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Abstract

The purpose of this article is to determine the factors influencing the complaint behavior of service customers and suggested a model that gives a dynamic view of customer’s complaint behavior. The conceptual model supported by study and research done in the context of complaint behavior analysis. In addition, numerous science researches in different industries (services and products) supported the model. Research findings show that the complaint behavior of customers is a very complex behavior of customer dissatisfaction. Many factors determine the type and severity of complaints and these factors can be classified into four factors such as personal (individual) factors, service factors, situational factors and macro element. Different Kinds of people’s coping strategies is an effective factor in the selection of complaint behavior type. Analyzing and identifying different factors that cause the complaint behavior is important for different types of services. This model is a comprehensive one in complaint behavior that identifies important factors.
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Introduction

Customer satisfaction is increasingly used for standard of customer related activities and a superiority standard for any business organization (Jamali, 2007, p372). Consequently, service failures are quite frequent and subsequent reduction in customer satisfaction and, on occasions, customer complaint. As negative service encounters, or service failures, may cause the defection of customers that are becoming increasingly intolerant of mediocrity, understanding the service recovery process could be fundamental. Although a service failure has the potential to destroy customers’ loyalty, the successful implementation of service recovery strategies may prevent the defection of customers who experience a service failure (Varela & et al, 2010, pp88-89). Complaints are a natural consequence of any service activity because “Mistakes are an unavoidable feature of all human endeavor and thus also of service

1- This paper Inference form M. A thesis.
delivery” (Johnston, 2001, p60). Recently, the importance of consumer complaint handling has been recognized. According to Mitchell (1993), a study shows that 51 percent of the sample who had complained about a service and 23 percent about products were less than completely satisfied with the responses they received. Ineffective handling of buyers' complaints increases their dissatisfaction and harms a marketer's reputation (R. Liu & et al, 2001, p58). In a service recovery perspective, complaints expressed to the firm can be also seen as an opportunity to strengthen the bond between the customer and the firm (Svari & et al, 2010, p33).

According to Heskett & et al. (1994), an unfavorable service experience can create ‘terrorists’, that is, customers who are so dissatisfied that they actively and systematically seek opportunities to criticize or damage the company or its reputation (Tronvoll, p13). In this context, also it is imperative that pay attention to customers and their satisfaction after received services. Also a major part of these affairs achieve through analysis and investigations of complaints and their reasons. Everybody that complains is more likely to buy again. Because of these reasons, recognition of complaint behavior for each company will be needed and that is a crucial factor. In this study, we verify the types of complaints and its influences on the company services. Also we introduce the specific and general affected factors on the complaint behaviors. For Literature review, we searched a lot of science and research paper for recognizing the all factor and element that affected on the complaint behavior. After recognized, the all factor categorized in four section. We see the Literature in blow text.

**Aim and Methods**

The purpose of the current research is to analyze the tape of complaint behavior and affected element on it. The paper introducing theoretical construct model for identifying different kinds of consumer complaint actions and affected factor on it. The model can using for complaint behavior segmentation. Paper construct based on the other empirical paper.

**Literature review**

A central theme in these studies and related research is the relationship among consumer dissatisfaction, consumer complaints, and marketing effectiveness. Dissatisfaction with a product or other aspect of the exchange is the primary driver of complaints (McAlister & et al, 2003, p342). However, complaints do not always stem from dissatisfaction and dissatisfaction does not always lead to a complaint; this suggests that dissatisfaction is a necessary, but not sufficient, cause for customers complaining (Tronvoll, 2007, p604).

"Complaints can be teacher of your business; the biggest problem is apparent it". Research shows that customers of an airline company that has been solved complaint effectively and suitable, has more positive affect about the company, in compared that everything was true for them and nobody has complained (Hopson & et al, 2002, pp165-164). Approximately 34% of customers who had major complaints, after solving their problems, referred to the company and for the minor important complaints this was 52%. If the complaints be resolved quickly, between 52% (major complaints) and 95% (minor complaints) of customer will back to that company again
Complaint management involves the receipt, investigation, settlement and prevention of customer complaints, and recovery of the customer (Hansen & et al, 2010, p7).

