5-1-2013

How We Complain: The Effect of Personality on Consumer Complaint Channels

Riley Allen Berry
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>

Part of the [Food and Beverage Management Commons](#), and the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Berry, Riley Allen, "How We Complain: The Effect of Personality on Consumer Complaint Channels" (2013). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 1803.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/4478197>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

HOW WE COMPLAIN: THE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY ON
CONSUMER COMPLAINT CHANNELS

By

Riley Berry

Bachelor of Science
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2012

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Master of Science Hotel Administration

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2013

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

We recommend the thesis prepared under our supervision by

Riley Berry

entitled

How We Complain: The Effect of Personality on Consumer Complaint Channels

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Hotel Administration

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration

Sarah Tanford, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Alison Green, Ph.D., Committee Member

Rhonda Montgomery, Ph.D., Committee Member

Gillian Naylor, Ph.D., Graduate College Representative

Tom Piechota, Ph.D., Interim Vice President for Research &
Dean of the Graduate College

May 2013

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore any connections that may exist between personality types and consumer complaint channels. A sample of 490 undergraduate students at the University of Nevada Las Vegas was surveyed during class time with a paper and pencil survey. The survey consisted of four service failure scenarios each with eleven possible courses of action. Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood to participate in each action on a seven point Likert-type scale. The three personality factors measured against the complaint behavior were Locus of Control, The California Psychological Inventory measure of Sociability, and Cattell's 16 personality factor of Relaxed vs. Tense. The three factors of consumer complaint channels proposed prior to conducting the study were; direct, indirect, and delayed.

Through factor analysis it was revealed that while three factors existed, it was not the factors originally proposed. The three factors that emerged were; active, passive, and delayed. It was found that both Sociability and the interaction of Relaxed vs. Tense have significant or marginally significant effect on consumer complaint channels. Sociability had a measurable effect of several active and one passive factor in complaint scenarios. The interaction of Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense had a measurable effect on two passive and two delayed factors in the complaint scenarios.

Keywords: Consumer Complaint Behavior, Consumer Complaint Channels, Personality Measures, Service Failure, Locus of Control, Sociability, Relaxed Vs. Tense,

Acknowledgments

There are many people with whom this thesis would not have been possible. I would like to thank Dr. Alison Green, Dr. Gillian Naylor, William Werner, Dr. Stowe Shoemaker, Dr. Curtis Love, Jeff Markle, Vaune Kadlubek, Anette Kang, Adam Carmer and Dr. Clark Kincaid for all allowing me access to their class. Instruction time is valuable and their kindness to share this time with me is appreciated. My committee; Dr. Rhonda Montgomery, Dr. Alison Green, and Dr. Gillian Naylor have been helpful and supportive throughout this entire process.

My family have loved and supported me in every way they have known how throughout my entire education. A special thanks to my grandparents Joe and Sherry Whitmore. This is only possible because of you. Sacrifices of time, money, and patience were offered to me at every opportunity. My fiancé and the love of my life Ella Bouchier has given unwavering support and understanding in every sacrifice that was made in this pursuit. Thank you for your caring, understanding, and time, even when time was not easy to give.

Dr. Sarah Tanford has been more than could ever be expected from a Chair. She has endured meetings up to several times a week for almost a year, countless emails, dozens of revisions, and last minute deadlines. She has shown more patience and dedication than any other instructor I have ever known. She has been a near perfect mentor who without, this project would never have been possible. Thank you for everything you have done. I could not have asked for better guidance through this process.

Table of Contents

Approval page.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii
List of Figures.....	viii
Chapter 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	2
Statement of Objective.....	3
Justifications.....	4
Limitations.....	5
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Consumer Complaint Behavior.....	7
Personality Types.....	11
Measures that Effect Consumer Complaint Behavior.....	17
Conclusion.....	17
Hypotheses.....	18
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	19
Subjects.....	19
Data Collection.....	20
Design.....	21

Procedure.....	22
Instrument.....	23
Analysis.....	25
Chapter 4 Analysis.....	26
Data Manipulation.....	26
Descriptives.....	27
Factor Analysis.....	31
Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).....	39
ANOVAS for Significant Effects.....	41
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	51
Summary.....	51
Recommendations.....	53
Limitations.....	55
Implications for Future Study.....	56
Conclusion.....	58
Appendix A. Survey	
Personality and consumer Complaint Behavior Survey.....	59
References.....	66
Author CV.....	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Personality Measures.....	30
Table 2: Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 1.....	32
Table 3: Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 2.....	32
Table 4: Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 3.....	33
Table5: Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 4.....	33
Table 6: Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 1.....	35
Table 7: Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 2.....	36
Table 8: Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 3.....	37
Table 9: Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 4.....	38
Table 10: Multivariate Analysis of Variance Tests (MANOVA).....	40
Table 11: Univariate Tests for Variables with Significant Multivariate Effect.....	42
Table 12: Means for Main Effects of Sociability.....	43
Table 13: Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 1 Passive Complaint Behavior.....	44
Table 14: Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 4 Passive Complaint Behavior.....	45
Table 15: Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 1 Delayed Complaint Behavior.....	46
Table 16: Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 3 Delayed Complaint Behavior.....	47

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure1: Age Group of Respondents.....	28
Figure2: Year in School of Respondents.....	28
Figure 3: Race/Ethnic Group of Respondents.....	29
Figure 4: Gender of Respondents.....	29
Figure 5: Personality Measures.....	31
Figure 6: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 1 Passive Complaint Behavior.....	44
Figure 7: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 4 Passive Complaint Behavior.....	45
Figure 8: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 1 Delayed Complaint Behavior.....	46
Figure 9: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 3 Delayed Complaint Behavior.....	47
Figure 10: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 1 and 4 Passive Complaint Behavior.....	49
Figure 11: Locus of Control x Tense vs. Relaxed	
Scenario 1 and 3 Delayed Complaint Behavior.....	50

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Consumer complaints are healthy for a business because they allow for correction (Susskind, 2005). Recently there has been an increase in the number of ways that a guest can present complaints when there is a lapse in service. With the rise of technology and the digital age, there are several new options for guests to express their dissatisfaction when service shortfalls occur. There has been extensive research done on why guests complain, and the different factors that effect a guest's propensity to complain (Gountas & Gountas, 2007; Gursoy, Mcleary, & Lepisito, 2007; Jones, Mcleary, & Lepisito, 2002; Kim & Chen 2010; Singh, 1990). There has been less research on what effects the avenue that a guest will choose to complain. How a customer complains can have a great impact on the business. One article has been published that addressed the channel of communication for guest complaints (Susskind, 2006). However, Susskind's article did not take into account personality types. This research attempts to bridge the gap that exists between the studies concerning consumer complaint behavior with regards to personality type, and the channels that consumers will choose to present their complaints.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to show that different personality types prefer to present hospitality complaints through different channels. Service shortfalls will occur in even the best run hospitality establishments. Some customers will present complaints directly to the establishment when the shortfall occurs. Some may never tell the business directly, preferring instead to use other indirect methods of expression such as social media or online reviews, or simply Negative Word of Mouth (NWOM). Managers have a tendency to focus their time and attention on the guests who complain while they are still

in the establishment. This can lead to a lack of attention to the guests who do not complain. The non-complaining guest may be just as, or even more, dissatisfied than the guest who complains. Armed with new information from this study, managers will have a greater ability to approach customers with a lower probability to complain directly to the establishment. This will increase the chances of identifying service shortfalls before the guest leaves the establishment. By identifying these shortfalls an establishment can start service recovery and mitigate consumer alienation. The goal is to create an environment where service shortfalls are expressed to the establishment before using other means that have a greater probability to tarnish an establishment's reputation, lower the probability of service recovery and ultimately lead to lost business and decreased revenue.

Statement of Problem

Customer complaints have been, and always will be, part of doing business. While this is true in all industries it holds especially true in the hospitality industry. As long as there are customer complaints, businesses will look for better, more efficient ways to solve and prevent as many complaints as possible. There are many ways that consumer complaints can be presented. For the personality types that prefer not to present their complaints at the time of the service shortfall businesses often lose the ability for corrective action or complaint resolution. The different channels that guests can choose for their expression of dissatisfaction are not all created equal in the eyes of the business hoping to receive the complaints. Certain methods leave the business at a severe disadvantage by either making recovery more difficult, or removing the ability for recovery altogether. Due to the recent accessibility of mass media to everyday guests, certain avenues of consumer complaints have the ability to reach a large portion of an

establishments target market. By achieving a greater understanding of what drives consumer complaint channels, businesses gain the ability to remove the barriers to the complaint methods that are most advantageous to both the establishment and the consumer.

Statement of Objective

The overall objective of most consumer complaint behavior studies is to create a better understanding of consumer complaint behavior. This allows businesses to better resolve complaints, mitigate alienation, help drive guest satisfaction, and increase repeat business. This study will bridge a gap in literature between personality types and complaint channels leading to a better understanding of how a business's consumers prefer to present complaints. In an industry where reputation is everything, it is important for an establishment to do everything in its power to keep its customers happy and resolve service shortfalls as soon as possible and to the greatest satisfaction of the guest.

Customer complaints that are voiced through internet channels of social media such as Twitter and Facebook can reach thousands of people immediately. Reviews that are placed on websites such as Urban Spoon, Zagat and Yelp can reach many potential customers that are in a business's direct target market. Not only is this immediately damaging, but also these reviews have the potential to have long lasting effects. Negative reviews may be especially damaging in that they reach the population that is interested in trying the product. These potential customers could be easily swayed by negative feedback. Once the damage is done, it is often very difficult to undo.

