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ABSTRACT

The effect of consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour

by

Marisa Janette de Klerk

Consumer complaint behaviour research in transitional and emerging countries, including South Africa, is still in its infancy stage. The vast changes to the South African consumer landscape along with the socio-political changes and the multicultural population’s ongoing cultural changes necessitate the monitoring of changes in personal values. However, very little research has been done in South Africa regarding consumers’ personal values. The effect of personal values on complaint behaviour in a South African context has also not yet been explored.

As an extension of the social adaptation theory, several researchers have proposed a value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Cai & Shannon, 2012) in order to explain the relationship between values and behaviour. The model proposes that causality flows from abstract values, through mid-range attitudes, to specific behaviours (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Hayley, Zinkiewicz & Hardiman, 2014); that is, values influence behaviour indirectly through attitudes. While the VAB model has been confirmed in a variety of consumer behaviour contexts, it has not yet been explored in a South African complaint behaviour context.

This study therefore used social adaptation theory and the VAB model as theoretical framework to determine the effect of consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’
complaint handling on their consumer complaint behaviour in the South African context. In addition, the relationships between demographic variables and personal values and also between demographic variables and consumer complaint behaviour were explored.

A survey was administered to consumers who were dissatisfied with the performance of a major household appliance within a four-year memory recall period. Data was collected via a self-administered questionnaire measuring personal values with Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV) and attitudes toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling, using an adapted version of Keng, Richmond and Han’s (1995) “Attitudes toward businesses” scale. Convenience sampling and snowball sampling were employed in Tshwane, a major metropolitan area of South Africa, which generated 361 usable questionnaires.

Exploratory factor analysis revealed three value dimensions, namely (1) Harmony and Respect, (2) Hedonism and (3) Achievement. Results of the Pearson correlation analysis showed that higher valuing of any one of the three value dimensions lead to more negative attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Furthermore, multinomial logistic regression analysis revealed that more negative attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling lead to a decreased likelihood of engaging in public complaint behaviour. Moreover, ANOVA revealed relationships between specific personal value dimensions and gender, age and population group.

The study has implications for marketers, policy makers, appliance retailers and consumer protection organisations.

**Keywords:** personal values, attitudes, consumer complaint behaviour, social adaptation theory, value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy model, major household appliance
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Navorsing oor verbruikers se klagte-gedrag in opkomende lande, insluitend Suid-Afrika, is nie baie ver gevorder nie. Die omvattende veranderende Suid-Afrikaanse verbruikerslandskap, teseamte met die volgehoue sosio-politieke veranderinge en die kulturele veranderinge in die multikulturele polulasie, noodsak die monitering van veranderinge in verbruikers se waardes. Daar bestaan egter baie min navorsing in Suid-Afrika oor verbruikers se persoonlike waardes. Voorts is die effek van persoonlike waardes op klagte-gedrag nog nie in die Suid-Afrikaanse konteks ondersoek nie.

Verskeie navorsers stel voor dat die waarde-houding-gedrag-hiërgargiemodel, wat uit sosiale aanpassingsteorie spruit, gebruik moet word om die verhouding tussen waardes en gedrag te verstaan. Die model stel dat oorsaalklikheid vanaf abstrakte waardes, deur houdings, na spesifieke gedrag vloe (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Hayley et al., 2014). Dit wil sê, waardes beïnvloed gedrag indirek deur houdings. Terwyl die waarde-houding-gedrag-model in 'n verskeidenheid klagte-gedrag-kontekste bevestig is, is dit nog nie in 'n Suid-Afrikaanse klagte-gedrag-konteks ondersoek nie. Gevolglik is die sosiale aanpassingsteorie en die waarde-houding-gedrag-model as teoretiese raamwerk in hierdie studie toegepas om die effek van verbruikers se persoonlike waardes en houdings teenoor kleinhandelaars se klagte-hantering op hulle klagte-gedrag in die Suid-Afrikaanse konteks te bepaal. Die verwantskappe tussen
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verbruikers se demografiese veranderlikes en hulle persoonlike waardes, en tussen
demografiese veranderlikes en klagte-gedrag is ook verken.

'n Opname is onder verbruikers wat ontevrede was met die werksverrigting van hulle groot
huishoulike toerusting oor 'n vier-jaar-herroepingstydperk gedoen. Data is deur 'n
selfgeadministreerde vraelys ingesamel waarin persoonlike waardes met Kahle (1983) se List
of Values (LOV) en houdings teenoor kleinhandelaars se klagte-hantering met 'n aangepaste
weergawe van Keng et al. (1995) se “Houdings teenoor besighede”-skaal gemeet is.
Geriefsteekproefneming en sneeubalsteekproefneming, wat 361 bruikbare vraelyste opgelever
het, is in Tswana, 'n groot metropolitaanse gebied in Suid-Afrika, onderneem.

Verkennende faktoranalyse het drie waardedimensies, naamlik (1) Harmonie en Respek, (2)
Hedonisme en (3) Prestasie, opgelever. Die Pearsonkorrelasie-analise se resultate toon dat 'n
toename in belangrikheid in enige van die drie waardedimensies tot 'n meer negatiewe houding
teenoor kleinhandelaars se klagte-hantering lei. Voorts dui die resultate van die multinomiese
logistiese regressie-analise daarop dat 'n toename in verbruikers se negatiewe houding teenoor
kleinhandelaars se klagte-hantering tot 'n afname lei in hul geneigdheid tot publieke klagte-
gedrag. Die resultate van die ANOVA-analise toon verder dat daar verwantskappe tussen
spesifieke persoonlike waardes en geslag, ouderdom en populasiegroep bestaan.

Die studie het implikasies vir bemarkers, beleidmakers, kleinhandelaars en
verbruikersbeskerming-organisasies.

**Sleutelwoorde:** persoonlike waardes, houdings, klagte-gedrag, sosiale aanpassingsteorie,
waarde-houding-gedrag-hiërargiemodel, groot huishoudelike toerusting
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CHAPTER 1

THE STUDY IN PERSPECTIVE

This chapter provides the backdrop to the study and introduces the research problem as well as a justification for the research. The aim, main objectives, design and methodology of the study are also briefly discussed and the structure of the dissertation is explained.

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A countless number of consumers issue complaints regarding products or services to acquaintances, sellers or third parties on a daily basis. In the literature, this phenomenon is known as consumer complaint behaviour. Complaints, whether public or private, all have the potential to influence a business negatively and to harm its reputation over time. Therefore it is crucial to know the causes and consequences of complaint behaviour, and how to mitigate and handle complaints (Chapa, Hernandez, Wang & Skalski, 2014).

Consumer complaint behaviour has been central to a large amount of research over the last few decades (Robertson, 2012). Researchers have especially displayed a growing interest in the antecedents and consequences of complaint behaviour, and research on the topic has been published in a broad selection of marketing journals (Fox, 2008; Yan & Lotz, 2009; Ashley & Varki, 2009; Dahl & Peltier, 2015). While research on consumer complaint behaviour seems to be in its maturity phase, there is still a lot to learn about the topic, especially in terms of contradictory findings within the marketing literature (Dahl & Peltier, 2015).

Studies on consumer complaint behaviour have mostly been conducted in Western societies and developed countries, especially in the American and European contexts (Liu & McClure, 2001; Razzaque, 2002; Phau & Sari, 2004; Phau & Baird, 2008), generating valuable theoretical and empirical findings in the first-world context (Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002; Essoussi & Merunka, 2007). It is, however, an undeniable fact that over 80% of the world’s consumer population reside in emerging consumer markets and transitional economies, while
developed countries comprise a shrinking part of the world’s economy (Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002; Essoussi & Merunka, 2007). This implies a need for research on specific consumer behaviour-related issues in specific contexts.

Due to significant cultural, socioeconomic and demographic differences between first-world countries and emerging consumer markets (Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002; Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006), concern is raised with regard to applying findings from high-income industrialised countries to emerging countries (Bodur & Sarigöllü, 2005), specifically emerging countries such as South Africa with its complex and culturally diverse consumer populations as well as its unique contextual circumstances (Rousseau & Venter, 2001; Bodur & Sarigöllü, 2005; Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006). More recently there has been a shift in complaint behaviour literature from more Western developed countries to more Asian developing countries such as China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea and Turkey (Sharma, Marshall, Reday & Na, 2010). However, complaint behaviour research in transitional and emerging countries in other parts of the world, such as Africa and South America, is still lacking.

South Africa, one of the most significant emerging consumer economies in Africa (Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002), is one such country where consumer complaint behaviour research is still in its infancy stage. South Africa is also part of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) alliance due to its expanding economy and increased consumer spending, making it one of the fastest growing markets in the world (Sonnenberg & Erasmus, 2013).