Also we are noticing and explaining each factor that influences their complaining behavior and managing complaint, at the following, paper studies complaint behavior and affected elements on it.

Customer complaint behavior

CCB is conceptualized as “a set of multiple (behavioral and non-behavioral) responses, some or all of which are triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase episode”. CCB is generally goal directed (McQuilken & et al, 2011, p954). Authors agree that complaining is an interpersonal post-purchase communication directed at the company causing the dissatisfaction Although complaining is more frequently understood to be a cognitive response it is sometimes defined as an emotionally loaded phenomenon where affects are apparent in both the content and the way the complaint is expressed (Velázquez & et al, 2010, p533).

Typology of complain behavior

Using factor analysis techniques (both exploratory and confirmatory), Singh (1988) found empirical support for the dimensional taxonomy in which the responses of CCB could be generally viewed as falling into one of three categories: voice responses, private responses, and third-party responses (R. Liu & et al, 2001, p560).

Day and Landon’s (1977) hierarchical typology distinguishes between behavioral and non behavioral responses at the first level and between public (e.g. seek redress, take legal actions) and private (e.g. switch provider, warn friends) actions at the second. Singh (1988) suggests a three-dimensional typology that discriminates among CCB responses on the basis of the object toward which the response is directed (e.g. family/friends, third parties, sellers/manufacturers) (B. Casado & et al, 2011, pp33). Hirschman (1970) classifies responses to dissatisfaction in terms of exit (switch providers), voice (complaints to friends, sellers, consumer organizations) or loyalty (do nothing) (ibid, p34). other research in this area has attempted to explain particular types of complaint behavior through various multi-factorial models. These have described complaining behavior with such terms as “non-action”, “private action”, and “public action”. (Tronvoll, 2007, p603)

Singh (1988) and related research and discussions of CCB taxonomies have direct managerial implications: firms’ post-purchase or defensive marketing strategies could (or should) be developed to encourage voice responses, avert private responses, and avoid third-party responses. (R. Liu & et al, 2001, p56)

By literature review, the study was conducted to determine the best type of compliant behavior and therefore we classify (complaint behavior) into three categories according to the Singh (1988) recommendation. According this recommendation, three categories included voice responses (such as voice to seller or service provider & no action), private responses (such as exit, verbal and online negative word of mouth and boycott) and third-party responses (such as take legal
actions, consumer agency and action by media or newspaper). At the follow, we are explaining each of the typologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st level: Behavioral vs Non Behavioral Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take No Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd level: Private vs Public Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd level: Specific actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boycott Brand/Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative WOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek Redress Directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complain to Agencies/Govt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th level: Tendency toward Interactive or Remote channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5th level: Channel of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Day and Landon’s (1977) classification of consumer complaining behavior (extension) (Mattila & Wirtz, 2004, p1478)

**Voice responses**

Voice responses are guided customer to complaints that are directly involved in the displeasing exchange (e.g. seeking redress from the seller) (R. Liu & et al, 2001, p56). Several cases can be occurred in the voice response include: debate the troublesome situation with company manager or employee, tell the the problem to firm so that they will do better in the future and etc (Ibid, p64). When those elements occur, decrease the voice to service provider (Svari & et al, 2010, p32; McQuilken & et al, 2011).

**Private responses**

Private action indicates that complaint is privately through negative Word-of-Mouth communications to family and friends or the decision not to repurchase the product or services again or boycott store (Ndubisi & et al, 2005, p67; Harrison, 2001, p399) and recently addition of web site communications (Velázquez & et al, 2010).

---

1. The legal claim of dissatisfy customer in a court cause the response of service provider or producer. Consumer agency supporting from the customers and using the consume laws for their.

