

PERSONAL VALUES AND PURCHASE DISSATISFACTION RESPONSE

John C. Rogers, California State Polytechnic University
Steven C. Ross, Western Washington University
Terrell G. Williams, Western Washington University

ABSTRACT

In this survey of 214 students consumer personal values were found to relate to specific consumer complaining behaviors. One hundred fifteen male and 99 female responses were investigated separately. Rokeach value scores were different between the genders, and they related to complaining behaviors differently as well. Suggestions for further research are advanced.

INTRODUCTION

An understanding of consumer complaining behavior is useful to practitioners in understanding market dissatisfaction and developing programs to enhance consumer satisfaction (Singh 1988). An important part of the research on complaining behavior has involved the determination of various precursors to complaining behavior and other reactions to purchase dissatisfaction. Research and observation indicate that different consumers faced with essentially the same source of dissatisfaction exhibit different directions and intensities of complaining behavior, suggesting that situational and personal forces may underlie the nature and direction of complaining behavior for individuals (LaTour and Peat 1979; Richins 1985).

Factors in the situation might include time pressures, presence or absence of other persons, etc. Personal variables might include personality, socioeconomic forces, perceived costs and benefits of complaining, propensity to complain and the purchase situation. In an exploratory study Rogers and Williams (1990) found consumer personal values to be significant antecedents to complaining behavior. This article seeks to further test and expand the findings of that study.

CONSUMER VALUES

Values are defined in a number of ways

(Clawson and Vinson 1978), but a common thread seems to hold that values are the beliefs about what is correct, just or fair and a representation of basic life goals (Munson and Posner 1979; Peter and Olsen 1987). Such basic socio/psychological factors may be logically expected to relate to a range of human motives and actions including consumer buying behavior (Henry 1976).

Much of the research into personal values and their relationship to buying behavior has been grounded in the Rokeach value system (Rokeach 1968, 1971, 1973). As indicated in Figure 1, Rokeach identified thirty-six basic values and divided them into instrumental (preferred modes of conduct) and terminal (preferred end states). Numerous studies have found that a variety of buying behaviors do indeed relate to consumer personal values (D'Onofrio, Rogers and Williams 1990; Pitts and Woodside 1983; Slama and Tashchian 1985; Sherrell, Hair and Bush 1984; Williams and Rogers 1989; Vinson and Gutman 1978; Vinson and Munson 1976; Vinson, Munson and Nakanishi 1976; Vinson, Scott and Lamont 1977).

CONSUMER COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR

Consumer complaining behavior (CCB) may be defined as an action or set of actions arising out of consumer dissatisfaction. The study of CCB has been complicated by the fact that we are not really talking about a single behavior but rather of a variety of possible behaviors ranging from no action to legal recourse (Singh 1988). The behaviors have been classified in several ways, but two taxonomies that are of interest in this study are advanced by Singh and Howell (1985) and Singh (1988). The first classifies complaining activities in terms of the following:

No action/action — the degree of complaining activity
Private/public — telling friends versus telling

the seller
 Redress/future behavior — seeking restitution
 versus simply not buying in the future
 Dyadic/third party — complaint to the seller
 versus complaint to a consumer action

group or court

The second identifies three types of complaining:

Voiced complaints (tell someone external to the consumer's social group and directly tied to the purchase, e.g. retailer, manufacturer, about the problem)

Private complaining (communicate to persons in one's own social group)

Third party complaining (complain to "official" persons or groups, e.g. Better Business Bureau, etc.)

Combining the above concepts, we conceptualize CCB alternatives for purposes of this study as:

Do nothing — internalize or ignore the dissatisfaction

Change future behavior — do not buy the item or patronize the seller in the future

Private complaining — warn family and friends about the product or seller

Voice complaint — complain to manufacturer or retailer

Third party — e.g., complain to consumer group, take legal action

Each of these behaviors is a significant response to dissatisfaction and can damage a marketer. Even the "do nothing" response is potentially harmful. Many consumers do not actively complain, but a dissatisfied customer who does nothing to resolve the problem or vent negative feelings is one to whom the seller cannot respond and resolve the problem (Olshavsky 1977; Sorensen and Strahle 1990). The customer may continue to buy the brand or patronize the store, but loyalty will likely be eroded, and subsequent dissatisfaction may result in stronger action in the future.