Since the new democratic dispensation that came into effect in 1994 (Bornman, 2006), South Africa has been undergoing rapid socio-political and socioeconomic transformation (Burgess & Harris, 1999; Stevens, 2003). These socio-political and socioeconomic changes have resulted in the enhancement of the living conditions of a number of previously disadvantaged citizens in South Africa (Erasmus, Makgopa & Kachale, 2005; Kempen, Bosman, Bouwer, Klein & Van der Merwe, 2011), allowing them to enter consumer markets as emerging consumers (D’Andrea, Ring, Lopez, Aleman & Stengel, 2006; Kempen et al., 2011). Within a relatively short period of time, millions of previously disadvantaged households belonging to lower-income groups migrated to middle- and high-income groups (Erasmus, 2010). For instance, many black people who used to live in rural areas or to occupy a lower socioeconomic status, have moved to cities or urban areas where they are now financially able to buy durables and expensive products (Viljoen, Botha & Boonzaaier, 2005). For many previously disadvantaged consumers, home ownership and the ability to afford products and services such as electricity, became a reality
for the first time (Gothan & Erasmus, 2008). The expenditure on products and services among these consumers has also increased as a means to exhibit newly obtained wealth and increased self-worth (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009) as well as to erase the asset deficit that most black people still experience owing to the history of South Africa (Nieftagodien & Van der Berg, 2007; PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) & Economist Intelligence Unit, 2012).

These increasingly rapid and radical changes in South Africa’s consumer environment are leading to changes in consumers’ values and lifestyles. For instance, black consumers are moving away from being traditional and conservative and are becoming more ambitious and self-motivated with a desire for self-improvement and education. It is therefore essential that marketers and researchers monitor these changes (Rousseau, 2003c:301).

According to Market Research.com (2015), the South African household appliances market had a compound annual growth rate of 2.6% between 2010 and 2014. The performance of this market is also expected to accelerate, with an anticipated compound annual growth rate of 5.7% between 2014 and 2019. Furthermore, according to a recent community survey released by Statistics South Africa in 2016, the ownership of household goods such as electric stoves, refrigerators and washing machines has increased significantly compared to 2011 (Statistics South Africa, 2016). The growing demand for major household appliances and the growth of the industry can be attributed to the rising needs of the emerging middle class (Nieftagodien & Van der Berg, 2007; Sonnenberg & Erasmus, 2013), the increased availability of credit for the middle class (Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016), increased home ownership among previously disadvantaged people (Tustin, 2004; PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) and Economist Intelligence Unit, 2012), increased access to electricity (Sonnenberg, Erasmus & Schreuder, 2014), as well as rising rates of urbanisation (Viljoen et al., 2005).

South African consumers experience many problems with the performance of their major household appliances, as the number of complaints received by consumer complaint websites (e.g. hellopeter.co.za) and consumer bodies (e.g. South African National Consumer Union, Consumer Goods and Services Ombudsman) shows. As the demand for major household appliances increases, the possibility to experience product problems also increases (Nieftagodien & Van der Berg, 2007; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2013). This is reflected in the Consumer Goods and Services Ombudsman (CGSO) Annual Report 2015/2016, where the number of formal complaints increased drastically from 60 complaints received in 2014/2015 to 343 complaints received in 2015/2016 (Consumer Goods and Services Ombud, 2016).
For the purpose of this study, major household appliances include refrigeration appliances (including refrigerators, freezers and combination fridge-freezers), cooking appliances (ovens, stoves and microwaves), laundry appliances (including washing machines and tumble dryers), dishwashers and vacuum cleaners. These appliances have been known to cause more formal complaints than less expensive and non-durable products due to the complex, expensive nature and relatively long life expectancy (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue, De Klerk & Isaac, 2012). However, retailers often underestimate consumers’ expressed dissatisfaction considering that far less consumers complain than would be expected (Dolinsky, 1994; Tronvoll, 2007), implying that complaint statistics does not provide a true reflection of the degree of dissatisfaction experienced by consumers.

Donoghue (2008) noted that few studies have been conducted on South African consumers’ complaint behaviour, especially regarding major electrical household appliances. Since then a number of studies have addressed this gap in the research (e.g. Donoghue, De Klerk, Ehlers, 2008; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009, 2013; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016; Donoghue, Van Oordt & Strydom, 2016). Although these studies investigated the effect of various consumer-related variables such as culture, demographics, knowledge, experience, emotions and causal attributions for product failure on complaint behaviour, personal values and attitudes, which have also been identified as antecedents to complaint behaviour (Souiden & Ladhari, 2011), have not yet been addressed in the South African context. In fact, very few studies exist in which the effect of values and/or attitudes on complaint behaviour have been investigated (e.g. Rogers & Williams, 1990; Keng et al., 1995; Keng & Liu, 1997; Phau & Sari, 2004). One such study is that of Rogers and Williams (1990) where the link between values and public complaint behaviour was confirmed using Rokeach’s Value Survey (RVS). The relationship between personal values and complaint behaviour among Singaporean consumers was confirmed by Keng and Liu (1997) by means of the List of Values (LOV) scale. Moreover, they found that self-oriented and group-oriented consumers differed with regard to their attitudes towards businesses and their attitudes towards complaining. Furthermore, in similar studies conducted by Keng et al. (1995) and Phau and Sari (2004), attitudes towards businesses and attitudes towards complaining were found to be significant predictors of differences between complainers and non-complainers in an Asian context.

There is some criticism against the examination of a simple values-behaviour relationship. Due to the relatively abstract nature of values, existing literature suggests that values have an indirect influence on consumer behaviour through less abstract mediating factors (Jayawardhena, 2004; Cai & Shannon, 2012). Attitudes are known as such factors and assist in
explaining the link between values and behaviour (Kim, Forsythe, Gu & Moon, 2002; Cai & Shannon, 2012).

Theoretically, it can be assumed that the causality flows from abstract values, through mid-range attitudes, to specific behaviours (Jayawardhena, 2004; Grankvist, Lekedal & Marmendal, 2007; Hayley et al., 2014). This sequence is known as the value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model, which emanated from social adaptation theory (Jayawardhena, 2004; Cai & Shannon, 2012). This causal relationship has been confirmed in a variety of contexts such as natural food shopping (Homer & Kahle, 1988), organic food purchasing (Grunert & Juhl, 1995), shopping mall patronage (Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Cai & Shannon, 2012), retail career choice (Shim, Warrington & Goldsberry, 1999), e-shopping (Jayawardhena, 2004), preference for eco- and fair-trade products (Grankvist et al., 2007) and reduced meat consumption (Hayley et al., 2014). Milfont, Duckitt and Wagner (2010) have also proven the cross-cultural validity of the VAB model in samples from South Africa, Brazil and New Zealand in the context of environmental issues. Considering the successful application of the VAB model in these different contexts, especially in a South African context, it is believed that the VAB model can be successfully applied to explain the effect of personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on South African consumers’ complaint behaviour regarding major household appliances.

Given the limited research on South African consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances and the link between consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, this research could shed more light on the role consumer-related variables play in consumers’ complaint behaviour.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The socio-political dispensation that came into effect in South Africa in 1994 have led to vast changes in the South African consumer landscape as the living standards of many previously disadvantaged citizens improved (Kempen et al., 2011) and home ownership as well as access to electricity for the first time became a reality for many citizens (Gothan & Erasmus, 2008). Thus, due to the changing profile of the South African consumer (Haupt, 2001; Erasmus, 2010) and the new emphasis on consumer rights (Donoghue, Van Oordt & Strydom, 2016), it is becoming increasingly evident that greater attention must be paid to understand the complaint behaviour of South Africans. Furthermore, major household appliances serve as an appropriate
product failure category when the growing demand for major household appliances among the emerging South African middle class is considered, together with the increase in complaints received regarding appliance failures.

Despite the investigation of a number of consumer-related variables as antecedents to complaint behaviour in a local context, no research has been conducted on the effect of personal values and attitudes on complaint behaviour in the South African context. Furthermore, research on personal values and attitudes as antecedents to complaint behaviour, have also been grossly neglected internationally, despite the importance of these factors in determining consumers’ complaint behaviour.

Several researchers have proposed a value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy model (Cai & Shannon, 2012), where it is assumed that causality flows from values, through attitudes, to behaviour (De Barcellos, Perin, Pérez-Cueto, Saab & Grunert, 2012). While the VAB model has been confirmed in a variety of consumer behaviour contexts, it has not yet been confirmed in a South African complaint behaviour context.

Therefore, given the limited research on South African consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances, and the limited research concerning the causal link between consumers’ personal values, attitudes and complaint behaviour, the purpose of this research is to extend an understanding of how South African consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling affect their subsequent complaint behaviour regarding major household appliances.

1.3 JUSTIFICATION

Findings obtained from this research study could contribute theoretically to the lacking body of literature concerning complaint behaviour, especially with regard to major household appliances, in the South African context. Furthermore, empirical verification of the VAB model in the South African complaint behaviour context would be invaluable. This study could also make a conceptual contribution by extending research on the antecedents of consumer complaint behaviour, more specifically, by examining its relationship with personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Furthermore, research and measurement issues could be illustrated and addressed in applying the LOV scale in emerging economies such as South Africa.
The findings of the study could have practical implications for role players who deal with complaints in the appliance retail industry. This could facilitate a variety of specialists such as marketers, policy makers, retailers, manufacturers, consumer scientists, consumer advisors and consumer protection organisations to handle complaints more effectively. An understanding of the factors underlying consumer complaint behaviour (such as values and attitudes) and the relationship between these concepts will also allow specialists to understand consumer complaint behaviour better and to segment the market accordingly. Moreover, this study might provide evidence that may encourage researchers in other developing countries to explore the relevance of personal values and attitudes as antecedents to complaint behaviour. Findings regarding the applicability of the VAB model in a South African complaint behaviour context might also be valuable to researchers who are developing causal models of complaint behaviour.