2. When the individual or group abstained from using, buying, or dealing with someone or some organization via an expression of protest. (Askdefine site, boycott)
The Internet complaint forum may be perceived as a vehicle for spreading negative word-of-mouth (Harrison, 2001, p402). Exit and Negative word of mouth (WOM) are the CCB types that appear most frequently in the CCB literature and these are one part of complaint behavior. Exit, otherwise termed switching or defection, involves customers ceasing to use an organization (McQuilken & et al, 2011, p954).

**Word of the mouth(WOM)** communication is informal advice and information about products, services and social issue that exchanges between individuals and among them (Huang & et al, 2011, p2). As an information source, positive WOM is a powerful input into decision making (Ng & et al, 2011, pp133).

Very satisfied customers always act by publishing favorable word of the mouth and it actually convert to advertise or in the contrary (Lavlak & et al, 2006, p241). WOM is one of the strategies used by customers to reduce their post-decision dissonance (Ng & et al, 2011, pp134). Based on the company research in US, each unsatisfied customer overtures its problem at least to 9 person, then 13 percent of this people, overture this situation for more than 20 others (kavousi & et al, 2005, pp383-384). also, in average one satisfied customer tells his/her good experience to product/service to 3 persons (kotler, 2003, p393). With negative word-of-mouth and exit responses, the organization often loses the opportunity to remedy and learn from the situation, suffers from reputation problems, and forfeits its investment and any potential future gains from that customer’s patronage (McAlister & et al, 2003, p342).

**Third-party responses**

Third party redress is defined as “an individual or organization who is external to the consumer who initiates redress and is not directly involved in the dissatisfying transaction”. (Reiboldt, 2003, p166) Public action refers to the direct complaint actions to the seller or a third party (e.g. consumer agency or government), which included seeking redress directly from retailer or manufacturer, and taking legal action. The public actions that could be taken by consumer included verbal complain to retailer/manufacturer, write comment card or complaint letters, write to newspaper or complain to consumer council (Ndubisi & et al, 2005, p67) Public responses refer to complaints directed at the parties involved in the transaction, whether they are manufacturers or distributors and complaints directed at third parties, such as consumer protection bodies, the media or legal action (Velázquez & et al, 2010, p533). Also included verbal complain to retailer/manufacturer, write comment card or complaint letters, write to newspaper or complain to consumer council (Ndubisi & et al, 2005, p67). and also the BBB (Better Business Bureau), governmental consumer protection departments, or media-sponsored consumer advocates (Fisher & et al, 1999, p577).

Although the number of consumers who take third-party actions is relatively small, these complaints can result in extensive legal costs, regulatory intervention, and corporate reputation problems. Research works by Duhaime and Ash (1979), Singh (1989), Tipper (1997),and Ursic (1985) suggest that third-party actions are most likely to occur when consumers: (1) perceive that the company’s initial remedy was not adequate; (2) have good access to the legal system and other formal agencies; (3) believe that all other complaining options have been unsuccessful; (4) experience
high anxiety levels about the complaint situation; and (5) have generally negative attitudes toward business practices (McAlister & et al, 2003, p342).

The effort and involvement associated with third-party complaint behavior normally indicate a degree of consumer dissatisfaction, company unresponsiveness, or related factor that can severely threaten marketing relationships and effectiveness (Ibid, p343). Furthermore under cases, three other time, consumers seek third party redress action: 1) when they have exercised all other complaint options; 2) when they perceive success of voice responses to be low; 3) when the action is not related to other complaint action (Reiboldt, 2003, p166).

Inertia or non-action

Customers often remain silent when service failures occur. In fact, a vast majority of dissatisfied customers fail to complain after a bad experience. Sometimes customers perceive the costs of complaining to exceed potential benefits, leading to inaction. Several personality variables also seem to predict whether consumers fall into the complainer or non-complainer category. For instance, Bodey and Grace (2007) show that attitude-toward-complaining and propensity-to-complain are two key characteristics discriminating between the two groups. (Kim & et al, 2010, p978) Cost-benefit theory suggests that before making a complaint, dissatisfied consumers examine a tradeoff (Huppertz, 2007, p428). If the costs and time spent on a complaint are perceived as exceeding the benefits as a result of a complaint, customers will tend to remain silent and take no action (Heung & et al, 2003, p284; Hansen, 1997, p134). Non-complainer considered that complaining was done by people with little else to do and believed that it would be futile (Heung & et al, 2003, p284). Sometimes, the customer decide to tolerate dissatisfaction or don’t protest, this situation depending on importance of the purchase of consumer, ease and simplicity of the reaction in dissatisfaction conditions, the overall level of customer satisfaction from store brand and behavioral characteristics of customers (Hawkins & et al, 2007, p564).