Although the listed behaviors suggest an increasing intensity of complaint behavior, it is not really appropriate to consider these as components of a complaining scale (Singh 1988). Rather they are independent actions which, in some cases, may be employed in combination by a consumer in response to purchase dissatisfaction.

Figure 1

Personal Values as Listed by Rokeach

INSTRUMENTAL	TERMINAL
AMBITIOUS Hard Working, aspiring	COMFORTABLE LIFE Prosperous life
BROADMINDED Open-Minded	EXCITING LIFE Stimulating, Active Life
CAPABLE Competent, effective	SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT Lasting contribution
CHEERFUL Lighthearted, joyful	WORLD AT PEACE Free of war and conflict
CLEAN Neat, tidy	WORLD OF BEAUTY Beauty of nature and the arts
COURAGEOUS Standing up for beliefs	EQUALITY Brotherhood, equal opportunity
FORGIVING Willing to pardon others	FAMILY SECURITY Taking care of loved ones
HELPFUL Working for the welfare of others	FREEDOM Independence, free choice
HONEST Sincere, truthful	HAPPINESS Contentedness
IMAGINATIVE Daring, creative	INNER HARMONY Freedom from inner conflict
INDEPENDENT Self-reliant, self-sufficient	MATURE LOVE Sexual and spiritual intimacy
INTELLECTUAL Intelligent, reflective	NATIONAL SECURITY Protection from attack
LOGICAL Consistent, well-mannered	PLEASURE Enjoyable, leisurely life
LOVING Affectionate, tender	SALVATION Saved, eternal life
OBEDIENT Dutiful, respectful	SELF RESPECT Self-esteem
POLITE Courteous, well-mannered	SOCIAL RECOGNITION Respect, admiration
RESPONSIBLE Dependable	TRUE FRIENDSHIP Close companionship
SELF-CONTROLLED Restrained, self-disciplined	WISDOM Mature understanding of life

Milton J. Rokeach, *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1968, p. 161

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In this study we employ the Rokeach value system as a measure of personal values and relate the resulting value scores to a set of complaining behaviors. Following Rogers and Williams (1990) we measure values using a rating scale as opposed to ranking them, which has often been used in value research. Other researchers have found rating to be acceptable and more adaptable to consumer research than ranking (Munson and McIntyre 1979; Vinson and Munson 1976; Vinson, Munson and Nakanishi 1976). Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each Rokeach value using a 5 point scale ranging from Very Important to Not Important at All.

Measuring CCB presents a conceptually difficult problem. Asking consumers to tell what they would normally do when dissatisfied with a purchase or what they have done in the past ignores situational and product-related factors which have been shown to be significant in determining the direction and intensity of complaining behavior. Singh (1988) suggests providing case scenarios as a basis for collecting data on complaining. This seems particularly appropriate when investigating the effects of personal factors on complaining behavior. Accordingly, we provided three dissatisfaction scenarios together with possible reactions to the problems.

Another problem with measuring complaining behavior is that what a consumer does is dependent on what happens in a hierarchy of complaints. For example, if a consumer has a problem with a product, returns to the retail store to complain and is met with a smile and an exchange or refund, the complaining behavior stops, and positive feelings may be restored. Thus, changing future behavior or third party complaining will likely not be pursued if the voiced complaint is successful.

The scenarios for this study were presented as extreme cases where a problem has been encountered and has been unresolved by the first attempt at resolution or redress. The person must now decide where to go from here. An initial complaint has been registered, and a variety of possible reactions are presented.

For comparison purposes, respondents were first asked to indicate the frequency with which

they had engaged in the behaviors indicated when dissatisfied with a purchase. This is given as the "No Reference Point" question. Respondents were first asked to indicate how frequently they engaged in each of the indicated behaviors when dissatisfied with a purchase (Table 1). This question relied on recall and perception independent of any product or situation.

Table 1
No Product-Specific Reference

When you are dissatisfied with a purchase, you have several options. Using the following scale,* please indicate how frequently you have engaged in any of the following behaviors when you have been dissatisfied with a product or service.

Do Nothing

1. Do nothing.

Change Future Behavior

1. Stop buying the brand involved.

Private Complaining

1. Warn family or friends.

Voice Complaint

1. Complain to manufacturer.

Complain to Third Party**

1. Complain to the Better Business Bureau.
2. Write to a newspaper.
3. Contact a lawyer or take legal action.

* Responses are Very often, Often, Occasionally, Seldom, Never.