A deeper understanding of consumers’ personal values could facilitate researchers in studying individuals from diverse cultures and to examine social processes and structures (Razzaque, 2002). Values could also be useful to segment consumers, as values are more closely linked to consumers’ behaviour than personality traits, and values are more fundamental and more directly linked to motivations than attitudes (Krystallis, Vassallo & Chryssohoidis, 2008; Ungerer, 2009:63). Since Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV) scale is a common approach to segmenting consumer markets (Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Shoham, Davidow & Brenchic, 2003), its application in the South African context could possibly prove to be useful to segment consumers based on their specific personal value orientation. Promotional strategies and marketing strategies could furthermore be developed and improved to reach these various market segments (Razzaque, 1995; Shoham et al., 2003). For instance, individuals who regard sense of belonging or warm relationships with others as very important may be more attracted to products that are positioned in a social context (Kahle, Rose & Shoham, 2000).

1.4 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

The aim of this research is to explore and describe the effect of consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances. In addition, the effect of demographic variables on personal values and consumer complaint behaviour will be explored.
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The following research objectives were formulated for this study:

**Objective 1:** To explore and describe consumers' personal values

**Objective 1.1:** To explore and describe consumers' personal value orientation

**Objective 2:** To explore and describe consumers' attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling

**Objective 3:** To explore and describe consumers' complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

**Objective 4:** To investigate the relationship between consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling

**Objective 5:** To investigate the effect of consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

**Objective 6:** To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers' personal value orientations

**Objective 7:** To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers' complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances
1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The present research project forms part of a follow-up study to the supervisor’s PhD study on consumers’ product failure attributions and their subsequent complaint behaviour concerning dissatisfactory major household appliances. The data for this follow-up study was already collected and coded when the co-investigator became involved in the project. The supervisor acted as the principal investigator, while the master’s student acted as a co-investigator in the research.

The study is quantitative, exploratory and descriptive in nature, implementing a survey design. The research design can furthermore be described as cross-sectional, following a deductive approach. The data was collected between September and October 2010.

The unit of analysis for this study was consumers 25 years and older who had experienced dissatisfaction concerning the performance of their major household appliances within the last four years and who resided in the middle- to upper-income suburbs across the Tshwane metropolitan area in South Africa.

A structured, self-administered questionnaire was compiled to obtain primary data. Although the questionnaire consisted of six sections, only four sections were analysed for the purposes of the current study. Section A consisted of six questions that recorded the demographic information of the respondents. In section C, Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of consumer complaint behaviour was used to classify the different actions consumers could take, and respondents had to indicate on a nominal (yes/no) scale which action they had taken. In section D, the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale developed by Keng et al. (1995) was slightly adapted to measure respondents’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and their responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Lastly, questions 1 and 2 of section E was measured using Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV). Respondents firstly had to rate the nine personal values on a 7-point Likert-type scale in question 1, and then in question 2 they had to circle the one value they regarded as most important in their lives.

To identify any possible errors or misunderstandings, the questionnaire was pre-tested with eight respondents. After a few language errors were corrected, the questionnaires were distributed by trained fieldworkers to willing respondents who met the pre-specified criteria. Snowball sampling was also employed by asking willing respondents to provide the contact
details of other prospective respondents who also met the outlined criteria. A total of 361 respondents participated in the study.

Following the collection of all the questionnaires, the completed questionnaires were edge-coded by the researcher and fieldworkers, and the data was captured and analysed with the help of a qualified statistician and research consultant of the Department of Statistics (University of Pretoria). Both descriptive and inferential statistics were performed to analyse the data.

To ensure the quality of the study, effort was made to eliminate error by enhancing the validity and reliability of the results and by implementing ethical guidelines.

1.7 PRESENTATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 provides the background to the study, the justification for the research, the main research objectives and a summary of the research design and methodology. The succeeding chapters are presented and structured as follows:

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the relevant literature pertaining to the main constructs of the study. The chapter begins with the conceptualisation of consumer complaint behaviour, followed by a discussion of the models and the factors affecting consumer complaint behaviour. This is followed by a discussion of consumers’ personal values as well as the application and the measurement thereof. The relationship between values and demographics is also discussed. The last section provides a general overview of attitudes including a discussion of the tri-component model of attitudes, the functions of attitudes as well as the formation and change of attitudes. The chapter concludes with a discussion of attitudes applied in a consumer complaint behaviour context.

Chapter 3 presents and explains the social adaptation theory as the theoretical framework of the study. The value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model is discussed further in terms of its origins in social adaptation theory and its application in a consumer behaviour context. Following the review of the literature, the conceptual framework is presented to set the stage for the phenomena being studied. The research goal and the objectives are also formally stated.

Chapter 4 explains the research design and methodology for the study. The data analysis is discussed and important concepts are operationalised. Chapter 4 starts off with a discussion of
the research design implemented in the study. Then the respective methodologies for studying consumer complaint behaviour, personal values, attitudes towards businesses and the value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy model are discussed. The sampling plan is discussed in terms of the unit of analysis, the sampling technique and sample size. The questionnaire as the measuring instrument is covered in detail. The data analysis is discussed and the main concepts are presented in an Operationalisation table. This is followed by an explanation of the relevant statistical methods. In the final section, the quality of the data is discussed in terms of the validity, reliability and the ethicality of the study.

Chapter 5 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample, followed by the analysis and interpretation of the results according to the objectives of the study. The findings are also discussed in terms of the literature on consumer complaint behaviour, personal values and attitudes.

Chapter 6 presents the conclusions for each objective of the study. The research is also evaluated and the implications and limitations of the study are addressed. Lastly, some recommendations are proposed for future research.

The research questionnaire is included in Addendum A. The suburbs where respondents resided are listed in Addendum B. Further, the plagiarism declaration is included in Addendum C.

For referencing, an adapted version of the Harvard method of referencing (as compiled by the Academic Information Service, University of Pretoria) was used, and for editing purposes, the choice of language was UK English.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the relevant literature pertaining to the main concepts of the study, namely, consumer complaint behaviour, personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the concepts of consumer complaint behaviour and specific consumer-related variables, including personal values and attitudes toward businesses. In the sections that follow, consumer complaint behaviour is firstly conceptualised, after which the models and factors affecting consumer complaint behaviour are discussed. The second section provides an overview of personal values, the measurement of personal values, the application of personal values in a consumer behaviour context and the link between demographics and personal values. In the last section, attitudes are explained in terms of conceptual definition, the tri-component model of attitudes, attitude functions and attitude formation and change, followed by the application of attitudes in a complaint behaviour context.

2.2 CONSUMER COMPLAINT BEHAVIOUR

The concept of consumer complaint behaviour has been of great interest to researchers over the last few decades (Heung & Lam, 2003; Mattsson, Lemmink & McColl, 2004; Fox, 2008). Consumer complaint behaviour is a complex phenomenon that originates throughout the purchasing and/or post-purchasing stages of the consumer decision making process (Day & Landon, 1977; Criè, 2003). Consumer complaint behaviour is known as a set of responses that arises from dissatisfaction (Singh, 1988; Phau & Sari, 2004; Tronvoll, 2007). It is also linked to the expectancy disconfirmation paradigm that proposes that dissatisfaction, resulting in consumer complaint behaviour, is caused by the negative disconfirmation of expectations (i.e.
when the actual performance of the product fails to meet the consumer’s expectations about the product’s performance) (Phau & Sari, 2004; Emir, 2011; Tronvoll, 2011).

The following two established principles are central to consumer complaint behaviour:

1) Consumer dissatisfaction is a central determinant of complaint behaviour, although dissatisfaction on its own is not enough to cause complaint behaviour.
2) Following a dissatisfactory purchase experience, consumers can adopt a variety of responses, including behavioural and non-behavioural responses (Crié, 2003; Velázquez, Contrí, Saura & Blasco, 2006; Goetzinger, 2007:11; Souiden & Ladhari, 2011), the latter of which should be considered to be legitimate forms of complaint behaviour (Crié, 2003; Yuksel, Kilinc & Yuksel, 2006; Robertson, 2012).

2.2.1 Conceptualising consumer complaint behaviour

Consumer complaint behaviour has been conceptualised in various ways. Researchers, however, agree that dissatisfaction with a product or service is the main cause of complaint behaviour (Singh, 1988; Crié, 2003; Velázquez et al., 2006; Kim & Chen, 2010). The definition used most often to conceptualise consumer complaint behaviour is that of Singh (1988:94), who defines it as “a set of multiple (behavioural and non-behavioural) responses, some or all of which are triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase episode”.

Generally, consumer complaint behaviour can be categorised according to behavioural and non-behavioural responses (Day & Landon, 1977:229-432; Yuksel et al., 2006). Behavioural responses include any action consumers take in response to dissatisfaction (Liu & McClure, 2001; Yuksel et al., 2006; Emir, 2011). These responses entail complaining to and seeking redress from retailers/manufacturers/service providers (second parties) and/or complaining to third parties such as public consumer protection agencies, voluntary organisations, ombudsmen and/or legal representatives (Crié, 2003; Kim, Kim, Im & Shin, 2003; Tronvoll, 2007; Kim, Lee & Mattila, 2014).