Complainers and non-complainers were found to be different in that non-complainers were more disconfirmation influenced (Lu Hsu & et al, 2008, p244). On the contrary, complainers were more likely to have repeat purchases with higher levels of loyalty (Phau & et al, 2004, p407; Namkung & et al, 2011, p497; Lu et al, 2008, p244).

Complaint motivator

Heung represented several different motivate for complaining. The complaint-motive variables included “seeking compensation”, seeking redress”, and “seeking apology”, requesting corrective action”, “asking for explanation” and “expressing emotional anger” (Heung & et al, 2003, p285). Also, customers use a kind of coping method for decreasing mental stress proportionate selected strategy. Berceuse of its importance, we explain it below:

Coping strategies: Based on their initial dissatisfaction response, consumers will decide their coping strategies in order to reduce the stress caused by a dissatisfying experience. These coping strategies can be categorized into three types: problem focused, emotion-focused, and avoidance-type behaviors. Problem-based
Coping strategies refer to customers acting directly to remedy the situation (Kim & et al, 2010, p978). In a consumer complaint behavior context, direct action (problem-based action) consists of voicing displeasure to the offending party. This could take the form of face-to-face, phone, or mail-based complaint interactions (Stephens & et al, 1998, p181). On the other hand, Emotion-focused coping is more internal controller and intended to conducting one’s mental responses (e.g. self-blame or sympathy) (Kim & et al, 2010, p978). In this way, individuals attempt to regulate their mental response to the problem to feel better. Instead of doing something, they remain silent and engage in any one of several self-deceptions (Stephens & et al, 1998, p181). Problem focused coping strategy included direct action and make plans to take action. Also for emotion focused coping strategy can mention self blame, self-control, denial and seeking social support. Physically get away from situation occur when customer used the avoidance coping strategy (Ibid, p174). Finally, avoidance-based coping refers to ignoring the situation and hence taking no action to make things better. Several studies in consumer behavior have further refined the definition of coping strategies based on private versus public actions and based on various motivations to complain (Kim & et al, 2010, p978). According to the literature and contexts of complaint behavior, for avoidance-based behavior can be mention no-action or inertia(determined by yellow color in model), for emotion-focused coping can be mention exit, verbal and online of negative word of mouth and boycott the purchase (that determined by blue color). Also for problem focused coping can be mention voice and seeking redress of weakness, which has been determined in the conceptual model by green color. Arrows has been entered on the types of complaint behavior in model. The arrows placed toward the some complaints behavior and several elements listed in it. Also these elements are determining element for each complaint behavior.

**Influencing Factors on the complaint behavior**

Two major streams of research are apparent in this area. The first has attempted to identify the motivation or antecedents for complaining behavior. Suggestions have included:

1. Situational factor: (such as products/service importance and time constraint and prior experience of complaint) (huppertz & et al, 2003, p136; Tronvoll, 2007, p603) likelihood of successful redress¹ and cost of services (Drew & et al, 2000, p2; Jin, 2010, p87) switching convenience² (Kasabov & et al, 2010, p707)

2. Customer factor (such as demographic and factor attitude toward complaint)

3. Industry structure


5. Individual factor (huppertz, 2003, p135)

---

1. Probability that the complainer will succeed
2. When change the service/product provider company are Simply (for customer)
After the literature review in complaint behavior, we categorized that on the four sections such as personal (individual) factors, service/product factors, situational factors and macro element (such as culture). At the follow we are explaining each component of factors.

