer. A "horrendous task" as many consumers put it.

Hence there is no significant difference between the service areas as far as complaint frequency is concerned. Consumer's perception of service experience across services may be less than adequate. These consumers assessment of service provider quality preferences may be influenced by many factors during the consumers purchase, ownership and service experience (Peacock, 1998).

Analysis using Correlation

The correlation coefficient of 0.72 between the scores of consumers on frequency of complaints and the tendency to complain bring out another important factor that those who have complained earlier and more likely to complain in future when they experience dissatisfaction (Saklani and Singh, 1997). Evidence has also been provided by a study by Bryant (1989) which exerts that perceived control of the consumer environment play an important role. Consumers evaluate their control over positive and negative experience separately and respond accordingly. Perceived trouble in making a complaint was negatively related to complaining (Bearden and Teel, 1983).
Analysis of Consumers tendency to complain

Singh (1990) examined relationships between the probability of successful complaints and the worth-whileness of complaints. He attributes the differences to the fundamental variations in the services he studied. Behavioral intentions rather than actual behavior were measured. While intentions are not always flawless predictions of behavior; the approach was based on the desire to assess the intensity of dissatisfaction responses (Singh, 1988) an objective achieved more readily by measuring behavioral intentions.

Table 28 showing the Association between personality and complaining behavior on Appendix V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X_{0.05} = 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly indicates that there is no significant difference in the propensity to complain between complainers and non-complainers, on all the questions in Appendix V. Singh (1988); Maute and Forrester (1993) found similar results, in their measurements of tendency to complain. Successful complaints increase future complaint behavior of consumers (Richins, 1983). The incidence of complaints varies with rates of response to complaints, levels of consumer satisfaction, with price of product/service (Resnik and Harmon, 1983).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No. 1 on Appendix V</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Complainers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No. 2 on Appendix V</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Complainers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No. 3 on Appendix V</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Complainers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No. 4 on Appendix V</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Complainers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No. 5 on Appendix V</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-complainers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Variables

Consistent results have been obtained with respect to income, education, occupation and age. Complainers tend to earn higher incomes, have more education, have professional jobs and are younger (Zaichowsky and Liefeld, 1977; Moyer, 1984). They have advanced, resource and perceived risk arguments to support these findings. Upscale consumers tend to have more resources, in terms of information and self-confidence, to deal with market place problems. In addition such consumers tend to perceive less risk or embarrassment in complaining. Thus these consumers are hypothesized to be more frequent complainers.

Age:

Consumer’s propensity to complain is found to be related to age (Barksdale and Darden, 1972; Gronhaug and Zaltman, 1981; Hustad and Pessemier, 1973; Miller, 1974; Zaltman, Srivatsava and Deshpande, 1978).

Table 29 (a) showing the Age of Consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>30 – 35</th>
<th>35 – 40</th>
<th>40 – 45</th>
<th>45 – 50</th>
<th>50 – 55</th>
<th>55 – 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 (b) showing the Association of age of consumers and complaining behaviour

Chi Square

\[
\text{Chi Square} = 11.42
\]

\[
\text{Fo at 0.05} = 11.05
\]

Chi Square analysis of association between age and complaint behavior revealed that the calculated value was 11.42 and the expected Chi Square value was 11.07 which is more than the calculated value hence there are significant differences.
in the complaint behavior in relation to age. All age groups reported higher level of dissatisfaction with services than with products. Saklani and Singh (1997)'s study showed that 50% of the complainers were from the 36 – 45 age groups, 23% belonged to the 25 – 35 age group and 23% belonged to 46 – 55 age group, while on 5% belonged to the 56 – 65 age groups.

Table 30 showing the personality characteristics of Consumer Age-wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th>Internals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 – 35</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>25.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 45</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>38.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 60</td>
<td>44.33%</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio – economic status

Researchers have found that complaint behavior is related to the socio-economic status of the consumer (Barnes and Kelloway, 1980; Best and Andreasen, 1977); Day and Bodur (1978).

Table 31 showing socio economic groups selected for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>No. of Consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 15,000</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and above</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who complain when dissatisfied tend to be members of more upscale socio – economic group than those who do not complain (Warland, Herrmann and Willits, 1975).
Table 32 showing the Income-wise break-up of Consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>No. of consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 15,000</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 – 25,000</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 – 50,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 – 1,00,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1,00,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N = 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average income group is Rs.10,000 – 15,000 per month, with 172 respondents belonging to this income group. Six respondents were found under the income group of Rs.50,000. Only five respondents were found in the Rs.1,00,000 monthly income group.

Among the complainers, 138 respondents were found to belong to the Rs.10,000 – 15,000 income per month. 72 respondents were found to belong Rs.15,000 – 25,000. 34 non complainers were found to be in the income group of Rs.10,000 – 15,000. Only 1 non complainer was found to belong to the above Rs.1,00,000 group where as 4 complainers were found in the same income group. This result complies with the studies by researchers (Saklani and Singh, 1997) that higher the resources, the greater the tendency to complain. In India, most of the complainers are from the Rs.10,000 – 15,000 per month category, clearly indicating that it is the middle income group that voices the dissatisfaction against inadequate services. (Saklani and Singh 1997).