Consumers can also engage in indirect or hidden responses which are not evident to retailers, manufacturers or service providers (Day et al., 1981; Donoghue, 2008:ii). These responses include boycotting the retailer, manufacturer or service provider, switching brands and/or spreading negative word-of-mouth to family and friends (Ndubisi & Ling, 2006; Kim et al., 2014).
Non-behavioural responses occur when consumers refrain from taking a specific action (Volkov, 2003; Yan & Lotz, 2009). Reasons for not taking action include the following: forgetting about the incident (Yan & Lotz, 2009; Robertson, 2012); feeling that complaining is not worth the time and effort (Hernandez & Fugate, 2004; Huppertz, 2007); lacking knowledge on where and how to complain (Hernandez & Fugate, 2004); lacking the motivation or the ability to complain (Huppertz, 2003); being unable to allocate time and effort to complaining (Souiden & Ladhari, 2011); displaying inadequate levels of dissatisfaction (Halstead, 2002); and/or perceiving the retailer as unresponsive (Hernandez & Fugate, 2004).

2.2.2 Models of consumer complaint behaviour

Although it is widely accepted that there are different types of consumer complaint behaviour, there has been a lot of deliberation regarding the classification of complaint behaviour response types to clearly conceptualise consumer complaint behaviour (Crié, 2003). A number of typologies have been suggested to classify and explain various responses to product and service failures (Kim & Chen, 2010; Tronvoll, 2011). However, only a few models have been rendered valid and useful, including those of Hirschman (1970), Day and Landon (1977) and Singh (1988). These models are discussed in the sections that follow.

2.2.2.1 Hirschman’s exit, voice and loyalty typology

Hirschman’s (1970) three-dimensional model was an early attempt to classify consumer complaint behaviour (Goetzinger, 2007:15; Walters, 2010:50). Three responses to dissatisfaction are proposed by Hirschman, namely exit, voice and loyalty (Mattsson et al., 2004; Sharma, Marshall, Reday & Na, 2010; Tronvoll, 2011; Kim et al., 2014). Exit refers to the voluntary decision to end the relationship with the retailer or manufacturer (Mattsson et al., 2004; Yuksel et al., 2006; Sharma et al., 2010). This is an active and destructive response to dissatisfaction (Crié, 2003; Sharma et al., 2010) since the company loses revenue, their membership count declines and they are unable to correct the mistakes that caused consumers to exit the relationship (Hirschman, 1970:4; Walters, 2010:50).

With the voice option consumers communicate their dissatisfaction directly to manufacturers or retailers, to friends and family through negative word-of-mouth or to third parties (Yuksel et al., 2006). Voicing complaints are constructive as companies are informed of problems with the product or service and change is expected (Hirschman, 1970:4; Walters, 2010:50).
Lastly, the loyalty option refers to the continuing support of consumers despite their dissatisfiedness, as they hope for future improvements (Yuksel et al., 2006; Ashley & Varki, 2009). According to Yuksel et al. (2006), consumers may decide to stay loyal as a result of their high opinion of the firm or because of switching costs, time and money limitations, location constraints, habit, inertia or a lack of perceived differentiation of alternatives. Consumers may also feel indifferent, trapped or that there are no other alternative options (Yuksel et al., 2006). Créé (2003) asserts that loyalty can become both a passive and a constructive response if consumers believe that positive changes can be made in the company.

2.2.2.2 Day and Landon’s taxonomy of complaint behaviour

Day and Landon (1977) proposed one of the first classification schemes that were completely dedicated to conceptualising consumer complaint behaviour. They suggested a two-level hierarchical categorization scheme of complaint behaviour where the first level differentiates between taking action (behavioural response) and taking no action (non-behavioural response), and the second level distinguishes between public and private action. Three types of response options are therefore proposed, namely taking no action, taking private action or taking public action (Day & Landon, 1977:429-432; Lam & Tang, 2003; Gursoy, McCleary & Lepsito, 2007; Kim & Chen, 2010; Tronvoll, 2011; Kim et al., 2014). Refer to Figure 2.1.

Consumers may decide not to take action if they want to forget or rationalise the incident or if they cannot remember the occurrence (Gursoy et al., 2007; Yan & Lotz, 2009). Consumers may also refrain from taking any action if they feel complaining is not worth their time and effort (Hernandez & Fugate, 2004; Huppertz, 2007). Private action includes spreading negative word-of-mouth to friends and family as well as boycotting or switching retailers, manufacturers, service providers or brands (Phau & Sari, 2004; Ndubisi & Ling, 2006; Kim et al., 2014). Public action entails complaining directly to the manufacturer or retailer, seeking redress (i.e. refunds, replacements, repairs, exchanges, apologies, etcetera) or complaining to third parties including consumer protection agencies, ombudsmen and legal representatives (Kim et al., 2003; Tronvoll, 2011; Kim et al., 2014). Consumers can also engage in both public and private actions, resulting in a variety of dissatisfaction responses (Singh, 1990a; Halstead, 2002; Phau & Sari, 2004).
Day and Landon (1976) propose that the nature and the importance of a product or service influence which behavioural action the consumer would engage in. It is further assumed that consumers are more likely to engage in public complaining when it involves expensive, complex products like household appliances. However, irrespective of the importance of a product or service, many consumers still opt to complain privately or not at all (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Crié, 2003).

2.2.2.3 Singh’s taxonomy of consumer complaint responses

Singh (1988) proposed that consumer complaint behaviour be categorised in terms of a three-dimensional schema. The various complaint behaviour responses are distinguished according to the object towards which consumers direct their dissatisfaction (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Walters, 2010:52). The three behavioural responses identified are private responses, voice responses and third-party responses (Singh, 1988; Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Yuksel et al., 2006; Kim & Lynn, 2007; Emir, 2011; Tronvoll, 2011; Chang, Khan & Tsai, 2012). Refer to Figure 2.2.
Consumers engaging in private responses direct their dissatisfaction towards persons who are neither directly involved in the dissatisfying experience nor external to their social circle, such as their friends and family (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Yuksel et al., 2006). Private responses include negative word-of-mouth communication, boycotting the firm or exiting (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Yuksel et al., 2006; Emir, 2011; Tronvoll, 2011). Consumers engage in voice responses when they express their dissatisfaction towards persons who are both directly involved in the dissatisfying experience and external to the consumer's social circle (e.g. retailers/manufacturers/service providers) (Yuksel et al., 2006; Chang et al., 2012). Voice is thus a direct, confrontational approach (Wan, 2011), which involves complaining and seeking redress from the firm (Yuksel et al., 2006; Emir, 2011). Consumers engaging in third-party responses direct their dissatisfaction in an indirect way at persons external to the consumer (Yuksel et al., 2006; Kim & Lynn, 2007). Third-party responses include taking legal action or complaining to third parties (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Yuksel et al., 2006; Kim & Lynn, 2007; Emir, 2011; Tronvoll, 2011).

For the purpose of this study, Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour served as the foundation for classifying consumer complaint behaviour responses. Their model of consumer complaint behaviour has achieved wide acceptance in consumer complaint behaviour literature. It has been applied internationally in a variety of complaint behaviour studies (e.g. Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Keng & Liu, 1997; Phau & Sari, 2004; Ndubisi & Ling, 2006; Yuksel et al., 2006), and in a South African context in studies conducted by Donoghue (2008), Muller (2014) and Van Oordt (2015).
2.2.3 Factors affecting consumer complaint behaviour

Although consumer dissatisfaction is widely recognised as a necessary determinant of consumer complaint behaviour, it is however an insufficient basis for predicting consumer complaint behaviour (Velázquez et al., 2006; Kim & Chen, 2010; Souiden & Ladhari, 2011). This implies that a variety of factors that go beyond dissatisfaction also influence consumer complaint behaviour (Halstead, 2002; Phau & Sari, 2004; Velázquez, Blasco, Saura & Contrí, 2010). Donoghue and De Klerk (2009) suggested categorising these factors into three groups based on previous research. These groups were consumer-related variables, product-specific variables and redress environment variables (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009; Lee & Cude, 2012). A discussion of the above-mentioned factors follows in the next sections.

2.2.3.1 Consumer-related variables

Consumer-related factors have been receiving the most attention in consumer complaint behaviour literature (Velázquez et al., 2010). These variables refer to the characteristics of individuals that are likely to affect their complaint behaviour (Souiden & Ladhari, 2011) and includes demographic variables, personality factors, attitudes (Yan & Lotz, 2009; Kim & Chen, 2010; Kim et al., 2010; Souiden & Ladhari, 2011), prior complaining experience (Kim et al., 2003; Kim & Chen, 2010; Velázquez et al., 2010), personal values (Keng & Liu, 1997; Volkov, 2003; Souiden & Ladhari, 2011), culture, as well as psychosocial factors such as emotions and causal attributions for product failure (Chelminski, 2003; Velázquez et al., 2010; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016).

Demographic variables

Demographic variables are some of the first and most common predictors used to predict consumers’ complaint behaviour (Fox, 2008). Numerous studies have found that demographic variables may influence consumer complaint behaviour (e.g. Keng & Liu, 1997; Heung & Lam, 2003; Reiboldt, 2003; Volkov, 2003; Ndubisi & Ling, 2006; Fox, 2008; Kim et al., 2010). Although gender, age and income are some of the most prevalent demographic variables discussed in complaint research (Fox, 2008), education, employment status and culture have also been explored (Reiboldt, 2003).

