

PREMIUM PRICE BLUES: CUSTOMERS VOICING PRICE COMPLAINTS, BUYING AND NOT BUYING

Warren S. Martin, University of Alabama at Birmingham
John E. Swan, University of Alabama at Birmingham

ABSTRACT

This qualitative, observational study examines customer price complaints and purchase or purchase avoidance responses in a setting involving a super premium ice cream shop. Unprompted customer comments concerning price were recorded. Satisfaction with price is linked to purchase. The study finds a high proportion of customers expressing dissatisfaction with premium prices. Purchase avoidance is very high among dissatisfied customers who ask about or know the price before ordering. Most of the other dissatisfied customers learn of the price after ordering/purchasing the product. The results suggest that a social norm of commitment to purchase overcomes dissatisfaction since customer commitment is generated by the structure of the transaction.

INTRODUCTION

Price has long been recognized as a key attribute in the decision to purchase or not purchase a product or service. Basic and applied research interest in consumer satisfaction/ dissatisfaction with price is demonstrated by the studies that have explored that topic (for two examples and general literature reviews see Bei and Chiao 2001 and Varki and Colgate 2001). A number of products and services are positioned as premium price offerings. To our knowledge, consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with and response to premium prices has not been explored. The purpose of this article is to report on a study of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with premium prices and purchase or avoidance of purchase given price dissatisfaction. Our study focuses on a premium-priced product but one whose cost is not large, as compared to a premium-priced automobile or home. Almost everyone in the mall could have bought the ice cream if they wanted to.

This study contributes to the literature regarding customer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with price in several ways. First, we find additional evidence that

supports current understanding of price dissatisfaction and customer responses. Such evidence includes reference prices and dissatisfaction, the classic disconfirmation model, and its prediction that dissatisfaction results in purchase avoidance. We extend the dissatisfaction-intentions relationship to dissatisfaction-behavior. Second, this research presents findings that are evidently new to the literature. We find that given dissatisfaction with price, the probability of purchase depends on whether price is known to the customer before or after an implicit commitment to purchase is made. Thus the impact of price dissatisfaction is moderated by a social norm of commitment to purchase. In turn, commitment to purchase is linked to the structure of the transaction in terms of when during the purchase process the consumer learns of the price. Also, since we did not find research in the literature that focuses on premium prices, we believe this article presents new findings on that topic. This study documents responses to price dissatisfaction for a particular brand at the retail point-of-sale. In summary, the findings will add to the richness of the satisfaction literature by presenting new understandings and suggesting areas for future research.

BACKGROUND

Setting and Industry

For this study we define price as the amount of money the customer pays for a product or service. In this study, the brand is a high-priced super premium ice cream marketed by a scoop shop located in a regional urban shopping mall.

There are only two major super premium ice cream brands with scoop shops. Both brand manufacturers have a relatively limited number of scoop shops. These products are highly rated in terms of physical attributes and are very consistent in terms of the major attributes. The high product standards yield a taste that consumers desire (due to

more butter fat, fewer artificial ingredients, better quality control and careful testing) and require higher expenditures for materials and labor. The super premium manufacturer passes these costs on to the retailer resulting in a higher price at super premium scoop shops than at other ice cream scoop shops. Many customers who usually consume less expensive brands resist paying the higher prices associated with the super premium brands. In addition, due to aggressive price discounting to move product through grocery stores, the price of ice cream in the super premium scoop shops is higher than the grocery store's super premium ice cream prices. There are customers who love the product but do not like the scoop shop price.

Relevant Literature

The literature on customer dissatisfaction with price is extensive. Several studies are relevant to our work. Price satisfaction / dissatisfaction is determined by perceived price fairness (Bei and Chiao 2001, and Campbell 1999) and how competitive a price is (Varki and Colgate 2001). Fairness/unfairness is related to the consumer's perception of the firm's pricing motives (Campbell 1999). In turn, both price satisfaction/dissatisfaction and fairness/unfairness are significantly related to intentions (Campbell 1999, Varki and Colgate 2001). The customer is likely to judge a price as less expensive in a high-priced context (Adaval and Monroe 2002) and more expensive if the price exceeds the customer's reference price (Niedrich, Sharma and Douglas 2001).

METHOD

Our general interest was in learning how customers respond to premium prices, not to test hypotheses drawn from a well-established literature stream. The literature suggests that very little is known about customer experience with premium prices. Thus an inductive, ethnographic method consisting of observation of consumers at the point of product selection and purchase was used (Hudson and Ozanne 1988, Hunt, 1991).

Setting

A super premium quality (and high-priced) ice cream shop located in a major urban shopping mall is the site of data collection. The Scoop Shop (pseudonym) is a franchised outlet of a major super premium brand of ice cream. The business is operated as a "scoop shop" (industry term). The Scoop Shop consists of a counter that customers approach to place an order. A worker takes the customer's order, prepares the order and takes payment. The Scoop Shop is located on the ground floor Food Court of the mall along with other shops offering food and drinks. In this article we use the term worker for any person in contact with a customer.

Observations

Workers were offered a small financial incentive (\$.25 per interview) to complete a short observation form on every customer that expressed opinions about the price of the ice cream. As a result, the data collection method is that of an observer rather than the self-report technique. Some of the observations were made as the result of a purchase and other observations were made as a result of an inquiry about the price and/or a close look at the menu board that posts prices for various offerings. In this paper, we use the term customer for both buyers and prospective buyers.

A training session was conducted with each worker. Sheets with the guidelines from the training session and copies of the observation forms were located in a convenient place under the cash register for quick access. The data collection took place over the summer months with various workers (all trained in data collection for this study), recording the statements that they associated with price, including the comment and a description of the person who made the statements. A copy of the data collection form with representative customer comments appears as the Appendix. The observation forms were reviewed for completeness daily by the first author for the first two weeks of the study, then weekly. If any questions arose, the worker was asked to elaborate on the material. Workers were asked to record verbatim the customer

statement about the price plus four demographic variables (gender, race, age and dress). Observation forms were completed on 100 situations (customer(s) or potential customer(s)) of which 98 were suitable for analysis.

Several of the customer and worker comments and behavioral recordings obtained from the observation forms appear throughout the remainder of this article. The comments have been left in the same form as they were written (except for omitting the brand name). The people writing the comments were standing up and often hurried. As a result the quotations are not necessarily grammatically correct (a number at the end of each quotation corresponds to the observation number).

Classification of Comments

The total set of 98 observations was independently read and classified by both authors on three variables. The first variable is price satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the second is purchase or purchase avoidance and the third variable is "does the consumer know or not know the price before placing an order?" Each variable is discussed below.

Price Dissatisfaction/Satisfaction. In general, dissatisfaction is negative affect (Oliver 1997). Price dissatisfaction is negative affect concerning price and is operationally defined as customer comments and or behavior indicating that the customer feels the price is high, too high, unjust to the buyer, unreasonable, unfair or unacceptable. Often the comments clearly express dissatisfaction as in this example recounting an exchange between an elderly woman and a worker.

Customer: "How much is a small yogurt?"
 Worker: "1.99". Customer: "That's a rip-off!"
 Worker: "No, it's a fair price". Woman to her friend: "Can you believe they want \$ 2.00 for this and extra for the toppings?" The friend looks embarrassed. The woman walks away (27).

Satisfaction is positive affect (Oliver 1997) and price satisfaction is positive affect concerning price. Price satisfaction is operationally defined as

customer comments suggesting that the price is acceptable or that the customer is pleased with the price or plans to repurchase at the Scoop Shop. An illustration of price satisfaction is a man who walks up in a good mood and says:

" I want a scoop of chocolate in a waffle cone. The worker prepares the order, rings it up and says, "it's \$ 2.74". He says: "Wow! I haven't been out in a while". The worker just smiles as the man counts out his money, gives the worker \$3.25 and says: "Your tip is included". Worker: "Thanks, have a nice day, enjoy it". He comes back and lets the worker know it was good stuff (48).

Purchase and Purchase Avoidance. Purchase or purchase avoidance is operationally defined on the basis of the consumer or worker comment or the worker account of the consumer's behavior. Most observations report if a purchase is made or avoided. An example of purchase avoidance is a man who asks:

"How much is a large Coke@?" When the worker tells him, he scrunches up his face and just walks away (4).

Price Know/Unknown Before Order Placed. The third classification is whether or not the customer appears to know the price before an order is placed. The service process starts with a prospect approaching the counter. Some customers know the price from prior experience with the Scoop Shop. The Scoop Shop procedure is for workers to first take the order, fill it and, unless asked, only give the price when payment is requested for the completed order. Many prospects learn of the prices of items by asking a worker or reading the menu board. For these customers, price is known before an order is placed or avoided and classification is relatively easy. A second group of potential customers do not check the price before they place an order. These customers are difficult to classify in terms of whether price is known or unknown before placing an order. Customers who express surprise or shock when they learn of the price during or after worker fulfillment of the order are classified as price

unknown. The remaining people were classified as price known. While this procedure was not perfect, it seems reasonable for this study.

Reliability of Classification. Both authors independently classified each observation for each of the three variables – YES, NO, OR "can't classify." Development of the classification rules included five steps. First, the authors reviewed many of the observations to learn of consumer and worker responses. Based on an initial understanding of responses to premium prices we decided that price dissatisfaction/satisfaction, purchase/purchase avoidance and price known/unknown before placing an order are important phenomena. The second step was to develop written classification rules based on the initial review of the comments. A third step was to classify the first 19 valid observations using the preliminary classification rules. Next, we compared our independent classifications of the 19 observations and refined the classification rules. The new classification rules were used to classify the remaining 79 observations. Agreement between the two authors was 86% in terms of price dissatisfaction/satisfaction and purchase/ purchase avoidance. The third variable of price known/ unknown before ordering was more difficult to classify with 77% agreement. The last step in the classification process was to discuss each classification about which we did not agree. The discussion made it easy to resolve our classification differences. One classification problem was that four observations contained price comments and behavior from more than one consumer. We solved this problem by adding additional consumers to the data set. As a result, the 98 observations yielded 102 responses. It was not possible to code each consumer comment on all of the variables, which resulted in missing data. If data is missing for one variable, the observation is omitted from analysis regarding that variable. Thus the numbers of observations for each analysis may vary.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Premium Prices and Price Dissatisfaction

Of the total sample, only 10 of the 96 customers

have responses coded as price satisfied and 86, or 90%, are price dissatisfied. The Scoop Shop owners estimate that about 25% of all those who approach the counter, including customers and prospects, complain about price. The price-dissatisfied percentage from this study is higher than the estimate of the Scoop Shop owners as the sample only includes customers commenting on price. Comparative data is lacking; however, it is clear from the comments that premium prices result in price dissatisfaction for many customers.