Justifications

This study will show which personality types prefer to present complaints through different channels. This information does several things for the industry. First, it is another step forward in understanding what drives consumer complaint behavior. By understanding the different types of personalities that may not complain at the time of the service shortfall, it gives managers a greater ability to approach these guests and create resolution. More importantly, if it can be determined why certain personality types prefer certain methods of complaint channels, there may be the ability to create channels that are preferred by the guest, but not as damaging to the business. This study will also show if consumers are more likely to express their disapproval of a situation if asked by a manager instead of a line level employee. This knowledge will help managers budget their time more efficiently. It will allow managers to anticipate how many guests may not present their complaints directly to the business.

This study will show approximately what types of people will leave without alerting anyone of the service shortfall, but will express their dissatisfaction in other ways. There have been previous studies that explore how many unsatisfied guests leave without lodging a complaint (Gursoy et al., 2003; Susskind 2004, 2005). These guests often do not return and participate in Negative Word of Mouth (NWOM) (Susskind 2004, 2005). The old adage was that a satisfied guest will tell three people, while a dissatisfied guest will tell twenty. Now both the satisfied and the dissatisfied, have the possibility to tell thousands. Never before has a single customer's opinion had the ability to influence so many other potential customers.

Limitations

Any results obtained from this study should be viewed with the understanding that there are several limitations. The first limitation associated with this study is using intention to measure complaint behavior. In some circumstances future intent is not always an accurate predictor of actual future behavior (Gursoy et al., 2003). The second limitation is that the sample will consist of undergraduate students. The method in which students respond to service shortfalls may not be representative of the overall population. However, it is important to remember that in the near future these students may grow into the target market. It could be assumed that a younger, more technology affluent group would be more likely to use internet means to voice their dissatisfaction. There are also likely to be distinct differences in the personality types of consumers of different ages and market segments. While the student sample is a constraint, it does allow for a certain measure of control for other factors that have been previously shown to effect complaint behavior such as age, income, and marital status. Although there will be some diversity in the sample group, it will be a much more homogenous group than could be expected from a random sampling of the population.

This study uses three measures of personality that are likely to affect the channels of consumer complaints. Given the number of personality measures available today it would not be possible to use all measures in a single study (Singh & Wilkes, 1996). This study also does not take into account service shortfall severity. Guests may choose to present their complaints through different channels based on the severity of the service shortfall. Another limitation is that this study does not take into account resolution of the complaint if it was brought to the attention of the establishment before leaving. It is likely

that a person has a higher probability to use online and written complaint methods if they presented their complaint during the time of the shortfall, and the complaint resolution did not meet their satisfaction. This study uses a scenario-based method for determining consumer complaint behavior. The scenarios are based on real world experiences that were either found in online databases, or witnessed by the author in industry. The limitation is that they are hypothetical scenarios which some of the respondents may not be able to identify with. This study may also not accurately reflect how people would behave if faced with the situation.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Introduction

There has been extensive research done regarding hospitality consumer complaint behavior (Gountas & Gountas, 2007; Gursoy, McCleary, & Lepisito, 2007; Jones, McCleary, & Lepisoto, 2002; Kim & Chen, 2010; Singh, 1989, 1990; Susskind, 2005). Due to the complexity of the services being offered and the differing expectations of the guests receiving the services, there will always be consumer complaints in the hospitality industry (Gursoy et al., 2007). Consumer complaints can be good for a business if handled properly. A guest that has received a service shortfall that was then met with successful consumer complaint resolution is likely to be more satisfied than a guest who did not experience a shortfall (Susskind, 2005). It is only through a thorough understanding of the consumer, consumer complaint behavior, and consumer complaint resolution that businesses have the ability to turn their service shortfalls from something that could be detrimental to the business into a positive moment of truth.

Consumer Complaint Behavior

Consumer complaints are a type of litmus test used to judge the health of a business. "Recovery cannot occur without a complaint" (Singh, 1996, p. 353). The consumer complaints that a business receives are one of the best tools to create corrective action so that future guests do not have the same unpleasant experience. It has been shown that often times a consumer who experiences a service shortfall will choose not to alert the business and will not return, or engage in negative publicity about the business (Jones, 2002). Some individuals believe that complaining is a necessary, worthwhile, and

important function of consumerism whereas others do not (Susskind, 2004). There are several factors that contribute to a guest's propensity to complain including barriers to complaint, shortfall severity, personality, and expected outcome of complaint, (Evanschitzky, Brock & Blut, 2011; Gronhaug & Zaltman, 1981; Jones et al., 2002; Kim & Chen, 2010; Susskind, 2004). It is in a business's best interest to reduce as many of the barriers to complaints as possible, so that resolution can occur at the time of the shortfall. By reducing these barriers to complaint a business can foster an environment where the guest has the impression that their opinion matters and that complaints are used to the full benefit of both the business and the guest.

Guests complain for many different reasons. Day and Landon (1977) listed three main purposes that consumers have when filing complaints: seeking redress, complaining, and personal boycott. Seeking redress is when the consumer is looking for a remedy to the shortfall in service. The main avenue in which the restaurant and hotel industry solves guest complaints is to either discount or remove the charge for an item, or to offer something else complimentary. An example of this is offering an upgrade to a suite due to a hotel room not being ready on time. Day and Landon (1977) listed complaining as communicating dissatisfaction for reasons other than seeking redress. An example of this would be a guest that at check-out informs the agent that the light bulb is burned out so the hotel can replace it before the next guest goes in. This guest is not dissatisfied with the experience; he/she is simply making the business aware so that it can improve. Discontinuing the purchase of a given product is personal boycott. Of those who experience a service shortfall and do not tell the offending company, 90% are likely not to repurchase in the future according to the Technical Assistance Research Program

(as cited in Jones et al., 2002). Due to the type of compensation that is often given, there has emerged a small group of people who engage in opportunistic guest complaints. That is they purposively complain with the intention of receiving items either at a discounted rate, or free of charge (Ro & Wong, 2012). While opportunistic complaints are not the focus of this research, it would be a disservice to legitimate consumer complaints to not list this as a possible reason for guest complaints. The difficulty in opportunistic complaints is that a guest who did not actually receive a service shortfall has the same damage potential as a guest with a legitimate complaint.

The propensity of a guest to complain following a service failure has been at the heart of numerous studies (Evanchschitzky et al., 2011; Gursoy et al., 2007; Jones et. al 2002, Susskind, 2004; Kim & Chen, 2010). The main reason for this focus is that businesses want to receive as many of the complaints as possible while there is still time for recovery. “Good service recovery can turn angry customers into loyal ones” (Susskind, 2005, p.165). Nearly half of all dissatisfied customers choose not to complain directly to the service provider. There are three main reasons that are cited for this. Guests will not complain if they feel it is not worth the time and effort, they do not know where or how to complain, or they believe that nothing will be done if they do complain (Lewis, 1987). When guests experience a service shortfall and do not complain to the business they are much more likely to show their disapproval in ways that can be much more damaging to the business (Susskind 2004, Susskind 2005).

In research by Gursoy (2007) it was shown that several factors contribute to a guest’s propensity to complain including interpersonal influence, Locus of Control, and price consciousness. Gursoy’s study proposed that there are numerous factors outside of a

business's control that can effect a guest's propensity to complain. Locus of Control has been used to predict complaint behavior in several studies (Gursoy et al., 2007; Huang & Chang, 2008; Kowalski, 1996). People with an internal Locus of Control seem to have a higher propensity to complain because they feel they will be able to take control away from the business that is providing the poor experience, and put an end to their dissatisfaction (Kowalski, 1996). Price consciousness is described as how concerned a person is about the price of a good or service (Gursoy et al., 2007). The more price conscious a person is the higher their propensity to complain. If a person is less price conscious the individual is unlikely to complain to anyone including the business, which can prove problematic (Gursoy et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2002). Susceptibility to interpersonal influence is how likely an individual is to be influenced by those around him/her, including family and friends. It has been shown that this has a strong influence on a consumer's propensity to complain (Gursoy et al., 2007; Jones et al 2002).

Consumers have always had several different channels with which to express their dissatisfaction with a service or product. The four types of complaints listed in Susskind's (2006) article are: face-to-face with manager, face-to-face with employee, written (letter, email, internet), and comment card. While these same channels exist there are several other ways that consumers show their dissatisfaction. The newest method is through social media. Social media comes with its own set of difficulties. While this method is not currently as prevalent as other forms of consumer complaint behavior, it may continue to grow in popularity as the younger generations gain a greater share of the market buying power.

Day and Landon (1977) separated consumer complaint behavior into two separate distinctions. The first distinction is between action and no action. No action simply means that while the guests experience a shortfall, they do not engage in complaining and remain loyal to the business. The second option of action is separated into either private action, or public action. Private action would consist of boycotting the product or brand, or engaging in NWOM. A public action would be listed as issuing a third party complaint or seeking legal action. Singh expanded on this idea in his 1989 article by indentifying three possible responses: voice responses, private responses, and third party responses. Singh listed a voice response as a customer that is seeking redress or that is simply taking no action. A private party response would be the customer engaging in NWOM, and the third party response would be to take legal action against the establishment (Butelli, 2007).