Component factors influencing on the of complaint behavior

There are many factors that affect the behavior of the complaint. One type of elements is services/product. Other elements are product/service costs and social importance. Some authors believe that complaint behavior increases when below situations occur:

1. When increases the customer dissatisfaction level
2. Consumers are more positive attitude toward complaining
3. Increase in the benefit of complaint
4. Increase the probability of the company blamed for the problem
5. Product and service for consumers be more important than the past
6. The most customer are reaching the Resources for complaint. (Mowen & et al, 2007, p430)
7. level of information and complaining experience (Velázquez & et al, 2010, p534)

Attribute of blame creates about complaint behavior by Customer. When customers are attributing product and service problems to the company and not to own, the complaint behavior increases. Moreover, if the problem is under the company control, customer dissatisfaction will increasing. Several types of people more tended to using complaint behavior more than other people includes younger people, higher income and education, dogmatic people, higher self-confidence and also individualist costumers. (c. mowen. S. minor, 2007, p430) Also, attribution of blame affected on the complaint behavior (Gruber & et al, 2008, p401).

According the literature review and in this context, several factors can mention such as consumer characteristics, the cost of the purchased product, the amount of seriousness (of the) problem, easily done in the mechanism of complaints, and retailer reputation in the response to customer. Also Bearden and Teel (1983) Expressed that severity of complaint is directly proportional to the level of customer dissatisfaction (Kanousi, 2005, p89-90). Research of B. Casado & et al (2011) presented that Magnitude of service failure in service recovery has significant and different effects on customers’ choice of a type of response. (B. Casado & et al, 2011, p32) Perceived severity of dissatisfaction, personal norms, societal benefits, and difficulty of complaining and service importance (Oh, 2006, p168) and prior experience of complaint had significant influences on the choice of complaint. (Jin, 2010, p87) Blodgett et al.(1995) who found that customers would react to a service incident when they know that a successful outcome is likely to occur (Tsarenko & et al, 2011, p386).

Researcher have examined the effects of attitudinal and personality factors on consumer complaining (Jin, 2010, p87; huppertz, 2003, p138) and assertiveness. (huppertz, 2003, p138) Blodgett and Granbois (1992), proposed that complaining is a

1. The level of dissatisfaction in customer that can categories in low, middle and high level.
function of not only dissatisfaction, but also of the importance of purchase, the expected benefit of complaining, and the personal characteristics of consumer (Kraft & Martin, 2001, p7).

**Magnitude of service failure:** The magnitude of service failure direct attention to the seriousness of service infirmity, that can be characterized as “high” or “low” according to the magnitude. when increases the severity of failure, unfairly treated will feel with customer, that goes to customer dissatisfaction. Service failure has a Three aspects, include time, frequency, and outcome. (Chang & et al, 2007, p248)

**Competitors density:** Buunk and Van Yperen (1991) identified two types of comparison: 1 relational; and 2 referential. The concept of relational comparison is similar to the equity theory, which postulates that customers compare their inputs and values to the businesses with the identified outcomes in terms of benefits they receive from the chosen. On the other hand, referential comparison occurs when customers evaluate their relationship status with those who are perceived to be similar to them. Consequently, these will influenced the pattern of complaint behavior and leads to a lesser likelihood of continuing the relationship (Tsarenko & et al, 2011, pp386-387).

**Consumer advocacy:** Researchers understand that consumer advocacy is positively related to consumer complaining (Chelminski & et al, 2011, p361). In the other hand, The purpose is to consider consumer advocacy, an individual’s general tendency to share information and warn other consumers about dissatisfactory products and service experiences, as related to complaining behaviors (Ibid, p362).

**Complaint importance:** The TARP data (1986) make a clear distinction between minor and major complaints. Minor complaints refer to incidents where monetary losses between $1 and $5 were incurred, while major complaints refer to incidents where losses in excess of $100 were incurred. TARP data indicate that, for those registering major complaints which were not resolved, a staggering 46 percent reported that they would switch brands. In contrast, the figure was only 19 percent for those registering minor complaints which were not resolved. Other factors may also determine the degree of importance which consumers attach to their complaints, including the extent of psychological cost, time lost, inconvenience, and the like (Dolinsky, 1994, P29).