Table 33 showing the Association between income and complaining behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo 10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the calculated value of Chi Square is higher than table value, income is related to complaining behaviour. Thus the hypothesis that income of consumer is related to complaining behaviour is accepted. As income rise, the better the resources, hence the tendency to complain go up.

The simple regression Model I done later in this Chapter also confirms such a relationship.

**Type of Occupation**

Consumers were also classified on the basis of their occupation, to find out if there was any association between the type of occupation and complaint behavior. Saklani and Singh (1977) found in their study that 55% of the complainers were government employees and semi government employees, 27% of the complainers owned their business; 11% of the complainers were from private companies and only 7% of the complainers were professionals.

In a sample of 300, 152 were found to be professionals with a technical/engineering background. 50 belong to the administrative & blue collar cadre, i.e. Managers, Executives and Officers of both Government and Private Enterprises. 31 were found to be self-employed in various fields such as exports, retail stocking etc. There were 24 house-wives in the sample. 22 were involved with sales and marketing jobs and 21 were found to belong to the clerical cadre.

**Table 34 showing the percentage of consumers selected from the various occupations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. of Consumers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blue collar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Home Maker</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sales/ Marketing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of consumers in the Professional/Technical group being 152 (51%). Next comes the administrative category with 15%. Thus most of the consumers fall in the decision-making group and sophisticated group. Yet this sophistication is different from the technical sophistication referred to in complaint behavior. For example, a General Manager of a concern becomes vulnerable as far as medical services are concerned. Such a person may go to a doctor, for medical help, assuming the doctor knows almost everything. But such a consumer is not technologically sophisticated enough to make a correct choice and is at the mercy of this service provider (Hunt, 1991)

152 people were found to belong to the professional/Technical cadre out of which 124 are complainers and 28 were non-complainers. 34 respondents who were found to be complainers were belonging to the administrative cadre and 11 non-complainers belong to the administrative cadre. 24 Self employed people were found to be complainers and 7 self-employed people were found to be non-complainers.

Those who complain, when dissatisfied tend to be from the professional and Technical occupations. This result follows preceding research generalizations in that those who complain are from the upscale socio economic groups. (Warland, Hermann and Willits, 1975)

Table 35 showing the Association between occupation and complaining behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Fe at 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>12.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi Square analysis of complainers and non complainers occupation indicated that there is a significant difference between the two. The hypothesis that there will be a significant difference between the occupation of complainers and non
Table 36 Chi Square values of the responses of professionals and non-professionals on Appendix IV based on complaint behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi Square analysis of the association between complaint behavior and the occupations in terms of professionals and nonprofessionals indicated that there was no significant relationship between them as found in the responses of consumers to Appendix IV.

Complaint behaviour involves not only time, effort and resources but also a need to know the procedures of complaint. Although professionals find the resources to complain, they may be reluctant to complain due to time and efforts needed to respond effectively. In India, complaining against institutions like Banks and Insurance is viewed with a lot of scepticism (Saklani and Singh, 1997) because the complainers are likely to feel that there is no point in complaining. Similar findings were obtained by Manrai and Manrai (1992) in their study of Bulgarian consumers.

The hypothesis that there will be a significant difference between the professional and non-professional complainer is rejected.

**Years of experience**

Consumers were grouped into six broad division, on the basis of their experience.
Table 37(a) showing the year of occupational experience of consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of experience</th>
<th>No. of Consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37(b) showing the Association between years of Occupational experience and complaining behaviour- on Appendix V

| Chi Square |  
|------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Fo         | Fe at 0.05                                       |
| 2.28       | 11.07                                            |

To test the association between years of experience and complaint behavior the Chi-Square analysis was done. Calculated value of Chi-Square was 2.28 and the critical value 11.07 at 0.05 level. This indicates that there is no significant association between these two attributes.

The Simple regression Model II calculated later in this chapter also indicates that there is no significant difference between occupational experience and complaint behaviour.

Multivariate Analysis

Regression analysis was used to predict values of one or more response variable (dependent) from a collection of predictor (independent) variable value. It was also used for assessing the effects of predictor variables on the responses. The
regression analysis is where 'y' is the response or dependent variable and the 'k' s are the predictor or independent variable.

Fitting of regression models were done for demographic variables and behavioral characteristics. A brief review of the demographic models considered are in the following tables:

**Table 38 showing the fitting of simple regression models for demographic variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models considered</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Regression</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y = -23.392+1.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model II</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y = -5.9639+4.6099%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For simple Regression Model I, the value of $\hat{R} = 0.93$. This clearly indicates that the monthly income and occupation experience of the respondents are very closely related.

