

# CONSUMER PERSONAL VALUES AS ANTECEDENTS TO DYADIC AND THIRD PARTY PUBLIC CONSUMER COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

John C. Rogers, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Terrell G. Williams, California State University, Northridge

## ABSTRACT

In this exploratory study, the Rokeach personal values are studied as possible antecedents to the public consumer complaining process at the dyadic and third party levels. Two hundred eighty-six college students responded to the questionnaire containing the Rokeach value scale and questions on general consumer complaining behavior. Discriminant analysis demonstrated that several value clusters significantly relate to the respondents' propensity to complain.

## INTRODUCTION

Post-purchase activities have received increasing attention in recent years. Focus has been on satisfaction, dissatisfaction, repeat purchasing, post purchase communications, and complaining behavior. Complaining behavior represents an important avenue of study since complaints provide information to companies which may be useful in improving products and services. At the same time, complaints may foster unfavorable attention in the market place and perhaps in the news media. Research on complaining behavior has focused on situation- and product-specific complaints and on the propensity to complain. In this exploratory study we will direct our attention toward the propensity to complain as a general state characteristic of a consumer and personal values as antecedents to the propensity to complain.

## CONSUMER COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR

Consumer complaint behavior (CCB) is defined as "...a set of all behavioral and non-behavioral responses which involves communicating something negative regarding a purchase episode and is triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with that episode" (Singh and Howell 1985, p. 42). Consumers have four fundamental alternatives when they are dissatisfied with a purchase or some aspect of it: (1) Take no action, (2) Discontinue use of the product, (3) Tell friends and others about their problems, (4) Complain to the retailer who sold the product or provided the service or to the manufacturer, (5) Complain to some sort of consumer protection group such as the Better Business Bureau, or (6) take legal action. In essence, complaining behavior has as its purpose communicating dissatisfaction for reasons other than seeking redress (Singh 1988), although redress may accompany stronger forms of complaining. Singh and Howell (1985) classify complaining activities as follows:

No action/action - the degree of complaining activity  
Private/public - telling friends versus telling the seller  
Redress/future behavior - seeking restitution versus simply not buying in the future  
Dyadic/third party - complaint to the seller versus complaint to a consumer action group or court

There appear to be two fundamental schools of thought on the structure of CCB (Singh and Howell 1985). The first suggests that CCB derives directly from the strength of the emotions associated with dissatisfaction without intervening personal or situational factors (Beardon and Teel 1983; Woodruff, Cadotte and Jenkins 1983). The second holds that CCB is a function of numerous situational, product and personal variables that are unrelated to the intensity of dissatisfaction (Day 1984). Empirical evidence (Day 1984) and the fact that a large portion of dissatisfied consumers do not complain (Best and Andreasen 1975; Day and Ash 1979) seem to argue for the second conceptualization.

Just as the degree of satisfaction with products varies widely over situations, products, and individuals (LaTour and Peat 1979), so too, complaining behavior varies widely across these factors (Richens 1983). Situational and product antecedents to complaining include the degree of dissatisfaction (Beardon and Teel 1983, Day 1984; Landon 1977; Lawther, Krishnan and Valle 1979, Oliver 1987; Richens 1987; Swan and Longman 1973), the perceived relative value of complaining (Day and Landon 1977, Richens 1980, 1982), opportunity to complain or ease of complaining (Fornell and Didow 1980; Richens 1987), perceived cause (attribution) for the dissatisfaction (Krishnan and Valle 1979; Richens 1987), previous buying/complaining experience (Day and Landon 1977; Day, et. al. 1981; Day 1984; Grønhaug and Zaltman 1981; Landon 1977; Richens 1982), importance of the purchase (Grønhaug 1977; Richens 1985), degree of monetary loss involved (Gilly and Gelb 1982), type of product (Day and Ash 1979; Day and Bodur 1978; Day, et. al. 1981; Day 1984; Landon 1977; Richens 1987; Summers and Granbois 1977), type of store involved (Day and Landon 1977; Strahle and Day 1985), reputation of the store (Beardon and Mason 1984; Day and Landon 1977; Day 1984; Granbois, Summers and Frazier 1977; Landon 1977; Summers and Granbois 1977), salience of the dissatisfying attribute (Cadotte and Turgeon 1988), prevailing social norms (the acceptability of complaining) (Jacoby and Jaccard 1982), culture/nationality (Richens 1987; Villarel-Camacho 1983), product price (Liefeld, Edgecomb and Wolfe 1975; Richens 1987), and attitude toward the offending firm (Lundstrom, Skelly and Sciglimpaglia 1979).

A number of person-specific antecedents to CCB have been identified. These include personality factors (Fornell and Westbrook 1979; Grabicke, Schaetzle and Staubach 1982; Nantel 1985; Richens 1982, 1987; Zaichkowsky and Liefeld 1977), values (Morganosky and Buckley 1987), the propensity to complain (Day and Landon 1977; Richens 1982), socioeconomic and demographic characteristics (Beardon, Teel and Crockett 1980; Bourgeois and Barnes 1979; Granbois, Summers and Frazier 1977; Grønhaug 1977; Liefeld, Edgecombe and Wolfe 1975; Mason and Himes 1973; Morganosky and Butler 1987; Richens 1982; Strahle and Day 1985; Stokes 1974; Thomas and Shuptrine 1975; Warland, Herrmann

and Willits 1975; Villarel-Camacho 1983), psychographics/lifestyle (Morganosky and Buckley 1987; Wall, Dickey and Talarzyk 1977; Westbrook 1977; Zaichkowsky and Liefeld 1977), degree of consumer alienation (Beardon and Mason 1983), and attitude toward complaining (Beardon, Teel and Crockett 1980; Beardon and Crockett 1981; Day, et. al. 1981; Day 1984; Richens 1982).