Personality Types

Personality tests have been used for over a century to show the differences in how humans think, feel and act. There are hundreds of different personality tests that can be used to measure everything from personality disorders to how well a person is suited to parenthood. Many of the first personality tests were used to diagnose clinical psychological diseases such as depression, schizophrenia, and anxiety. While some of the early tests are still used today, many have been altered or expanded in order to encompass a growing scientific understanding of the human psyche. There are certain factors in a person's personality that have been shown to effect consumer complaint behavior (Frew & Shaw, 1999; Gountas & Gountas, 2006; Gursoy et al., 2007; Huang & Chang, 2008; Jones et al., 2002; Kowalski, 1996,). The main personality measures that have been

linked to consumer complaint behavior are: Locus of Control (Gursey et al., 2007; Huang & Chang, 2008; Kowalski, 1996), Verbenke emotional types (Gountas & Gountas, 2006), Madrigal personality theories (Frew & Shaw, 1999), price consciousness, and interpersonal influence (Gursey et al., 2007). Other popular tests of personality that have been used in the business world include the Meyers-Briggs, Jung, the Big Five, Keirsey temperament, Eysneck and color code. While each of these personality profiles have been used in academic studies, and each have their strengths and weaknesses, they were not utilized in this study. Many of these tests require a large commitment of time to take accurately, which makes them difficult to group together in a questionnaire with other measures. Some personality tests have been shown to retain their accuracy when shortened while other lose validity when taken away from their original context.

The three measures of personality that have been chosen for this study are: Rotter's Locus of Control, the California Psychology Inventory Measure of Sociability, and Cattell's 16 PF test of relaxed versus tense. The reason for choosing these three measures is that they have been shown to effect other factors of consumer complaint behavior (Frew & Shaw, 1999; Gountas & Gountas, 2007; Gursoy et al., 2007; Huang & Chang, 2008; Jones et al., 2002; Kowalski, 1996). It would stand to reason that if they effect propensity to complain they may also have an effect on the channel of preferred consumer complaint. All three measures of personality are classic measures that are well grounded in clinical psychology. Another reason for the choice of these three tests is that both the California Psychology Inventory Measure of Sociability and Cattell's Sixteen Personality factor test have substantially shortened versions that have been shown in empirical studies to be an accurate measure of personality when compared to the full test

(Vilianni & Wind, 1975). In Villianni's same study a shortened version of the Locus of Control scale was shown not to be an accurate predictor of personality when compared to the original scale. Despite this fact, the shortened test was used in Gursoy's 2007 article, which was well received. To ensure maximum accuracy the original Locus of Control questionnaire is used with the only change being the removal of the six filler questions in the interest of brevity.

Locus of Control is the personality factor that is arguably the most often measured with respect to consumer complaint behavior. One reason for this is that in several studies it has been shown to be an accurate predictor of a guest's propensity to complain (Gursey et al., 2007; Huang & Chang, 2008; Kowalski, 1996). Locus of Control measures to what degree a person perceives that rewards are controlled by an individual's actions, versus the degree that the person perceives the rewards are controlled by external forces and are not dependent on the actions of the individual (Rotter, 1966). If the person has the perception that their own actions or their own characteristics control the events that effect their lives, they have an internal Locus of Control. If they perceive that external events outside of their control have a great influence on the outcome of a situation or event, the person has an external Locus of Control. Someone with an external Locus of Control will have a strong belief in luck, chance, or fate. The old saying, "Luck is when preparation meets opportunity" is a blend of the two dichotomies. There are many people that have adopted elements of the external Locus of Control as a defense mechanism against failure (Rotter, 1966). Many people will attribute their success to hard work, and their failures to bad luck. Since its creation in 1966, the Locus of Control scale has been applied to several different areas such as children's Locus of Control (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973),

health Locus of Control (Wallston, 1976), and more recently the work Locus of Control scale (Spector, 2011). All of these different measures use the same scale of measurement, but instead measure a person's predisposition to a certain idea or task.

The theoretical background for Locus of Control comes from Rotter's earlier work on social learning theory (Rotter, 1960). Rotter states that in social learning theory, reinforcement will strengthen the expectancy that a particular action will be subsequently followed by that reinforcement in the future. This is a very similar idea to Pavlov's famous dog experiments. When the reinforcement is not viewed as hinging upon the action of the individual, then its occurrence will not have the same influence on expectancy. An individual's history and culture will have a strong influence as to what extent the individual feels his/her own actions influence their expectations of reinforcement (Rotter, 1966). This is an important motivating factor since a person's actions change based on whether the individual feels that there is chance involved in a given task. Specifically, motivation decreases when tasks are based on chance rather than skill (Feather, 1959 as cited by Rotter, 1966). Even tasks of skill that have a high element of statistical uncertainty, such as batting in baseball, lead to an entirely different course of action than elements of the same sport with less statistical uncertainty such as fielding. Baseball players have long intricate rituals that surround batting due to the external Locus of Control these batters have applied these rituals as a coping mechanism to deal with the high level of failure. The best batting average in history is Ty Cobb with a .336 batting average (Carter & Strayer, 2012). That means the best batter that ever lived failed nearly 65% of the time. Fielding, which has a high percentage of success, does not need the rituals because a coping mechanism is unnecessary (Gladwell, 2008).

The measure of sociability used in this study is the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) scale. The CPI consists of 480 true or false questions. It shares about half of those questions with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The main difference between the two is that the MMPI is used to determine mental health and personality disorders, while the CPI is used as a measure of personality traits in healthy people. The total CPI test measures several different personality characteristics. The only measure from the CPI test used for this study is the measure of sociability. The sociability scale was originally labeled the Sp or social participation scale. This scale was later changed to the Sy or sociability scale (Megargee, 1972). This test was originally administered to high school students with the number of extracurricular activities the student participated in being the external criterion. Out of 100 questions that were administered there were forty-two that had substantial differences between the top and bottom quarters of the students. The evolution of the scale has led to the number of questions being shortened to thirty-six true or false questions. Twenty-two of the questions raise the sociability score if marked true, with fourteen raising the score if marked false. Not surprisingly many of the questions ask the respondent how well they enjoy social interaction. Other questions assess poise and self-assurance when dealing with others, while some questions are based on intellectual and cultural interests.

It has been shown that the sociability section of the CPI test can be shortened while still revealing accurate information about the personality of an individual (Villani & Wind, 1975). By taking this relatively long test and shortening it, researchers gain the ability to combine this test with other measures and find out if sociability is a predictor of preferred channels of consumer complaints.

R.B. Cattell established the 16 PF questionnaire in 1957 (Cattell & Mead, 2008). Since then it has been used in over 2,000 publications and has been listed as among the five most used normal-range instruments in research and practice (Butcher & Rouse, 1996). After the original 1949 publication the test has undergone four revisions, with the most recent occurring in 1993. The test measures five separate areas of personality: extraversion, independence, anxiety, self-control, and tough-mindedness. There are other five factor models, including The Big Five that have been presented and have similar factors to Cattell's original five. For example in the NEO-PI-R model, low anxiety/high anxiety is listed as neuroticism, and on the Big Five it is listed as emotional stability.

Cattell's personality test consists of 185 multiple choice questions. Each of the questions has a three-point answer format. The normal time it takes to complete the test is about 35-50 minutes if the test is administered with paper and pencil, and 25-40 minutes on a computer (Cattell & Mead, 2008). The test is available with several different variations, including one for 12-18 year olds, one for employee selection, and an abbreviated version. The same study that showed that the CPI test for sociability can be shortened while still maintaining its accuracy as a predictor of personality showed that the Cattell's can also be shortened with the same accuracy (Villain & Wind, 1975).

These three personality tests were chosen for several reasons. The first is that all three measure personality on a dichotomous scale. What this does is give the ability to rank each individual with a number that corresponds to how high or low someone ranks on the respective personality traits. This allows for the numbers to be analyzed statically in relation to consumer complaint behavior. Another reason is that all three of these tests have been shown to be viable measures of an individual's personality. The final reason is

that all three of the tests could be completed in a relatively short period of time, which allows for the collection of other information that will be compared to the personality types.

Measures that Effect Consumer Complaint Behavior

There are several other measure besides personality that have been shown to have an impact on consumer complaint behavior. Studies have examined the effect of income, education, gender, political membership, marital status, race, and occupation and their effect on complaint behavior (Gronhaug & Zaltman, 1981; Jones et al., 2002; Kim and Chen, 2010; Singh, 1990). Many other areas of personality, besides the three chosen for this study, have been shown to effect consumer complaint behavior. Perceived self-importance (Kim & Chen, 2010), Jung's four personality orientations (Gountas & Gountas, 2007), interpersonal influence (Gursoy et al., 2007; Jones, 2002), and Madrigal personality traits (Frew & Shaw, 1998), have all been shown to be personality measures that effect at least one area of consumer compliant behavior.

Conclusion

There has been considerable study done on personality types with regard to consumer complaint behavior (Butelli, 2007; Day & Landon, 1977; Gountas & Gountas, 2004, 2007; Gursoy, Mcleary & Lepsito, 2007; Jones Mcleary & Lepsito, 2002) and brief study in consumer complaint channels (Susskind, 2006). Despite the past and ongoing research into personality and consumer compliant behavior, there seems to be a gap in the literature with regards to personality types and the channels with which they prefer to present consumer complaints. The intention of this study is to bridge that gap. By creating a study that measures the connection between consumer complaint channel and

personality type, the ever-expanding compendium of knowledge for consumer complaint behavior is moved forward.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Customers displaying an internal Locus of Control are more likely to use the direct methods of consumer complaint channels.

Hypothesis 2: Customers displaying an external Locus of Control are more likely to use non-action or indirect methods of consumer complaint channels.

Hypothesis 3: Customers displaying a high level of sociability are more likely to use direct methods of consumer complaint channels.

Hypothesis 4: Customers displaying a low level of sociability are more likely to use non-action or indirect methods of consumer complaint channels.

Hypothesis 5: Customers that are tense are more likely to use direct methods of consumer complaint channels.