Price Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Purchase/Purchase Avoidance

As shown in Table 1, all ten of the price-satisfied customers made a purchase. In contrast only 42% (36 of 86) of the dissatisfied customers made a purchase, and 58% (50 of 86) of price-dissatisfied customers avoided making a purchase. The differences are significant (Chi-Square probability =.000). The results show that purchase avoidance is the most common response to price dissatisfaction. A question at this point is why do 42% of price dissatisfied customers buy?

When Price Becomes Known in the Service Process: Customer Commitment, Price Dissatisfaction, Purchase and Purchase Avoidance

The thesis of this section is that whether the customer knows the price before or after the order is placed impacts customer commitment, and, in turn, that commitment influences purchase and purchase avoidance. In this section we present behavior categorized by different sequences in which customers learn of the price. Of the 102 observations, 91 could be classified as price known/unknown and price satisfied/ dissatisfied. The classification and the number of customers in each category appear in Table 2.

Price Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction and Price Known/Unknown

As shown in Table 2, whether customers knew the price or not before they ordered had little impact

Table 1
Price Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Purchase/Avoid Purchase

	Price Satisfaction/ Acceptance	Price Dissatisfaction	Total
Purchase	10 100%	36 42%	46
Avoid Purchase	0%	50 58%	50
Total	10 100%	86 100%	96

Chi Squared = 12.113; significant at the 0.00 level.

Table 2
Price Known/Unknown Price and Price Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

	Price Known	Price Unknown	Total
Price Satisfaction/ Acceptance	5 9%	4 12%	9
Price Dissatisfaction	53 91%	29 88%	82
Total	58 100%	34 100%	91

Chi Squared = 0.289; not significant.

Table 3
Price Known/Unknown and Price Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Purchase/Avoid Purchase

	Price Known		Price Unknown	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Purchase	5 100%	9 17%	4 100%	24 83%
Avoid Purchase	0	44 83%	0	5 17%
Total	5 100%	53 100%	4 100%	29 100%

Table 4
Price Dissatisfied Consumers: Price Known/Unknown and Purchase/Avoid Purchase

	Price Known	Price Unknown	Total
Purchase	9 17%	24 83%	33
Avoid Purchase	44 83%	5 17%	49
Total	53 100%	29 100%	82

Chi Squared = 33.723; significant at the 0.00 level.

on the price satisfaction or price dissatisfaction. Of the respondents who did not know the price before the order was prepared, 12% were price-satisfied compared to 9% for the price known group. The Chi Squared probability is not significant. It appears that the level of satisfaction /dissatisfaction is not significantly different for the price know/unknown customers.

Price Known/Unknown, Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction And Purchase/Avoid Purchase

An Overview of When Price is Known. If the customer was dissatisfied with price, but learned of price after ordering, (the price unknown group of Table 3), a high proportion, 83% (24 of 29), made the purchase. In contrast, if price is known before ordering and the prospect is dissatisfied, only 17%

(9 of 53) buy. We see that the entire price satisfied group of customers buy. Table 3 is presented as descriptive data since some cell sizes are too small for a statistical test.

Satisfaction/dissatisfaction are often studied as post-purchase phenomena. Thus it is important to note that in this study some customers were dissatisfied with price before purchase as the focus of this study was on price satisfaction/dissatisfaction, both pre and post-purchase.

Price Dissatisfied Consumers and Purchase/Avoid Purchase

Returning to Table 3, it can be seen that a contrast is possible by confining the analysis to only the 82 dissatisfied customers (53 + 29) and the results are presented in Table 4. As shown in table 4, if the customer knows of the price before an order is placed and is dissatisfied with price, a high proportion of prospects, 83% (44 of 53), do not purchase. In the case of customers who learn of the price after the order is placed (often after the order is prepared) and are price dissatisfied, only 17% do not purchase. The contrast is striking and the differences are significant (Chi-Square probability = .000). The results suggest that the timing of when price becomes known as the service process unfolds is a major factor impacting purchase/purchase avoidance among the price dissatisfied.

The finding that 83% of dissatisfied customers who learn of the price after ordering buy in contrast to only 17% of the price known (before ordering) could possibly be related to a lower level of price dissatisfaction in the price known group. However, our review of the dissatisfaction comments in the two groups suggests that both groups had equivalent, strong levels of price dissatisfaction. Many of the comments in both groups suggest feelings of a price that is "too high", beyond or far beyond what is justified for the product. In the price known group a man in the 55+-age class illustrates a beyond justified price as he asks:

"How much for a pint of vanilla caramel". Worker: "\$4.99 plus tax". He points to the triple scoop cup and says: "How much for this little thing?" Worker: "\$4.52." He shakes his head

and says: "Y'all have too high a price for your ice cream". He walks away and is not happy (22).

A similar comment from the price unknown group is an older man who asks for a yogurt in a waffle cone, the worker hands him the cone and says:

"that's \$2.74." Customer: "Lord-a-mighty that's a terrible price! Do you think this money grows on trees?" "Who owns this place?" Worker: "I do". Customer says as he pays: "Well, write me when you retire to Hawaii" (85).

DISCUSSION

Discussion will focus first on the theoretical implications of the results, highlight new findings and discuss how current understanding of customer satisfaction and responses to price relate to premium prices and customer behavior. The second major topic is implications for managerial action.

Theoretical Implications

Reference Prices and Dissatisfaction. The results find a high proportion of customers are dissatisfied with the Scoop Shop's premium prices. An explanation for premium price dissatisfaction is suggested by the concept of a reference price, the price against which a customer compares the focal price, and a price above the reference price will be judged as too high (Niedrich, Sharma and Wedell 2001). The classic disconfirmation model posits that outcomes below expectations result in dissatisfaction. It is reasonable to assume that the reference price is the expected price, thus a price exceeding the reference price will result in dissatisfaction. A common theme of many dissatisfied Scoop Shop consumers was surprise that the price was so high. Those results suggest a price exceeding the reference price, negative disconfirmation and dissatisfaction with price. The results suggest two contributions to the literature. First, the reference price concept is useful in understanding customer response to and dissatisfaction with premium prices. Second the

disconfirmation model applies to premium prices.

Purchase Avoidance. A second major finding is that price dissatisfaction is associated with purchase avoidance, a result predicted by the disconfirmation model (Oliver 1997) as negative disconfirmation leads to lower intentions and repurchase. Taken together, premium price dissatisfaction and purchase avoidance suggest that the classic disconfirmation model applies to premium prices. Recently Fournier and Mick (1999) have called for a contingent, multi-process model of satisfaction and found that in some situations the classic disconfirmation model applies while in others it does not. Our results have found a situation where the classic model applies. However, as we shall argue below, other processes are part of the picture.

Structure of the Service Process and Purchase Commitment

In this section we interpret data showing that dissatisfied customers who learn of price after the order is prepared feel a commitment to buy and most do so. Drawing from Schouten and McAlexander (1995) we define customer commitment as making consumption decisions to uphold values even if a sacrifice is necessary to do so. Schouten and McAlexander (1995) note that some working-class families are strongly committed to a biker subculture and make a major financial sacrifice in buying one or more Harley- Davidson motorcycles.

Our analysis finds that if the customer knows of the price before an order is placed and is dissatisfied with price, a low proportion of prospects, 17% purchase (Table 4). Before the order is placed customers feel little commitment to purchase. In contrast, 83% of price dissatisfied customers who learn of the price after the order is placed purchase (Table 4). The contrast suggests that an implicit social norm of purchase commitment is strongly felt by the dissatisfied and price unknown customers and 83% complete the purchase. In effect the commitment norm "overrules" dissatisfaction (Table 4).

In our society, placing an order is making a promise to the seller that I will buy. We interpret the

sequence of consumer and worker behavior and the resulting purchase commitment norm as being generated by the structure of the transaction that is the pattern of operations employed by the Scoop Shop. Recall that if the customer asks for a product the Scoop Shop worker prepares the order, presents it to the customer and then voices the price and requests payment. Many customers only learn of the price at that point. The customer has made a commitment to purchase a perishable product. Many dissatisfied customers voice their dissatisfaction, but purchase. Customers who know the price before the order is prepared have a lower commitment to purchase and a high proportion of those consumers do not purchase.

Next we consider, "walk-offs", those people who did not know the price until presented with the prepared order and refused to purchase. Of the 29 customers who learned of the price after the order is prepared, five, 17% were "walk-offs" (Table 4). We examined the five observations to see if ambiguities in the classification could possibly impact the results. The five observations were clear in suggesting that the "walk-offs" did not know the price until presented with the completed order and told the price.

We speculate that the "walk-offs" were so surprised by what they feel is a completely unreasonable price that the purchase commitment norm is either not felt or overwhelmed. A second speculation is that anger on the part of the walk-offs drove their behavior. A third possibility is that these people have weak purchase commitment norms. A fourth speculation is that the unreasonable price is taken as a justification for walking off. Combinations of the four are also possible. An observation that speaks to those possibilities is that of an older man:

"\$2.15? For this little thing? That's too much. He handed it back to me & said 'I'm not going to pay for that...I thought it would be bigger than that'...He wouldn't pay & walked off" (52).

We believe that the transaction structure-purchase commitment and purchase-purchase avoidance findings and theory make a new

Table 5
Price Dissatisfied Consumers: Purchase/Avoid Purchase and Race

	Caucasian	African American	Total
Purchase	26 53%	7 25%	33
Avoid Purchase	23 47%	21 75%	44
Total	49 100%	28 100%	77

Chi Squared = 5.729; significant at the 0.017 level

contribution to the satisfaction/dissatisfaction literature. Transaction structure is included in some studies, however seldom as an intervening variable identified to explain the reason why different results are found.