** A third party complaining scale was developed by summing the scores on the individual items for males and females separately. The reliability coefficient for males is $\alpha = .7430$ and for females $\alpha = .8688$.

The three scenarios presented offered a dissatisfaction situation connected to a specific product or service that respondents would likely be familiar with or at least be able to relate to. The first scenario is an auto repair incident (Table 2). The second situation involves a toaster (Table 3). Finally, Table 4 represents an unhappy experience in a restaurant.

Previous research suggests that men and women differ substantially in their values (D'Onofrio, Slama and Tashchian 1985; Williams and Rogers 1989). In their previous study, Rogers and Williams (1990) suggested that men and women should be analyzed separately. Accordingly males and females are evaluated

independently in this study. Multiple regression is employed to indicate which values are associated with the various complaining responses.

Table 2
Product-Specific Automobile Scenario

Assume that you have recently gotten your car out of the shop in the dealership where you purchased it. You paid more than \$500.00 for the repairs. However, within a day of getting the car back the same problem you had paid to repair has started again. You return to the garage to get the problem fixed. The service manager tells you that there is nothing that can be done. You will simply have to pay for additional repairs. You argue, but to no avail. What is the likelihood* that you would take each of the following steps if the problem continues to be unresolved?

Do Nothing

1. Pay for additional repairs.

Change Future Behavior

1. Never buy that make of car again.

Private Complaining

1. Warn family or friends about the dealer.

Voice Complaint

1. Complain to higher level management in the dealership.

Complain to Third Party**

1. Complain to the Better Business Bureau.
2. Write to a newspaper.
3. Contact a lawyer or take legal action.

* Responses are Quite likely, Somewhat likely, Not very likely, Unlikely, Never.

** A third party complaining scale was developed by summing the scores on the individual items for males and females separately. The reliability coefficient for males is $\alpha = .7028$ and for females $\alpha = .7749$.

RESULTS

A questionnaire containing the Rokeach Value scale and the dissatisfaction scenarios together with the complaining responses was administered to Juniors and Seniors at two large western universities. A total of 214 persons, 115 male and 99 female, provided usable questionnaires. There were no significant differences between the two student samples for value scores or for complaining behaviors.

Consistent with previous findings, consumer personal values appear to act as significant antecedents to the full gamut of complaining behaviors investigated. Analysis showed that males and females registered different intensities of

Table 3
Product-Specific Toaster Scenario

Assume that you bought a toaster for \$29.95 two months ago. This morning the toaster began to smoke and stopped working. On returning it to the store where you bought it, you were told that nothing would be done for you. What are you likely to do now?*

Do Nothing

1. Take Do Nothing.

Change Future Behavior

1. Stop buying that brand.

Private Complaining

1. Warn family or friends.

Voice Complaint

1. Complain to store manager.

Complain to Third Party**

1. Complain to the Better Business Bureau.
2. Write to a newspaper.
3. Contact a lawyer or take legal action.

* Responses are Quite likely, Somewhat likely, Not very likely, Unlikely, Never.

** A third party complaining scale was developed by summing the scores on the individual items for males and females separately. The reliability coefficient for males is $\alpha = .8129$ and for females $\alpha = .8240$.

feeling toward virtually all of the values investigated. Mean scores on the complaining behaviors, however, showed no differences between males and females. This suggests that the relationships observed between values and CCB are a function of consumer gender and values rather than of product or question effects. Results are presented for males and females separately as analysis of the combined sample seems inappropriate.

In general, responses across the no-product-specific question and the three dissatisfaction scenarios differed significantly. Thus, it appears that the way a question is posed and the product or service involved is an important factor to be considered in CCB research.

A number of values related to the five complaining variables across all four questions as noted in Tables 5 through 8. The stepwise regression analyses were performed relating the value variables by sex to each complaining variable for the no product-specific question and the three product related scenarios. The assumptions associated with regression analysis held up

Table 4
Product-Specific Restaurant Scenario

You have ordered a meal at a nice restaurant. The food is overcooked. You ask the waiter to return the food to the kitchen, but he refuses to do so, telling you that the food is prepared well, and the fault is your own in being too picky. What is your likelihood of doing each of the following?*

Do Nothing

1. Finish your meal and pay for it.

Change Future Behavior

1. Refuse to pay for the meal.

Private Complaining

1. Tell your friends never to go to the restaurant.

Voice Complaint

1. Complain to the restaurant manager.

Complain to Third Party**

1. Complain to the Better Business Bureau.
2. Write to a newspaper columnist or editor.
3. Contact a lawyer or take legal action.