**PERSONAL VALUES**

Consumers' personal values have been found to relate to a variety of consumer behaviors (Becker and Conner 1981; D'Onofrio, Slama and Tashchian 1985; Henry 1976; Pitts 1983; Scott and Lamont 1973; Sherrell, Hair and Bush 1984; Williams, Parent and Rogers 1987; Williams and Rogers 1989; Vinson and Gutman 1978; Vinson and Munson 1976; Vinson, Munson and Nakanishi 1976; Vinson, Scott and Lamont 1977). Values are variously defined as needs, beliefs, motives, objects of interest, desires, standards, and social imperatives (Munson 1984). Values consist of beliefs about phenomena that individuals consider to be right, desirable, fair or just (Posner and Munson 1979). They are also described as expressions of people's most basic needs and goals or mental representations of the end states they try to achieve in their lives (Peter and Olsen 1987). Values underlie processes for comparison, establishing standards, judging issues, debating options, planning activities, reaching decisions, resolving differences, and exerting interpersonal influence (Munson 1984).

Rokeach studied values extensively, and his concepts and measurement scale have been widely applied in consumer research (Rokeach 1968; 1973). He identified thirty-six basic human values and divided them into instrumental and terminal categories with eighteen values in each group (See Table 1). Instrumental values relate to one's preferred modes of conduct or behavior, while terminal values are representative of preferred end states of being. Instrumental values are more stable than attitudes, but less stable than terminal values (Howard and Woodside 1984).

From a consumer behavior perspective, terminal values may relate to desired lifestyles or end states arising from buying activities. The character and direction of buying activities may, in turn, be based on instrumental values which relate to the means used to reach the desired end states. Thus the terminal value, "Comfortable Life" may be sought through application of the instrumental value, "Ambitious." Purchases may reflect careful decisions to select the "right" products to reflect the fruits of ambition and the attainment of a comfortable life style. On the other hand the terminal value, "Exciting Life" could be achieved through activities related to the "Imaginative" instrumental value. Travel, luxury items and entertainment consumption could grow from such values.

**PERSONAL VALUES AND COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR**

Attitudes and activities growing out of values are likely to directly affect and define behaviors involving

**Table 1  
Personal Values as Listed by Rokeach**

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

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

complaining about products and services. In particular, consumer values as measured by the Rokeach value scale have been found to be associated with the level of consumer purchasing involvement (D'Onofrio, Slama and Tashchian 1985; Williams, Parent and Rogers 1987) and product involvement (Sherrell, Hair and Bush 1984). Previous research on CCB relative to purchase and

complaining attitudes and importance of purchase (Day, et. al. 1981; Day 1984; Gilly and Gelb 1982 Grønhaug 1977; Landon 1977; Richens 1985; Summers and Granbois 1977) suggests that purchasing involvement and product involvement would likely be associated with complaining behavior (Beardon, Teel and Crockett 1980; Beardon and Crockett 1981; Day, et. al. 1981; Day 1984; Richens 1982). One study of complaining behavior for apparel products applied a personal value schema proposed by Kluckhohn (1951) which describes values as concepts directing selection from possible modes, means and ends of action (Morganosky and Buckley 1987). The authors concluded that complainers value functionality or practicality over aesthetics and aesthetics over fashion or product newness.

In a study applying the Rokeach value system, Prakash (1984) determined that values are antecedents to consumer product expectations. Based on the assertion that product expectations affect consumer satisfaction (Gilly 1980; Granbois, Summers and Frazier 1977; Oliver 1980; Prakash 1981) we would anticipate that personal values would be antecedent to CCB. Prakash (1984, p. 147) gives the causal sequence as: Personal values lead to expectations which lead to confirmation (disconfirmation) of expectations which lead to satisfaction (dissatisfaction). We add to this that dissatisfaction will lead to behavior that may include complaining. Personal values could be expected to influence domain-specific values which relate to product expectations (Vinson, Scott and Lamont 1977). Thus, we suggest that personal values will relate to purchase expectations and to subsequent complaining behavior.

### MEASURING VALUES

Rokeach originally measured values by having respondents rank them. No ties were allowed, forcing respondents to consider each value as more or less important than other values in the scale (Rokeach 1971). Subsequent research has suggested that failure to allow for ties may yield faulty information as many values may be of equal significance to respondents (Gutman and Vinson 1978).

Ranking scales tend to suffer from ipsitivity, that is, the characteristic of scale scores of individuals to be dependent on their own scores for other items in the scale and therefore to be independent of, and not comparable with, the scores of other individuals (Hicks 1970; Ng 1982). Obviously, this limits the usefulness of ranked scales for consumer research. Given the shortcomings of ranking scales, several researchers recommend the use of rating scales. A rating scale is easier to administer and yields results similar to, and often superior to, ranking (Clawson and Vinson 1977; Feather 1973; Huisman and Kosci 1981; Moore 1975; Munson and McIntyre 1979; Munson and Posner 1979, 1980; Munson and McIntyre 1979; Ng 1982).