Hypothesis 6: Customers that are relaxed are more likely to take non-action or use indirect methods of consumer complaint channels

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Subjects

The test respondents were comprised of undergraduate college students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. There have been studies that have shown the effects of socio-demographic factors on consumer complaint behavior (Day & Landon, 1977). By using a student population the heterogeneity of the sample is reduced, increasing the ability to control some of the other factors that have been shown to influence complaint behavior.

The limitation of this sample is that a homogenous sample may not be representative of the overall population. While taking a sample of this type does control for certain factors such as age and education level, it will not control for other factors such as income, religion, nationality and hospitality usage habits. The sample size consisted of approximately 490 students taken from undergraduate classes in various majors throughout UNLV. All respondents had to be over the age of 18 and have dined at casual sit down restaurant in the last two months. There are approximately 22,000 undergraduate students enrolled at UNLV. If the 490 student sample size is achieved the calculations for the rest of the student body will have a 4.38% margin of error. The sample for this study will be a sample of convenience and the students for the survey will be chosen based on the accessibility of the class. Access to the students will come from partnering with instructors from both the hotel college and the other colleges on campus.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted during class time in undergraduate classes at UNLV. The collection period started on February 26th and ended on March 12th. The survey was given primarily to students with one of four different majors; Hotel Administration, Business Management, Engineering, and Science. Many of the classes surveyed contained students from more than just a single major. The class of “Old World Wines” was surveyed, which attracts students from many majors throughout UNLV. Given the anonymous nature of the survey it was not recorded which major a student was in and is unknown what percentage of respondents belonged to each major.

Of 610 collected surveys, 490 were usable. There are several factors that contributed to the high level of unusable surveys. The greatest limitation was respondents that had not utilized restaurant services in the recent past. Surveys were considered unusable if any of several qualifications were not met. The participant was required to be over 18 years of age and have dined at a casual sit down restaurant at least once in the last two months. If the respondent did not meet either of these qualifications, the survey was not used. The survey was also unusable if any of the personality profile questions were skipped or had duplicate answers. The largest limitation of otherwise usable surveys came from the Locus of Control questions. Respondents often circled both answers or skipped one of the questions, rendering their survey unusable. Although it was extremely rare, since the survey was voluntary, if someone responded to the survey with all of a single answer (e.g. all answers B), that survey was not used.

Design

The test questions are broken into several different sections. The first section is composed of the two screener questions. The screener questions were used to determine if the respondent has recently used restaurant services. This allows us to disregard their questionnaire if they are not at least a casual user of restaurant products.

The second section consists of four situations each of which illustrates a service shortfall. Each service shortfall situation has eleven courses of possible consumer complaint channels. These complaint channels are not mutually exclusive. For example a person may voice a concern to the server in a restaurant, but also make a Facebook post about the service shortfall. Each of the service failures differ slightly; however care was taken to keep all service failure scenarios relatively similar.

The third set of questions is the questions that pertain to personality. The first personality factor measured is Locus of Control. The questions used for Locus of Control are the original questions used by Rotter (1966). Rotter's original questionnaire consisted of 29 questions, of which six were filler. The six filler questions were removed in order to keep the questionnaire a reasonable length. The other 23 questions were presented in their original form. The second personality measure used is The California Psychological Inventory's measure of Sociability. While the California Psychological Inventory's full Sociability test consists of 36 true or false questions, it was shown by Villani & Wind (1975) that an abbreviated version could be used with the same accuracy as the full test. The third measure of personality used is Cattell's sixteen-factor test of Relaxed versus Tense. This was another test that even when shortened is an accurate measure of personality when compared to the original (Villani & Wind, 1975).

The last section of the questionnaire consisted of questions relating to demographics. The demographics section is usually left at the end of any survey so that the respondent is not required to produce sensitive personal information before completing the main questions. The end of this survey also contained questions regarding demographics for the same reason. The demographic questions obtained information about the respondent's age, gender, race, and credit hours currently enrolled in. While demographics are not the focus of this study it gave valuable information about what constitutes the sample population.

Procedure

The students completed a written questionnaire that took between ten and twenty minutes to complete. The questionnaire was administered with paper and pencil inside of a classroom at the start of a class. All questionnaires were filled out anonymously. Since there was no reward for completing the survey, there was no incentive for a respondent to take the survey multiple times. After all the written samples were collected the data was manually input into spreadsheet format so that it could be uploaded into SPSS for analysis. The respondents were not required to answer the entire questionnaire and they had the ability to terminate the test at any time. Responses were used even if any of the demographic data was not complete. While the demographic data will give us information on what constitutes the sample it was not needed for the data analysis. Responses were not used if any of the personality or complaint behavior data was not complete.

Instrument

Of the questions that were used in the data analysis the first presented in the questionnaire was the questions pertaining to Locus of Control. The original test of Locus of Control was used in lieu of a more concise or abbreviated version to ensure reliability. Each question in the Locus of Control section of the survey consisted of two statements. The reader was to pick the one that they agree describes their views or opinions of themselves best. Based on their responses the individual can be ranked on the scale of Locus of Control, which ranges from completely internal to completely external. Someone who has a completely internal Locus of Control believes that everything that happens to them is completely due to their own actions. This person does not believe in luck, chance, fate, or destiny. Someone who has a completely external Locus of Control believes that their actions have absolutely no effect on their lives. This will rank the respondents on a dichotomous scale of having either an internal or external Locus of Control. For the purposes of this study it was not necessary to know how far on each side of the scale the person ranks. For the analysis each individual will correspond to either a "1" for internal, or a "2" for external.

The second measure of personality measured was The CPI measure of sociability. A shortened version has been shown to be an accurate predictor of this measure of personality. This shortened version was the measure used for the current study. This abbreviated version consists of six statements that the respondent ranked on a five point Likert-type scale on how well they believe the statement describes them. Like Locus of Control, sociability is a dichotomous scale with one side being completely social and the

other side being completely unsocial. With this measure the respondents were labeled as either sociable or unsociable for analysis.

The third and final measure of personality used is Cattell's measure of Relaxed versus Tense. Cattell's original relaxed versus tense questionnaire consisted of 16 questions. The shortened version that was used for this study consists of four questions each with a five point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. As was the case with both other measures of personality, it is a dichotomous scale that separated the respondents into being labeled relaxed or tense.

The four scenarios of consumer complaint behavior each have eleven possible courses of action. Each of the eleven options was rated in a seven point Likert-type scale asking how likely they would be to take the following action with one being not likely at all, and seven being extremely likely.

The eleven possible responses fall into one of three categories; non-action, direct response, and indirect response. Responses one, three, and four comprise the non-action, or action only if provoked category. Respondents in this category either would not say anything at all, or would only make the establishment aware of the service failure if directly asked by either an employee or management. Responses two, five, seven and eleven comprise the direct response category. Respondents in this category would let the establishment know without involving any outside parties. Responses in this category include comment cards, speaking to the manager, or writing a letter or email to management. Responses six, eight, nine, and ten comprise the indirect response category. Each of these responses does not tell the establishment directly, but does tell third parties of the service shortfall. This category includes action ranging from NWOM to negative

online reviews. There originally were eight situations, which were narrowed down to four through pretesting. The goal of this was to ensure the same severity of service failure across scenarios, as well as having accurate, believable, and clear scenarios.

Analysis

For this study the complaint channels are the dependent variables and the personality types are the independent variables. Each of the measures of personality was measured independently against the complaint channels. The measures were systematically manipulated one by one to find the two levels of each variable. This study demonstrated whether these personality factors cause consumers to choose certain complaint channels over others. A factor analysis was conducted with each scenario to see if the three proposed dimensions exist. Before combining the factors Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the factors. Once the factors were found they were averaged and the analysis was done on both the averages and the individual items. Data were analyzed using a 2x2x2 multivariate analysis of variance or a MANOVA on the individual items. Due to the fact that there are multiple dependent variables a MANOVA was used to find if the independent variables had significant effects on the dependent variables. For the results that are significant a univariate ANOVA was conducted on each of the significant factor items. In order to determine the source of the significant interactions a simple effects test was used.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis

Data Manipulation

Once the data were collected they were input manually into an excel spreadsheet. Each survey contained 83 pieces of data that were entered as a number ranging 1-7. Many of the items needed to be transformed before they could be properly analyzed. All transformations and analysis were conducted in SPSS. The first manipulation was to alter the responses from the personality measures into the dichotomized factors needed for analysis. Each of the personality measures needed to be coded so that the personality measure was represented by either a 1 or 2 which would correspond to; internal or external, relaxed or tense, or sociable or unsociable, respectively.

The personality measure Locus of Control consisted of 23 questions each with two possible responses. In the original excel workbook the responses were input as either a 1 for A or 2 for B. In some questions A corresponded to internal, and in some B corresponded to internal. The data was recoded so that 1 always corresponded to internal and 2 always corresponded to external. Each respondent then had a number ranging from 23-46 with 23-34 being labeled internal and 35-46 being labeled external.

Sociability was measured with six questions, each with a 5-point Likert-type scale. In the original excel workbook this was entered as a number of 1-5. Like Locus of Control, some questions rated sociable with a higher number, and some rated sociable with a lower number. These were coded so that 5 always corresponded to unsociable and 1 always corresponded to sociable. This created a score for each respondent that ranged

from 6-30. Any respondent that scored from 6-18 was labeled sociable and 19-30 was labeled unsociable.

Relaxed vs. Tense was measured with four questions each with a 5-point Likert-type scale. Each of the answers was input as 1-5 in the original excel workbook. Since 1 always corresponded to tense and 5 always corresponded to relaxed, no recoding was needed. This created a score of 4-20 for each respondent. Any respondent with a score of 4-12 was labeled tense and 13-20 was labeled relaxed.