Under Simple Regression Model II, the value of $\hat{R} = 0.43$. This shows that the education qualification and the income of the respondents are fairly related. These relationships were obtained with an eagerness to establish similar ratios with complaint behavior.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

To ascertain the relationships among more than two variables, the multiple regression analysis has been used.

$$y = a + b_1 \ k_1 + b_2 \ x_2 + b_3 \ x_3 + \ldots B_k \ k_k$$
where $y$ is the dependent variable which is to be predicted $X_1$, $X_2$, $X_3$ ..... $X_k$. are the ‘k’ known variables on which predictions based. Regression analysis was calculated to study the effect two or more independent variables on the dependent variable.

Table 39 showing the multiple regression model of demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model I</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Non professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1 = -5966.9371 + 54.8210 X_2 + 3024.6467 X_3$</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model II</td>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Rural/Urban Professional</td>
<td>Non professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1 = 2.3128 + 1.0786 X_2 - 0.2393 X_3$</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model III</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1 = -17154.6 + 383.34 X_2 - 1.4788 X_3$</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model IV</td>
<td>Professional Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1 = 1.483 + 0.0130 X_2 + 0.0031 X_3$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Multiple Regression Analysis done for the various demographic variables indicate the following:

In the Multiple Regression Analysis Model I, the $R = 0.84$. This value establishes that a strong relationship exists between Income, Experience and the Professional/ Non professional factors. The professional / non professional aspects of
respondent influences income, more than the occupational experience of the respondents.

In the Multiple Regression Model II, the $R^2 = 0.49$. this indicates that there is a fairly good relationship between educational qualification of rural and urban respondents with their professional/ non professional status.

While in the Multiple Regression Model III, there is again a strong relationship indicated between experience, age and the gender of respondents.

The Multiple Regression Model IV also indicates a positive relationship between the educational qualification, experience and the professional/ non professional status of consumers. The Model I to IV were done to find out if there were similar relationships with complaint behaviour.

Regression Analysis of Psychological Characteristics

Complaint Behavior scores were subjected to simple regression Analysis with Income and experience.

Table 40 showing the Simple Regression analysis of Psychological Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>y = complaint behavior</th>
<th>$y = 1.3029 + 0.0395x$</th>
<th>0.4240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>y = frequency of Complaint</th>
<th>$y = 0.8516 + 0.0480x$</th>
<th>0.9498</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x = experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simple Regression Model I indicates that the frequency of Complaint behavior as indicated in Appendix IV is related to Income. Simple Regression Model II shows that there is a significant relationship between frequency of complaints and occupational experience. The value of $R^2$ being 0.94. The value of $x = 0.048$ indicates the change in the dependent variable $y$, for every unit change in the
independent variable, x. The regression equation explains 95% of the total variation observed in the dependent variable. Thus only 5% of the total variation in the dependent variable y (frequency of complaints) remains unexplained by the regression equation.

**Multiple Regression analysis of Psychological Characteristics**

- \( X_1 \) = Propensity to Complaint
- \( X_2 \) = Internality

**Table 41 showing the Multiple Regression Analysis of Psychological Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Regression Equation</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model I ( X_1 = ) complaint behavior ( X_1 = 1.9051 + 0.0957 X_2 + 0.4655 X_3 )</td>
<td>0.8639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 = ) Educational qualification | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_3 = ) Rural/ Urban | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model II ( X_1 = ) frequency of Complaint ( X_1 = 6.6816 + 0.2234 X_2 + 0.0264 X_3 )</td>
<td>0.1691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 = ) Income | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_3 = ) Experience | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model III ( X_1 = ) frequency of Complaint ( X_1 = 3.989 - 1.8136 X_2 + 0.7767 X_3 )</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 = ) Male/ female | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_3 = ) Professional Non professional | |</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complaint behaviour scores were subjected to Multiple Regression analysis Model I with two predictors namely educational qualification and the geographical location of respondents namely rural and urban. Results indicated that there was a significant relationship among these variables. The \( R^2 \) value being 0.86 Multiple
Regression Model II indicated a very low $R^2$ which was 0.16. This evidence shows that the relationship between complaint behavior income and occupational experience is not significant.

Similarly in Multiple Regression Model III, the $R^2 = 0.05$, which brings out the fact that the relationship between frequency of complaints, gender and occupational status, namely professional / non professional is not significant.

**Coefficient of Determination $R^2$**

The coefficient $R^2$ expresses the proportion of the variance in $y$ determined by $x$ that is the ratio of the explained variance to the total variance. Therefore the coefficient of determination expresses the proportion of the total variation that has been explained or the relative reduction in variance when measured about the regression equation, rather than about the mean of the dependent variable.

**Size of Family**

Consumers living in joint family system (extended family) may have the time and resources to complain. Hence an attempt was made to find if there were differences in the size of family of complainers and non complainers.