* Responses are Quite likely, Somewhat likely, Not very likely, Unlikely, Never.

** A third party complaining scale was developed by summing the scores on the individual items for males and females separately. The reliability coefficient for males is $\alpha = .7592$ and for females $\alpha = .8688$.

well with very little multicollinearity present in the analyses.

Over all of the questions and all values, males and females value-to-CCB relationships coincided in only three cases. Across the four questions and five CCBs, thirty of the thirty six values entered a regression equation at least once with more terminal values (16) entering the regression equations than instrumental (14). Different value-to-CCB relationships were observed over the questions and CCBs. The discussion proceeds by considering each of the purchase dissatisfaction responses for each of the questions posed to respondents.

No Product-Specific Reference Point

Table 5 provides the regressions for the No Product-Specific Reference Point question. A total of 7 instrumental and 12 terminal values entered the regression equations for this question. Nearly twice as many values predicted male CCBs as female CCBs.

No Action. The stepwise regression analyses are significant for both the male and the female groups. The regression for the males is substantially stronger than that for the female group. Males with high value scores on Responsible and Forgiving and low value scores on Helpful and True Friendship are more likely to take no action. On the other hand, females are more likely to take no action as the strength of the World of Beauty value decreases.

Change Future Behavior. Only males show a significant relationship between values and CCB, and the relationship is fairly strong. The males are more likely to stop buying as their value scores for Exciting Life and Freedom increase and as World of Peace decreases.

Private Complaining. The stepwise regressions are significant but equally weak for both males and females. Males are more likely to warn family and friends as their Family Security value increases. Higher scores on Wisdom are associated with private complaining by females.

Voice Complaint. Male values are not associated with complaints to management, but female values are. Female respondents with higher Forgiveness and lower Salvation and Happiness scores indicate that they have more often complained to management when dissatisfied.

Third Party Complaining. Stepwise regression analyses are significant for both male and female groups. Males report that they have more often engaged in third party complaining behavior as their value scores for Imaginativeness and Salvation increase and as Inner Harmony decreases. Females are more likely to complain to third party with higher values for Clean and Cheerful and a lower score for Salvation.

Automobile Scenario

The Automobile Repair Problem scenario associated CCBs are analyzed in Table 6. A total of 6 instrumental and 11 terminal values entered the regression for this question. Substantially more terminal values than instrumental entered the regression equation for females. The number of values in the equations was approximately equal

across the CCBs.

No Action. The results indicate that the stepwise regressions are significant for both males and females. The regressions for the two groups are similar and relatively strong. The males are more likely to say that they would take no action as their value scores for Obedient and Happiness increase and as their scores for Loving and Cheerful decrease. Females are more likely to say that they would take no action as the strength of their Capable and Mature Love values decrease.

Change Future Behavior. In this case, the stepwise regression is significant only for the female group, but it is fairly strong. Females are more likely to stop doing business with the dealership as their values for Freedom, Salvation and Comfortable Life increase.

Private Complaining. The stepwise regressions are fairly strong and about equal for males and females. The expressed likelihood of warning family and friends increases for males as their World of Beauty, Salvation and Capable values increase. Females are more likely to warn others as Inner Harmony and Family Security increase and Capable decreases.

Voice Complaint. Males indicate that they would be more likely to voice their complaint to the manufacturer of the auto as their Wisdom value score increases. Females with higher World of Beauty, Capable and Family Security values indicate a greater likelihood for complaining to the manufacturer.

Third Party Complaining. Although the regression is weaker for males than for females, both groups show a relationship between values and CCB. As the Wisdom value increases, males are more likely to consider complaining to a third party. Females with higher Imaginative and Capable values indicate a higher probability of third party CCB.

Toaster Scenario. Table 7 shows the stepwise regression equations for persons who were confronted with the toaster problem. Eleven instrumental and 9 terminal values entered the

regression equations. The split between males and females was about equal.