Not all researchers agree that a Likert scale should be used in measuring values (Prakash 1984; Rankin and Grube 1980; Reynolds and Ray 1980). One problem with rating scales is that they can lead to end-piling. This is the tendency for a respondent to rate a value toward the high end of the scale, resulting in many tied ratings at the

one or two highest scale points. If all of the items in the scale look attractive to the respondent this will be a particular problem. The values in the Rokeach scale all tend to have a certain amount of appeal for most respondents, so the value scale will be quite susceptible to end-piling. Although it has been suggested that end-piling is not a problem (Munson and McIntyre 1979), the nature of values and potential rating problems suggests that all research results should be scrutinized for end-piling effects. The mean scores on each of the values measured in other reported research were very high, suggesting the presence of end-piling (Slama, Williams, Parent and D'Onofrio 1985). This effect must be taken into account if the true relationship between values and consumer behavior is to be understood.

Three possibilities have been suggested for dealing with the problem of end-piling in the value scale. One alternative is to apply a social desirability scale to the values and to level the responses against the expressed desirabilities of each respondent for each value (Crowne and Marlowe 1964; Smith 1967). A second method involves treating each respondent separately and adjusting the responses of those considered to be exhibiting end-piling by dropping their responses by one or two points (Smith 1967). A third method of dealing with the problem is to standardize the rating scores (Munson 1984).

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between values and public complaining behavior. The data necessary to explore values and complaining behavior were gathered from a sample of 284 students at a major western university. As luck would have it, our sample of students had both values and public complaining behavior. Consequently, we believe our sample is most appropriate for an exploratory study of this nature.

In this exploratory study, we focus on the most intense and involving kinds of CCB. Public actions suggest that the individual is willing to make greater effort in reporting problems (Day and Landon 1977; Singh and Howell 1985). We consider the degree of reported general activity associated with public complaining behavior, that is complaining to parties other than family, friends and associates. This is broken into two types of behavior, dyadic (complaints to the offending dealer or manufacturer) and third party (complaints to groups such as the Better Business Bureau or consumer protection offices and various levels of legal action).

Previous research indicates that there are significant differences between consumers who engage in dyadic vs. third party complaining (Day and Bodur 1977; Day and Ash 1979; Fornell and Westbrook 1983; Singh and Howell 1985). The thrust of our research is to measure the propensity to complain in terms of the degree to which consumers engage in dyadic and third party public complaining. Since this is an exploratory study, we opted to measure these complaining behaviors in a simple fashion. While some argue for the value of multi-dimensional scales for measuring complaining behavior, other research indicates that unidimensional measures can be as good as multi-item scales (Day, Lee

and Johnson 1985). Accordingly, we simply ask respondents whether they generally complain about unsatisfactory purchases to the store of purchase, whether they have complained to a consumer protection or information body, and whether they have taken legal action in a consumer dispute. These are measured on five point Likert scales. Thus, those who score low on the individual items and on the summations of the items are considered public non-complainers and those who score high are public complainers. Those who score high on the complain-to-dealer scale are dyadic complainers, while those who score high on the consumer group/legal scales are third-party complainers.

Values are measured using a six-point scale (Not Important at All to Extremely Important) applied to each of the thirty-six items in the Rokeach scale. This allows for ties and removes ipsitive effects. Scores are normalized to reduce end-piling effects. We follow the suggestion of Vinson, Munson and Nakanishi (1977) and Prakash (1984) and factor the normalized value scores for the Instrumental scale and the Terminal scale separately to arrive at value clusters which are then related to the complaining scores to determine which personal values act as antecedents to dyadic and third-party public complaining behavior (Bartlett 1950; Cattell 1966; Stewart 1981).

## RESULTS

Results of the study indicate that personal values are related to complaining behavior. This is particularly evident as respondents with a high propensity to publicly complain are compared against those with a low propensity.

### Terminal Values

The terminal values were first tested to see if the data set was appropriate for factor analysis (Armstrong and Soelberg 1968; Shaycroft 1970; Stewart 1981). Two widely accepted methods for testing the statistical appropriateness of the factor analysis for this set of variables were employed (See Table 2).

The Bartlett test of sphericity was significant, giving an indication that the data set is appropriate for factor analysis (Bartlett 1950). Further the measure of sampling adequacy, MSA (Kaiser 1970) was near the "meritorious" range of .80, lending further support to the suitability of the data set for factor analysis.

A principle components factor extraction (Cattell 1966) was first run, followed by the orthogonal, Quartimax rotation. The Quartimax rotation was employed because a general factor might be expected, given the relationship among the variables in the Instrumental and Terminal values sets (Carroll 1953; Stewart 1961). Further, if that were not the case, it is generally as good an orthogonal rotation procedure as the Varimax or any of the other orthogonal procedures (Dielman, Cattell and Wagner 1972; Gorsuch 1970; Horn 1963). The results of the factor analysis, as seen in Table 2, are reasonably good. Five factors: Security, Tranquillity, Hedonistic, Gregarious and Accomplishment were extracted which explain 57% of the cumulative

Table 2  
Factor Analysis of Terminal Values

QUARTIMAX ROTATION TERMINAL VALUES					
Factors:	Secur- <u>ity</u>	Tran- <u>quillity</u>	Hedon- <u>istic</u>	Greg- <u>arious</u>	Accomp- <u>lishment</u>
Variables					
Comfortable Life			.68		
Exciting Life			.62		
Accomplishment					.78
World at Peace	.78				
World of Beauty	.75				
Equality	.72				
Family Security	.61				
Freedom				-.55	
Happiness		.56			
Inner Harmony		.77			
Mature Love		.81			
National Security					
Pleasure			.73		
Salvation			-.54		
Self Respect		.57			
Recognition				.62	
Friendship					
Wisdom					

Cumulative variance explained by the five factors: 57%  
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin MSA = .77  
Bartlett Test of Sphericity, Significance = .0000

variance. Loadings below .50 were deleted from the table. As can be seen, the remaining loadings group nicely, allowing for easy interpretation of the factors.