**Table 42 showing the size of family of consumers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Family</th>
<th>Total Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage of consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a sample size of 300, 128 were found to have 4 members in the family. 62.6% of the sample had an average of 4 members, closely followed by 3 members families amounting to a total of 55 families out of 300. 5 Member families are also quite popular with 49 families in that category. 15 were found to be 6 member families and above members were found to be a joint family system and there were 5 single members in the sample. The average family size in the present sample was 4.

Saklani and Singh (1997) found that 16% of complainers came from one member family, while 25% complainers from 2 member families, 46% complainer from 3–5 member families and 13% complainers from 5 and above member families. The present study also found similar results in that the complainers were found 4 member families.

The average Indian family size is 4. The average obtained in this study is also 4.

Table 43 showing the size of families of Complainers and Non-Complainers and their mean Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Non Complainers</th>
<th>Complainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x \quad 4.47 \quad 4.20 \]
The above table indicated that both the averages namely for complainers and non complainers family size was 4.

Table 44 showing the Chi Square value calculated for the nuclear and extended families and the frequency of complaints as obtained from Appendix IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
<td>3.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi square analysis indicates that there is no significant difference between nuclear and extended families and their complaint behavior. The above table indicates that self assuredness, self worth and perceived competency are more plausible aspects that bring out the differences in complaining than the size of the family. Thus the number of members in the family of the consumer does not have an impact on the complaining behaviour of consumers.

**Gender**

Care was taken to see that there was proper representation given to both sexes in all categories of consumers. Comparative analysis of Tables reveals that females and males are differently inclined in expressing their complaints. Chi Square analysis of responses to the complaint activity schedule indicate that there is a significant difference in the males and females on Appendix IV. Similar differences were also found in previous research. (Saklani and Singh, 1997).

Singh (1988) found that men who often deal with a particular industry, shopping and medical care. Whereas a large proportion (70%) of female complainers complained about grocery items and other household goods, while automotive repair had a smaller (33%) percentage of women complainers. Such a trend indicates that women prefer complaining in situation where they were more aware of, that is their
relevant interest areas, wherein they had faced a dissatisfying experience. The three different complaint situations namely Banking, Insurance and Medical considered in this study afford substantial variations. More evidence must be accumulated before generalizing of finding.

Hypothesis is accepted because there does appear to be difference in the gender as far as complaining behavior is concerned. Saklani and Singh (1997) found only 10% women complain. Another important finding is that Indian women still shy away from complaining.

Table 45 (a) showing the gender wise distribution in the three Service sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the above table indicate that the proportion of males and females are the same in the three service areas. Dissatisfaction in service areas are felt by both sexes equally hence a study into the similarities and differences is meaningful. Indian women in general, tend to still hesitate to complain. Factors such as speaking out in public places like Banks or Insurance companies, often force them to suffer deficiencies in the services. Most women in India, still expect their men at home to speak up for them and rarely confront service providers on their own. Complaint rates in public utilities due to these service sectors being less responsive to complains. Further the consumer’s also perceive less responsiveness from public sector service providers with no exit options.(Gronhaug and Arndt, 1979).
Table 45(b) showing the Association between Gender and Complaining behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These gender differences were also seen in the Consumer Complaint activity schedule (Appendix IV). Chi Square Analysis indicated that there is a significant difference between the men and women complainers. With the calculated value of Chi Square 4.83 and the critical value = 3.841. It is clear that there are differences, between male and female consumers.

Women consumers may complain more frequently with respect to grocery or services and certain product deficiencies, with which they are more familiar. But it is very rare to find women complaining in Banks, Medical services or at Insurance companies. When they do, they are either more aware of procedures or are professionals dealing with consumer services.

Geographic Location

Consumers were selected from all parts of Chennai. One third of the sample comprised of consumers from the rural areas in Tamilnadu.

Table 46 showing the association between geographical location (Urban/ Rural) and complaining behaviour- on Appendix IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With stupendous communication development in India, the wide gap between the rural and urban consumers is narrowing down. Education is also another important factor in India. Variables such as these have definitely made the rural consumer more similar to the urban one. Yet there are some distinctive features of the rural consumer that set him well apart from his urban counterpart.

Table 47 showing the Personality Characteristics of rural and urban consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages of externals among rural and urban consumers indicate that 21% of urban males are externals, while only 4% of the rural males are externals. Internality is more prevalent among rural and urban consumers. 59% of the urban males were internals and 15% of the rural males were internals. A similar percentage for urban women (59%) was obtained. While for rural women, the internals were 14%. Thus evidence seem to show that internals are more common among both rural and urban consumers.

Table 48 showing the Chi Square Analysis of the buyer characteristics of rural and urban consumers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi Square Value observed between the rural and urban consumer on their buyer characteristics was 9.69. The expected value being 9.49. Hence there is association between buyer characteristics and the geographical location of the
consumer. Most of the consumer in this study fall in the conservative or thrifty buyer groups. This could very well have been the reason for the differences between rural and urban consumers on buyer characteristics. The multiple regression analysis also indicates that the geographical location (rural-urban) is related to complaint behaviour.