Demographics and Actions of Price Dissatisfied Consumers

In this section we report on testing the demographic measures (gender, race, age or dress) as possible independent variables to better understand the actions of price dissatisfied customers. The number of price satisfied and all demographic categories were too small to include in this analysis. The four age categories were reduced to two, adult and 55+. Dress was also reduced to two categories, professional/casual (see appendix for a description of the categories).

The following were tested using 2 by 2 tables: each demographic variable with purchase/avoid purchase as the dependent variable for three groups of dissatisfied customers; all dissatisfied customers, the price unknown subset of the price dissatisfied observations; and the price known subset of the price dissatisfied observations. Four demographics for three groups gave 12 tests (see Table 5 as an illustration).

Only one comparison found a significant difference between customers with different demographics. Among dissatisfied customers, African Americans (Table 5) were found to be significantly less likely to purchase compared to Caucasians. This observation may be the result of shopping norms. One speculation is that price-shopping norms may differ widely based on race and this area could be one of interest for future studies.

Extending the Literature From Intentions to Behavior

A finding from several studies in the literature is that price dissatisfaction results in lower intentions to buy. Campbell (1999) reports that perceived price unfairness lowers shopping intention. Bei and Chiao (2001) report the same finding. Varki and Colgate (2001) found evidence in a data set that perceptions of how competitive a bank's fees and charges are impacts likelihood of intentions to switch or recommend the bank. A second data set did not support that finding. While the finding of a price dissatisfaction-intentions relationship is important, the issue of the extent to which intentions are acted upon is not answered by studies that do not extend to behavior. Our study found that dissatisfaction did impact behavior, but the intervening variable of purchase commitment is important.

Suggestions for Future Research. Several possibilities for future research are identified by this study. An implication of this observational study and its setting is the likely impact of the face-to-face consumer-marketer relationship. It is reasonable to assume that purchase commitment is strengthened by the face-to-face interaction. The sequence of activities has customers who place an order doing so face-to-face with a Scoop Shop worker and even with price dissatisfaction, 83% purchase. A hypothesis for future research is that purchase commitment is stronger in face-to-face interactions than in less personal settings.

Another idea for future research is to contrast patterns of operations. In fast food counter sales two basic patterns of operations are employed that could have a different impact on consumer commitment. The Scoop Shop sequence is pay after. A worker states the price after the completed order is presented

to the customer and payment is requested. Many fast food counter sales business use an opposite sequence of pay first. That is, after the consumer places an order, it is priced and payment is requested. The order is not prepared until after payment. If a pay-first consumer is price dissatisfied, we assume that purchase commitment is relatively low as the order has not been prepared. A hypothesis for future research is that a higher proportion of price dissatisfied pay-first consumers compared to pay after will be purchase avoiders.

Limitations. This study has several limitations. A major limitation is that observations were only made on customers who voiced an opinion on price. The observations do not include satisfied or dissatisfied customers who did not speak up. Thus most of the sample is of complainers. Another limitation is that some of the observations were difficult to classify in terms of the price known/unknown before placing an order. The sample size is small and only represents one location. The findings can't be generalized to the whole population.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Our findings suggest several interesting managerial implications. Price is an area of unrelenting conflict between suppliers, retailers and customers. Customers would like to have a lower price resulting in downward pressure on price. The amazing growth of discount retailers and the concurrent decline of traditional retailers document the widespread desire for lower prices. At the same time, there is always upward pressure on prices from suppliers and employees who want more money for their efforts. A premium price is associated with a premium product and forms part of a premium brand image. Executives expect that some customers will find a premium price to be unfair. However, a danger is that too many customers will find the price unacceptable. Furthermore, customers may feel the high price implies that the company has undesirable motives (Campbell 1999).

Price perception may be linked to the stage in the product life cycle. For a super premium item,

the price is always high, but the feeling associated with the high price should differ according to the stage of the life cycle and the particular market. For a customer to say "The price was high, but worth it" is substantially different from a customer who says "The price was high and I'm not sure it was worth it." In the former case, the likelihood that the customer will buy again is much higher. In the latter case, the likelihood of buying again is relatively lower.

Some factors suggest that ice cream scoop shops are in the decline stage of the product life cycle in several geographic locations. The number of children as a percentage of the population is down compared to prior decades. Although not all frozen ice-cream type products are high fat, many people associate high fat with the super premium ice cream image and the number of people who are concerned about not eating high fat products has grown in recent years. Finally, increased competition from supermarkets in terms of lower prices has changed the reference price for many customers. The end result is more price dissatisfaction. The challenge is how to build a customer base and reduce price dissatisfaction. While the scoop shops can influence the perception, to a large extent these retailers are dependent on the actions of the national brand manufacturer to justify the price. Without strong support, the retailers will face continuing price dissatisfaction.

This paper documents customer responses to premium prices in a single location. It is not known if our findings generalize to other settings or if premium prices for other products/services result in behaviors not observed in this study. Future research could explore such possibilities.

REFERENCES

- Adaval, Rashmi and Kent Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 4, (March) 572-588.
- Bei, Lien-Ti and Yu-Ching Chiao (2001), "An Integrated Model for the Effects of Perceived Product, Perceived Service Quality, and Perceived Price Fairness on Consumer Satisfaction and Loyalty," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 14, 125-140.

Campbell, Margaret (1999), "Perceptions of Price Unfairness: Antecedents and Consequences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36, (May) 187-199.

Fournier, Susan and David Glen Mich (1999), "Rediscovering Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing*, 63, (October), 5-23.

Hudson, Laurel and Julie Ozanne (1988), "Alternative Ways of Seeking Knowledge in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, (March 1988) 508-521.

Hunt, Shelby (1991), *Modern Marketing Theory: Critical Issues in the Philosophy of Marketing Science*, South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Niedrich, Ronald W., Subhash Sharma and Douglas Wedell (2001), "Reference Price and Price Perceptions: A Comparison of Alternative Models," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 3, 339-354.

Oliver, Richard L. (1997) *Satisfaction: A Behavioral*

Perspective on the Consumer, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schouten, John W. and James McAlexander (1995), "Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22, (June) 43-61.

Varki, Sajeev and Mark Colgate (2001), "The Role of Price Perceptions in an Integrated Model of Behavioral Intentions," *Journal of Service Research*, 3, 3, (February), 232-240.

Send correspondence regarding this article to:
 Warren S. Martin
 School of Business Administration
 University of Alabama at Birmingham
 Birmingham, AL 35294-4460 U.S.A.
 fax: 205-975-0058
 email: wmartin@uab.edu

Appendix

A Sample of the Data Collection Form with Comments

Comments on Price:

For each comment please circle number corresponding to: gender, race, age, if they appear to be working class or professional, and the person's behavior.

<p>Lady asked how much a waffle cone was when told it was \$2.74 with tax; she said That's ridiculous! That is really high. I could buy a Whole half gallon for that!" I said Yes, but its not a Brand X? Would you like to taste one of our flavors? She said yes and later did buy an ice cream but continued to complain about the price.</p>	<p>1 Male 2 Female 1 White 2 Black 3 Other 1 Teenager 2 Young Adult 3 Adult 4. 55+ 1 Professional Dress 2 Blue Collar 3 Casual Other _____</p>
<p>Looked at menu board and asked what a small was? I showed her and she picked up the cup and said \$1.99 for this small cup? I said yes. She then asked how much a yogurt with gummy bears was and I said \$2.47 with tax. Two of the girls bought single cups but still couldn't believe the cups were so small.</p>	<p>1 Male 2 Female 1 White 2 Black 3 Other 1 Teenager 2 Young Adult 3 Adult 4. 55+ 1 Professional Dress 2 Blue Collar 3 Casual Other _____</p>

POST PURCHASE BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF DISSATISFIED RETAIL CONSUMERS IN MEXICO

Mariana Hernandez

Douglas L. Fugate, Western Kentucky University

ABSTRACT

US retailers are increasingly interested in entering the consumer market in Mexico. Demographic and purchasing trends are highly favorable. However, there is relatively little information available on post-purchase satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior among Mexican consumers. The present study presented four purchasing scenarios to a stratified sample of adults in the centrally-located Mexican state of Queretaro. The four scenarios described an unsatisfactory experience with a convenience good, a shopping good, a durable good, and a service. Respondents were asked to indicate which of six consumer complaining behavior (CCB) responses they were likely to pursue on a five point scale. Results indicated that complaining to friends and family was the most likely result with very little attention given to responses involving third parties. Even complaining to the local store or seller was not a common response. US retailers must teach Mexican consumers that complaining is a useful endeavor. Otherwise, US retailers will not be able to capture information from dissatisfied consumers. Such information is critical in generating customer loyalty; particularly from firms that have a different cultural orientation.

INTRODUCTION

Passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994 fundamentally changed the trading relationship between Mexico and the United States. Besides the obvious impact on national accounts - imports and exports - between the two countries, U.S. retailers gained an unprecedented opportunity to deal directly with the Mexican household consumer. Unfortunately, this new level of consumer intimacy, even with one of our closest geo-political neighbors, demands an understanding of Mexican consumer behavior that simply does not exist.

While there is a strong tradition of consumer research in the United States, not nearly as much is known about the Mexican consumer. Historical factors such as Mexico's level of economic development, governmental controls, political volatility, and a large proportion of their population residing in lower socio-economic circumstances have limited academic/business appeal and access. As a direct result, few empirical studies have been published on consumer behavior in Mexico.

Despite the lack of information, U.S. retailers have a growing interest in this young and vibrant market (Triplett 1994, Frastaci 1999, Yelkur 2000). David Hirschman, VP of the Association of American Chambers of Commerce in Latin America, is quoted as saying, "U.S. companies are bullish on Mexico for the mid-to-long term." (Green 1997). As evidence of this fact, the US giant retailer Wal Mart has made a major commitment to head south with other retailers following suit (Francese 1993, Green 1997, Rangel 2000).