### Instrumental Values

The same procedure as described above was followed for factor analyzing the Terminal Values. As shown in Table 3, both the Bartlett test and the MSA indicate that the data set is quite appropriate for a factor solution. The results of the factor analysis, as above, are reasonably good. Five factors (Good Scout, Mr. Spock, Good Citizen, Ice Man, and Donald Trump) were extracted yielding an explained cumulative variance of 62%. Once again, the factor loadings group nicely thus allowing for an easy interpretation of the factors.

### Comparison of Value Factors by Dyadic Complaining Behavior

Two polar groups, high and low, were formed by sorting the dyadic question. Those individuals that scored 4 or above on the item were assigned to the high group, and those that scored 2 or below were placed in the low group. A comparison between the groups on the ten factors is shown in Table 4. The factor score means are

**Table 3**  
**Factor Analysis of Instrumental Values**

QUARTIMAX ROTATION INSTRUMENTAL VALUES					
Factors:	Good Scout	Mr. Spock	Good Citizen	Ice Man	Donald Trump
Ambitious					.73
Broadminded		.64			
Capable		.75			
Cheerful					
Clean			.68		
Courageous	.51				
Forgiving	.83				
Helpful	.81				
Honest	.67				
Imaginative				-.56	
Independent		.75			
Intellectual		.74			
Logical		.64			
Loving	.60				
Obedient			.59		
Polite			.79		
Responsible					.55
Self-Controlled				.61	

Cumulative variance explained by the five factors: 62%  
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin MSA = .84  
Bartlett Test of Sphericity, Significance = .0000

significantly different on three factors. Security, Good Scout, and Donald Trump all have the same characteristics. The high group has a positive mean and the low group has a negative mean. This implies that the stronger the value the more likely the individual is to be a complainer or vice versa. For example, an individual who scored "high" on the factor Security would also be a person who displays dyadic public complaining behavior. A tentative, value profile for the two groups indicates that a person who is security minded, ambitious and Boy-Scout-Like exhibits dyadic public complaining behavior. Conversely, an individual who lacks ambition, has bad manners and is not concerned about the world around him displays dyadic public noncomplaining behavior.

**Comparison of Value Factors by Third Party Complaining Behavior**

Two polar groups were again formed, this time, by sorting a scale that was constructed from the third party complaining questions. However, the scale was standardized and the high and low groups were assigned based on plus and minus one standard deviation respectively. A comparison of the factor score means is shown in Table 5. Five factors have significantly different means. Coincidentally, Security, Hedonistic,

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of Value Factors by Dyadic Public Complaining Behavior\***

TERMINAL VALUES					
Factors:	Security	Transquillity	Hedonistic	Gregarious	Accomplishment
High Group mean n=130	.2648	-.0224	.0172	-.0440	.0460
Low Group mean n=120	-.2575	.0121	-.0019	-.0847	-.0981
t-test sig	.000	not sig	not sig	not sig	not sig

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES					
Factors:	Good Scout	Mr. Spock	Good Citizen	Ice Man	Donald Trump
High Group mean n=130	.0785	.0266	.0113	-.0405	.0891
Low Group mean n=120	-.1587	-.0289	-.0521	-.0067	-.1581
t-test sig	.03	not sig	not sig	not sig	.03

\*The high and low groups were formed by sorting on the dyadic question. Those individuals that scored high on that question (SA or A) were included in the complaining group and those that scored low (D or SD) were included in the noncomplaining group. The neutrals were not included in the analysis.

Accomplishment, Good Scout, and Donald Trump have the same characteristics as described about the dyadic public complaining behavior. That is the high group has a positive mean, and the low group has a negative mean. Once again, implying that the stronger the value the more likely an individual is to exhibit complaining behavior or vice versa. For example, a person who scored "high" on the factor Hedonistic would be a person who shows third party complaining behavior. The tentative, value profiles for the two groups indicate that a person who is security minded, hedonistic, ambitious, concerned about accomplishment, and Boy-Scout-Like displays third party complaining behavior. At the same time, an individual who lacks ambition, is not concerned about life or the world about him, has bad manners, and is not concerned about accomplishments shows third party public noncomplaining behavior.

**Table 5**  
**Comparison of Value Factors By**  
**Third Party Complaining Behavior\***

TERMINAL VALUES					
Factors:	Secur- ity	Tran- quillity	Hedon- istic	Greg- arious	Accomp- lishment
High Group mean n=48	.2104	-.0709	.1652	-.1586	.3684
Low Group mean n=52	-.0468	.0511	-.1938	-.0516	-.1682
t-test sig	.000	not sig	.03	not sig	.005

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES					
Factors:	Good Scout	Mr. Spock	Good Citizen	Ice Man	Donald Trump
High Group mean n=48	.2103	-.2226	-.1924	-.1827	.2044
Low Group mean n=52	-.1838	-.1973	.1679	-.0637	-.2012
t-test sig	.03	not sig	not sig	not sig	.03

\*The high and low groups were formed by sorting on a scale that was constructed by summing the third party complaining questions. The scale was standardized and then the high and low groups were determined by grouping those individuals whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the standardized mean into the complaining (high) and noncomplaining (low) groups respectively. The neutral group was not included in the analysis.