It has been consistently found that complainers usually have a higher socioeconomic status than non-complainers (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Tronvoll, 2007), seeing as they tend to have
professional jobs, earn higher incomes and have had better education than non-complainers (Phau & Sari, 2004; Volkov, Harker & Harker, 2005). Consumers belonging to a higher socioeconomic class have the financial resources to purchase a wider variety as well as more expensive products, which might lead to a greater incidence of dissatisfaction and complaint behaviour (Tronvoll, 2007). Moreover, consumers with a high socioeconomic status tend to possess the knowledge, confidence and motivation to complain when they are dissatisfied (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Tronvoll, 2007). Consumers with a low socioeconomic status, on the other hand, tend to be less likely to complain and are therefore usually segmented as vulnerable consumer groups (Ennew & Schoefer, 2003). Contradictory results have however also been found by Tronvoll (2007), where consumers with a lower socioeconomic status had the highest complaint frequency of all the socioeconomic classes.

Results are inconclusive regarding the demographic profile of complainers and non-complainers. Complainers have been reported to be younger than non-complainers (e.g. Heung & Lam, 2003; Lam & Tang, 2003; Phau & Sari, 2004; Volkov et al., 2005). Opposite results have however also been obtained (Sujitthamrak & Lam, 2007; Phau & Baird, 2008). In addition, Broadbridge and Marshall (1995) found no significant differences between various age groups and their complaint behaviours.

In terms of gender, some studies found that females were more likely to complain than males (e.g. Keng et al., 1995; Heung & Lam, 2003; Phau & Sari, 2004; Volkov et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2010). Yet again, other studies found that males were more likely to complain publicly than females (Manickas & Shea in Kim et al., 2010). Moreover, Broadbridge and Marshall (1995), Lam and Tang (2003) and Sujitthamrak and Lam (2007) found no significant relationships between gender and complaint behaviour. Due to the mixed results obtained by the various studies, one can conclude that the relationship between gender and complaint behaviour might be influenced by specific factors such as the context of the research (Sujitthamrak & Lam, 2007).

With regard to income, Sujitthamrak and Lam (2007) found that respondents from higher-income groups were more likely to complain than lower-income groups. These findings were supported by Broadbridge and Marshall (1995), Lam and Tang (2003), Heung and Lam (2003) and Emir (2011). Sujitthamrak and Lam (2007) specifically found that respondents from medium- to higher-income groups were more inclined to seek redress and to complain to management than lower-income groups. Donoghue (2008) further found that lower-income
groups were significantly more likely to boycott retailers and to complain to retailers for reasons other than seeking redress.

Concerning level of education, Sujitthamrak and Lam (2007) showed that consumers with university educations complained more than consumers with a lower level of education. Similar results were obtained by Lam and Tang (2003) in that Hong Kong consumers with a higher education were more likely to complain privately about their dissatisfaction with restaurant services by refusing to dine in the restaurant, by spreading negative word-of-mouth and by pursuing friends and family to stop supporting the restaurant. Singh (1990a) and Broadbridge and Marshall (1995), however, found no significant relationships between level of education and different types of complaint behaviour.

In terms of population group, black South Africans are traditionally viewed as more collectivistic in nature, whereas white South Africans tend to conform to more individualistic values (Adams, Van der Vijver & De Bruin, 2011). However, Wissing, Wissing, Du Toit and Temane (2006) acknowledge that great variations exist within these contexts on an individual level. Donoghue’s (2008) study showed that black consumers were more actively involved in complaint behaviour than white consumers, contradicting previous research which suggests that collectivists are more likely to be more passive in terms of complaint behaviour than individualists (Liu & McClure, 2001; Laufer, 2002; Zourrig, Chebat & Toffoli, 2009). Furthermore, compared to white consumers, the black consumers were only slightly more likely to engage in negative word-of-mouth and were much more likely to switch firms or boycott the firm. They were also more prone to complain to the seller to obtain redress or for alternative reasons when a major household appliance was the object of dissatisfaction. These findings probably relate to the fact that urban black South Africans recently began to embrace a mixture of African and Western values due to rising urbanisation and acculturation while most of the white South African consumers still subscribe to Western values (Rousseau, 2003b:401; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016). Black people are therefore progressively embracing individualistic values such as assertiveness and self-confidence in addition to their collective will (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009).

**Personality factors**

It has been established that complainers’ personality traits differ from those of non-complainers as complainers tend to be more individualistic, self-confident, assertive (Keng et al., 1995; Phau & Sari, 2004; Bodey & Grace, 2006; Kim et al., 2010), competitive (Huang, Wu, Chuang & Lin,
2014), independent, less conservative, and willing to take risks and stand up for their rights (Phau & Sari, 2004). Non-complainers, on the other hand, are more relaxed, conciliatory, guilt-prone (Huang et al., 2014), unassertive, insecure (Bodey & Grace, 2006; Huang et al., 2014), risk averse and highly conservative (Bodey & Grace, 2006).

**Attitudes**

Consumers with favourable attitudes towards complaining have been found to be more likely to complain (Halstead & Dröge, 1991; Bodey & Grace, 2006; Kim & Chen, 2010) and to seek redress (Halstead & Dröge, 1991; Kim et al., 2003; Ekiz & Au, 2011). A favourable attitude towards complaining is specifically expected to increase consumers’ likelihood to engage in public complaining, but also to complain privately in the case of compensation (Oh, 2006; Fox, 2008).

Numerous researchers have examined the effect of consumers’ attitudes toward businesses on complaint behaviour (e.g. Barnes & Kelloway, 1980; Keng et al., 1995; Keng & Liu, 1997; Lau & Ng, 2001; Phau & Sari, 2004). Barnes and Kelloway (1980) explored the effect of Canadian respondents’ attitudes toward businesses on their complaint behaviour but found no significant relationship. The study undertaken by Keng and colleagues (1995), on the other hand, confirmed the relationship between Singaporean consumers’ attitudes toward businesses and their complaint behaviour. They found that complainers in general held more positive attitudes toward businesses, whereas non-complainers were more prone to distrust firms and to believe that complaining would be a waste of time and effort. In a similar vein, Lau and Ng (2001) found that Singaporean consumers with a poor attitude towards businesses were more likely to engage in negative word-of-mouth behaviour and were more likely to attribute blame towards the firm. Moreover, Phau and Sari’s (2004) study involving Indonesian respondents revealed that both complainers and non-complainers held more negative attitudes toward businesses in general.

In the South African context, Van Oordt’s (2015:92-93) research revealed that knowledge of consumerism could be associated with complaint behaviour, but that attitudes towards consumerism did not play a significant role in consumer complaint behaviour. Further research on the link between consumers’ attitudes toward business, and in the case of this study, specifically consumers’ attitudes toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling, could provide more insight into the effect of attitudes as antecedent to complaint behaviour.
Experience

Consumers’ previous experiences with product or service encounters influence their satisfaction or dissatisfaction level when evaluating current products or services (Bodey & Grace, 2006; Kim et al., 2010). In addition, consumers’ past experiences, in terms of the number of purchases, the level of dissatisfaction, previous complaints and the degree of consumption, influence their decision to complain or not (Velázquez et al., 2010). It has also been noted by Reibolt (2003) that prior complaining experiences usually lead to more positive attitudes towards complaining as well as an increased probability of future complaining.

Personal values

Personal values are regarded as an antecedent to complaint behaviour (Souiden & Ladhari, 2011). Rogers and Williams (1990) investigated the link between values and public complaining behaviour by using the Rokeach Value Survey. They found that consumers who complain in public tend to be security conscious, ambitious and seek accomplishment, whereas consumers who do not complain in public tend to be more impolite, lack ambition and do not seek personal accomplishments.

Keng and Liu (1997) confirmed the existence of a relationship between personal values and complaint behaviour in an Asian setting. They used the LOV to categorise respondents as either group-oriented or self-oriented, based on the respondents’ selection of personal values. Self-oriented consumers were found to have positive attitudes towards complaining and were more self-confident, assertive and risk averse, which caused them to engage primarily in public complaint behaviour. In contrast, group-oriented consumers were mainly only willing to take private actions (Keng & Liu, 1997). As personal values are one of the central constructs of the study, it is discussed in more detail in section 2.3.

Culture

Consumers from different cultural backgrounds tend to differ in the ways in which they express their dissatisfaction (Ngai, Heung, Wong & Chan, 2007; Huang et al., 2014) and therefore to differ in terms of their complaint intentions and behaviours (Patterson, Cowley & Prasongsukarn, 2006). Individualism is generally used to describe the predominant cultures of Western Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand, whereas African, Middle Eastern and East Asian countries are characterized primarily by collectivism (Triandis, 2001).
Individualistic consumers are more likely to engage in formal complaint behaviour directed at second or third parties and are more inclined to take legal action than their collectivistic counterparts (Zourig et al., 2009). Individualists have the confidence to voice complaints since their self-esteem and attitudes are based on self-expression, uniqueness and the validation of internal attributes (Laufer, 2002; Patterson et al., 2006). Individualists tend to be more dissatisfied with service failures when it involves the loss of economic resources (Chan & Wan, 2008; Huang et al., 2014). They are also more concerned with their personal goals and interests; therefore they are less lenient when their service and purchase goals are disturbed (Chan & Wan, 2008).