Business decisions regarding the specific timing of business entry into Mexican retail markets will depend in part upon the stability of the peso, the growth rate of household income, the availability of household credit, employment levels, and the emergence of a vigorous middle class. However, successful business entry depends upon understanding the Mexican consumer at the most fundamental level: satisfying his or her needs.

Customer satisfaction is not a single event, but a process. The process encompasses both consumption and post-consumption activities. The focus of this particular study is to gain an understanding of post-purchase behaviors of Mexican retail consumers that are related to purchase dissatisfaction. Gaining insights into this area of consumer behavior will be immensely valuable to US businesses attempting to capture a share of this emerging retail market.

CONSUMER COMPLAINT BEHAVIOR (CCB)

Understanding postpurchase consumer behavior attempts to discover how people feel and/or behave after buying certain goods or services. Most consumers will engage in some sort of negative behavior if the product or service acquired is not what was expected or is not what was promised by the seller. Fornell's (in Vavra 1997) model used disconfirmation of perceived quality, value, and expectations as the determinants of consumer dissatisfaction (see also Churchill and Suprenant 1982; Oliver 1980; Tse and Wilton 1988; Woodruff, Cadotte and Jenkins 1983). Behaviors resulting from disconfirmation might include refusing to buy the product in the future, complaining to the seller, warning friends, initiating negative word of mouth communications, seeking recourse from private or government agencies, complaining directly to the manufacturer, or initiating legal actions (cf. Bearden and Teel 1983, Day and Landon 1977, Day 1980, Singh 1988 and Rogers, Ross and Williams 1992). All of these behaviors are collectively called consumer complaining behavior (hereafter referred to as CCB). They are a somewhat diverse but not mutually exclusive group of responses as consumers may proceed in sequential fashion from simple to more involved complaining behaviors depending on the results sought.

Gathering knowledge about how, when, and where consumers express their dissatisfaction is very important to marketers because it allows them to capture the events responsible for consumer disconfirmation, address the sources of disconfirmation and thereby place themselves in a position to preserve/restore brand/store satisfaction, and to prevent consumer dissatisfaction and/or defection in the future. Forward thinking retailers will funnel all complaints into a centralized collection and analysis system where they can become market research data. The popular phrases "a complaint is a gift" and "thank heavens for complainers" express the importance of addressing failures in the customer value delivery system.

DETERMINANTS/ANTECEDENTS OF CCB IN THE UNITED STATES

Numerous authors have studied consumer complaining behavior in the United States. While it is a useful starting point for studying other national markets, it is important to remember that cultural differences can produce markedly different responses to similar events.

Complaint behavior in the US has been linked to a variety of situational factors. Landon (1977) offered the following set:

1. The level of dissatisfaction of the consumer
2. The importance of the product to the consumer
3. The amount of benefit to be gained from complaining
4. The personality of the consumer
5. To whom the blame of the problem is attributed
6. The attitude of the consumer toward complaining
7. Previous experience with the product and with complaining

Other generalizations have been made about consumer dissatisfaction and complaint behavior by Richins (1983).

1. Those who complain when dissatisfied tend to be members of more upscale socioeconomic groups than those who do not complain.
2. Personality characteristics, including dogmatism, locus of control, and self confidence, are only weakly related to complaint behavior, if at all.
3. The severity of dissatisfaction is positively related to complaint behavior.
4. The greater the blame for the dissatisfaction placed on someone other than the one dissatisfied, the greater the likelihood of the complaint.
5. The more positive the perception of retailer responsiveness to a consumer complaint, the greater the likelihood of a complaint being lodged.

Young high income and educated people tend to complain more; although some poor individuals with low education may also react to dissatisfaction (Broadbridge and Marshall, 1995). It now appears that the greater the access to communication media like the web, the more people voice dissatisfaction especially by negative word of mouth comments (Allen 2001).

Those who don't complain state (in ranked order) that:

1. They didn't think it was worth the time or effort
2. They decided no one would be concerned about their problem or resolving it.
3. They did not know where to go or what to do. (Technical Assistance Research Programs Institute study in Lovelock, 2001)

In general, the models of CCB identify two major reasons for complaining (Krapfel 1985):

1. Consumers will complain in order to recover an economic loss such as exchanging the product for another one or getting their money back.
2. Consumers will complain to rebuild their self-image.

Finally, Tom Peters (1988) provides these economic impacts of dissatisfied customers:

It costs five times more to get a new customer than to retain a current one.

Twenty-six of 27 customers fail to report a bad experience.

Ninety-one percent of dissatisfied customers won't return.

Thirteen will tell 20 or more people further polluting your reputation.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND CCB IN THE UNITED STATES

There are different laws and organizations that

protect consumers' rights in the United States. In principle, the early laws that protected consumers were designed to promote competition. They were "consumerist" primarily in the sense that the government assumed consumers would achieve the highest average standard of living when the economy was organized on a competitive basis rather than on a controlled basis. Later laws addressed specific conditions that were more closely aligned with consumerist concerns, e.g. financial disclosures, product usage warnings, nutritional labeling, age appropriateness, etc. and provided for a variety of remedies.

U.S. consumers have grown to expect certain rights associated with consumption. These rights, first articulated by President Kennedy are: to be informed, to have choices, to be safe, and to be heard. Most consumers look for and patronize manufacturers, distributors, and retailers that will provide satisfying goods and services as well as take action to resolve any problems that arise. When problems are identified, consumers want them to be resolved; they want to receive satisfaction. Even if consumers are not aware at the time of purchase that specific warranties or guarantees exist, they still expect the seller/manufacturer to fulfill their (the buyer's) expectations. Manufacturers, distributors, and retailers are usually quick to fulfill these expectations as customer retention - based on satisfaction - has been closely linked to long term profitability (Best, 2004, p. 15)

From a cultural perspective, the act of complaining and seeking redress is acceptable among U.S. consumers. They know that they have express and implied rights to show their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with any good or service, and also to receive a response to their complaint. It might even be considered a consumption related ritual. Unfortunately, this understanding of CCB in the United States may not be of much use to retailers going to Mexico. The value of the following study is that it explores CCB among Mexican retail consumers under conditions of post purchase dissatisfaction in their native marketplace and made no *a priori* assumptions.

BACKGROUND OF CONSUMER COMPLAINT BEHAVIOR IN MEXICO

Administrative Agencies

The Federal Law for the Protection of Consumers took effect in 1976. This was the first modern national consumer protection law established in Mexico. Two pro-consumer organizations were created under the provisions of this law: the National Consumer's Institute and the Federal Consumer Advocate's Office (PROFECO).

Unfortunately, the initial Federal Law did not protect consumers' rights as expected. Reforms resulted in the consolidation of the two organizations in 1992. Under this arrangement, PROFECO became the dominant entity and the National Consumer's Institute operated as an adjunct of PROFECO. It was hoped that the reconfigured PROFECO would be better equipped to defend and regulate all activities concerning consumer rights. Consumer access to PROFECO was provided through offices in the major cities of all 32 Mexican states.

PROFECO. The main objective and function of the PROFECO is to protect the rights of consumers, and to give consumers the means and knowledge of the laws to protect themselves. Immediate assistance is gained via an 800 telephone number. Major assistance activities include offering consumers information about products and services that are of better quality and price; teaching consumers to utilize their income and household resources better, and informing consumers of their rights and the laws that protect them. The PROFECO provides other types of information that helps consumers enrich their lifestyles. The PROFECO also has a special center where it conducts investigations into contract fulfillment, verification of product claims, nutrition, and product research and development. They assist in cases that go to arbitration by providing information and names of arbitrators.

The PROFECO reaches out to consumers with T.V. and radio programs and a monthly magazine. There appears to be a growing awareness of the role and scope of the PROFECO's consumer-related activities (Palacios 2001).

Relevant Findings and Literature on Consumer Complaining Behavior in Mexico

Current Status of Complaining. Palacios (2001) says there still is not a well established culture of consumer complaining in Mexico. It has been only in the last five years that consumer complaining has noticeably grown. Actual numbers are hard to come by since the PROFECO has had various modifications and has not kept good records. However, complaints in the Mexican state of Queretaro during the last 5 years have increased by 50% to an average of 230 to 300 complaints monthly, roughly 12 to 15 complaints a day. The complaints are principally against telephone companies, cellular companies, gas distributors, language schools, contractors, and service providers (mechanics, carpenters, welders, among others). There are a large number of complaints against stores which offer a discount or promotion that is not fulfilled, or that offer guarantees for electric appliances that are not honored.

From a temporal perspective, the majority of complaints in Queretaro occur in August right before school starts when consumers spend heavily on school tuition, books, uniforms, and other related expenses. In December consumers are more likely to complain about toys and unjustified price increases during the Christmas season.

There is not much information on consumer complaining behavior other than that offered by the PROFECO. Most consumer behavior literature found on the subject in Mexico is translated from foreign authors, mostly from the United States. Since there are no journals published in the country like *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research* or *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, original material published in Mexico on the subject of CCB is not readily available.

Role of Market Structure on Complaining Behavior. The lack of consumer complaining behavior in Mexico may result from the fact that a number of large companies enjoy monopoly market positions. Both the telephone company (Telmex), and Pemex, the state owned oil company, are legal monopolies. There are other virtual monopolies in Mexico like Bimbo (bread), and Gerber (baby food).

These companies do promise certain service and quality but they have no direct incentives to provide consumers with an opportunity for registering complaints or to make consumer-friendly responses when complaining does occur.

For consumers, switching to another source is only a limited option. Generally, if there is another company that sells the same product or service, it too offers about the same quality, price, and service levels. Therefore, consumers may feel there is no purpose in leaving one business for another.

There are companies who actively attempt to generate customer satisfaction; mostly transnational companies like Kellogg's, Coca-Cola, and New Holland who have a corporate culture of responding to consumer concerns. Most Mexican companies don't have mechanisms to deal with consumer complaints.

Mexico has had an economy dominated by scarcity where people were conditioned to purchase what was available. As a consequence some suppliers of products and services choose not to provide quality products or services to the customer. Many believed that they did not have to respond if people complained. In addition, prior to NAFTA, the central government controlled foreign products entering the Mexican market. This situation suppressed competition so manufacturers and providers of services were not forced to improve their offerings to compete with others selling similar products or services.