Table 49: showing the average frequency of complaint of rural and urban population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Values in the above table indicate that rural population complain more frequently than the urban groups. Saklani and Singh, (1997) indicated in their study of Consumer Complaint that the rural group is well aware of the product expectations and take it up with the manufacturer more actively than the urban population. Such a situation could occur more definitely in the rural areas because the manufacturers cannot antagonise the rural population and serve in that place. While in the urban areas, the garb of anonymity is more and the population is also shy of confronting the seller to save his face. The efficacy of dissatisfaction responses especially in the service areas can deter many urbanites from redressing their complaints.

An interesting fact from this analysis is that once the rural consumers take up their dissatisfaction with the service provider, they see to it that their grievances are looked into properly, and thoroughly.

Table 50: showing the association between geographical location (rural-urban) and severity of complaints (Appendix III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fe at 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>5.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table analyses the complaint characteristics of the rural and urban consumers. Chi square analysis did turn up a significant differences between the mild, moderate and severe complainers in the rural and urban group.

Table 51 showing the Association between consumer complaint behavior and geographical location namely urban and rural on Appendix V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Significant at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square analysis of rural and urban complainers and non complainers on Appendix V indicated no significant differences in their propensity to complain.

Rural consumers are generally known to approach a complaint situation directly and head on. While the urban consumer is hindered by his anonymity in the city, fear of his response back firing and the inability to spend time, effort and money in a long drawn out fight with service providers like Banks, Insurance companies or with Medical personal.

Marital Status

Table 52 (a) showing the Association between personality and marital status of consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52(b) showing the association between marital status and complaining behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Fe at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 289 married people, 74 were found to believe in the externalities as the cause of reason for this about life, where as 215 believed internal factors. Out of 5 unmarried people, 4 were found to believe externals and 1 internal factors. Of the widowed 6, half believed in the external factors and the other half the internal factors.

As the calculated value of Chi Square is only 6.01 and the table value at 0.05 level is 5.99. Taken together, the results suggest that there is a significant differences between the marital status of consumers and their complaint behavior.

Education:

Educational background is also an important variable in complaint behavior (Barnes and Kelloway, 1980; Bourgeois and Barnes, 1979; Hustad and Pessevier, 1973; Liefeld, Edgcombe and White, 1975).

As education gives more product knowledge and creates a better awareness of market conditions, it was hypothesized that education would play a role in complaining behavior. Simple Regression Analysis of data indicated that as education increases, incomes increase and thus with better resources the individuals has the time and backing to indulge in complaint behavior. Those who are highly educated complain more frequently. Multiple Regression model also indicated that education did have its impact on complaint behavior. Saklani and Singh (1997) found that
Indian Complainers were more educated. 88% were from highly educated group. The higher the education, the more the complaining behavior.

**Table 53 showing the Chi Square analysis of the educational qualification of complainers and non complainers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Fo</th>
<th>Fe at 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that there is a significant difference between complaint behavior and their educational qualification. Hirchman (1970) makes the assumption that different people respond differently to quality decline. Further they notice it at different times, as a result of differential information, education, perception, use and so on. (Singh, 1990). Bearden and Teel (1983) defend the preceding relationship in that consumers who complain are heavy users of external information.

**Discussions and Limitations**

Complaining is not easy and is seldom pleasant. When a minor dissatisfaction is experienced, consumer responses often are minimal. Most often consumers neither complain nor spread negative reports of the service involved. When dissatisfaction is serious, the consumer might have a higher tendency to complain. It is at moderate levels of dissatisfaction that there is the most impact. If complaints are encouraged, the service institutions have the chance to remedy legitimate complaints and win back the consumer. If complaints are discouraged, fewer consumers may complain and instead, they may inform others about their unsatisfactory experiences and avoid repurchase or boycott the service institution.

There are important implications for marketing researchers in this study. While it is obvious that there are many internal and external variables that affect
consumers responses to dissatisfaction, this study has only dealt with the problem in a very small way. Many additional factors may influence complaint behavior like individual variables, situational variables and managerial variables need to be studied. The paucity of research on Consumer Complaint behavior necessitated this study to be exploratory in nature. There remains may research questions to be considered.

Then, is it naivette or optimism that leads the Indian consumer to ignore the stark reality of not complaining when the need arises? The yawning gap between the complainer and the non-complainer needs to be more vigorously looked into. The need to revamp the system, so that the rumbles of dissatisfaction emanating from the most silent sufferers could be heard and recourse provided. A large majority of the Indian Consumers need to be “pushed” or given the initial impetus to their simmering feelings of dissatisfaction. A draconian solution perhaps, but nevertheless telling of the degree of frustration and despair felt by the common man as a consumer of products and services.