Descriptives

The age of the respondents ranged from 18-53 with the majority falling into the 22-25 age range (see Figure 1). While there were respondents from all years in school, the majority ranked as seniors with the number of respondents declining with each previous year. This can be attributed to the classes available to take the survey were primarily 200-400 level classes (see figure 2). The majority of respondents were either Caucasian or Asian with a smaller percentage falling into the other categories (see figure 3). Slightly more women took the survey than men with the percentages 53% female to 47% male (see figure 4).

Figure 1. Age group demographics.

Figure 2. Year in school demographics.

Figure 3. Race/ethnic group demographics.

Figure 4. Gender demographics.

The personality measures all had a very close to even split. Locus of Control had the greatest disparity with 57% Internal and 43% External. Due to the Locus of Control measure having an odd number of questions it was necessary to make the midpoint correspond to either internal, or external. In the interest of keeping an accurate distribution the midpoint was included as internal. Relaxed vs. Tense and Sociability both measured 53% and 47% with sociable and relaxed both receiving the higher percentage (see Table 1 and Figure 5). The higher percentages of certain social traits may be attributed to the sample being composed entirely of college students. It may also be attributed to the decision of where to place the midpoint in the coding process, which splits the Locus of Control spectrum.

Table 1

Personality Measures

		Total Sample %	Sample Size
Sociability	Sociable	53	258
	Un-Sociable	47	232
Relaxed Vs. Tense	Relaxed	53	261
	Tense	47	229
Locus of Control	Internal	57	279
	External	43	211

Figure 5. Personality measures.

Factor Analysis

Each of the four scenarios had eleven possible complaint behaviors labeled A-K with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Not likely at all” to “Extremely Likely”. Each of the four service failure scenarios offered the same eleven complaint options in the same order (see Tables 2-5).

Table 2

<i>Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 1</i>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.
No complaint Action	3.62	2.08
Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	5.00	2.00
Make the server aware only if asked about the meal	3.70	2.07
Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	4.10	2.13
Ask for the manager and make him/her aware	3.99	2.18
Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	5.36	1.93
Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	3.29	2.10
Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	2.57	1.88
Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a post on your wall)	2.92	2.04
Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	2.55	1.93
Write a letter or email to the management after you have left	2.01	1.62

Table 3

<i>Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 2</i>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.
No complaint Action	3.24	2.29
Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	5.59	1.79
Make the server aware only if asked about the meal	3.73	2.18
Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	4.08	2.20
Ask for the manager and make him/her aware	4.39	2.19
Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	5.19	2.00
Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	3.17	2.09
Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	2.60	1.90
Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a post on your wall)	3.02	2.18
Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	2.62	1.97
Write a letter or email to the management after you have left	2.22	1.75

Table 4

<i>Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 3</i>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.
No complaint Action	2.45	1.71
Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	6.23	1.27
Make the server aware only if asked about the meal	4.18	2.38
Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	4.64	2.32
Ask for the manager and make him/her aware	5.67	1.80
Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	5.85	1.63
Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	4.10	2.24
Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	3.22	2.18
Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a post on your wall)	3.62	2.34
Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	3.16	2.23
Write a letter or email to the management after you have left	2.79	2.12

Table 5

<i>Complaint Behavior Statistics for Scenario 4</i>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.
No complaint Action	4.35	2.05
Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	5.96	1.47
Make the server aware only if asked about the meal	4.19	2.23
Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	4.45	2.19
Ask for the manager and make him/her aware	4.85	2.07
Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	5.66	1.71
Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	3.39	2.12
Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	3.84	2.02
Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a post on your wall)	3.29	2.24
Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	2.79	2.03
Write a letter or email to the management after you have left	2.40	1.85

Before administering the survey, three factors of complaint behavior were proposed. In order to find out if the three proposed factors existed, a factor analyses was done on each scenario. For each of the factor analysis done the extraction method used was maximum likelihood. The rotation method used was Promax with Kaiser Normalization. Each of the scenarios converged in 4 iterations with the exception of scenario one which converged in five iterations. The number factors were determined by having an eigenvalue of one or higher. On each of the four scenarios there were three distinct factors. Though three factors existed they were not the factors originally proposed. The original factors proposed were direct action, indirect action, and non-action or action only if questioned. The new factors that emerged through the factor analysis were active action, passive action, and delayed action. The option of “no complaint action” was included as an inverse factor with active action. Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) stated that a loading of .32 and above is required. All of the factor loadings except one in scenario 4 were above the .32 factor-loading requirement. In scenario 4 the inverse of non-action only had a factor loading of .263, due to this low loading it was not included in further analysis (see Tables 6-9).

Table 6

Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 1

Factor	Components	Factor Loading	Percent Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha
Active	No complaint behavior	-.557	29.74	.733
	Alert server of the incident	.773		
	Alert manager of the Incident	.706		
Passive	Alert server only if asked	.467	11.13	.616
	Alert manager only if asked	.996		
Delayed	Negative comment card	.628	11.25	.849
	Negative review on business's social media	.938		
	Negative review on your social media	.737		
	Negative review on an online review site	.836		
	Write a letter or e-mail to management	.483		

Note. KMO measure of Sampling Adequacy = .795; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2_{(471)}=1776.09, p<.0001$

Table 7

Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 2

Factor	Components	Factor Loading	Percent Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha
Active			12.37	.764
	No complaint behavior	-.649		
	Alert server of the incident	.894		
	Alert manager of the Incident	.649		
Passive			10.75	.783
	Alert server only if asked	.882		
	Alert manager only if asked	.742		
Delayed			34.63	.870
	Negative comment card	.607		
	Negative review on business's social media	.960		
	Negative review on your social media	.757		
	Negative review on an online review site	.831		
	Letter or e-mail to management	.595		

Note. KMO measure of Sampling Adequacy = .809; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2_{(471)}=2305.106, p<.0001$

Table 8

Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 3

Factor	Components	Factor Loading	Percent Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha
Active	No complaint behavior	-.635	11.37	.675
	Alert server of the incident	.695		
	Alert manager of the incident	.640		
Passive	Alert server only if asked	.831	13.65	.829
	Alert manager only if asked	.871		
Delayed	Negative comment card	.578	29.41	.872
	Negative review on business's social media	.943		
	Negative review on your social media	.780		
	Negative review on an online review site	.824		
	Letter or e-mail to management	.671		

Note. KMO measure of Sampling Adequacy = .766; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2_{(471)}=2081.782, p<.0001$

Table 9

Factor Analysis for Service Failure Scenario 4

Factor	Components	Factor Loading	Percent Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha
Active			12.88	.600
	No complaint behavior	-.263		
	Alert server of the incident	.705		
	Alert manager of the Incident	.664		
Passive			8.73	.805
	Alert server only if asked	.858		
	Alert manager only if asked	.800		
Delayed			30.05	.865
	Negative comment card	.533		
	Negative review on business's social media	.964		
	Negative review on your social media	.749		
	Negative review on an online review site	.809		
	Letter or e-mail to management	.647		

Note. KMO measure of Sampling Adequacy = .772; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2_{(471)}=1963.078, p<.0001$

The complaint actions that comprised active complaint behavior are; "Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving," "Ask for the manager and make him/her aware of the incident," and the inverse of "No complaint action."

Passive complaint action was comprised of; "Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager," and "Make the server aware only if asked by the server." Delayed action had the largest number items and was comprised of; "Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review," "Write a negative review on the business's social media page,"

“Write a negative review on your social media page,” “Write a negative review on an online review site,” “Write a letter or email to the management describing the incident after you have left.” One of the possible choices of complaint behavior in the survey was “Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left.” This did not meet the requirements of any of the three factors and was left out of any further analysis.

Cronbach’s Alpha was used to determine the internal consistency or reliability across scenarios and the new proposed factors. An individual test was run on each factor in each scenario for a total of twelve tests. Despite one of the proposed factors only having two items, all test achieved the acceptable cutoff of .60, with the scores reaching as high as .872 (see Tables 6-9). Nunnally (1978) specifies the requirement to be .7, however DeVellis (1991) states that a value of .6, though undesirable, is acceptable.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

In order to determine which, if any, of the personality measures had a measurable effect on consumer complaint behavior, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. The .05 level was chosen for the significance criterion, while values between .05 and .1 were considered marginally significant. The two items that showed significance of less than .05 were “Sociability” and the interaction of “Relaxed vs. Tense and Locus of Control” indicating that these two personality measures had a significant effect on complaint behavior (see Table 10). No items measured to be marginally significant. Effect sizes (partial eta squared) for Sociability measured .054 and the interaction of Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense measured .050. Both of these scores fall into the small to medium range (Cohen, 1988).