**Inconvenience:** A state or an example of problems or trouble, which often causes a delay or loss of comfort occurred when customer complained from producer or service provider.

**Religion and complaining:** In the second study (Hirschman, 1982), it was found that religious affiliation also affected the criteria used to make buying decisions. Finally, Hirschman (1983) concluded that few other variables exhibited the range and depth of explanatory power offered by religious affiliation (Swimberge & et al, 2009, p341). Highly religious individuals will appraise violations of religious standards as very stressful events and perceive them as threatening to the “self” (Ibid, p342). Swimberge & et al (2009) study indicate that consumer religious commitment significantly influences store loyalty and complaint intentions (Ibid, p340).

1. The wasted and remained time that affected on the complaint intention. Time lost refers to wasted time for used the company product or services.
Psychological cost: Psychological cost defined the customers’ mental stress or emotion labor during the sale experience. Also argue that psychological costs refer to the emotional aspects of the sale experience costs, while time and effort costs refer to the rational aspects. (Broekhuizen & et al, 2003, p10)

Attitude toward complaining: Attitude toward complaining is defined as the personal tendency of dissatisfied consumers to seek compensation from the firm (Yuksel & Kilinc, Yuksel, 2006, p15). Attitudes influenced how people consume in general, and evaluate purchased goods and services in particular. For this reason, marketing divisions of countless companies investigate their consumers’ attitudes towards their products and/or services. This investigation includes the basic understanding of how members of their target market think, behave and act when they face a problem, in other words, what are their attitudes towards complaining (Hekiz & et al, 2011, p327). Furthermore, previous studies have indicated that the customers’ perceived justice influences complaint behaviors, as well as their emotions and loyalty towards the firm (Svari & et al, 2010, p27). Yuksel & et al (2011) researches indicated that Chinese respondents tend to forgive and forget failures, whereas Americans seek a remedy from third parties and this is represented, culture clearly affects Attitude toward complaining and general intention to stay loyal which suggests that practitioners should consider the cultural background of their customers while designing and implementing their service recovery systems (Hekiz & et al, 2011, p327).

Complaint addressee: The complaint addressee can also be used to define the concept and is the most commonly used criterion for classifying complaints. There is agreement that the complaint may be directed at the provider (the manufacturer or the distributor), or parties not involved in the transaction including consumer protection bodies, the media and the law. Depending on the complaint addressee, the aim of the complaint may vary (Velázquez & et al, 2010, p533).
Demographical variable

Demographic variables such as age, income and education are found to influence complaint behavior. Previous studies showed that those who complained were younger in age, had better education and higher income. Dearden and Mason (1984) found that there is a positive relationship between CCB, and education and income. However, CCB is found to be inversely related to age. In addition, Keng et al. (1995) found that females were more likely to complain than males (Phau & Sari, 2004, p410). Also in other research that implementation in Singapore finding that complainers who resorted to public action were older, better educated and earned higher income. They were also found to be more assertive and exhibited greater self-confidence and individualistic trait. (keng & et al, 2008, p59) Babakus et al. (1991), however, pointed out that Mexican-American complainants tended to have a lower level of education. Han et al. (1995) stated that public complainers in Singapore are older, but most studies have indicated that younger people file more complaints than older people (Ngai & et al, 2007, p1378). Based on the research that implied in Taipei, presented Private actions were preferred by adolescent customers to express dissatisfaction, followed by using the internet or through actions of parents. Adolescent customers who were satisfied with service or food compensations would be likely to have repeat purchases. Nevertheless, adolescents who were unsatisfied with the service or food recovery did not totally cease purchasing (Lu & et al, 2008, p243).