No Action. The regression for males is weaker here than for females, but both show significant relationships between values and the probability of doing nothing about a purchase problem. Males are more likely to take no action as the strength of their Pleasure value increases and as their Capable value decreases. On the other hand, females say they would be more likely to take no action as their Courageous value increases and as Honesty, Self Respect and Helpful scores decrease.

Change Future Behavior. Males indicate a higher probability of brand boycott as their value score for Love increases. A higher Wisdom score is associated with buying cessation for women in the sample.

Private Complaining. Males with stronger Salvation and Clean values are more likely to tell friends about the toaster incident. Females, on the other hand are more likely to warn friends as their Freedom and Wisdom values increase.

Voice Complaint. The regression coefficient for males is substantially stronger than that for females. Males are more likely to complain to the manufacturer about the toaster as their World of Beauty, Wisdom and Happiness values increase and as Intellect and Forgiving decline. Females with a stronger Intellectual value are more apt to complain to the toaster manufacturer.

Third Party Complaining. The regressions are roughly equal for males and females and are relatively strong. Males are more likely to complain to third parties as their Clean and Social Responsibility values increase and as their Responsibility value decreases. Increases in the strength of Imaginative and Pleasure values are associated with increased third party complaining intentions for females.

Restaurant Scenario. Table 8 presents the regressions for the restaurant problem scenario. Males have more instrumental values in the equations while terminal values are in the majority

for females. Overall, 9 instrumental and 11 terminal values entered the stepwise regressions.

No Action. Pleasure is positively associated with male intentions to take no action when confronted with dissatisfaction in a restaurant, while those with lower Imaginative values are less likely to do nothing. High True Friendship and Capable and low Wisdom values are associated with females indicating they would take no action.

Change Future Behavior. Only females show a relationship between values and boycotting the restaurant in the future. Their probability of staying away from the restaurant increases with World Peace and decreases with Capable and Wisdom.

Private Complaining. The relationship between values and private complaining is fairly strong for both males and females. The likelihood of warning others increases for males as their Freedom value increases and Inner Harmony and Wisdom decrease. Females are more likely to warn friends and family with higher Wisdom and lower Logical value scores.

Voice Complaint. Both males and females showed a strong relationship between values and complaining to the chef. Males with lower National Security and Inner Harmony values were more likely to complain. Higher Obedient, Logical and Honest values of females are associated with complaining to the chef, while Polite show a strong negative relation to such complaining behavior.

Third Party Complaining. The stepwise regressions are significant for both males and females in influencing the intention to complain to a third party. Males are more likely to say they would complain to third parties as their Clean and Polite scores increase and as Logical decreases. Females are more likely to complain to a third party as the strength of their values for Pleasure and National Security increase and Family Security decreases.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between consumer personal values and responses to purchase dissatisfaction. Men and women were studied separately to account for their differences in value strengths. In most of the purchase situations values were found to explain significant amounts of variance in the types of CCB exercised by respondents. More terminal values were found to explain variance than instrumental values. The instrumental values, Ambitious, Broadminded, Independent and Self-Controlled did not enter any of the regression equations. Among the terminal values, only Sense of Accomplishment and Equality failed to enter any of the stepwise regressions. Wisdom, Freedom, Family Security, Capable, and Clean were the most common values relating to CCB for females. For males, Wisdom and Salvation were the most common.

More relationships to CCB were noted among males than females for the non-product specific question. The numbers were about the same among the product scenarios. The value relationships were different across products, but the major difference was noted between the non-product specific question and the scenarios. Although similar relationships were noted among the three product scenarios, there was absolutely no overlap in relationships for either males or females between the no-product and the product scenarios.

Future research should use consumers with more buying experience than the student groups used here. With less buying experience, the students would likely have less contact with dissatisfying purchases and subsequent complaining behavior. They would likely not have developed solid opinions and normal reactions to dissatisfaction. Based on the rather high R^2 values observed here, it is apparent that further research should be carried out in this area. Consideration should be given to using some sort of ranking measure for values as well. The value scores for respondents were consistently high suggesting yeasaying and social desirability issues resulting in end-piling. With more discrimination among values the relationships might become more clear.