Table 10

Multivariate Analysis of Variance Tests (MANOVA)

Effect		Value	F	Sig.	Partial eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.969	1231.240	.000	.969
	Wilks Lambda	.031			
	Hotelling's Trace	31.369			
	Roy's Largest Root	31.369			
Locus of Control	Pillai's Trace	.020	.791	.660	.020
	Wilks Lambda	.980			
	Hotelling's Trace	.020			
	Roy's Largest Root	.020			
Sociability	Pillai's Trace	.054	2.223	.010*	.054
	Wilks Lambda	.946			
	Hotelling's Trace	.057			
	Roy's Largest Root	.057			
Relaxed Vs. Tense	Pillai's Trace	.023	.909	.537	.023
	Wilks Lambda	.997			
	Hotelling's Trace	.023			
	Roy's Largest Root	.023			
Locus of Control *	Pillai's Trace	.032	1.306	.211	.032
	Wilks Lambda	.968			
Sociability	Hotelling's Trace	.033			
	Roy's Largest Root	.033			
Locus of Control *	Pillai's Trace	.050	2.063	.018*	.050
	Wilks Lambda	.950			
Relaxed Vs. Tense	Hotelling's Trace	.053			
	Roy's Largest Root	.053			
Sociability * Relaxed vs. Tense	Pillai's Trace	.020	.801	.650	.020
	Wilks Lambda	.980			
	Hotelling's Trace	.020			
	Roy's Largest Root	.020			
Locus of Control* Sociability *	Pillai's Trace	.029	1.155	.313	.029
	Wilks Lambda	.971			
Relaxed Vs. Tense	Hotelling's Trace	.029			
	Roy's Largest Root	.029			

Note. *p<.05

One way ANOVA for Significant Effects

The MANOVA test indicated that the “Sociability” personality measure and the “Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense” interaction had significant effects, justifying the use of univariate tests on each dependent variable. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine which factors from each scenario were effected by the significant personality measures. For “Sociability” scenario 1 active, scenario 3 active, scenario 4 active and scenario 4 passive all had a significance of less than .05 indicating that they were significant. Scenario 1 active, scenario 3 active, and scenario 4 active all had a Partial eta squared of between .01 and .06 indicating a small to medium effect size. Scenario 4 passive had a partial eta squared of less than .01 indicating a small effect (Cohen, 1988).

Table 11

Univariate Tests for Variables with Significant Multivariate Effect

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial eta Squared
Sociability	Scenario 1 Active	29.095	29.095	10.33	.001**	.021
	Scenario 2 Active	1.832	1.832	.612	.435	.001
	Scenario 3 Active	12.696	12.696	8.231	.004**	.017
	Scenario 4 Active	17.866	17.866	7.932	.005**	.016
	Scenario 1 Passive	6.981	6.981	2.188	.140	.005
	Scenario 2 Passive	2.459	2.459	.620	.432	.001
	Scenario 3 Passive	.662	.662	.140	.709	.000
	Scenario 4 Passive	14.984	14.984	3.744	.054	.008
	Scenario 1 Delayed	1.060	1.060	.458	.499	.001
	Scenario 2 Delayed	.019	.019	.007	.932	.000
	Scenario 3 Delayed	3.706	3.706	1.131	.288	.002
	Scenario 4 Delayed	.101	.101	.037	.848	.000
Locus of Control * Relaxed Vs. Tense	Scenario 1 Active	.054	.054	.019	.890	.000
	Scenario 2 Active	.984	.984	.329	.567	.001
	Scenario 3 Active	1.354	1.354	.877	.349	.002
	Scenario 4 Active	1.277	1.277	.567	.452	.001
	Scenario 1 Passive	12.777	12.777	4.005	.046*	.008
	Scenario 2 Passive	.052	.052	.013	.909	.000
	Scenario 3 Passive	4.875	4.875	1.027	.311	.002
	Scenario 4 Passive	27.787	27.787	6.943	.009**	.014
	Scenario 1 Delayed	7.269	7.269	3.140	.077	.006
	Scenario 2 Delayed	3.106	3.106	1.184	.277	.002
	Scenario 3 Delayed	10.953	10.953	3.341	.068	.007
	Scenario 4 Delayed	5.135	5.135	1.863	.173	.004

Note. *p<.05; **p<.01

There are three complaint scenarios in which active compliant behavior and one in which passive complaint behavior had a significant effect for Sociability (see Table 12). Based on these means it is apparent that respondents who are Un-Sociable are more likely to participate in passive complaint behavior, while respondents who are sociable are more likely to participate in active complaint behavior.

Table 12

Means for Main Effects of Sociability

Variable	Un-Sociable		Sociable		F Test	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Scenario 1 Active	4.232	.114	4.737	.108	10.333	.001
Scenario 3 Active	5.652	.084	5.985	.080	8.231	.004
Scenario 4 Active	5.222	.102	5.618	.097	7.932	.005
Scenario 4 Passive	4.513	.136	4.150	.129	3.744	.054

Note. Sample size was: sociable 258, un-sociable 232

In consumer complaint scenarios one and four, passive factors had a significant Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense interaction as did complaint scenarios one and three delayed. These interactions had an interesting and unexpected effect on the mean of complaint behavior for the factors. Lower passive complaint means were found from respondents who were “internal-relaxed” and “external-tense” (see table 13 and figure 6). The reverse was true if a respondent was “external- tense” or “internal-relaxed” higher means were found (see Table 14 and Figure 9). This was true for both of the passive factors on consumer complaint scenarios that had significant effect (see Figure 10).

For the interaction of “Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense” scenario 1 passive, scenario 4 passive, had a significance of less than .05 indicating that they were significant. Scenario 1 delayed and scenario 3 delayed had a significance between .1 and .05 indicating at least marginal significance. All items had a score of below .06 for Partial eta squared indicating a small or small to medium effect (see Table 11).

Figure 6. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 1 passive behavior.

Table 13

Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 1 Passive Complaint Behavior

	Tense	Relaxed	F-Value	Sig.	Sample Size
Internal	4.084	3.696	2.708	.101	279
External	3.817	4.098	1.411	.236	211
F-Value	1.066	3.241			
Sig.	.303	.073			
Sample Size	229	261

Figure 7. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 4 passive complaint behavior.

Table 14

Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 4 Passive Complaint Behavior

	Tense	Relaxed	F-Value	Sig.	Sample Size
Internal	4.542	3.951	6.330	.102	279
External	4.218	4.614	2.663	.104	211
F-Value	2.184	7.057			
Sig.	.141	.008**			
Sample Size	229	261			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Figure 8. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 1 delayed complaint behavior.

Table 15

Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 1 Delayed Complaint Behavior

	Tense	Relaxed	F-Value	Sig.	Sample Size
Internal	2.431	2.739	2.748	.098	279
External	2.880	2.683	1.063	.304	211
F-Value	4.661	.114			
Sig.	.032*	.736			
Sample Size	229	261			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

The findings are reversed for scenarios that had significant effects on delayed consumer complaint behavior. Respondents that scored “internal-relaxed” and “external-tense” had higher means than “external-relaxed” and “internal-tense” (see Figure 9 and Table 16).

Figure 9. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 3 delayed compliant behavior.

Table 16

Simple Effect of Interaction for Scenario 3 Delayed Complaint Behavior

	Tense	Relaxed	F-Value	Sig.	Sample Size
Internal	3.125	3.598	4.049	.045*	279
External	3.459	3.312	.456	.500	211
F-Value	1.510	1.914			
Sig.	.220	.168			
Sample Size	229	261			

Note. *p<.05.

Simple effects tests indicated that the personality measure of “Tense” had significance of less than .10 only with service failure scenario one delayed. The personality measure “Relaxed” had significance of less than .10 with service failure scenario one passive and four passive. Internal Locus of Control just missed with service failure scenario one passive with a score of .101. Internal Locus of Control achieved the required significance with service failure scenarios four passive, scenario one delayed, and scenario three delayed. External Locus of Control did not have any factors that reached the required level, though it came close with service failure scenario four passive, which received a significance of .104.

Figure 10 and 11 show the graphs of all of the means of interaction. From this graph it is easy to see that tense and relaxed have opposing means with respect to delayed instead of passive consumer complaint behavior.

Figure 10. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 1 and 4 passive compliant behavior.

Figure 11. Locus of control x tense vs. relaxed scenario 1 and 3 delayed complaint behavior.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Summary

All of the theses proposed in this study were built around the three proposed factors of consumer complaint channels: direct, indirect and non-action. However the results revealed the three factors of complaint channels that were different than those originally propose. The three factors that emerged were: active, passive and delayed. These three factors are connected to how and when an individual would engage in complaint behavior and are less connected with where the complaint was directed. With this being the determining factor it means businesses have a smaller challenge in breaking down barriers to optimal complaint channels. Optimal complaint can be defined as the channels that come to the business and do not reach the outside consumer base. This indicates that customers are more likely to make the server aware of the incident than any other method of complaint behavior. Customers are more likely to ask for the manager than to tell the manager only if asked. As a whole customers are more likely to utilize active complaint behavior than any other method.

Hypotheses one and two stated the expectation was that customers displaying an internal Locus of Control more likely to use direct complaint channels while external Locus of Control are more likely to use indirect channels, or display no complaint behavior. According to the findings of this study, there is no significant link between Locus of Control and preferred complaint channels. Hypotheses three and four stated the expectation was that customers displaying a high level of sociability would prefer direct complaint methods and customers displaying a low level of sociability would prefer

either indirect complaint methods or no complaint behavior. The findings of this study suggest that sociable customers are more likely to prefer active complaint channels and unsociable customers are more likely to prefer passive complaint channels. Hypotheses five and six stated that customers that are tense are more likely to prefer direct complaint channels and customers that are tense are more likely to prefer indirect complaint channels or no complaint behavior. According to the findings of this study there is no significant link between Relaxed versus Tense and complaint channel preference.

While Sociability was a reasonably accurate predictor of active and passive complaint behavior, it was not an accurate predictor for delayed complaint behavior. A more sociable person is more likely to engage in complaint behavior through active complaint channels, and a less sociable person is more likely to engage in complaint behavior through passive complaint channels. This is not a surprising discovery when considering the personality characteristics that sociability measures. A less outgoing individual is not to be as likely to prefer face to face confrontation and is therefore more likely to use passive complaint methods. Given that delayed complaint behavior is not confrontational it is not surprising to find that sociability is not an accurate predictor of this complaint behavior.