For perception of demographical variable on the complaint behavior, adjusted blow table to paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Profile characteristics</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morganosky and Buckley (1986)</td>
<td>Demographic variables (age, education, income, race, employment status, family type), lifestyle and attitude variables</td>
<td>Analysis revealed that higher income and better-educated consumers were significantly more likely than lower income and less educated consumers to agree with the statement “if I buy clothes I am not satisfied with, I take them back to the store and complain”. Other demographic variables such as age, employment status, and family type did not reveal significant differences (p. 224)</td>
<td>607 telephone interviews of women residence in the state of Illinois having at least one child less than 18 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh (1989)</td>
<td>Demographic variables (age, sex, education, income)</td>
<td>..third party complainers are younger, less educated, and come from higher income brackets (p. 355)</td>
<td>Questionnaire to dissatisfied patients within medical service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solnick and Hemenway (1992)</td>
<td>Demographic variables (age, sex, income)</td>
<td>..females and patients from areas with higher incomes are more likely to complain (p. 99)</td>
<td>639 respondents made a written complaint within medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosier et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Demographic variables segmented by zip codes (consist of 87 variables such as housing type, age, household composition, etc.)</td>
<td>Characteristics these categories (complainants) have in common include above average education, managerial or professional status and above average income (p. 847)</td>
<td>13,362 complaints made to Independent Television Commission in UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogarth and English (2002)</td>
<td>Demographic variables (age, sex, income, education, race)</td>
<td>more likely to be male than female... Middle-aged (median 52), slightly higher income (about 120 per cent of US household median), were more highly educated (89 per cent have at least high school diploma, compared to 78 per cent of the US population), and were more likely to be non-white (32 per cent were non-white compared with 25 per cent of the US population) to agree with the statement that indicate that they</td>
<td>Written complaints to Federal Reserve about banking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Literature review of complainer characteristics (Tronvoll, 2007, p30).
Psychological variable:
Complaining behavior has been related to several individual differences, including age, attitude towards complaining, personal values and personality. One of the personality traits most often linked to complaint behavior is extraversion, as extraverts are seen as more likely to engage in some form of complaining. For instance, Harris and Mowen (2001) found extraversion was positively related to people taking legal action after purchasing a lemon car (Daly & et al, 2010, p292).

**A & B personality:** The type-A person is said to be easily irritated, highly competitive, always in a hurry, and hence more aggressive. Type-B individuals, conversely, are relaxed, somewhat unassertive, and conciliatory toward the outside world. Therefore, the type-A person might be considered more likely than the type-B person to engage in aggressive complaining (Bennett, 1997, p160).

**Culture:**
Culture Values affected on the customers complaint behavior such as group-oriented or self-oriented (Ah & et al, 1997, p89) and Individualism or collectivistic. Individualism is the degree to which an individual is most concerned with and pursues self-interests. Personal goals and achievement, self-reliance, pleasure and independence, and competition are valued in highly individualistic cultures. In contrast, in collectivistic cultures a rigid social framework is emphasized (i.e. in-groups and out-groups exist) and one’s behavior is determined more by the goals shared with an in-group (RSwanson, & et al, 2011, p220). Sudharshan (2001) suggest that consumers from cultures with lower (versus higher) individualism tend not to complain to the service provider when they receive poor service (Baker, Meyer, Chebat, 2011, p3). According the research that implemented in Singapore (Hang & et al, 1997) that confirmed two groups differed in terms of demographic and psychographic characteristics and those clarified Group-oriented consumers were found to resort to private action, while their self-oriented counterparts were more prepared to opt for public actions (Hang & et al, 1997, p89). Also, Becker (2000) and Hofstede (1980) stated that the cultural trait that most distinguishes Asian nations is collectivity, while for non-Asian nations it is Customer Complaint behavior individualism (Ngai & et al, 2007, p1379).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer complaint behavior</td>
<td>McQuilken &amp; et al, 2011; R. Liu 2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>costs and time spent</td>
<td>Heung &amp; et al, 2003;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attitude toward complaint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>private responses, third-party responses</td>
<td>R. Liu &amp; et al, 2001;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>products/service importance and time</td>
<td>huppertz &amp; et al, 2003; Tronvoll,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: references of model factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boycott</td>
<td>Mattila &amp; Wir tz, 2004; Ndubisi &amp; et al, 2005; Harrison, 2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-of-mouth</td>
<td>Harrison, 2001; Mattila &amp; Wir tz, 2004; Ng &amp; et al, 2011;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>Daly &amp; et al, 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of blame</td>
<td>c. mowen. S. minor, 2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumer characteristics, cost of the purchased product, the amount of seriousness problem</td>
<td>Kanousi, 2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior experience of complaint</td>
<td>Jin, 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and complaining</td>
<td>Swimberghe &amp; et al, 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likelihood of successful redress and cost of services</td>
<td>Drew &amp; et al, 2000; Jin, 2010;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion & Conclusion