One may also go as far to say that by their sheer existence these complaints indicate the sad lack of quality control standards, which have inevitably percolated down the line to all aspects of products and services influencing or affecting the Indian Consumer. The phenomenal growth of the corporate giants, who claim to offer the state-of-the-art technology to the consumer have done very little to the consumer. An outcome of the opening up of the Indian business sector to the outsiders, have left many bewildered.

Women, considered as the vulnerable consumers, are targets of unscrupulous message and exploitation even today. The tragic loss of ideals in public conduct cannot be ignored. Women are more reluctant to walk up to a clerk to voice their grievances and if at all she does, the situation is turned into one of ignorance on the
part of the women. In this arena alone failure cannot be ignored or glossed over. Gender discrimination also adds to the suffering of the women, wherein she has to get the help of men in her family to come to her rescue. This is visible in the glaring spotlight of statistics which reveal that women tend to suffer in silence than complain. This situation needs to be contemplated and changes brought about.

The emerging middle class caught inextricably between the have's and have-not's have been left high and dry by both the Government and private enterprises. As for consumers, not only are they falling for unabated media hype, discounts in the price of a product of service, but are also getting increasingly trapped by discriminating trends in every day issues. What are the immediate problems controlling a consumer facing multi-faceted information and persuasion techniques? A near impossible solution evidently but nevertheless is indicative of the degree of frustration and despair felt by the consumer. With progressive dilution of ethical standards within the governmental framework mainly due to the lack of finances, expertise, productive and innovative ideas to revamp the system, the pendulum has swung to the other extreme.

The adage that the consumer is always right, has adorned a commercial meaning. It is often the more wealthy who have access to all public facilities. Unless the public systems are empowered with information and schemes to make complaint redressal options available to all citizens, the desired benefits of these programs will remain a dream to the common man. Most of these programs are well established and propagated through the media. But the question arises about the appropriateness of the delivery systems and formats used in promotion and propagation of the messages in the advertisements. Even a cursory glance at these messages would indicate the extent to which anomalies and disabling conditions are camouflaged to paint a rosy
picture of the situation. Consumers are often denied the basic right to unbiased information. Ironically enough this deepening crisis has been sparked off by the new economic policy. Lacunae in taking action against these, has lead to puffery and exaggeration in advertisements which have reached extravagant levels. Surely enough the consumers suffer immensely from this weakness in the system. This weakness from time immemorial has strengthened from divisiveness and an indifference to the plight of others, blamed usually and falsely on spiritual traditions. It cannot be forgotten that the resurgence of mutual trust among consumers and the business, and solidarity can lead to amicable solutions to complaint situation.

Inadequately or inextricably camouflaged, redressal or complaint procedures daunt any hard working consumer, conscious of his time and effort spent on needless exercises to cater to the whims and fancies of the concerned manufacturer. Juxtaposed between an inadequate complaint system and an impervious manufacturer the consumer is bound to loose his faith in the system. Hence the need of the hour is to prompt the state or administration to the revamp the policies involved in handling complaints against products and services within the existing infrastructure and materials.

Eventually, when complaints are taken up by the consumer, proper procedures have to be adopted. As Shah (1994) predicted the complaints are increasing and becoming more sophisticated and complicated. For every 1 customer who complains, 26 others will not tell you they were dissatisfied. Of these 26, 19 will not come back, most will tell 9 to 10 others. Atleast 3 will tell more than 20 people (Shah 1994). A cynic may say, with a lot of truth that anything will be an improvement over the existing services. Consumer groups give consumers a lot of pampered comfortable service to the consumer. The belief is that consumers approaching an institution or
public utility service with a complaint often face an unscrupulous wall of silence and callous treatment. Such a stressful situation is all too frequently changed, due to the timely intervention of the consumer groups to ameliorate the sufferings of the consumers. Top of the line equipment and personalized service along with high-tech care enable the consumer organization to tackle the complaint of the individual consumer. Evidently such an effort will boost the morale of the middle class and get them proper access to relevant complaint procedures.

A judicious mix of pragmatic approach within an integral system may be a healing balm for both the consumer and the seller.

Limitations:

The findings should be evaluated in the light of certain limitations. Though Banking, Insurance and Medical services seem to reflect variations in consumer complaint responses, more evidence must be accumulated before a claim for invariant consumer complaint behavior structure can be made.

Consumer buyer characteristics may not be exhaustive in that the proposed taxonomy may not extend to the whole breath of consumer buyer styles. Research indicates that consumers may engage in multiple response patterns according to episodic – specific variables, example, prior experience, alienation, which in turn may become the critical component of the consumer buyer behavior.

The empirical analysis of 10 items only on Appendix III may be insufficient to identify the consumer complaint intentions, other items, can be developed that cover other means of complaining.