In contrast, members of collectivistic societies avoid confrontation due to their fear of disrupting the social harmony of a situation (Patterson et al., 2006; Ngai et al., 2007; Chan & Wan, 2008). They are thus more willing to complain privately by spreading word-of-mouth or exiting from a situation (Phau & Sari, 2004; Chan & Wan, 2008; Huang et al., 2014).

**Emotions**

Negative emotions such as anger, sadness and regret are known to have a significant influence on consumer complaint behaviour (Mattsson et al., 2004; Tronvoll, 2011; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2013. Negative emotions, evoked by product or service failures, are augmented when consumers perceive a lack of fairness in retailers’ complaint handling, contributing to post-complaint behavioural responses (Kim et al., 2010). Donoghue and De Klerk (2013) found that consumers who experienced high levels of anger, shame, frustration or sadness due to the appraisal of product performance failures were more likely to contact retailers or manufacturers to obtain redress. Donoghue, De Klerk and Isaac’s (2012) study also pointed to the strong power of emotions in consumers’ choice of coping strategies in the form of complaint behaviour, with, among others, significant relationships between high levels of anger, sadness, shame and frustration on the one hand, and problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies on the other.

**Causal attributions**

Various researchers have studied the influence of attributional processing on consumer complaint behaviour (e.g. Weiner, 2000; Laufer, 2002; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016). It has been found that consumers who attribute blame for the product or service failure to the retailer, manufacturer or the product or service itself (external
factors) tend to be more dissatisfied and more willing to complain than when they blame themselves for the product or service failure (internal factors) (Weiner, 2000; Hernandez & Fugate, 2004). When consumers attribute the product failure externally, they may also decide to spread negative word-of-mouth as a way to vent their anger (Folkes, 1988; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016).

Furthermore, previous research suggests that consumers who blame a company for a product or service failure usually prefer a refund over a replacement by way of compensation. Consumers also tend to be more angry and vengeful when they believe the company could have prevented the failure from happening (Curren & Folkes, 1987; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016).

### 2.2.3.2 Product-specific variables

Product-specific variables influence dissatisfied consumers’ decisions to seek redress, to take private or public action or to take no action (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2013). Product-specific variables that influence complaint behaviour entails the nature or type (complexity) of product (Keng et al., 1995; Kincade, Giddings & Chen-Yu, 1998; Hansen, Wilke & Zaichkowsky, 2010), the price of the product (Day & Landon, 1977:434; Kincade et al., 1998; Phau & Sari, 2004; Hansen et al., 2010), the durability of the product (Day & Landon, 1977:434; Kincade et al., 1998; Hansen et al., 2010), the product’s importance to the consumer (Homburg, Fürst & Koschat, 2010; Sharma et al., 2010), the severity of the dissatisfaction (Day & Landon, 1977:434; Donoghue, 2008:29; Homburg et al., 2010), the type of product failure (Kincade et al., 1998; Donoghue, 2008:29), and the problems caused as a result of the dissatisfaction (Singh & Wilkes, 1996; Homburg et al., 2010).

The importance of the product to the consumer depends on the cost and the degree of relevance of the product to the consumer (Blodgett, Granbois & Walters, 1993; Homburg et al., 2010). The significance of the product or service also determines how much time and energy consumers are willing to invest in complaining (Blodgett & Granbois, 1992; Walters, 2010:55). Blodgett et al. (1993) found that dissatisfied consumers who perceived the product as important were more likely to spread negative word-of-mouth.

The perceived seriousness of a problem refers to how intensely a consumer experiences dissatisfaction due to the problem or failure (Weun, Beatty & Jones, 2004; Homburg et al., 2010; Walters, 2010:55). The severity of a problem is a determinant of the effort with which a
consumer responds to a product or service failure (Richins, 1983; Walters, 2010:55). Consumers respond with a minimal effort when minor dissatisfaction is experienced and as a result they will be unlikely to lodge any form of complaint (Richins, 1983; Fox, 2008; Walters, 2010:55). When dissatisfaction is severe enough, consumers will complain, regardless of other factors influencing the situation (Richins, 1983; Hernandez & Fugate, 2004; Fox, 2008; Walters, 2010:55).

Past research suggests that the amount of formal complaints increase as the complexity, cost and life expectancy of the products increase (Day & Landon, 1977:432; Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue, 2008:30). Therefore, complex and expensive products such as major household appliances are known to cause more public complaints than smaller, less expensive goods such as grocieries, which generate more private complaints (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue, 2008:24). It is furthermore known that consumers are more likely to seek redress in the case of durables than non-durables (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Kincade et al., 1998; Donoghue, 2008:30). Lastly, Donoghue (2008) found that the type of product failure, whether it was functional or symbolic, influenced consumers’ dissatisfaction with major household appliances and their subsequent complaint behaviour in a South African context.

2.2.3.3 Redress environment variables

Consumers sense the need for redress when the product or service falls short of their expectations (Rousseau, 2003a:457). Retailers are the main influencers and controllers of the redress environment variables (Halstead & Dröge, 1991; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2006). Consumers’ complaint behaviour may be influenced by redress environment variables, which may include perceptions of companies’ responsiveness to complaints (Richins & Verhage, 1985; Augusto de Matos, Vargas Rossi, Teixeira Veiga & Vieirra, 2009; Kim et al., 2010; Sharma et al., 2010), perceptions of the inconvenience involved in complaining (Richins, 1983; Mattila & Wirtz, 2004; Sharma et al., 2010) and perceptions of the likelihood of successful complaining (Kim et al., 2003; Velázquez et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2010).

Consumers evaluate companies’ responsiveness to complaints, i.e. companies’ willingness to provide solutions to consumers’ dissatisfaction with products or services and to supply complaint handling procedures (Blodgett & Granbois, 1992; Augusto de Matos et al., 2009), according to the fairness of the redress offered (i.e. the amount of compensation offered), the fairness of the complaint process (i.e. perceived timeliness and whether complainants felt they had control over the process), and the fairness of the interpersonal treatment received (i.e.
employee empathy, politeness and effort) (Donoghue, 2008:31; Homberg et al., 2010). These are collectively known as perceived justice/fairness, which largely determines whether consumers engage in complaint behaviour (Kau & Loh, 2006). It should be noted that consumers are more likely to complain directly to a company when they have a positive perception of the company’s responsiveness to complaints (Lau & Ng, 2001; Kau & Loh, 2006).

Consumers’ perceptions of the likelihood of successful complaining are also known to determine their willingness to complain (Velázquez et al., 2006), and link with the responsiveness of companies (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009). Consumers may judge the possibility of successful complaining based on the company’s sensitivity towards the complainant (Velázquez et al., 2006) and the possible personal and social benefits of complaining (Singh & Wilkes, 1996; Stephens & Gwinner, 1998; Velázquez et al., 2006). If consumers perceive the likelihood of successful complaining to be low, they might decide to rather switch retailers or spread negative word-of-mouth (Singh, 1990b; Blodgett & Granbois, 1992; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009).

Perceptions of the inconvenience involved in complaining entail the anticipated cost, time and effort it would take to engage in complaint behaviour (Bodey & Grace, 2006; Kim et al., 2010). Consumers are more likely to engage in formal complaint behaviour if the complaint handling mechanism for the unsatisfactory product or service does not cause the consumer to go through a great deal of trouble and if the perceived monetary and psychological costs are low (Richins, 1983; Donoghue, 2008:32-33).

2.3 PERSONAL VALUES

Values are believed to be among some of the most significant psychological constructs (Cai & Shannon, 2012). Not only do values serve as the basis for cognition, emotions, attitudes and behaviour (Hills in Li & Cai, 2012), but they are also regarded as antecedents to culture, society and personality (Rokeach, 1973:3; Grankvist et al., 2007; Pintol, Nique, Añaña, & Herter, 2011).

Values have been defined in various ways (Keng & Liu, 1997; Roe & Ester, 1999), and no universally accepted definition exists. There is, however, general agreement concerning the basic aspects that a definition of values should include (Kopanidis, 2008:34). Most researchers agree that a value constitutes a belief that is abstract and enduring in nature and therefore this is central to most definitions of values (Shrum, McCarty & Loeffler in Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014).
The most widely accepted definition of values is that of Rokeach (1973:5), who viewed values as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”.

Schwartz and Bilsky (1987:551) proposed a more comprehensive definition of values; they defined values as “(a) concepts or beliefs, (b) about desirable end states or behaviours, (c) that transcend specific situations, (d) guide selection or evaluation of behaviour and events, and (e) are ordered by relative importance”. Another widely used definition of values is that of Schwartz (1994:21), who conceptualised values as “desirable, transsituational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or other social entity”. Irrespective of how values are defined, one can conclude that values remain fundamental to individuals and society as a whole (Claxton, McIntyre, Clow & Zemanek, 1996).

Values are not beliefs that can be proven in the traditional sense since they are “abstract ideals” (Rokeach, 1973:10; Thompson & Troester, 2002) that consciously and cognitively symbolize human needs (Schwartz, 1994; Hartman, Shim, Barber & O’Brien, 2006; Li & Cai, 2012). Values are essential to personal identity, and are linked to cognitive processing style and personality differences (Claxton et al., 1996; Kropp, Lavack & Silvera, 2005). Values guide what is important to us in our lives (Schwartz, 2005, 2012), and as a result, affect our judgements, preferences and choices (Williams in Shoham et al., 2003). Each individual holds a few values that vary in importance; thus, while one person may regard a particular value as very important, another person may not see it as equally important (Schwartz, 2005, 2012).