By far the most interesting item for analysis that emerged from this study was the interaction of the personality measures of Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense. In the responses for this interaction an interesting pattern emerges. The first pattern, which would be expected, is that for the significant factors there is an inverse relationship between passive and delayed complaint channels (Hogan & Nicholson, 1988, Rotter 1960, 1966). The interesting part is that for passive complaint factors both internal-tense

and external-relaxed are more likely to use passive complaint channels. The direct opposite occurs in delayed factors from relevant scenarios, external-tense and internal relaxed are more likely to use delayed complaint channels. Respondents that measured opposite in both Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense measures, exhibited the same preference in consumer complaint channels. In other terms customers that differ in both measures of personality, are likely to use the same type of complaint channels. Word of mouth was the only complaint option that did not correspond to any other factors in the factor analysis. This can be attributed to its ability to be used in conjunction with any and all of the other items (Gursoy, McCleary, & Lepisito, 2007).

This interaction was unexpected. Though there has been very little research done on how personality effects complaint channels, it would be expected that certain personality traits would have the same effect regardless of the persons other personality factors (Butcher & Rause, 1996, Gountas & Gountas, 2007). The results shown from this study would not have been predicted by previous research, especially research in the hospitality industry. While the literature on different personality types and expectations of behavior based on personality is virtually limitless, the author found no literature on the expectations of action based on the interaction of different popular personality measures. There is ample area for further study into the interactions of these and other personality traits with regards to consumer complaint behavior.

Recommendations

The information that is presented in this study is a potential starting block for a series of other studies in the area of consumer complaint behavior, especially the area of compliant channels. Each of these studies would be a step towards greater understanding

of consumer complaints. The more advanced our understanding of consumer complaint behavior, the better our ability to create positive consumer complaint resolution.

Ultimately the end goal of studying consumer complaint behavior is to keep the guest as happy as possible, with the fewest resources possible. Industry professionals need to balance resolution cost with possible detriment to the business that can result from poor recovery or non-action. Every guest will respond differently in a service shortfall situation. Every service shortfall situation is different and unique. The consequence of having a dissatisfied customer continues to grow with the emerging ways that customers can express their dissatisfaction. As the younger, more technology affluent, generation grows into purchasing power there may continue to be a rise in popularity of the delayed channels of complaint behavior. Many of these channels are still in their infancy. If there is the possibility for growth in preference to use these channels, then studies into the resolution of delayed complaint channels are paramount.

The only delayed response that was more likely than no complaint action was filling out a guest comment card. This indicates that customers are more likely to not complain, than to complain online or in a letter to management. In general customers that were willing to write, were more likely to do so by using a comment card than any other method. This is extremely good news for businesses. From the perspective of the business, comment cards are by far the preferred method of delayed complaint channels. Many establishments have moved away from comment cards for various reasons. This study provides evidence that they may still be a useful tool even in this digital age. By breaking down the barriers for the written methods that have the smallest impact on an establishments target market, industry gains the ability for correction and resolution.

Unfortunately for businesses the next most used source is the individual's social media. While this method was not as likely to be used as traditional word of mouth, it has the potential to reach a far greater audience. It is preferable to writing a negative review on an online site, which would be the least desirable complaint behavior from the perspective of a business.

One of the most likely courses of action was "Ask for a manager and make them aware." With this being the case it is imperative to have a manager available to handle and mitigate guest complaints. In this recession economy it has become the norm in this to have fewer managers each with a far greater span of responsibilities than was expected in the past. In areas such as handling guest complaints which do not bring any revenue to the bottom line, it can be easy to forget how vital these actions are to an establishment. Evidence from this study showed that not having a manager on the floor has the potential to have detrimental effects to an establishment's complaint resolution capabilities.

This study also shows that even when personality does have an effect on an individual's complaint behavior it can be extremely difficult to predict that behavior due to personality interactions, as is demonstrated in the Locus of Control and Relaxed vs. Tense interactions. While having a strong understanding of personality types has a great benefit to understanding consumer complaint behavior, the complaint behavior alone is not enough to ascertain a customer's personality type. Personality type has been, and continues to be one of the best ways to predict potential behavior.

Limitations

There are several limitations for this study. The first is that the sample for this study consisted entirely of undergraduate students at the University of Nevada Las

Vegas. Due to this the sample population may not accurately reflect the total population, or a business target population. The second is that this study did not account for any corrective action that may have occurred. A customer may be more likely to use differing channels of complaint behavior if the resolution did not meet to their satisfaction. Another limitation is that the scenarios used for this study, while realistic, were fictional scenarios that the respondents may or may not have been able to relate too.

Implications for Future Study

The first implication for future study would be a follow-up study that examined how different personality types preferred compliant resolution. Just as there are several different types of complaint channels, there are several different channels of complaint resolution. With the information from this follow up study a guide could be created for managers showing the best way to resolve consumer complaints based on how the complaint was presented.

Another follow-up study would be an investigation of the probability of consumers using delayed channels after using active or passive channels with limited or no success. Essentially it would be a study of how well an establishment can mitigate NWOM or online word of mouth by understanding personality types for direct consumer complaints. A similar study of consumer complaint channels could look at shortfall severity and consumer complaint channels. By changing the dependent variable to severity of the service shortfall, an accurate gauge of a consumer's propensity to use delayed channels of consumer complaints could be developed.

While the personality measures used for this study were carefully chosen, there are many other personality tests that could be used in lieu of Locus of Control,

sociability, and relaxed versus tense. One of the most popularly used personality measures in business is the Meyers-Briggs which is based on the Jung personality factors (Butcher & Rause 1996). Due to its popularity, many managers have taken the test as a way to interact with each other and their employees more effectively. For anyone who is already familiar with this study it will be easier to understand the implications from a study of personality, if they are already familiar with the personality test.

If it is found that certain personality types prefer to utilize delayed consumer complaint channels, it would be of benefit to businesses to know why they prefer those methods. A follow up study to determine the causation of choice would be extremely beneficial to both academia and the industry. The logical next step to that study would be to find consumer complaint methods that these personality types would still like to use to voice their complaint, but that do not cause the same amount of damage to the reputation of the business.

A future study that would compliment this study would be to investigate how age effects consumer complaint channel preference. If it is true that the younger generation has a higher propensity to use indirect channels of consumer complaints then it is more important than ever to identify how this can be combatted. By identifying emerging trends early on, the ability is gained to get ahead of the curve and find solution to these problems before they are detrimental to the industry. While age information from this data set could be used to this end, the data does not have enough variability in age to be useful for this type of analysis.

In a future study it would be extremely beneficial to find out in what order a customer would take each action. This would give the researcher valuable insight into

the steps involved in the complaint process. Another factor that could be measured in this study that would prove beneficial to the industry would be the possibility for corrective action. This study would show how likely guests are to use the more damaging complaint channels if they received resolution. While great effort was put into keeping the possible responses as direct and succinct as possible, the ability to control for possible corrective action, as well as possible simultaneous action, would create a much more realistic complaint scenario survey.

Conclusion

Consumer complaint behavior has been, and continues to be, one of the most studied issues in the hospitality industry. It is an issue where academic study can have a great effect on industry standards. It is an issue for which there are no universal truths and each situation must be handled with delicate poise and professionalism. It is only through careful understanding of the contributing factors that effect a consumer's decision of where, when, and how to complain that industry will be able to effectively mitigate the damage that can be caused by service failures. Due to the emerging area of mass media consumer complaint channels, businesses must be more diligent than ever in the identification and resolution of guest complaints.

Appendix A

Personality and Consumer Complaint Behavior Survey

Thank you for taking part in this survey. The purpose of this study is to see if there are any links between personality type and how consumers prefer to present complaints. If you choose to volunteer to participate in this study, you will complete a survey on which you rate what your actions would be based on given scenarios. You will also answer questions about your personality. The survey will take 10-15 minutes of your time. There will not be direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. There are risks involved in all research studies. This study includes only minimal risks. You may feel uncomfortable when answering some of the questions. You may choose not to answer any question, and may also discontinue participation at any time. There will no be financial cost to you to participate in this study. You will not be compensated for your time. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study without any consequences to you as a student. All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for 4 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be completely discarded.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Riley Berry at (702)-370-1660 or berryr3@unlv.edu. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects at 702-895-2794 or toll free at 877-895-2794 or via email at IRB@unlv.edu. If you agree to participate, please continue with the survey. If you do not consent, please return your questionnaire.

If you agree to the terms above, please continue this survey. If not, please return your questionnaire.

Instructions: Please fill in the circle next to the answer for the following questions:

1. In the past two months, have you dined at a casual sit down restaurant for any meal? (e.g., Chili's, Applebee's, TGI Fridays, Denny's, IHOP, Macaroni Grill) (check one)
Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Are you over 18 years of age? (check one)
Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered no to either of the above questions please return your survey you are not eligible for this study. Thank you for your time. If you did not answer no to any of the above questions please continue.

3. What is your year in school? (check one)

☐ First year

☐ Sophomore

☐ Junior

☐ Senior

4. In what year were you born? (Please fill in) _____

Instructions: Please read each of the following scenarios and rate how likely you would be to take each of the actions listed on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being extremely unlikely and 7 being extremely likely. Please rate every action listed by circling the number that corresponds with your answer.