#### Comparison of Value Factors for Overall Public Complaining Behavior

The high and low groups were formed by sorting a scale that was constructed by combining all three public complaining questions. As before, the scale was standardized, and the high and low groups were formed based on their z-scores. The neutral group was dropped from the analysis because our major interest was in the polar-extreme groups (Hair, Anderson and Tatham 1987) of public complaining behavior and public noncomplaining behavior. In order to analyze the data and develop a value profile for overall public complaining behavior, a discriminant analysis was run. Discriminant analysis is

ideally suited for developing profiles of groups and therefore was selected as the analysis technique (Crask and Perreault 1977; Morrison 1969, Perreault 1979).

#### THE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

The discriminant analysis comparing the value factors with overall public complaining behavior is shown in Table 6. The discriminant function was constructed by inputting the factor scores generated from the Quartimax, orthogonal rotation of Roekeach's value scale. As shown in Table 6, the independent variables are the ten value factors and the dependent grouping variable is overall public complaining behavior.

#### Validation

The discriminant function is significant at the .001 level, and the classification matrix indicates that the discriminant function is valid (Morrison 1969). That is the discriminant function correctly classifies 70% of the respondents whereas the maximum chance probability is only 52%. To clarify the meaning of the 70% hit ratio, it can be thought of as akin to the coefficient of determination (Hair, Anderson and Tatham 1987). It should be noted that the split sample approach was not used because of the somewhat limiting size of the sample. Thus the hit ratio of 70% has an upward bias in the prediction accuracy (Frank, Massey and Morrison 1965). However, this upward bias should not be sufficient to offset the thirty six per cent increase in the predictive accuracy generated by the discriminant function.

#### Interpretation

The preferred method for interpretation, using discriminant loadings or structure correlations, was employed to determine the relative importance of each of the ten value factors (Hair, Anderson and Tatham 1987). As can be seen from Table 6, using the recommended loading cut-off of .30, the four value factors of Security, Accomplishment, Good Scout, and Donald Trump emerge again as the factors of interest. The factor means show the same characteristics that were established when the individual components of public complaining behavior were examined. That is, the high group has positive means and the low group has negative means. This implies that the more strongly the value is held the more likely an individual is to exhibit public complaining behavior. For example, a person who scored high on the value factor Security would be an individual who displays public complaining behavior. Conversely, a person who scored low on Security would display noncomplaining behavior. The value profile, generated from the discriminant analysis, indicates that the two groups display quite different value sets. The public complainer is security conscious, ambitious, seeks accomplishment and is Boy-Scout-Like. Whereas, the public noncomplainer lacks ambition, has bad manners, is not interested in accomplishment, and is not concerned with the world around him.

**Table 6**  
**Comparison of Value Factors for**  
**Overall Public Complaining Behavior**  
**Using Discriminant Analysis\***

<u>Group Means and Loadings</u>					
TERMINAL VALUES					
Factors:	Secur- ity	Tran- quillity	Hedon- istic	Greg- arious	Accomp- lishment
High Group mean n=52	.3751	-.1937	.1032	-.1070	.2604
Low Group mean n=48	-.3991	.0065	.0149	-.0804	-.1639
Loadings	.5956**	-.1588	.0745	-.1625	.3397**

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES					
Factors:	Good Scout	Mr. Spock	Good Citizen	Ice Man	Donald Trump
High Group mean n=52	.2299	-.1102	-.2702	.0031	.3452
Low Group mean n=48	-.1517	.0405	-.0884	.1298	-.2222
Loadings	.3156**	-.1131	-.1206	-.0820	.3811**

Classification Matrix

Actual Group	Cases	Predicted Group	
		High	Low
High	52	40(77%)	12(23%)
Low	48	18(37%)	30(63%)
Overall Classified Correctly		70%	
Maximum Chance Classified		52%	

\*The high and low groups were formed by sorting on a scale constructed by summing all public complaining questions. The scale was standardized, and high and low groups were determined by grouping those individuals whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the standardized mean into the complaining (high) and noncomplaining (low) groups respectively. The neutral group was not included in the analysis. The canonical discriminant function was significant at the .001

level.

\*\*Loadings above .30 were considered significant as per normal convention.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The nature of this study was exploratory, and the purpose was to investigate the relationship between values and complaining behavior. The results of this study suggest that the investigation of values as they relate to public complaining behavior may be fruitful. The discriminant analysis on overall complaining behavior confirmed the component parts analysis. That is, values appear to influence public complaining behavior. The profiles that were developed are most interesting. The public complainer is security conscious, ambitious, seeks accomplishment and is Boy-Scout-Like. Whereas, the public noncomplainer lacks ambition, has bad manners, is not interested in accomplishment, and is not concerned with the world around him.

The limitations of this study, which are quite typical of exploratory studies, are centered on sample size and scale construction. Although the sample size was sufficient for the present analysis, a larger sample size is needed to examine the value-complaining behavior of men versus women. It seems that this would be a most interesting research topic which would provide an interesting contrast. Careful scale construction with adequate reliability testing is a prerequisite for further investigations. The three item scale, which measured only public complaining behavior, needs to be expanded to include the other components of complaining behavior and perhaps it should be "beefed up" relative to public complaining behavior. However, given these limitations, the relationship between consumer personal values and complaining behavior, no doubt exists and should be investigated further.