REFERENCES

- Clawson, C. Joseph and Donald E. Vinson (1978), "Human Values: A Historical and Interdisciplinary Analysis," in H. Keith Hunt, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 5, 396-.
- D'Onofrio, Marianne J., Mark E. Slama and Armen Tashchian (1985), "Consumer Purchasing Involvement and the Rokeach Value System," in R. L. King, ed., *Retailing: Theory and Practice for the 21st Century*, Academy of Marketing Sciences, 146-149.
- Henry, W. A. (1976), "Cultural Values do Correlate with Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, (May) 121-127.
- LaTour, Stephen and Nancy C. Peat (1979), "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Consumer Satisfaction Research," in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 431-437.
- Munson, J. Michael and S. H. McIntyre (1979), "Developing Practical Procedures for the Measurement of Personal Values in Cross-Cultural Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, (February), 48-52.
- Munson, J. Michael and B. Z. Posner (1979), "The Values of Engineers and Managing Engineers," *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, E26, 2, 55-60.
- Olshavsky, Richard (1977), "Non-Behavioral Reactions to Dissatisfaction," in Ralph Day (ed.), *Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 159-162.
- Peter, J. Paul and Jerry C. Olsen (1987), *Consumer Behavior: Marketing Strategy Perspectives*, Homewood, IL: Irwin, 112.
- Pitts, Robert E. and Arch G. Woodside (1983), "Personal Value Influences on Consumer Product Class and Brand Preferences," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 119, 37-53.
- Richins, Marsha L. (1985), "The role of Product Importance in Complaint Initiation," in Keith Hunt and Ralph Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 50-53.
- Rogers, John C. and Terrell G. Williams (1990), "Consumer Personal Values and Third Party Public Consumer Complaining Behavior: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 3, 71-81.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1968), *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1971), "The Measurement of Values and Value Systems," in G. Abcarian and J. W. Soule, eds., *Social Psychology and Political Behavior: Problems and Prospects*, Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 20-39.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1973), *The Nature of Human Values*, NY: Free Press.
- Sherrell, Daniel L., Joseph F. Hair, Jr. and Robert P. Bush (1984), "The Influence of Personal Values on Measures of Advertising Effectiveness: Interactions with Audience Involvement," in Robert E. Pitts, Jr. and Arch G. Woodside, eds., *Personal Values and Consumer Psychology*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 169-185.
- Singh, Jagdip (1988), "Consumer Complaint Intentions and Behavior: Definitional and Taxonomical Issues," *Journal of Marketing*, 52, (January), 93-107.
- Singh, Jagdip and Roy D. Howell (1985), "Consumer Complaining Behavior: A Review and Prospectus," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 41-49.
- Slama, Mark R. and Armen Tashchian (1985), "Selected Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics Associated with Purchasing Involvement," *Journal of Marketing*, 49, (Winter), 72-82.
- Sorensen, Robert C. and William M. Strahle (1990), "An Analysis of the Social Aspects of Complaint Reporting: A Survey of Survey of VCR Owners," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 3, 82-91.
- Rogers, John C. and Terrell G. Williams (1990), "Consumer Personal Values as Antecedents to Dyadic and Third Party Public Consumer Complaining Behavior: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 3, 71-81.
- Williams, Terrell G. and John C. Rogers (1989), "Personal Values and Consumer Response to Direct Marketing," in John C. Rogers, ed., *Proceedings: Western Decision Sciences*, 164-166.
- Vinson, Donald E. and J. Michael Munson (1976), "Personal Values: An Approach to Market Segmentation," in Kenneth L. Bernhardt, ed., *Marketing: 1776-1976 and Beyond*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 313-318.
- Vinson, Donald E., J. Michael Munson and Masao Nakanishi (1976), "An Investigation of the Rokeach Value Survey System for Consumer Application," in William D. Perrault, Jr., ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 247-252.
- Vinson, Donald E., J. D. Scott and L. M. Lamont (1977), "The Role of Personal Values in Marketing and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 41, (April), 45-50.
- Vinson, Donald E. and J. Gutman (1978), "Personal Values and Consumer Discontent," in R. J. Ebert, R. J. Monroe and K. J. Roering, eds., *Proceedings of the American Institute for Decision Sciences*, 201-203.