In addition frequency of complaining could be measured in various other ways giving ample avenues for improving on the existing pattern of conceptualization.
Finally, the probability of complaining relies on consumer's evaluation of his future behavior and seeks to capture their intentions to complain in future episodes. An approach although externally valid (that is because of validation by behavioral data) poses problems in such recall-based designs. The projective nature of these measures also evades future replication.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study examines the conceptualization and measurement of Consumer Complaint behavior in three service areas, namely, Banking, Insurance and Medical. The following hypothesis were formulated:

1. There will be a significant difference in the personality of complainers and non-complainers
2. There will be a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of complainers and non-complainers
3. There will be a significant difference in the complaining intentions (methods) of complainers and non-complainers
4. There will be a significant difference in the frequency of complaints among complainers.
5. There will be significant differences in the propensity to complain between complainers and non-complainers
6. There will be a significant difference in the income of complainers and non-complainers.
7. There will be a significant difference in the gender of complainers and non-complainers
8. There will be a significant difference in the educational qualifications of complainers and non-complainers
9. There will be a significant difference in the occupation of complainers and non-complainers
10. There will be a significant difference among the professional and non-professionals in their complaint behavior
There will be a significant difference in the size of family of complainers, and non complainers.

There will be a significant difference between nuclear and extended family structure of complainers and non complainers.

There will be a significant difference in the age of complainers and non complainers.

There will be a significant difference in the marital status of complainers and non complainers.

There will be a significant difference among the mild, moderate and severe complainers.

There will be a significant difference in the Personality of mild, moderate and severe complainers.

There will be a significant difference in complaint behaviour across services.

Sample

300 consumers, comprising of 237 complainers and 63 non complainers were selected on expost-facto basis. Males and females, 197 and 103 respectively were included in this study. Buyers from rural background were also selected, numbering 45, while the urbanites were 255. Consumers were from the city of Chennai and from rural areas, with varied age, educational qualification, occupation, income and occupational experience were included.

The following instruments were administered to the above sample:

a) Rotter's E - I scale, b) Instrument to measure buyer characteristics, c) Instrument to measure complaint intentions (methods), d) Instrument to measure frequency of complaints, e) Instrument to measure propensity to complain.

Various statistical techniques were used to analyze the results. They included:
a) Calculation of ratios, proportion and percentage. b) Calculation of 5x5 Latin Square Analysis. c) Calculation of two-way analysis of variance. d) Calculation of 2x2x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance- Hierarchical Model. e) Chi-Square analysis. f) Simple Regression Analysis. g) Multiple Regression Analysis. h) Stratification Analysis. i) Correlation Analysis. j) The ‘t’ test of proportion

The following conclusions were drawn from the study:

1. There is a significant difference in the personality of complainers and non-complainers.
2. There is a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of complainers and non-complainers.
3. There is a significant difference in Personality characteristics of complainers and non-complainers across services.
4. There is a significant difference between the services on complaint behaviour.
5. There is no significant difference in the complaint intentions (propensity to complain) of consumers.
6. There is a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of mild, moderate and severe complainers.
7. There is a significant difference between the personality of complainers and the nature of complaints.
8. There was a significant difference between the frequency of complaining activity and the personality characteristics of complainers.
9. There is no significant difference in the frequency of complaints across the three service areas.
10. There is a significant difference between complainers and non-complainers on their propensity (tendency) to complain.
11. There is a significant difference in the age of complainers and non-complainers.
12. There is a significant difference between the personality and age of consumers.
13. There is a significant difference in the buyer characteristics of rural and urban consumers.
14. There is a significant difference in the severity of complaints of rural and urban consumers.
15. There is no significant difference in the propensity to complain among rural and urban consumers.
16. There is a significant difference in the type of occupation of complainers and non-complainers.
17. There is no significant difference between professional and non-professionals in their complaint behaviour.
18. There is no significant difference in the size of the family of complainers and non-complainers.
19. There is a significant difference in gender as far as complaint behaviour is concerned.
20. There is a significant difference in the frequency of complaints and gender.
21. There is no significant difference between complainers and non-complainers from the nuclear and extended family.
22. There is a significant difference in the marital status of complainers and non-complainers.
23. There is a significant difference in the educational qualification of consumers and their complaint behaviour.
24. There is no significant difference in the occupational experience of consumers and their propensity to complain.
25. There is a significant difference between the occupational experience and frequency of complaints.

26. There is a significant difference between the income of complainers and non-complainers.
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PERSONAL DATA SHEET

1. Name : 
2. Address : 
3. Age in Years : 
4. Educational Qualifications : 
5. Occupation /Designation : 
6. Years of Experience : 
7. Monthly Income : 
8. Number of members in family : 
9. Marital Status : 
10. Complaint Information :
   a) Number of complaints to service provider : 
   b) Nature of Complaint : 
   c) Response expected from service provider : 
   d) Response given by concerned authority : 
APPENDIX I

Instructions

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the ONE statement of each pair which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned.