**REFERENCES**

- Anderson, Ronald D., Jack L. Engledow and Helmut Becker (1979), "Evaluating the Relationships Among Attitude Toward Business, Product Satisfaction, Experience, and Search Effort," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (August), 394-400.
- Armstrong, J. S. and P. Soelberg (1968), "On the Interpretation of Factor Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 70 (June), 361-364.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1950), "Tests of Significance in Factor Analysis," *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 3 (January), 77-85.
- Beardon, William and Melissa Crockett (1981), "Self Monitoring, Norms and Attitudes as Influences on Consumer Complaining," *Journal of Business Research*, 9, 255-266.
- Beardon, William and Barry Mason (1984), "An Investigation of Influences on Consumer Complaint Reports," in Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., *Advances in*

- Consumer Research*, 11, 490-495.
- Beardon, William and Jesse E. Teel (1983), "Selected Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaint Reports," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20 (February), 21-28.
- Beardon, William, Jesse E. Teel and Melissa Crockett (1980), "A Path Model of Consumer Complaint Behavior," in Richard P. Bagozzi, et. al., eds., *Marketing in the 80's*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 101-104.
- Best, Arthur and Alan R. Andreasen (1977), "Consumer Responses to Unsatisfactory Purchases: A Survey of Perceiving Defects, Voicing Complaints and Obtaining Redress," *Law and Society Review*, 11 (Spring), 701-742.
- Bourgeois, Jacques and James Barnes (1979), "Viability and Profile of the Consumerist Segment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5 (March), 217-228.
- Cadotte, Ernest R. and Normand Turgeon (1988), "Dissatisfiers and Satisfiers: Suggestions from Consumer Complaints and Compliments," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 1, 74-79.
- Carroll, J. B. (1953), "An Analytic Solution for Approximating Simple Structure in Factor Analysis," *Psychometrika*, 18 (March), 23-38.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966), "The Meaning and Strategic Use of Factor Analysis," in R. B. Cattell, ed., *Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Crask, Melvin R. and William D. Perreault, Jr. (1977), "Validation of Discriminant Analysis in Marketing Research," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (February), 60-68.
- Day, Ralph L. (1984), "Modeling Choices Among Alternative Responses to Dissatisfaction," in Thomas C. Kinnear, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 496-499.
- Day, Ralph L. and Stephen B. Ash (1979), "Consumer Responses to Dissatisfaction with Durable Products," in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 438-444.
- Day, Ralph L. and Muzaffer Bodur (1978), "A Comprehensive Study of Satisfaction with Consumer Services," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 64-74.
- Day, Ralph L. and E. Laird Landon (1977), "Toward a Theory of Consumer Complaining Behavior," in Arch G. Woodside, Jagdish N. Sheth and Peter D. Bennett, eds., *Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior*, New York: North-Holland, 425-433.
- Day, Ralph L., Klaus Gräbicke, Thomas Schaeztle and Fritz Staubach (1981), "The Hidden Agenda of Consumer Complaining," *Journal of Retailing*, 57, 86-106.
- Day, Ralph L., Hanjoon Lee and Susan Johnson (1985), "Comparisons of Single-Item and Multiple-Item Measures of Satisfaction," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 23-26
- Dielman, T. E., R. B. Cattell and A. Wagner (1972), "Evidence on the Simple Structure and Factor Invariance Achieved by Five Rotational Methods on Four Types of Data," *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 7 (April), 223-231.
- D'Onofrio, Marianne J., Mark E. Slama and Armen Tashchian (1985), "Consumer Purchasing Involvement and the Rokeach Value System," in R. L. King, ed., *Retailing: Theory and Practice for the 21st Century*, Academy of Marketing Sciences, 146-149.
- Feather, N. T. (1973), "The Measurement of Values: Effects of Different Assessment Procedures," *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 25, 221-231.
- Fornell, Claes and Nicholas M. Didow (1980), "Economic Constraints on Consumer Complaining Behavior," in Jerry C. Olsen, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 7, 318-323.
- Fornell, Claes and Robert A. Westbrook (1979), "An Exploratory Study of Assertiveness, Aggressiveness and Consumer Complaining Behavior," in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 105-110.
- Frank, Ronald E., William F. Massey and Donald G. Morrison (1965), "Bias in Multiple Discriminant Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2 (August), 250-258.
- Gilly, Mary C. (1980), "Complaining Consumers and the Concept of Expectations," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Refining Concepts and Measures of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 44-49.
- Gilly, Mary C. and Betsy D. Gelb, "Post-Purchase Consumer Processes and the Complaining Consumer," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (December), 323-328.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1970), "A Comparison of Biquartimin, Maxplane, Promax, and Varimax," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30 (Winter), 861-872.
- Gräbicke, Klaus, Thomas Schaeztle and Fritz Staubach (1982), "The Influence of Personality Factors on Complaining Behavior," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Conceptual and Empirical Contributions to Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 26-31.
- Granbois, Donald, John Summers and Gary Frazier (1977), "Correlates of Consumer Expectations and Complaining Behavior," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 18-25.
- Grønhaug, Kjell (1977), "Exploring Consumer Complaining Behavior: A Model and Some Empirical Results," in William D. Perreault, Jr., ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 159-165.
- Grønhaug, Kjell and Gerald Zaltman (1981), "Complainers and Noncomplainers Revisited: Another Look at the Data," in Kent B. Monroe, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 8, 83-87.