Values are mainly learned or acquired conceptually (Li & Cai, 2012) by means of socialisation (Hoyer, McInnes & Pieters, 2013:384; Liu, Bao & Liu, 2013), and are shaped by personal experiences, lifestyle and consumption patterns (Fountain & Lamb, 2011; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014) as well as personal heritage (Kahle et al., 1988; Kropp et al., 2005). Values are handed down from one generation to another (Sudbury & Simcock, 2009; Merchant & Khallaayoune, 2010). These values are usually reinforced by society (Kim et al., 2002; Vincent, 2014), culture (Hoyer et al., 2013:384) and institutions such as schools, businesses, government, mass media, or reference groups (Hoyer et al., 2013:384; Vincent, 2014).

As soon as a value is learned, it becomes part of an organised system of value priorities wherein each value is arranged by importance relative to the others (Rokeach, 1973:11; Schwartz, 2005, 2012). This is known as a value system and according to Rokeach (1973:5) it can be defined as “an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct
or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance”. Rokeach (1973:22) noted that the concept value system should be distinguished from the concept value orientation even though the two concepts seem somewhat synonymous. According to Rokeach (1973:22), a value system entails a rank ordering of various values along a single continuum. Value orientation, on the other hand, refers to “clusters of prioritised values” (Stern & Dietz, 1994; Fransson & Gärling, 1999).

Rokeach (1973:7) observed differences between individuals’ values. The term personal values, rather than values in general, are used to distinguish values measured at the individual or micro-level from values measured at the broader, more societal or macro-level (Schiffman, Sherman & Long, 2003; Purutçuoğlu, 2008). Personal values are therefore defined as “modes of conduct or end states of existence, that, once internalised, become guiding criteria for actions” (Rokeach, 1973:7; Thompson, 2009).

Various types of values have been identified in previous research, ranging from personal values (Rokeach, 1973:7; Kahle, 1983) to social values (Rokeach, 1973:7; Gurel-Atay, Xie, Chen, & Kahle, 2010), cultural values (Schwartz, 1999; Qian, Razzaque & Keng, 2007), organisational values (Kabanoff, Waldersee & Cohen, 1995), work values (George & Jones, 1997; Roe & Ester, 1999), specific consumption values (Antill, 1984), and materialistic values (Hurst, Dittmar, Bond & Kasser, 2013). Shim et al. (1999) note that all of these values have the same fundamental nature, that is, they serve as guiding principles, but they are different in terms of the context in which they are regarded. For instance, personal values refer to the desired behaviour or end-state of an individual (Hansen, 2008). It is related to a person’s own sense of self and concerns a person’s own judgements with regard to the best possible living (Nilsson, Von Borgstede & Biel, 2004). On the other hand, social values refer to the desired behaviour or end-state of a society or group (Hansen, 2008). It reflects a person’s interaction with other people and groups of people and their perception of other people’s judgements with regard to the best possible living (Nilsson et al., 2004).

2.3.1 Measurement of personal values

Due to the abstract nature of values, the measurement thereof is highly elusive (Beatty, Homer & Kahle, 1988; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). Researchers recommend the use of a combination or a list of values rather than a single value to increase the effectiveness of the measurement of values (e.g. Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; Kahle & Kennedy, 1988, Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). Different value surveys have been developed to measure and assess
personal values (Keng & Liu, 1997; Lee, Soutar & Louviere, 2007; Watkins, 2010). The most recognized value surveys include the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), Values and Lifestyle Survey (VALS), Schwartz Values Survey (SVS), Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ) and Kahle’s List of Values (LOV). These value surveys are discussed in the sections that follow.

2.3.1.1 Rokeach’s Value Survey

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), developed by Rokeach (1973), is one of the most widely used value measurement approaches (Kahle, 1996:141; Allen, 2001; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). The RVS consists of a total of 36 values that are subdivided into 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values, which are then ranked in order of importance (Beatty, Kahle, Homer & Misra, 1985; Razzaque, 2002). Terminal values are defined as ideal end states of existence (Rokeach, 1973:7; Bearden, Netemeyer & Haws, 2011:151; Li & Cai, 2012) and represent life goals (Iskra & Moskvicheva, 2014). Terminal values include values such as true friendship, mature love, self-respect, happiness, inner harmony, equality, freedom, pleasure, social recognition, wisdom, salvation, family security, national security, a sense of accomplishment, a world of beauty, a world at peace, a comfortable life and an exciting life (Rokeach, 1973:119; Kamakura & Mazzon, 1991; Bocsi, 2012; Ladhari & Tchetgna, 2015).

Instrumental values, on the other hand, refer to preferred modes of conduct (Rokeach, 1973:7; Bearden et al., 2011:151; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014) and serve as tools to achieve terminal values or life goals (Iskra & Moskvicheva, 2014). Instrumental values include personality traits and personal characteristics such as being ambitious, broadminded, capable, cheerful, clean, courageous, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, intellectual, logical, loving, obedient, polite, responsible and self-controlled (Rokeach, 1973:119; Wang & Rao, 1995; Bocsi, 2012). Terminal and instrumental values are considered two separate yet functionally interrelated systems, wherein instrumental values are active in the attainment of terminal values. In general, personal values correspond to terminal values, whereas instrumental values correspond to values of desirable activities (Rokeach, 1973:7; Kopanidis, 2008:35).

The RVS is known to have various limitations: Information can sometimes get lost as a result of rank orderings; the process of ranking of the values is difficult and time consuming (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Li & Cai, 2012; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014); the significance of the RVS’s values in consumers’ daily lives is sometimes questioned (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Li & Cai, 2012; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014; Lee, Lusk, Mirosa & Oey, 2014); the values of the RVS are not all related to consumer behaviour (Kahle, 1996:141; Shoham et al., 2003); and rank ordering may
result in ipsative or non-independent data that may be considered less informative than ratio or interval scaling (Razzaque, 2002). The above criticism of the RVS has led to the development of a number of other measurement approaches emanating from the RVS, including the LOV (Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014).

### 2.3.1.2 Values and Lifestyle Survey

The Values and Lifestyle Survey (VALS) is another popular conceptualisation of values and have been suggested as an alternative measurement approach to the RVS (Shoham et al., 2003). VALS was developed at SRI (Stanford Research Institute) International by Mitchell (1983) and is based on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs and Riesman, Glazer and Denney’s (1950) social character theory (Kahle et al., 1986; Beatty et al., 1988; Shoham et al., 2003).

With VALS, 34 demographic and attitudinal measures are used to group consumers into one of nine lifestyle categories for which distinct profiles are provided (Kahle et al., 1986; Kahle, 1996; Shoham et al., 2003). The nine lifestyle groups identified by Mitchell (1983) in the United States are survivors (4%), sustainers (7%), belongers (35%), emulators (9%), achievers (22%), I-am-me (5%), experiential (7%), societally conscious (9%), and integrated (2%).

### 2.3.1.3 Schwartz’s Value Survey

Schwartz’s (1992) theory of human values has been validated cross-culturally in more than 60 countries (Schwartz, 1992, 1994; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris & Owens, 2001; Hansen, 2008; Lee et al., 2014). The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) comprise of a list of 57 single-value items (e.g. wisdom, stimulation, creativity, authority), representing ten distinct value domains, namely security, hedonism, benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, universalism, tradition, conformity, achievement and power (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et al., 2001; Kitsawad & Guinard, 2014; Lee et al., 2014). These ten motivationally distinct value domains are intended to encompass the core values recognised in various cultures around the world (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; Kitsawad & Guinard, 2014).

The ten value domains represent a continuum of related motivations that gives rise to a circular arrangement as depicted in Figure 2.3 (Schwartz, 1994; Burgess & Harris, 1998; Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006). The closer values are located to one another around the circle, the more alike their underlying motivations are and vice versa (Schwartz et al., 2001; Struch, Schwartz & Van der Kloot, 2002; Schwartz, 2012).
The ten value domains are further grouped into two bi-polar value dimensions. The first value dimension refers to “openness to change” versus “conservation” and contrasts stimulation and self-direction values to tradition, security and conformity values. The second value dimension refers to “self-enhancement” versus “self-transcendence” and opposes achievement and power values to benevolence and universalism values (Schwartz, 1994; Burgess & Harris, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2001; Ungerer & Strasheim, 2011; Schwartz, 2012).

FIGURE 2.4: THEORETICAL MODEL OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE TEN MOTIVATIONAL TYPES OF VALUES (Schwartz, 2012)

In general, the SVS has been criticised as being too large and time consuming to complete, and the equivalence across cultures of some of the value items has also been questioned (Struch et al., 2002; Watkins, 2010). The SVS also requires a high level of mental effort since values are presented in their abstract form outside a specific context (Schwartz et al., 2001; Ungerer, 2009:124; De Barcellos et al., 2012). The abstractness of the SVS therefore causes major problems with the implementation of the survey in samples from emerging consumer markets
(Schwartz, Lehmann & Roccas, 1997; Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006). For example, previous studies applying the SVS in a South African context noted that Schwartz’s values theory may not suit the value systems of consumers that are young, less educated, or elderly and illiterate (Schwartz & Bardi in Burgess & Harris, 1998; Ungerer, 2009:123). This also pertains to consumers belonging to African, Indian, Malaysian and rural cultures in emerging countries (Schwartz & Bardi in Burgess & Harris, 1998; Ungerer, 2009:123).