1. a) Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b) The trouble with most children now a days is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a) Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b) People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a) One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don’t take interest in Politics.
   b) There will always be war, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a) In the long run people get the respect they deserve in the world.
   b) Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognised no matter how hard he tries.

5. a) The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b) Most students don’t realise the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a) Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
   b) Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a) No matter how hard you try some people just don’t like you.

b) People who can’t get others to like them don’t understand how to get along well with others.

8. a) Heredity plays the major role in determining one’s personality.

b) It is one’s experience in life which will determine what they’re like.

9. a) I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

b) Trusting to fate has never turned out.

10.a) In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.

b) Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11.a) Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

b) Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12.a) The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.

b) This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13.a) When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

b) It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14.a) There are certain people who are just no good.

b) There is some good in everybody.

15.a) In may case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b) Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin

16.a) Who gets to be the best often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first

b) Getting people to do the right thing depends upon the ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17.a) As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.

b) By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18.a) Most people don’t realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

b) There really is no such thing as “luck”

19.a) One should always be willing to admit mistakes.

b) It is usually best to cover up one’s mistakes.

20.a) It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

b) How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21.a) In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.

b) Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22.a) With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

b) It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
23.a) Sometimes, I can’t understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b) There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24.a) A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b) A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25.a) Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b) It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26.a) People are lonely because they don’t try to be friendly.
   b) There’s not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27.a) There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b) Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28.a) What happens to me is my own doing.
   b) Sometimes I feel that I don’t have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29.a) Most of the time I can’t understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b) In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
APPENDIX II

Kindly go through the whole questionnaire and mark 'Yes' if you agree with the statement and 'No' if you disagree with it.

1. I usually look for the lowest possible price when I shop.
2. I like to take chances while I buy products.
3. I am an impulsive buyer.
4. Better products and better services are coming up all the time.
5. I usually buy what I would like to have.
6. I am the kind of person who carefully plans whatever I do.
7. I am the kind of person who will try anything once.
8. When I must choose between the two, I usually buy a product or service for status rather than for comfort.
9. Five years from now, my income will be much higher enabling me to afford a lot more.
10. I spend time to consider the quality and price of a product.
11. I try to set a limit for my monthly expenses.
13. I like trying out new products when they first come out.
14. My achievements are ahead of me.
15. Products and services must be altered to the needs of the individual consumer.
16. I want to learn how good a new product is before trying it.
17. New products and services must be tried immediately.
18. Most of the time I buy products which are not required urgently by me.

19. My judgement in the selection of products are mostly correct.

20. I prefer shops which give individual consumer services.

**SCORING**

1. Thrifty : 1, 6, 11, 16

2. Risk Taker : 2, 7, 12, 17

3. Impulse Purchaser : 3, 8, 13, 18

4. Optimist : 4, 9, 14, 19

5. Conservative : 5, 10, 15, 20
APPENDIX III

When a product or a service causes dissatisfaction to you, which of the following options would you prefer in your order of preference. Please rank the following from 1 to 10 as per your decision. Rank 1 for the most preferred option. Rank 2 for the next and so on.

1. Complaints through letters.

2. Complaining directly in person

3. Complaints through magazines/ suggestion boxes

4. Complaints through institutions/ Associations/ Private action groups/ Consumer forums.

5. Giving written account in the respective shops/ institutions.

6. Visiting shops/ institutions regularly to argue out your case.

7. Seeking proper redressal channels like asking the authorities concerned.

8. Educating oneself first with the format of Complaint procedure.

9. Persistent verbal complaints till a solution or response is given.

10. Take legal action.
APPENDIX IV

For each of the following activities, please place an “X” in the box that best indicates how often you have engaged in the activity during the past 12 months.

NIL  1-5  6-10  11 or More
Times  Times  Times  Times

1. Went to the shop to complain.

2. Went to the parent company
   (Head Office)

3. Had legal advice.

4. Went to the concerned agency
   (government)/ Consumer protection.

5. Wrote to the branch.

6. Wrote to the concerned person.

7. Attended consumer awareness
   program.

8. Went to the company’s consumer
   service cell.

9. Wrote to the private consumer
   protection Agency.

10. Went to the media for airing grievances.
APPENDIX V

Read the questions given below and mark your opinion on the scale given. Mark 1 for Never, 2 for rarely, 3 for undecided and 4 for frequently and 5 for Always.

1. What are the chances that you would complain about a product/service when you are dissatisfied?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. Are you likely to complain when dissatisfaction occurs?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

3. What are the chances that you will complain to the Store Manager on your next trip?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

4. What are the chances that you will go back to the shop immediately and find a solution?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

5. If an appropriate answer is not given, what are the chances that you will persist till the matter is settled?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
20th January, 1997

TO WHOMSOEVER IT MAY CONCERN

I have received the questionnaire prepared by Usha Jayakumari Paul as part of Doctoral Research in the field of Consumer Behaviour. In my opinion the questionnaire contains appropriate questions to provide meaningful responses in understanding Consumer Complaint Behaviour.
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