The Role of Culture in Complaint Behavior.

Latin American markets have experienced much change in the last 50 years. Besides integrating new ideas and attitudes from other countries, Latinos (a term that is not much in favor in Mexico) have learned to accept new products, services, and ways of doing business. This process has been difficult for Latin Americans in general who have a different behavioral frame of reference than those of most North American/ European cultures (Strahle, Hernandez, Garcia and Sorensen, 1992; Villareal-Camacho 1983). Part of this difficulty can be explained by the dimensions articulated by Hofstede's Cultural Typology: power distance, individualism, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance. Mexico scored high on power distance

(81), low on individualism (30), high on masculinity (69) and high on uncertainty avoidance (82) (Hofstede 1991 and 2001).

Placed in a consumerist context, cultures with *high power distance* acknowledge or even expect that power will be distributed unevenly amongst members of society. This disparity means many consumers would not expect to challenge corporations or even merchants when poor quality goods and services were provided. Complaining would be viewed as a futile effort since those without power are not entitled to redress or even acknowledgement by those with more social power.

People in individualistic cultures are primarily concerned with their own interests. They act on their own and are less concerned about the harmony of the society. It is acceptable to let their complaints be heard by others; there is no shame in expressing their feelings in public. In *collectivist* cultures, members' "attitudes toward events, actors, and objects depend on how they relate to the individuals' needs to belong..." (Lui and McClure, 2001). Collectivist culture members interact closely within a group, the in-group, which is defined as "...family and friends and other people concerned with my welfare..." (Triandis, 1995). Most information is kept within the in-group and there is not much interchange of information with out-groups. When negative emotions are to be expressed they are done in the intimacy of family and friends.. Collectivist cultures will avoid interaction with out-groups, which could be the complaint department in a store (Triandis, 1995).

In *masculine* societies, the men are expected to be more assertive, competitive and concerned with material success while women are expected to be more nurturing. In the marketplace, this suggests that men would be more likely than women to complain as this is an assertive behavior that concerns redressing economic matters or regaining loss of esteem.

The fourth dimension, *uncertainty avoidance*, has to do with the extent to which members of a society are uncomfortable with unclear, ambiguous, or unstructured situations. Since there is no tradition of consumer complaining and consumer satisfaction in Mexico, the outcome of complaining would be an uncertain event and thus something to be avoided.

These cultural characteristics are all evident in the following study of postpurchase CCB among adult Mexican retail consumers.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study is an exploratory investigation into the consumer complaining intentions of dissatisfied Mexican consumers under a variety of purchase conditions. Liu and McClure (2001) expressed the importance of understanding different cultures influences for businesses that want to go global. With information from this study, companies and researchers can know what to expect and how to deal with a different type of consumer than that of a developed country like the United States.

It is of particular interest to understand CCB in emerging economies (underdeveloped countries) because of the potential global impact these countries will have on long term demand for a variety of retail goods and services. Most of the population in developing nations is very young; in Mexico 50% of the population is under 25 years old.

INVESTIGATION SITE

The following study examined consumer complaint behavior in the state of Queretaro in the Bajio region of Mexico. The state capital, also called Queretaro, was believed to be quite representational of the emerging but still somewhat undeveloped Mexican economy. Queretaro is in the center of the country, well away from the U.S. border, resort towns and the mega-cities where consumer responses would be more likely to reflect outside influences. It is a middle-class, industrial city of 700,000 where retailers like Costco, Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's, and Blockbuster have their place along with international manufacturing companies, such as General Electric, Massey Ferguson, Gerber Products, New Holland, Meritor, Daewoo, and Kellogg's de Mexico. Mexican national industries like Pemex, Telefonos de Mexico, Vitro, and Mabe are also found there. Manufacturing activity focuses on food processing (dairy products, canned fruit and vegetables, baby foods), as well as chemical (fertilizers), automotive, and farm vehicle industries. The city of Queretaro

contains a good cross section of the general population of Mexico, and supports three major economic sectors: agriculture, industry and services.

METHODOLOGY

The research method used is a close replication of CCB studies presented by Slama and Williams (1991), Rogers, Ross & Williams (1992), and Huang (1994). As in the original studies, all published in the *JCS/D&CB*; consumers were given a survey describing four different purchasing scenarios, each with a noticeable element that would cause dissatisfaction with the purchased good or service. Consumers then evaluated seven specified complaining behaviors they would likely pursue in each scenario using a five-point probability or intention scale (see Survey Questionnaire). A score of +2 means it was a *very likely* response, +1 means *somewhat likely*, 0 means *not very likely*, -1 means *unlikely*, and -2 means *very unlikely*.

Likelihood responses were recorded for all seven behavioral responses because consumers often engage in multiple acts when facing a dissatisfying purchase situation. Six of the seven behaviors were active responses such as telling friends or family. The remaining behavior was passive in that the customer indicated the likelihood that they would "Do Nothing" in response to a dissatisfying purchase experience. The likelihood score of this behavior must be numerically interpreted in reverse to be consistent with the other behavioral likelihoods. For example, the consumer who is *very likely* (i.e. +2.0) to "Do Nothing" is also the same person who is *very unlikely* (i.e. -2.0) "to tell friends and family."

In many respects, these response choices, e.g. stopping patronage or complaining; approximate those reflected in the body of Albert Hirschman's book, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Hirschman (1970) introduced *Exit* as the behavior of switching from an unsatisfactory offering to one that is more satisfying. Remaining a customer but complaining in various forms was called *Voice*. In either case, the seller should examine the reasons that customers exit and listen to their complaints. A positive response to both should increase customer *Loyalty*. Hirschman's work is generally viewed as a manifesto for

improving customer retention and satisfaction although it was normed on U.S. cultural values and not those found in other countries (see for example, Ping 1993).

All of the product purchase scenarios used were quite similar to those proposed by Huang (1994), but adapted to products and services that most Mexicans use. An examination of Table 3B suggests that, for validating research results, dissatisfaction with each of these products or services generated a unique set of responses. The scenario adaptations for the subject market are discussed below:

The fast food used in the above mentioned studies was changed to a typical Mexican food that people buy to take home. Mexican fast food differs from United States style fast food. Mexicans stop by street vendors to eat tacos, tortas or other typical foods right on the spot or to take them home. What is known to U.S. consumers as a fast food restaurant (McDonald's, Kentucky Fried Chicken and Dominos Pizza) in Mexico is quite expensive and people go to them more as a treat than as a convenience. For this question the fast food restaurant was changed to a torta (a type of hot sandwich) stand.

The toaster in the original studies was replaced by a television. It is an appliance of much broader household application than a toaster as toasted bread is typically not an important part of the food menu in Mexico.

The use of a jacket and an auto repair service in this instance did not change from the original study. However, it is important to note that textiles are readily available and relatively inexpensive in Mexico, thus the jacket example was written to ensure that it was a shopping good as planned in the research design. Auto repair in Queretaro is a high risk service purchase because there are fewer standards and there are many independent mechanics who may not have the expertise or tools needed to complete a repair. Also, the cost of auto repair is usually negotiated afterwards which greatly increases the probability of dissatisfaction.

Reference prices used for the jacket and the auto repair were in the high average range to ensure that perceived economic loss would be a contributing factor in complaint behavior. Torta prices were not mentioned as tortas are an inexpensive item. TV

prices were not mentioned either as televisions are widely available in many price ranges and are readily found in most households.

The research questionnaire was developed with information obtained from two group sessions with people of both sexes, different ages groups, and three different social classes. All session participants were able to easily relate to the test products or services. Product prices used in the study were based on actual market values.

THE SAMPLE

One hundred and eighty consumers were interviewed using a stratified sampling technique. Since shopping malls are not yet as common in Mexico as in the U.S., a "street intercept" (rather than a mall-intercept) technique was used to obtain respondents. In terms of gender, 93 were men (52%) and 87 were women (48%). Fifty-two percent of the total interviews are from the lower classes, 39% from the middle class, and 9% from the upper class. These percentages represent the approximate distribution of social classes in the country of Mexico (INEGI). The majority of the interviews were given to people between 20 and 40, this is not a surprise since the majority of the Mexican population is under 25 year old (see Table 1). The majority of the interviews were given to consumers with a low income, followed by fewer in the medium income range, and even less with higher income levels (See Tables 2A and 2B). This approximates the distribution of incomes within the general population (INEGI). Most respondents (over 90%) indicated that they had engaged in consumer complaint behavior at least one time over the previous six month period (see Table 3A) suggesting they were familiar with their complaining options.

The questionnaire (see Attachment 1) was only administered to people that were economically active. People with incomes usually spend money and have positive or negative reactions to their purchases. Students in Mexico typically aren't employed--depending instead on allowances from their families--so most buy cheap products that they suspect are of low quality anyway. Students are not as likely to complain so they were not interviewed in this study.

Table 1
Age Distribution of Respondents by Sex

	Women	Men	Overall
20-30	46%	53%	49%
31-40	30%	22%	26%
41-50	7%	14%	11%
51-60	7%	4%	6%
61-70	5%	4%	4%
over 70	6%	3%	4%

Table 2A
Monthly Income

\$155-311	58%
312-466	
467-778	
779-1555	26%
over 1556	16%
	100%

Table 2B
Monthly Income by Sex

	Women	Men
\$155-311	70%	46%
322-466		
467-778		
779-1555	21%	31%
over 1556	9%	23%

Table 3A
Frequency of CCB During the Last 6 Months

	Women	Men	Overall
1 time	33%	26%	29%
2 times	26%	16%	21%
3 times	18%	24%	21%
4 times	7%	11%	9%
more than 5	9%	14%	12%
None	6%	10%	8%
	100%	100%	100%

RESULTS

General CCB

In response to the questions about general, i.e. non-product specific, complaining behavior (Table 4A, first column), respondents indicated that it was *not very likely* (-0.38) that they would "Do Nothing" when dissatisfied with a purchase. When given six action choices, "Telling Family and Friends," i.e. negative word of mouth communication, was the most likely manner by which consumers would voice their dissatisfaction. "Stop Buying" was second in terms of likelihood ranking but neither of these two choices registered as high as *somewhat likely* (i.e. +1.0) on the five point scale used in the study. Complaining to the store was *not very likely* (-0.38). More formalized complaining measures (subsequently called higher order CCB; those that involved third parties such as writing a newspaper or contacting PROFECO) had a much lower likelihood of occurring, approaching *very unlikely* (range of -1.62 to -1.81).