- Hair, Joseph, Ralph E. Anderson and Ronald L. Tatham (1987), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 2nd. edition, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Henry, W. A. (1976), "Cultural Values do Correlate with Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8 (May), 121-127.
- Hicks, L. E. (1970), "Some Properties of Ipsitive, Normative, and Forced-Choice Measures," *Psychological Bulletin*, 74 (3), 167-184.
- Horn, J. L. (1963), "Second-Order Factors in Questionnaire Data," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 23 (Spring), 117-134.
- Howard, John A. and Arch G. Woodside (1984), "Personal Values Affecting Consumer Psychology," in Robert E. Pitts, Jr. and Arch G. Woodside, eds., *Personal Values and Consumer Psychology*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 3-12.
- Huisman, S. E. and Z. J. Kosc (1981), "An Evaluation of Ranking, Rating and Paired Comparisons as Methods for Value System Measurement," Department of Social Psychology, Amsterdam: Free University.
- Jacoby, Jacob and James J. Jaccard (1981), "The Sources, Meaning and Validity of Consumer Complaining Behavior: A Psychological Review," *Journal of Retailing*, 54 (Fall), 4-24.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1963), "A Second Generation Little Jiffy," *Psychometrika*, 35 (December) 401-415.
- Kluckhohn, C. M. (1951), "Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action," in T. Parsons and E. Shils, eds., *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Krishnan, S. and Valerie A. Valle (1979), "Dissatisfaction Attributions and Consumer Complaining Behavior," in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 445-449.
- Landon, E. Laird (1977), "A Model of Consumer Complaint Behavior," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 31-35.
- LaTour, Stephen A. and Nancy C. Peat (1979), "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Consumer Satisfaction Research," in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 432-437.
- Lawther, Karen, S. Krishnan and Valerie A. Valle (1979), "The Consumer Complaint Process: Directions for Theoretical Development," in Ralph L. Day and H. Keith Hunt, eds., *New Dimensions for Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 10-14.
- Liefeld, John P., F. H. C. Edgecombe and Linda Wolfe (1975), "Demographic Characteristics of Canadian Consumer Complainers," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 9 (Summer), 73-80.
- Lundstrom, William J., Gerald U. Skelly and Donald Scigliampaglia (1979), "How Deep are the Roots of Consumer Discontent? A Study of Rural Consumers," in Ralph L. Day and H. Keith Hunt, eds., *New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 153-156.
- Mason, Joseph Barry and Samuel H. Himes, Jr. (1973), "An Explanatory Behavioral and Socio-Economic Profile of Consumer Action About Dissatisfaction with Selected Household Appliances," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 7 (Winter), 121-127.
- Moore, M. (1975), "Rating Versus Ranking in the Rokeach Value Survey: An Israeli Comparison," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 405-408.
- Morganosky, Michelle Ann and Hilda Mayer Buckley (1987), "Complaint Behavior: Analysis by Demographics, Lifestyle, and Consumer Values," in Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson, eds., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, 223-226.
- Morrison, Donald G. (1969), "On the Interpretation of Discriminant Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6 (May), 156-163.
- Munson, J. Michael (1984), "Personal Values: Considerations on Their Measurement and Application to Five Areas of Research Inquiry," in Robert E. Pitts, Jr. and Arch G. Woodside, eds., *Personal Values and Consumer Psychology*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 13-33.
- Munson, J. Michael and S. H. McIntyre (1979), "Developing Practical Procedures for the Measurement of Personal Values in Cross-Cultural Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (February), 48-52.
- Munson, J. Michael and B. Z. Posner (1979), "The Values of Engineers and Managing Engineers," *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, E-26, 2, 55-60.
- Munson, J. Michael and B. Z. Posner (1980), "Concurrent Validation of Two Value Inventories in Predicting Job Classification and Success for Organizational Personnel," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 536-542.
- Nantel, Jaques (1985), "Can the Self-Monitoring Construct Improve Predictions of Consumer Complaining/ Noncomplaining Behaviors?" in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 54-58.
- Ng, S. H. (1982), "Choosing Between the Ranking and Rating Procedures for the Comparison of Values Across Cultures," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, 169-172.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (November) 460-469.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1987), "An Investigation of the Interrelationship Between Consumer (Dis)Satisfaction and Complaint Behavior," in Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson, eds., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, 218-222.
- Perreault, William D., Jr. (1979), "Alternative Approaches for Interpretation of Multiple Discriminant Analysis in Marketing Research," *Journal of Business Research*, 7 (March).
- Pitts, Robert E. and Arch G. Woodside (1983), "Personal Value Influences on Consumer Product Class and Brand Preferences," *The Journal of Social*