Send correspondence regarding this article to:
 Terrell G. Williams
 Department of Finance, Marketing and Decision Science
 Western Washington University
 Bellingham, WA 98225-9077

Table 5
Regression Analysis of Rokeach Values with Complaining Behaviors, No Product-Specific Reference Situation, Grouped by Male and Female

Do Nothing

Males			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Helpful	-.678	-.431	.000
True Friendship	-.631	-.372	.000
Responsible	.645	.392	.000
Forgiving	.397	.341	.000
Constant	3.109		.000
Multiple R =	.510		
Adj R Square =	.230		
Sig of F =	.000		

Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
World of Beauty	-.321	-.204	.020
Constant	3.355		.000
Multiple R =	.240		
Adj R Square =	.050		
Sig of F =	.020		

Change Future Behavior

Males			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Exciting Life	.310	.242	.008
World at Peace	-.255	-.267	.008
Freedom	.405	.240	.012
Constant	1.488		.000
Multiple R =	.400		
Adj R Square =	.130		
Sig of F =	.000		

Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
None significant			
Multiple R =			
Adj R Square =			
Sig of F =	No equation		

Private Complaining

Males			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Family security	.371	.302	.001
Constant	1.354		.000
Multiple R =	.300		
Adj R Square =	.080		
Sig of F =	.000		

Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Wisdom	.400	.295	.005
Constant	1.358		.000
Multiple R =	.290		
Adj R Square =	.080		
Sig of F =	.000		

Voice Complaint

Males			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
None significant			
Constant			
Multiple R =			
Adj R Square =			
Sig of F =	No equation		

Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Salvation	-.347	-.355	.001
Forgiving	.387	.284	.009
Happiness	-.664	-.231	.021
Constant	4.990		.000
Multiple R =	.420		
Adj R Square =	.150		
Sig of F =	.000		

Complain to Third Party

Males			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Inner Harmony	-.537	-.383	.000
Imaginative	.341	.231	.012
Salvation	.236	.218	.023
Constant	13.960		.000
Multiple R =	.400		
Adj R Square =	.130		
Sig of F =	.000		

Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Salvation	-.385	-.375	.000
Clean	.398	.232	.019
Cheerful	.337	.229	.020
Constant	14.156		.000
Multiple R =	.490		
Adj R Square =	.210		
Sig of F =	.000		

Table 6
Regression Analysis of Rokeach Values with Complaining Behaviors, Automobile Scenario,
Grouped by Male and Female

Do Nothing				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Loving	-.314	-.270	.004	Capable	-.701	-.374	.000
Obedient	.303	.322	.000	Mature Love	-.459	-.224	.023
Cheerful	-.348	-.288	.009				
Happiness	.483	.212	.028	Constant	5.512		.000
Constant	3.963		.000				
Multiple R =	.440			Multiple R =	.440		
Adj R Square =	.160			Adj R Square =	.190		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		
Change Future Behavior				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
None significant				Freedom	.724	.329	.001
				Salvation	.268	.203	.041
Constant				Comfortable life	.419	.194	.048
				Constant	.249		.592
Multiple R =				Multiple R =	.460		
Adj R Square =				Adj R Square =	.180		
Sig of F =	No equation			Sig of F =	.000		
Private Complaining				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
World of beauty	.177	.233	.014	Inner harmony	.405	.408	.000
Salvation	.115	.197	.031	Mature love	-.415	-.325	.004
Capable	.223	.192	.042	Family security	.237	.230	.020
Constant	.355		.118	Constant	.964		.000
Multiple R =	.400			Multiple R =	.440		
Adj R Square =	.140			Adj R Square =	.170		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		
Voice Complaint				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Wisdom	.378	.221	.021	World of Beauty	.381	.250	.014
				Capable	.510	.229	.023
Constant	1.830		.000	Family Security	.390	.200	.048
				Constant	.749		.121
Multiple R =	.220			Multiple R =	.400		
Adj R Square =	.040			Adj R Square =	.130		
Sig of F =	.020			Sig of F =	.002		
Complain to Third Party				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Wisdom	1.078	.282	.008	Imaginative	1.228	.351	.000
				Capable	1.831	.318	.001
Constant	8.054		.000	Constant	5.664		.000
Multiple R =	.260			Multiple R =	.480		
Adj R Square =	.060			Adj R Square =	.210		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		

Table 7
Regression Analysis of Rokeach Values with Complaining Behaviors, Toaster Scenario, Grouped by Male and Female