Table 4B elaborates on these basic findings using frequency distributions. Almost 50% (79/180) were *somewhat or very unlikely* to Do Nothing. While this establishes a baseline of respondents wishing to complain, their intended actions were mostly limited to two behaviors. In particular, it shows that roughly 80% of the respondents would be

Table 3B
Frequency of Complaint Factors by Product

FACTORS CONSIDERED WHEN COMPLAINING				
Torta	Jacket	Repair	TV	
36%	25%	20%	20%	The importance that the product has to purchaser
29%	30%	28%	16%	The price paid
24%	28%	29%	17%	Fulfillment of expectations
11%	16%	23%	47%	How dissatisfied purchaser feels

Table 3C
Frequency of Complaint Factors by Product and Sex

FACTORS CONSIDERED WHEN COMPLAINING BY SEX								
Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	
Torta		Jacket		Repair		TV		
40%	32%	28%	23%	16%	23%	16%	24%	The importance that the product has to purchaser
27%	31%	31%	29%	28%	29%	16%	15%	The price paid
23%	24%	25%	32%	32%	26%	18%	16%	Fulfillment of expectations
10%	13%	16%	16%	24%	23%	49%	45%	How dissatisfied purchaser feels
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Table 4A
Mean CCB Response Scores by All Purchases and by Specific Purchases

	General Purchases	Torta	Jacket	Car Repair	Television
Do Nothing	(0.38)	(0.67)	(0.57)	(0.69)	(0.84)
Stop Buying at that Store	0.51	0.48	1.12	1.36	1.09
Tell Family and Friends	0.83	0.68	1.19	1.35	1.42
Complain to Store	(0.38)	0.43	0.25	1.17	1.23
Complain to PROFECO	(1.62)	(1.79)	(1.36)	(0.81)	(0.20)
Write Newspaper	(1.79)	(1.82)	(1.81)	(1.73)	(1.61)
Contact Lawyer	(1.81)	(1.91)	(1.77)	(1.70)	(1.62)

Note: Use scale of +2 *Very Likely* to -2 *Very Unlikely* whenever mean CCB scores are reported. "Do Nothing" should be interpreted in reverse, e.g. -1.0 would mean, "it is unlikely that I would do nothing" about an unsatisfactory purchase." Mean CCB scores are rounded to the nearest whole number for discussion purposes, e.g. 1.37 would be *somewhat likely*.

Table 4B
CCB Frequency by Likelihood

GENERAL CCB FREQUENCY						
	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	9	22	70	50	29	180
Stop buying	36	57	57	19	11	180
Tell family and friends	61	56	40	14	7	178
Complain to store	18	31	41	47	43	180
Complaint to PROFECO	4	7	11	22	140	180
Write to newspaper	1	4	5	9	160	179
Contact a lawyer	4	1	4	11	160	180

Table 4C
Mean CCB Likelihood Scores by Sex - All Purchases

	Men	Women
Do Nothing	(0.34)	(0.41)
Stop Buying at Store	0.58	0.43
Tell Family and Friends	0.73	0.93
Complain to Store	(0.09)	(0.70)
Complaint to PROFECO	(1.62)	(1.62)
Write to Newspaper	(1.82)	(1.77)
Contact a Lawyer	(1.78)	(1.83)

very unlikely to involve third parties in their CCB and that even complaining to the store was not a very popular option; just 27% (49/180) were *very or somewhat likely* to do that. About one-half of all respondents (93/180) would be *very or somewhat likely* to stop buying in response to a dissatisfying purchase.

Mean CCB likelihood scores varied across each of the four products used in the study (Table 4A, columns 2-5). When comparing the mean CCB of individual products to the mean CCB of General Purchases, respondents indicated a greater likelihood of lower order complaining about specific products in most cases. Apparently, visualizing dissatisfaction with a specific product in a research setting is more

likely to prompt complaining behavior compared to a set of nonspecified products. The overall CCB pattern for the four products followed a typical level-of-consumer-involvement hierarchy. The propensity to complain tended to increase with the significance of the purchase. This relationship was anchored by the convenience good (torta) at the low end of concern, moving to the shopping good (jacket), then the service (car repair) and then the durable good (television). However, the likelihood of complaining to a third party about any of the four products was still quite low.

When asked what factors would trigger CCB for each product (Table 3B), no clear causal relationships emerged. A generalized sense of

Table 5
Likelihood of Specific CCB by Sex - All Purchases

	SPECIFIC COMPLAINT BEHAVIORS									
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Not Very Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	3%	6%	15%	10%	37%	41%	26%	29%	18%	14%
Stop buying	16%	24%	33%	31%	33%	30%	11%	10%	6%	5%
Tell family and friends	33%	35%	38%	25%	20%	24%	7%	10%	2%	6%
Complain to store	3%	16%	13%	20%	22%	24%	34%	18%	28%	22%
Complaint to Profeco	1%	0%	5%	3%	3%	9%	13%	11%	78%	77%
Write to newspaper	1%	0%	3%	1%	0	6%	8%	2%	87%	90%
Contact a lawyer	2%	1%	0	2%	0	3%	8%	4%	90%	89%

Note: Multiple responses are possible for any purchase; columns do not add up to 100%. Rows are equal to 100% if women and men are added separately.

Table 6
Mean CCB Scores by Age and Sex - All Purchases

	21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61 and Above	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Stop Buying	.38	.69	.35	.50	.83	.77	.67	1.50	.34	.00
Tell Family	.93	.94	.85	.55	1.00	1.08	.50	1.50	1.66	(.50)
Tell Store	(.93)	(.16)	(.23)	(.10)	(1.33)	0.31	(1.00)	.75	(1.00)	(1.68)
Tell Profeco	(1.43)	(1.59)	(1.73)	(1.60)	(2.00)	(1.54)	(2.00)	(.50)	(1.91)	(2.00)
Write Paper	(1.58)	(1.73)	(1.92)	(2.00)	(1.83)	(1.85)	(2.00)	(1.50)	(2.00)	(2.00)
Get Lawyer	(1.53)	(1.67)	(2.00)	(1.80)	(2.00)	(1.92)	(2.00)	(1.25)	(2.00)	(2.00)

Note: The last two age groups were collapsed due to small cell size. Mean CCB is weighted average of both groups.

Table 7
Mean CCB Scores by Income and Sex - All Purchases

	\$155-311		\$312-466		\$467-778		\$779-1,555		Over \$1,556	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Stop Buying	.50	.30	.33	.50	.88	.20	.62	.61	.38	.63
Tell Family	.45	1.06	.83	1.13	1.0	.45	.97	1.06	1.14	1.25
Tell Store	(.85)	(.85)	(.33)	(1.50)	(.53)	(.75)	.24	(.72)	.29	.25
Tell PROFECO	(1.6)	(1.64)	(1.50)	(1.88)	(1.59)	(1.65)	(1.62)	(1.89)	(1.52)	(.88)
Write Paper	(1.90)	(1.76)	(1.83)	(2.00)	(1.88)	(1.85)	(1.69)	(1.89)	(1.81)	(1.13)
Get Lawyer	(1.75)	(1.82)	(1.67)	(2.00)	(1.71)	(1.80)	(1.79)	(1.89)	(1.71)	(1.13)

dissatisfaction (bottom row, Table 3B) reflected the widest wide range of percentage responses (11% to 47%) but even this was not indicative of cause and effect. When the complaint factors were examined by sex and product (Table 3C), there were still no observable relationships. This suggests that the

causes of CCB and subsequent remedies must be approached on a product by product basis.

General Complaining by Sex, Age, and Income

When general complaining behavior was

examined by sex, men consistently reported a higher number of complaints (3 times or more) over a 6 month period than women (Table 3A). Men were slightly less likely than women to Do Nothing Table 4C). In regards to the type of general complaining behavior for all purchases (Table 4C), men were more likely to Stop Buying at the Store or to Complain to the Store. Women were more likely to Tell Friends and Family. The mean scores for both sexes were below the *somewhat likely* level for lower order CCBs. They approached *very unlikely* (-1.62 to -.183) in terms of higher order CCBs for both sexes.

When mean likelihood scores are disaggregated (Table 5), the data again suggests that sex of the respondents had little effect upon the occurrence of each specific CCB although small differences can be noted. These are the same patterns that were observable in Table 4C. As before, neither sex wanted to complain to third parties like the PROFECO, a newspaper, or a lawyer.

Sex was crossed with Age (Table 6) and then with Income (Table 7) to produce two tables of response likelihood scores. Younger males and females (i.e. under 30 years of age) are *somewhat likely* to tell their friends and family, but otherwise are not very active complainers (Table 6). Between 31-40, Tell friends and family is still *somewhat likely* by males and marginally so for females. Other forms are *not very likely*. Between 41-60, both men and women are *somewhat likely* to stop buying from the seller/manufacturer and to tell friends and family. Women in this age group are more likely than men to Tell the Store about an unsatisfactory purchase. Female CCB declines rather markedly after age 60 to lower levels. In contrast, men seem more willing to maintain a complaining posture—although a low profile one—past age 60. Neither sex seems inclined to involve third parties in CCB at any age.

Choosing the “Stop Buying” option approached the *somewhat likely* stage (range of 0.20 to 0.88) across all sex-income combinations (Table 7). There was more variance for both the “Tell friends and family” and “Tell the store.” choices. The latter CCB responses are generally positively correlated with increases in income for men, the same is not true for women. The highest likelihood CCB levels

of taking action and complaining are associated with incomes over \$1,556 per month.