Finding in this research can be applied for long-term and strategic planning, in order to attract customers and receive benefit from their. Previous research emphasis on importance of complaint behavior in their research and this research identify and categories complaint behavior element for better understand of costumer behavior.
Pre-Research in the scope of customer complaint behavior identifies many complaint elements that cause the complaint reactions. Numerous studies applied to introduce the model for complaint behavior elements and factors. In the study that was conducted by Kasabov & et al (2010) endeavored to presentation of business model that is based on customer complaints Management. Their model compared management and recovery system of complaint with traditional method. Their study verification all elements that affect of recovery system in post-complaint behavior and did not consider the pre-complaint behavior. But research is similar with present study in reviews affecting element on complaint behavior. Also in other studies, Tronvoll & et al (no date), Has reviewed the previous models on the customer complaint behavior in services, and in three types of behavior included, complaint response, communicative complaint response and practical complaints response. Their study has many similarities with the framework of present research and we used from complaint behavior categories in own research. But their research, category complaint behavior in four category and did not verify other categories. As well as, widely researches had implied for categorization of complaint behavior, that we can mention the Singh (1988), day and London (1977) and Hrychmn (1970) researches, and we due to the comprehensiveness of the Singh’s model, we use its categories as basis of own model. In addition, in this study not only verifying the types of complaint behavior, but also has been recognized and analyzed of effective factors on the complaint behavior. Own model is more comprehensive than previous models. Another research, only verified complaint behavior in one or two dimension and do not regard other dimension. Singhs model in other models in complaint behavior higher comprehensiveness and has covered many factors.

The model show when customer is dissatisfied, different actions may be performed by the customer, including Customer Personal response (including the collective purchase boycott, switching and exit, negative word of mouth (verbal and online) communication,), complaint response of customer (including the voice, seeking redress from seller), third party action (including legal action, agency of consumers protection, acting by newspapers and media) and finally the on action or inertia. In the meantime, four factors that affecting on the customer actions include personal (individual) factors, service factors, situational factors and macro elements. Dissatisfaction customers determine the type of action by the each of four factors. Dissatisfaction Customer Select the type of response and action, severity and repetition rate of complaint that affected by four factors such as personal factors (including attitudes toward complaint, customer advocacy, religious beliefs, demographic variables, personality, psychological costs, personal norms and attribution of blame), services factors (including type of services, magnitude of service failure, level of dissatisfaction, service importance, service cost and switching convenience), situational factor (including prior experience of complaints, time lost, switching convenience, complaint addressee, competitor density, inconvenience and likelihood of successful redress ) and macro elements( including culture).

Also, dissatisfaction customers according to coping strategies, select the type of different responds. The previous researches show that individual factors such as demographic and psychological variables have specifically impact on the personal
response behavior (that is based on emotion). But in the other cases, there are different factors that specifically influence on the type of responses. The behaviors based avoidance creates by the series of factors that is toward the non-action. In this case, the most damage received to company, because the customers haven’t capacity and intention to complaint and the company loses the opportunity to identify strengths and weakness. While the customer doesn’t tend to repurchase company’s products, then their customers have lost. Research finding tabloid in figure 1.

In order to, each service provider and manufacture for responding to customer complaint behavior must be use the segmentation concept. For complaint segmentation, service provider can use these factors (identified in this research). By dividing the customer complaint behavior in several segment, each company can respond and uses to each opportunity.
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