Do Nothing

Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Capable	-.685	-.338	.000	Honest	-1.061	-.282	.006
Pleasure	.426	.248	.018	Self respect	-1.019	-.310	.003
				Courageous	.587	.360	.001
				Helpful	-.454	-.214	.040
Constant	3.827		.000	Constant	5.031		.000
Multiple R =	.330			Multiple R =	.480		
Adj R Square =	.090			Adj R Square =	.190		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		

Change Future Behavior

Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Loving	.351	.284	.003	Wisdom	.357	.255	.015
Constant	1.060		.000	Constant	1.201		.000
Multiple R =	.280			Multiple R =	.260		
Adj R Square =	.070			Adj R Square =	.050		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.020		

Private Complaining

Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Salvation	.183	.259	.005	Freedom	.388	.306	.003
Clean	.234	.240	.009	Wisdom	.248	.235	.020
Constant	.748		.001	Constant	.624		.009
Multiple R =	.380			Multiple R =	.390		
Adj R Square =	.130			Adj R Square =	.130		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		

Voice Complaint

Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
World of Beauty	.534	.380	.000	Intellectual	.545	.287	.006
Happiness	.724	.244	.007				
Intellectual	-.510	-.294	.004	Constant	1.560		.000
Forgiving	-.373	-.241	.001	Multiple R =	.210		
Wisdom	.419	.228	.021	Adj R Square =	.070		
Constant	1.581		.000	Sig of F =	.006		
Multiple R =	.500						
Adj R Square =	.240						
Sig of F =	.000						

Complain to Third Party

Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Clean	.843	.287	.002	Imaginative	.934	.319	.001
Responsible	-1.121	-.262	.006	Pleasure	1.084	.303	.002
Social Recog.	.574	.205	.029	Constant	9.064		.000
Constant	11.124		.000	Multiple R =	.460		
Multiple R =	.430			Adj R Square =	.190		
Adj R Square =	.160			Sig of F =	.000		
Sig of F =	.000						

Table 8
Regression Analysis of Rokeach Values with Complaining Behaviors, Restaurant Scenario,
Grouped by Male and Female

Do Nothing							
Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Imaginative	-.357	-.239	.015	Capable	-.641	-.295	.003
Pleasure	.366	.199	.042	Wisdom	-.654	-.358	.001
Constant	3.615		.000	True Friendship	.563	.219	.044
Multiple R =	.270			Constant	4.920		.000
Adj R Square =	.060			Multiple R =	.440		
Sig of F =	.020			Adj R Square =	.170		
				Sig of F =	.000		
Change Future Behavior							
Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
None significant				World at peace	.456	.264	.011
Constant				Polite	-.431	-.216	.036
Multiple R =				Constant	2.285		.000
Adj R Square =				Multiple R =	.330		
Sig of F =	No equation			Adj R Square =	.090		
				Sig of F =	.000		
Private Complaining							
Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Inner harmony	-.267	-.232	.013	Logic	-.296	-.339	.002
Freedom	.518	.268	.005	Wisdom	.334	.298	.007
Wisdom	-.347	-.243	.011	Constant	1.437		.000
Constant	2.023		.000	Multiple R =	.360		
Multiple R =	.380			Adj R Square =	.110		
Adj R Square =	.120			Sig of F =	.000		
Sig of F =	.000						
Voice Complaint							
Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Natl Security	-.333	-.249	.011	Polite	-1.124	-.539	.000
Inner Harmony	-.303	-.217	.025	Obedient	.632	.432	.000
Constant	3.908		.000	Logical	.352	.211	.025
Multiple R =	.380			Honest	.985	.227	.016
Adj R Square =	.130			Constant	1.259		.029
Sig of F =	.000			Multiple R =	.560		
				Adj R Square =	.290		
				Sig of F =	.000		
Complain to Third Party							
Males				Females			
Variables	B	Beta	Sig.	Variables	B	Beta	Sig.
Clean	.653	.268	.006	Pleasure	.859	.256	.030
Logical	-.762	-.277	.005	Family Security	-1.102	-.296	.005
Polite	.578	.204	.046	Natl Security	.802	.255	.032
Constant	12.129		.000	Constant	11.452		.000
Multiple R =	.410			Multiple R =	.450		
Adj R Square =	.140			Adj R Square =	.170		
Sig of F =	.000			Sig of F =	.000		