- Psychology*, 119, 37-53.
- Prakash, Ved (1981), "An Investigation of Predictive Brand Expectations as Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee.
- Prakash, Ved (1984), "Personal Values and Product Expectations," in Robert E. Pitts, Jr. and Arch G. Woodside, eds., *Personal Values and Consumer Psychology*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 145-154.
- Rankin, W. L. and J. W. Grube (1980), "A Comparison of Ranking and Rating Procedures for Value System Measurement," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 233-246.
- Reynolds, T. J. and J. P. Jolly (1980), "Measuring Personal Values: An Evaluation of Alternative Methods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, (17) (November), 531-536.
- Richens, Marsha L. (1980), "Consumer Perceptions of Costs and Benefits Associated with Complaining," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Refining Concepts and Measures of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 50-53.
- Richens, Marsha L. (1982), "An Investigation of Consumers' Attitudes Toward Complaining," in Andrew Mitchell, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 9, 502-506.
- Richens, Marsha L. (1983), "Negative Word-of-Mouth by Dissatisfied Consumers: A Pilot Study," *Journal of Marketing*, 47 (Winter), 68-78.
- Richens, Marsha L. (1985), "The Role of Product Importance in Complaint Initiation," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 50-53.
- Richens, Marsha L. (1987), "A Multivariate Analysis of Responses to Dissatisfaction," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences*, 15 (Fall), 24-31.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1968), *Beliefs Attitudes and Values*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1971), "The Measurement of Values and Value Systems," in G. Abcarian and J. W. Soule, eds., *Social Psychology and Political Behavior: Problems and Prospects*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 20-39.
- Rokeach, Milton J. (1973), *The Nature of Human Values*, New York: Free Press.
- Shaycroft, M. F. (1970), "The Eigenvalue Myth and the Dimension Reduction Fallacy," Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Minneapolis.
- Sherrell, Daniel L., Joseph F. Hair, Jr. and Robert P. Bush (1984), "The Influence of Personal Values on Measures of Advertising Effectiveness: Interactions with Audience Involvement," in Robert E. Pitts, Jr. and Arch G. Woodside, eds., *Personal Values and Consumer Psychology*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 169-185.
- Singh, Jagdip and Roy D. Howell (1985), "Consumer Complaining Behavior: A Review and Prospectus," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 41-49.
- Singh, Jagdip (1988), "Consumer Complaint Intentions and Behavior: Definitional and Taxonomical Issues", *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (January), 93-107
- Slama, Mark E., C. R. Michael Parent, Terrell G. Williams and Marianne J. D'Onofrio (1984), "Values and Lifestyles: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Mormons and Non-Mormons," C. F. Keown, ed., *Proceedings of the Consumer Psychology Symposium - American Psychological Association/Division 23*, (December), 20-23.
- Slama, Mark E., Terrell G. Williams and C. R. Michael Parent (1985), "Personal Values and Retail Shopping Orientation: The Recreational and Economic Shopper," *Proceedings: American Institute for Decision Sciences, Western Division*, 82-84.
- Smith, D. H. (1967), "Correcting for Social Desirability Response Sets in Opinion-Attitude Survey Research," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37, 284-287.
- Stewart, David W. (1981), "The Application and Misapplication of Factor Analysis in Marketing Research," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 51-62.
- Stokes, R. C. (1974), "Consumer Complaints and Consumer Dissatisfactions," paper presented to the Food and Drug Law Institution, Phoenix, AZ, April.
- Strahle, William and Ralph L. Day (1985), "Sex Roles, Lifestyles, Store Types and Complaining Behavior," in H. Keith Hunt and Ralph L. Day, eds., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 59-63.
- Summers, John and Donald Granbois (1977), "Predictive and Normative Expectations in Consumer Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior," in William D. Perreault, Jr., ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 155-158.
- Swan, John E. and Douglas S. Longman (1973), "Consumer Satisfaction with Automobile Repair Performance: Attitudes Toward the Industry and Governmental Control," in B. W. Becker and H. Becker, eds. *Combined Proceedings*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 249-255.
- Thomas, William R. and F. Kelly Shuptrine (1975), "The Consumer Complaint Process: Communication and Resolution," *Business and Economic Review*, 21 (June), 13-22.
- Villarel-Camacho, Angelina (1983), "Consumer Complaining Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," *AMA Educators Proceedings*, 68-73.
- Vinson, Donald E. and J. Michael Munson (1976), "Personal Values: An Approach to Market Segmentation," in Kenneth L. Bernhardt, ed., *Marketing: 1776-1976 and Beyond*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 313-318.
- Vinson, Donald E., J. Michael Munson and Masao Nakanishi (1976), "An Investigation of the Rokeach Value Survey for Consumer Application," in William

- D. Perreault, Jr., ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 247-252.
- Vinson, Donald E. and J. Gutman (1978), "Personal Values and Consumer Discontent," in R. J. Ebert, R. J. Monroe and K. J. Roering, eds., *Proceedings of the American Institute for Decision Sciences*, 201-203.
- Vinson, Donald E., J. D. Scott and L. M. Lamont (1977), "The Role of Personal Values in Marketing and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 41 (April), 44-50.
- Wall, Marjorie, Lois Dickey and W. Wayne Talarzyk (1977), "Prediction and Profiling Consumer Satisfaction and Propensity to Complain," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 91-101.
- Warland, Rex H., Robert O. Herrmann and Jane Willits (1975), "Dissatisfied Consumers: Who Gets Upset and What Do They Do About It?" *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 9 (Winter), 152-162.
- Westbrook, Robert A. (1977), "Correlates of Post Purchase Satisfaction with Major Household Appliances," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 91-101.
- Williams, Terrell G., C. R. Michael Parent and John C. Rogers (1987), "Consumer Values and Purchasing Involvement Revisited," *Proceedings of the Decision Sciences Institute*, Boston, (November).
- Williams, Terrell G. and John C. Rogers (1989), "Personal Values and Consumer Response to Direct Marketing," in John C. Rogers, ed., *Proceedings: Western Decision Sciences Institute*.
- Woodruff, Robert B., Ernest R. Cadotte and Roger L. Jenkins (1983), "Modeling Consumer Satisfaction Processes Using Experience Based Norms," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20 (August), 286-304.
- Zaichkowsky, Judy and John Liefeld (1977), "Personality Profiles of Consumer Complaint Letter Writers," in Ralph L. Day, ed., *Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 124-129.