Complaining Behavior Associated with Specific Products

Results found in the last set of tables (Table 8) should be combined with Table 4A for interpretation. The unsatisfactory car repair and the unsatisfactory television set evoked fairly consistent and likely intentions to “Stop buying at that store”, to “Tell friends and family” and to “Complain to the store.” The torta and the jacket evoked lower CCB intentions. This would be consistent with the theory of consumer involvement. Only the television was deemed important enough to involve a third party and that was not very likely (-0.20) to occur. Individual findings are described below:

Tortas. Regarding the convenience good, the torta, respondents approached the position of being *somewhat unlikely* (0.67) that they would Do Nothing (see Table 4). Some would stop buying that particular food, talk to family and friends about their experience, or complain to the store but all of these responses (0.48 and 0.68 and 0.43 respectively) were mostly lower for tortas than any of the other three products. It is interesting that respondents apparently wanted to complain about an unsatisfactory torta, but in reality they did not do very much about it. Tortas are purchased mainly from transient street vendors where CCB is more difficult to implement.

Damaged Jacket. When responding about the shopping good, the jacket with a ripped shoulder, respondents tended toward complaining action; they were *somewhat unlikely* (0.57) to Do Nothing. It was *somewhat likely* that they would stop patronizing the store that sold the jacket and tell friends and family (1.12 and 1.1.9 respectively) about their dissatisfaction. Again, taking stronger action was not indicated, with Complain to store being *not very likely* (0.25) and the other responses being *very unlikely* (range of -1.36 to -1.81).

Car Repair. Regarding the intangible service repairs, many respondents indicated that they would register their complaints about the car repair by not

Table 8
Frequency of CCB for Each Product Used in the Study

FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC CCB FOR JACKET PURCHASE						
	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	12%	8%	21%	28%	31%	100%
Stop buying	49%	27%	14%	8%	2%	100%
Tell family and friends	53%	26%	13%	6%	3%	100%
Complain to store	49%	34%	38%	34%	25%	100%
Complaint to PROFECO	7%	11%	13%	27%	42%	100%
Write to newspaper	4%	2%	5%	7%	82%	100%
Contact a lawyer	2%	4%	7%	7%	80%	100%

FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC CCB FOR FAST FOOD PURCHASE						
	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	9%	8%	24%	21%	37%	100%
Stop buying	34%	22%	17%	14%	13%	100%
Tell family and friends	39%	23%	17%	8%	12%	100%
Complain to store	36%	19%	13%	16%	16%	100%
Complaint to PROFECO	2%	1%	3%	7%	88%	100%
Write to newspaper	2%	2%	2%	3%	92%	100%
Contact a lawyer	0%	2%	1%	2%	95%	100%

FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC CCB FOR AUTO REPAIR						
	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	18%	6%	12%	18%	47%	100%
Stop buying	62%	14%	13%	7%	4%	100%
Tell family and friends	62%	21%	10%	5%	2%	100%
Complain to store	63%	12%	9%	8%	7%	100%
Complaint to PROFECO	16%	8%	11%	12%	54%	100%
Write to newspaper	1%	2%	4%	7%	86%	100%
Contact a lawyer	3%	1%	6%	4%	86%	100%

FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC CCB FOR TV PURCHASE						
	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely	
Do nothing	14%	5%	15%	13%	52%	100%
Stop buying	50%	24%	15%	8%	3%	100%
Tell family and friends	62%	23%	11%	3%	1%	100%
Complain to store	62%	15%	12%	7%	4%	100%
Complaint to PROFECO	29%	8%	14%	8%	39%	100%
Write to newspaper	6%	1%	4%	6%	83%	100%
Contact a lawyer	4%	3%	6%	2%	85%	100%

going back to the mechanic and telling family members and friends about their negative experience. It was also *somewhat likely* that they would complain to the provider of the service. There also are some that would involve the PROFECO, but the majority still didn't consider third parties (PROFECO, newspapers and lawyers) to be an

appropriate vehicle in their complaint behavior.

Television. As for the durable TV purchase, there was a stronger tendency to want to complain; it was *somewhat unlikely* that they would Do nothing when dissatisfied (0.84). Three quarters of the respondents were *somewhat or very likely* to stop

buying the product in question and complain to the store. Negative word of mouth communications would be used more often for the television than the other three products, however, it didn't reach as high as *very likely*. Still there was only a very weak tendency to complain to the PROFECO or involve other third parties.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Finding One. Respondents consistently preferred not to involve third parties in their complaint behavior. On the surface, this suggests a very serious consumer lack of confidence in government and business

This result might actually be positive news for U.S. retailers. It means that there is no widespread tradition of resorting to third parties before attempting to gain satisfaction from the seller. This would allow entering retailers to take a proactive approach to generating and capturing consumer complaints. It also suggests that entering retailers should not rely on information from third parties to help them discover areas of customer dissatisfaction or even look for historical CCB trends in third party archives.

Finding Two. About half of the respondents would complain to the offending retailers. Even though there are more businesses competing for business, more products to choose from, and a growing awareness that consumer satisfaction is a reasonable expectation, Mexican consumers are unsure of the effectiveness of complaining. Some even reported it as a waste of time.

This belief might reflect the high power distance found in Mexico. Consumers do not expect that store managers (who have power) will pay much attention to customers (who have no power). In contrast, many U.S. consumers plainly adhere to the "customer is always right" philosophy and U.S. retailers respond accordingly. One of the main priorities of US retailers in Mexico would be to establish credibility in the complaining process. In-store signage or promotions that claim "customer satisfaction guaranteed" is not of much use if the signs are not believed, much less tested for truth.

Finding Three. Complaint behavior in Mexico was most evident in the "negative word of mouth" response. Not only is this the most common response, it is the most damaging response since word of mouth communications are generally highly credible regardless of its veracity. It is important that retailers learn to combat this phenomenon because this type of complaining does not provide them with actionable feedback. Providing an attractive, alternative "voice" is extremely important.

Finding Four. In-group complaining is a strong tendency. Telling friends and family (the in-group) is very consistent with behavior in a collectivist culture. Mexico is a collectivist culture, where most people act on behalf of their social group instead of acting for themselves as in an individualistic culture. This is the group that can be trusted, retailers (the out-group) cannot. Having to complain to the business or to a third party means that the consumer has to get involved with an out-group who is not part of their social group.

Given this tendency to engage in negative word of mouth complaining instead of confronting the provider or using third parties as intermediaries, US retailers have two choices: (a) establish themselves as part of the "in-group" through calculated relationship marketing or (b) teach younger consumers that individualistic behavior is acceptable; perhaps by demonstrating that the entire social unit will benefit when retailers are given a chance to compensate for unfulfilled expectations. However, the latter course of action would require very diligent attention to a customer satisfaction program. Unfortunately, this is a pattern that will be difficult for retailers to change since it is a culturally ingrained behavior.

Finding Five. Not returning to the business is also a tendency. The survey results showed that dissatisfied respondents would be *somewhat likely* (0.51) to stop buying at an establishment or using a particular service for all but the tortas.

The nature of complaining behavior about the tortas might be a bit puzzling to US retailers. These results appear to be related to structural variables rather than complaining variables. In Mexico there is quite a bit of informal commerce generated by

street vendors and at informal markets i.e. tianguis. When consumers buy on the street and are unsatisfied with their purchase, it is difficult to go back and complain since a street vendor changes places, and some markets are set up only on certain days. The consumer is left with no guarantee that they will again find the vendor, or that they will get any response to their complaint since there is no invoice, receipt, or any written form that proves that the product was bought from a particular vendor. Likewise, there is little information to provide to friends and family. This also explains, at least in part, why third party involvement is the least likely in the case of tortas. Since US fast food retailers are likely to be franchisees with fixed retail locations and hours of operation, consumer CCB should be greatly facilitated if complaint initiation and service recovery programs are implemented.

However, it should be noted that the typical Mexican household spends about one-third of its income on food; much more than in the US. Any unsatisfactory food purchase is likely to be of more significance in this environment than in the United States. Food retailers should take appropriate steps to deal with this reality.

Not returning to a business after an unsatisfying purchasing experience does not favor the retailers seeking return patronage. This form of "silent withdrawal" response leaves retailers with no feedback about the sources of consumer dissatisfaction, loss of future revenues from that customer, and with the cost of replacing a lost customer with a new one. Retailers should implement mechanisms to encourage consumers to let them know what made them unhappy, so that services and products can be improved. Also, they need to train retail employees on how to handle complaints from customers in a manner that will encourage consumers to voice their dissatisfaction.

Finding Six. Younger shoppers are more likely to complain than older shoppers but still follow the example of their elders. As a culture, Mexicans do considerable talking but take little action, unless the matter is of great importance and there is a high probability of success; likely an adjunct of uncertainty avoidance. This has been explained as follows:

For a long time, Mexicans were restricted to hardly any competition among brands or companies. They got used to complaining to family and friends since they knew that little would be done by businesses. People, especially younger ones, are starting to understand that complaining will lead to results, especially when they hear favorable comments on resolutions that the PROFECO has obtained. But generally, it is not yet a habit for people to believe that if they complain they will get an answer. It seems that young people follow the customs of their elders, not complaining directly to the store, manager, or manufacturer, or to third parties. Like older people, they complain by negative word of mouth (Hernandez 2001).

Retailers who can provide convincing evidence of their good will in resolving complaints, particularly among younger shoppers, should be able to establish store loyalty. This will require careful management of a system that encourages complaining among young shoppers and resolves them in a prompt, effective manner. Effective recovery from complaints generally results in a more loyal customer and protecting the lifetime income stream that would be generated by that customer.

Finding Seven. Not surprisingly, it appears that higher price of and/or higher involvement with the product or service, e.g., television and car repair, increases the chances that consumers will complain. Mexican consumers tend to plan for such purchases. Food and textiles are relatively inexpensive goods on a per unit basis and thus are not as involving as the more important television (social role) or car repair (performance and financial risk). The television and auto repair are important purchases. Consumers give thought to what they are going to buy and take the time to study the characteristics of these higher cost items. The likelihood of telling friends and family, complaining to the store, and stopping buying is noticeably higher for both of these products. This behavior is similar to that found in Mexican-American consumers when they are not satisfied with their more expensive purchases. (Cornwell and Bligh 1991). However, third party involvement was still quite unlikely. Retailers can

respond to this finding in two different ways: the first is to determine which goods are more likely to be high involvement purchases and take particular efforts to encourage CCB so that consumer problems can be addressed for these items. The second course is to teach consumers that satisfaction can and should be obtained for all types of goods, not just those that are the most important purchases.