5. While dining at a casual sit down restaurant you order a hamburger with no cheese. When the order comes it has cheese on it. You alert the server who takes the order back to the kitchen. When the order re-arrives you notice that the cheese was scraped off and the burger patty was turned over. How likely are you to take the following actions with **1** being not likely at all and **7** being extremely likely? Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

	Not Likely at all						Extremely likely
A. Eat the burger since it does not have cheese now	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Make the server aware of the incident only if asked about the meal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Ask for the manager and make him/her aware of the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a Facebook post on your wall?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Write a letter or email to the management describing the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. While dining at a casual sit down restaurant (E.G. Chili's, TGI Fridays, Applebee's) you order the house salad. When it arrives you find a moldy soft spot on one of the tomatoes. How likely are you to take the following actions with **1** being extremely unlikely and **7** being extremely likely? Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

	Not likely at all						Extremely likely
A. Pick out the tomato and eat the salad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Make the server aware of the incident only if asked about the meal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Ask for the manager and make him/her aware of the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a Facebook post on your wall?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Write a letter or email to the management describing the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. While dining with your family you would like to order a popular dish that can sometimes be spicy. You ask the server how spicy the dish is. The server tells you that it can be made as mild or spicy as wanted. You order the dish saying you want no spice and that you do not like spicy food. When the dish comes you take a bite and find that it is extremely spicy. As the waiter walks by you stop him/her say that the food is very spicy and ask for a glass of milk to cool your mouth off. After waiting for several minutes with a burning mouth you see the server text messaging by the register. You stop another worker in the restaurant and ask for the milk which is brought out quickly. Despite your best efforts you don't see the server again till near the end of the meal when she brings out the milk and the check. On the check is the full charge for the dinner, of which you have only eaten one bite, as well as charges for two glasses of milk. How likely are you to take the following actions with **1** being not likely at all and **7** being extremely likely? Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

	Not likely at all						Extremely likely
A. Pay the check and Leave	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

C. Make the server aware of the incident only if asked about the meal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Ask for the manager and make him/her aware of the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Verbally tell your friends about the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a Facebook post on your wall?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Write a letter or email to the management describing the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. While dining with friends before going to a movie, your food order does not come out with the rest of the tables. The server apologizes and says he/she forgot to ring it in. When your friends are about 75% finished your order comes out, but it is incorrect. You have a movie to catch and do not have time wait for a new order. How likely are you to take the following actions with **1** being not likely at all and **7** being extremely likely? Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

	Not Likely at all						Extremely likely
A. Eat the order since you are hungry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Make the server aware of the incident either immediately or before leaving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Make the server aware of the incident only if asked about the meal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Make the manager aware only if asked by the manager	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Ask for the manager and make him/her aware of the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. Verbally tell your friends about the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Fill out a guest comment card with a negative review	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Write a negative review on the businesses social media page (e.g. their Facebook wall)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. Write a negative review on your social media page (Tweet or make a Facebook post on your wall?)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. Write a negative review on an online site (e.g. Yelp, Zagat, Urban Spoon, Trip Advisor)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Write a letter or email to the management describing the incident after you have left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Instructions:

Below are a series of questions with two possible answers, A or B. Please circle the following statement that you agree most with for each question. Please only circle one, either A or B.

8. A. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
 B. Peoples misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
9. A. One of the major reasons we have wars is because people don't take enough
 interest in politics.
 B. There will always be wars no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
10. A. In the long run people get what they deserve in this world.
 B. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard
 he tries.
11. A. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
 B. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by
 accidental happenings.
12. 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.
13. 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 with
 others.
14. A. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
 B. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a
 definite course of action.
15. A. In the case of a 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.
16. 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.
17. A. The average citizen can have 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.
18. 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 be a
 matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
19. A. In my 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.

20. A. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
B. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has nothing to do with it.
21. A. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, not control.
B. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
22. 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.
23. A. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
B. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.
24. A. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by good ones.
B. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. A. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
B. There is not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
29. 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
30. A. Most of the time I can 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.

Instructions:

Please read each of the following statements and put an X in the box based on how much you agree the statement describes you.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. I am always glad to join a large gathering					
32. I consider myself a very social outgoing person					
33. I find it easy to mingle among people at a social gathering					
34. When I am in a small group, I sit back and let others do most of the talking					
35. I have decidedly fewer friends than most people					
36. I am considered a very enthusiastic person					
37. I get tense as I think of all the things lying ahead of me					
38. Quite small setbacks occasionally irritate me too much					
39. I wish I knew how to relax					
40. I shrink from a facing crisis or difficulty					

Instructions:

Please fill in the circle next to the answer, or fill in the blank for the following questions:

41. What is your gender? (check one)

☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Other

42. What is your race/ethnic group? (check one)

- ☐ Caucasian
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Other

References

- Butelli, S. (2007, September 06). Consumer complaint behavior (CCB): A literature review. Retrieved from <http://dspaceunipr.cilea.it/bitstream/1889/1178/1/Butelli%2520Literature%2520review.pdf>
- Butcher, J., & Rause S. (1996). Personality: Individual differences and clinical assessment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47,87-111. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.87
- Cattell, E.P., & Mead, A.D. (2008). The sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16pf). In G. Boyle, G. Matthews, and D. Saklofske (Eds.). *The sage handbook of personality theory and assessment* (pp. 135-159). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Carter, A., & Strayer, T. (2012, November 02) The official website of Ty Cobb. Retrieved from <http://www.cmgtw.com/baseball/cobb/know.html>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Day, R. L., & Landon, E. L. (1977). Toward a theory of consumer complaining behavior. *Consumer and industrial buying behavior*, 95, 425-437.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development*. Newberry Park, NJ. Sage Publications
- Evanschitzky, H., Brock, C., & Blut, M. (2011). Will you tolerate this? The impact of effective commitment on complaint intention and postrecovery behavior. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(4), 410-425. doi:10.1177/1094670511423956
- Frew, E. A., & Shaw, R. N. (1999). The relationship between personality, gender, and tourism behavior. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 193.

- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York, NY: Brown and Company.
- Gountas, J., & Gountas, S. (2007). Personality orientations, emotional states, customer satisfaction, and intention to repurchase. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(1), 72-75
- Gountas, S., & Gountas, J. (2004). The influence of consumers' emotions on their service product evaluation. *Tourism Analysis*, 8(1), 125-128.
- Gronhaug, K., & Zaltman, G. (1981). Complainers and non-complainers revisited: Another look at the data. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 83(7).
- Gursoy, D., McCleary, K. W., & Lepisto, L. R. (2007). Propensity to complain: Effects of personality and behavioral factors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 358-386.
- Huang, J., & Chang, C. (2008). The role of personality traits in online consumer complaint behavior and service recovery expectation. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 36(9), 1223-1232.
- Jones, D. L., McCleary, K. W., & Lepisto, L. R. (2002). Consumer complaint behavior manifestations for table service restaurants: Identifying sociodemographic characteristics, personality, and behavioral factors. *Journal Of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 26(2), 105.
- Kim, J., & Chen, J (2010). The effects of situational and personal characteristics on consumer complaint behavior in restaurant service. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(1), 96-112.

- Kowalski, R.M. (1996). Complaints and complaining: Functions, antecedents, and consequences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 179-196.
- Lewis, R.C., & Morris S.V. (1987). The positive side of guest complaints. *Cornell Hotel Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 27(13). doi:10.1177/001088048702700409
- Megargee, E.I. (1972). Class 1 scales: Measures of poise, ascendancy, self-assurance and interpersonal adequacy. In W. Henry, N. Sanford (Eds.) *The California psychological inventory handbook* (pp.47-49). San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.
- Nowicki, S., & Strickland, B. R. (1973). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 148-154. doi:10.1037/h0033978
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. (2d Ed.) New York, NY. McGraw-Hill.
- Ro, H., & Wong, J. (2012). Customer opportunistic complaints management: A critical incident approach. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 31(2), 419-427. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.06.017
- Rotter, J. (1960). Some implications of a social learning theory for the prediction of goal directed behavior from testing procedures. *Psychological Review*, 67(5), 301-316. doi: 10.1037/h0039601
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external locus of control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28
- Singh, J. (1989). Determinants of consumers' decisions to seek third party redress: An empirical study of dissatisfied patients. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 23(2), 329-363

- Singh, J. (1990). Identifying consumer dissatisfaction response styles: An agenda for future research. *International Journal of Marketing*, 24(6), 55-72.
doi:10.1108/03090569010140516
- Singh, J., & Wilkes, R. (1996). When consumers complain: A path analysis of the key antecedents of consumer response estimates. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24(4), 350-365.
- Spector, P.E. (2011). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61(4), 335-340. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x
- Susskind, A. M. (2004). Consumer frustration in the customer-server exchange: The role of attitudes toward complaining and information inadequacy related to service failures. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 28(1), 21-43.
doi:10.1177/1069348003257328
- Susskind, A. M. (2005). A content analysis of consumer complaints, remedies, and repatronage intentions regarding dissatisfying service experiences. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(2), 150-169. doi:10.1177/1096348004273426
- Susskind, A. M. (2006). *An examination of guest complaints and complaint communication channels: The medium does matter!* Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University, School of Hotel Administration, The Center for Hospitality Research.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Villani, K. A. E., & Wind, Y. (1975). On the usage of “modified” personality trait measures in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(30), 223-228

Wallston, B. S., Wallston, K. A., Kaplan, G., & Maides, S. A. (1976). Development and validation of the health locus of control (HLC) scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44(4), 580-585. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.44.4.580

VITA
Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Riley Berry

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science, Hotel Administration, 2011
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Special Honors and Awards:

2006 Fourth Quarter Ritz-Carlton Lake Las Vegas Employee of the Quarter
2006 Ritz-Carlton Lake Las Vegas Employee of the Year
2012 First Quarter Four Seasons Overnight Employee of the Quarter

Thesis Title: How We Complain: The Effect of Personality Type on Consumer Complaint Channels

Thesis Examination Committee:

Chairperson, Sarah Tanford, Ph. D.
Committee Member, Rhonda Montgomery, Ph. D.
Committee Member, Alison Green, Ph. D.
Graduate Faculty Representative, Gillian Naylor, Ph. D.