Finding Eight. Consumer complaining behavior is not strongly correlated with sex of the respondent. In general, Mexico would be classified as a masculine-oriented society but because women do much of the shopping, the typical male dominance patterns are not as prevalent in CCB. Therefore, American retailers should direct their customer relationship management programs at women as well as men.

The findings of this study clearly demonstrate that American retailers should not simply export an American style customer satisfaction program into Mexico. Any such program should reflect the structural and cultural differences found between these two markets. By using the results from this study, U.S. retailers should be in a much better position to formulate an effective customer relationship management program among its Mexican customers.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY

Any time behavioral intentions are used as a proxy for behavior, there is an opportunity for misrepresentation of actual market phenomenon. However, trying to find a sample of Mexican retail consumers with an identical set of four disappointing purchase situations would be nearly impossible. Replication of this study with a different marketbasket of goods and services would help validate these descriptive findings. Income, age, and gender were all considered but because of the skewed distribution of age and income in Mexico, only small samples were available above age 40 and a monthly income above \$700. Subdivision by gender would have made them even smaller. Further studies would need to have much larger samples and/or highly stratified samples to provide valid statistical tests of significance using these variables.

This study provides a platform for further studies; particularly comparative studies with other underdeveloped countries in Hofstede's typology (1981). Also, it could be redefined for a specific product or service that a company is interested in promoting globally. Understanding consumer complaint behavior from different cultures will lead to a better understanding of consumer satisfaction and help develop effective strategies to better serve customers.

REFERENCES

- Allen, Paul (2001), "Business Complaint Sites Give Consumers Room to Vent," *Business Journal*, 15, 1-2.
- Bearden, William and Jesse Teel (1983), "Selected Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaint Reports," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20 (February), 21-8.
- Best, Roger J. (2004), *Market-Based Management, 3rd Edition*, (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- Broadbridge, Adelina and Julie Marshall (1995), "Consumer Complaint Behavior: The Case of Electrical Goods," *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 23, 9-11.
- Churchill, Gilbert and Carol Suprenant (1982), "An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19, 491-504.
- Cornwell, T. B. and A. D. Bligh (1991), "Complaint Behavior of Mexican-American Consumers to a Third Party," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 25 (1), 1, 18.
- Day, Ralph (1980), "Research Perspectives on Consumer Complaining Behavior," in *Theoretical Developments in Marketing*, C. Lamb and P. Dunne (eds.), Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association, 211-215.
- Day, Ralph and E. Laird Landon, Jr. (1977), "Towards a Theory of Consumer Complaining Behavior," in *Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior*, A. Woodside, J. Sheth, and P. Bennett (eds.), Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Francese, Peter (1993), "A New Land of Opportunity," *American Demographics*, 15, (6), 2-3.
- Frastaci, Mona (1999), "Approaching Mexican Retailers," *Apparel Industry*, 60, (5), 26-30.
- Green, Paula (1997), "Two US Retailers Expand Their Presence in Mexico," *Journal of Commerce*, (October 21), 7A.
- Hernandez, Mariana (2001), E-mail interview from Mexico (May).
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert (1991), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (New York: McGraw-Hill), 53, 68, 84 and 113.
- Hofstede, Geert (1981), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing*

- Values, Behavior, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications).
- Hofstede, Geert (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behavior, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd Ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications), 502.
- Huang, Jen-Hung (1994), "National Character and Purchase Dissatisfaction Response," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 7, 257-266.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e Informática (INEGI) (2001), INEGI provides geographic, demographic and economic information of Mexico. Basic Tabulations. United Mexican States, *XII General Census of Population and Dwelling*, Mexico.
- Krapfel, R. E. (1985), "A Consumer Complaint Strategy: Antecedents and Outcomes," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, E. Hirschman and M. Holbrook (eds.), Ann Arbor: MI: Association for Consumer Research, XII, 346-350.
- Landon, E. Laird (1977), "A Model of Consumer Complaint Behavior," in *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Ralph Day (ed.), Symposium Proceedings, School of Business, University of Indiana, Bloomington, IN: 20-22.
- Liu, Raymond and Peter McClure (2001), "Recognizing Cross-Cultural Differences in Consumer Complaint Behavior and Intentions: An Empirical Examination," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18, 54-74.
- Lovelock, Christopher (2001), *Services Marketing*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 166.
- Oliver, Richard (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460-469.
- Palacios, Mario (2001), Sub-Director of PROFECO, Personal Interviews in Queretaro, Mexico, (September).
- Peters, Tom (1988), *Thriving on Chaos*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Ping, Robert (1993), "The Effects of Satisfaction and Structural Constraints on Retailer Exiting, Voice, Loyalty, Opportunism, and Neglect," *Journal of Retailing*, (Fall), 320-352.
- Rangel, Enrique (2000), "Wal-Mart is Grande," *San Diego Union-Tribune*, June 2, C-1.
- Richins, Marsha (1983), "Negative Word of Mouth by Dissatisfied Consumers: A Pilot Study," *Journal of Marketing*, Winter, 69.
- Rogers, John C., Ross Steven and Terrell Williams (1992), "Personal Values and Purchase Dissatisfaction Response," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 5, 81-92.
- Singh, Jagdip (1988), "Consumer Complaint Intentions and Behavior: Definitional and Taxonomical Issues," *Journal of Marketing*, 52, (January), 93-107.
- Slama, Mark and Terrell Williams (1991), "Consumer Interaction Styles and Purchase Complaint Intentions," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 4, 167-174.
- Strahle, William, Sigredo Hernandez, Hector Garcia and Robert Sorensen (1992), "A Study of Consumer Complaining Behavior: VCR Owners in Puerto Rico," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, 5, 179-191.
- Triandis, Harry (1995), *Individualism and Collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triplett, Tim (1994), "Middle-Class Mexicans Share Traits with U.S. Counterparts," *Marketing News*, 28 (21), 8.
- Tse, David and Peter Wilton (1988), "Models of Consumer Satisfaction Formation: An Extension," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 204-212.
- Vavra Terry G (1997), *Improving Your Measurement of Customer Satisfaction*, New Jersey: ASQC Quality Press, 24-26.
- Villarreal-Camacho, A (1983). "Consumer Complaint Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," *American Marketing Association Educators Proceedings*, 68-73.
- Woodruff, Robert, Ernest Cadotte, and Roger Jenkins (1983), "Modeling Consumer Satisfaction Processes Using Experience-Based Norms," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 296-304.
- Yelkur, Rama (2000), "Consumer Perceptions of Generic Products: A Mexican Study," *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 9, (7), 446-456.

Send correspondence regarding this article to:

Douglas L. Fugate
1 Big Red Way
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101 U.S.A.
email: douglas.fugate@wku.edu

Appendix Survey Instrument

1. Indicate the frequency with which you complain when dissatisfied with a purchase or service: (Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions by circling a number to the right of the item using the following scale)

+2 Very likely +1 Somewhat likely 0 Not very likely -1 Somewhat Unlikely -2 Very unlikely

Do nothing about the incident

Stop buying at the store/using the service/ buying the brand

Tell family and friends about your bad experience

Complain to the business manager and/or complain to the manufacturer

Complain to the PROFECO
 Write to a newspaper
 Contact a lawyer or take legal action.

2. Imagine that last week you purchased a jacket for \$50.00. This week the shoulder seam ripped out beyond repair. You are certain that it ripped because of poor workmanship and not because of your actions. The store management where you bought the jacket refused to exchange it or refund your money: (Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions by circling a number to the right of the item)

Do nothing about the incident
 Stop buying at the store and/or stop buying the brand
 Tell family and friends about your bad experience
 Complain to the store manager and/or complain to the manufacturer
 Complain to the PROFECO
 Write to a newspaper
 Contact a lawyer or take legal action

3. Assume that you buy a *torta* to take home, You specifically ask that no chile be but on it. After you pay for the *torta*, you realize that there is a lot of chile on it, You tell the clerk, and you are told that nothing will be done for you: (Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions by circling a number to the right of the item)

Do nothing about the incident
 Stop buying at that establishment
 Tell family and friends about your bad experience
 Complain to the person in charge
 Complain to the PROFECO
 Write to a newspaper
 Contact a lawyer or take legal action

4. You take your car into a garage to repair an oil leak. After paying \$150, you notice that the car is still leaking oil. You take the car back, and you are told that they will fix the leak again but at an extra charge: (Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions by circling a number to the right of the item)

Do nothing about the incident
 Stop going to that garage
 Tell family and friends about your bad experience
 Complain to the person in charge
 Complain to the PROFECO
 Write to a newspaper
 Contact a lawyer or take legal action

5. You buy a TV. When you get home you find that there is no sound. At the store where you purchased the TV they tell you that they can't do anything. Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions: (Indicate how likely it is that you would take each of the following actions by circling a number to the right of the item)

Do nothing about the incident
 Stop buying at the store and/or stop buying that
 Tell family and friends about your bad experience
 Complain to the store manager and/or manufacturer
 Complain to the PROFECO
 Write to a newspaper
 Contact a lawyer or take legal action

6. In the last six months, how many times have you complained

1 time _____
 2 times _____
 3 times _____

4 times _____
5 or more 5 times _____

7. When you complain, it depends on: (number from one to four, one being the most important, two second and so forth)

_____ The importance that the product has for you
_____ The price paid
_____ Your expectations of the product/service were not fulfilled
_____ If the product/service does not satisfy your needs
_____ How dissatisfied you feel

8. Female _____ Male _____

9. Your age range

20-30 _____
31-40 _____
41-50 _____
51-60 _____
61-70 _____
71 or more _____

10. Your monthly income range

USD\$155 - 311 _____
322 - 466 _____
467 - 778 _____
779 - 1555 _____
1556 or more _____