2.3.1.4 Portrait Values Questionnaire

Schwartz, Lehmann and Roccas (1997) developed the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) to address the limitations of the SVS by measuring the same ten-value construct in a more concrete and comprehensible way so that it can be applied in less advantaged populations like South Africa where the SVS is not as suited (Schwartz et al., 2001; Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002). This allows the extension of values research to numerous emerging consumer markets that have been insufficiently researched in the past (Burgess & Steenkamp, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2001; Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002).

The PVQ contains 40 short verbal descriptions or portraits of people to which the respondents are asked to compare themselves (Schwartz, 2012; Sundberg, 2014). Each portrait describes an individual’s goals, aspirations or wishes which indirectly point to the importance of a value (Schwartz et al., 2001; Ungerer, 2009:4; De Barcellos et al., 2012). For example, the following two items measure hedonism and universalism respectively: (a) “He/she really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to him/her” and (b) “He/she strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him/her” (Kitsawad & Guinard, 2014).

A shorter version of the PVQ has also been developed which contains only 29 brief textual portraits (Burgess & Steenkamp, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2001; Steenkamp & Burgess, 2002). Schwartz et al. (2001) found support for the structure of Schwartz’s values model in South Africa, using the 29-item PVQ as a measurement instrument, although they did not provide strict tests of measurement invariance. Ungerer (2009) addressed the problem by testing the measurement invariance of Schwartz’s values across cultural groups, and the results pointed to the validity of Schwartz et al.’s (2001) PVQ scale within a cross-cultural context in South Africa.
2.3.1.5 List of Values

Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV) was developed to address the limitations of the RVS and to find a simpler and more economical measurement of personal values (Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). The LOV measures the values that are central in people’s lives (Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Bearden et al., 2011:151). It is one of the value measuring instruments that have been widely applied in order to investigate the relationship between personal values and the behaviour of consumers (Kim et al., 2002; Thompson, 2009). The scale was developed at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center and is based on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of values theory, Rokeach’s (1973) list of terminal values, Feather’s (1975) values and education study, and values derived from Veroff, Douvan & Kalka’s (1981) study (Kahle, Beatty & Homer, 1986; Fall, 2000; Razzaque, 2002; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). It is also most directly linked to the social adaptation theory (Kahle et al., 1986; Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005; Thompson, 2009) since it was created to “assess adaptation to various roles through value fulfilment” (Kahle et al., 1986:406).

In order to create the LOV scale, the RVS scale’s 36 value items were reduced to nine terminal value items (Lee et al., 2007). These values are mainly person-oriented (Fall, 2000) and include self-respect, being well respected, self-fulfilment, sense of accomplishment, excitement, security, sense of belonging, fun and enjoyment in life, and warm relationships with others (Kahle et al., 1986; Razzaque, 2002; Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005; Lee et al., 2014). However, only two of these values are the same as the values used in the RVS, namely sense of accomplishment and self-respect. The other values are more abstract values, developed by combining two or more values of the RVS scale. Security is for example collectively used for both family security and national security, and being well respected replaces respect and admiration (Watkins & Gnoth, 2005).

The LOV is implemented by providing respondents with a list of the nine personal value items and asking them to rank and/or rate each value item based on how important they regard it in their daily lives (Kahle et al., 1986; Thompson, 2009). Respondents are then grouped into value segments on the basis of their highest ranked or rated value (Kahle et al., 1986; Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Thompson, 2009).

Different approaches have been used to implement the LOV. Participants have been asked to identify their two most important values (e.g. Kahle, 1983), to rank the nine value items in order of importance (Lee et al., 2007) or to rate the nine value items on a 7-point or 9-point Likert-type
scale, ranging from unimportant through to very important (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Kim et al., 2002; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Lee et al., 2007). The LOV has also been implemented by using a “rate then rank” or vice versa approach (e.g. Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Merchand & Khallaayoune, 2010), or by asking respondents to rate the nine value items and then to select their single most important value from the list (Keng & Liu, 1997; Schiffman et al., 2003; Grankvist et al., 2007; Gurel-Atay, Xie, Chen & Kahle, 2010; Li & Cai, 2012).

Unlike the RVS, no definitions of the value items are included in the LOV scale (Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Thompson, 2009). Previous literature does however provide descriptions of the nine value items (Kahle, 1996:137; Grankvist et al., 2007; Gurel-Atay et al., 2010). A brief description of each value item in the LOV scale is provided in Table 2.1.

### TABLE 2.1: BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF THE VALUE ITEMS (Kahle, 1996:138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sense of belonging</td>
<td>To be accepted and needed by your family, friends, and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Excitement</td>
<td>To experience stimulation and thrills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>To have close companionships and intimate friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>To find peace of mind and to make the best use of your talents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being well respected</td>
<td>To be admired by others and to receive recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fun and enjoyment in life</td>
<td>To lead a pleasurable, happy life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td>To be safe and protected from misfortune and attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-respect</td>
<td>To be proud of yourself and confident with whom you are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>To succeed at what you want to do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various underlying dimensions of the LOV have been identified in previous studies (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Keng & Yang, 1993; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; Razzaque, 1995; Keng & Liu, 1997; Jayawardhena, 2004; Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). By grouping the nine personal values of the LOV scale into dimensions, certain value dimensions become important in situation-specific contexts (Shim et al., 1999; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014).

Kahle’s (1983) LOV scale distinguishes between internal and external values where internal values include self-fulfilment, sense of accomplishment, fun and enjoyment in life, excitement, warm relationships with others, and self-respect, and external values include security, being well respected, and sense of belonging (Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Bearden et al., 2011:151). External values entail the presence, judgement and opinions of others, while internal values do
not (Kropp et al., 2005). Individuals who regard internal values as more important are mainly internally motivated (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; Kropp et al., 2005). Internally oriented individuals are more self-motivated (Madrigal, 1995; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). They further possess the need to be in control of every aspect of their daily lives (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Kahle, 1996:136; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005) and they believe they have the ability to influence or control outcomes (Madrigal, 1995; Kropp et al., 2005; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). On the other hand, individuals who usually value external values more than internal values are more inclined to rely on external forces, like fate and luck, to guide their lives and to solve their problems (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005).

Studies conducted in the context of complaint behaviour (Keng & Liu, 1997), e-shopping behaviour (Jayawardhena, 2004), food purchasing (Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005) and choice of academic degrees (Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014) confirmed Kahle’s (1983) internal and external value distinction. Homer and Kahle’s (1988) findings in the context of natural food shopping also revealed an internal and external dimension, although a third factor, namely interpersonal values were also identified. The categorisation of the values into the various dimensions differed slightly from Kahle’s (1983) internal and external classification. Sense of belonging, being well respected, and security were grouped under the external value dimension; self-fulfilment, excitement, sense of accomplishment and self-respect were grouped under the internal value dimension; and fun and enjoyment in life and warm relationships with others were categorised under the interpersonal value dimension.

Although external and internal dimensions are predominant in most studies (Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Li & Cai, 2012; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014), other dimensions have also been identified. For example, Keng and Yang (1993) collapsed the nine items of the LOV into four dimensions, namely respect (being well respected by others and self-respect), harmony (security, sense of belonging and warm relationships with others), achievement (self-fulfilment and sense of accomplishment), and hedonism (excitement and fun and enjoyment in life). Madrigal and Kahle (1994) recognized four dimensions of the LOV in their study on vacation activity preferences, namely an external factor (sense of belonging, being well respected and security), an enjoyment/excitement factor (fun and enjoyment in life, excitement), an achievement factor (sense of accomplishment, self-fulfilment), and an egocentrism factor (self-respect, warm relationships with others). Keng and Liu (1997) distinguished between group-oriented (warm relationships with others, security and sense of belonging) and self-oriented (self-respect, being well respected, self-fulfilment, fun and enjoyment in life, excitement and sense of accomplishment) values in their study on complaint behaviour among Singaporean consumers.
Shim and Eastlick (1998) identified a self-actualisation dimension (self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, security, being well respected and self-fulfilment) and a social affiliation dimension (excitement, sense of belonging and warm relationships with others) in the context of regional mall shopping.

More recently, Jayawardhena (2004) classified the items of the LOV into a self-direction dimension (self-respect and self-fulfilment), an enjoyment dimension (excitement and fun and enjoyment in life), and a self-achievement dimension (sense of accomplishment, being well respected and security) in their examination of the influence of personal values on e-shopping attitude and behaviour. Chryssohooidis and Krystallis (2005) conducted a study in an organic food consumption context among consumers living in Greece in which they grouped the LOV items into three underlying dimensions labelled self-respect (self-fulfilment; self-respect; sense of accomplishment and excitement), enjoyment of life (fun and enjoyment and warm relationships with others), and belonging-security (sense of belonging, security and being well respected). In addition, despite using the same methodology as Madrigal and Kahle (1994), Watkins and Gnoth (2005) identified four dimensions in the context of Japanese tourism behaviour, where self-fulfilment, sense of belonging and sense of accomplishment loaded under Factor 1, excitement and security loaded under Factor 2, being well respected and warm relationships with others loaded under Factor 3, and self-respect loaded under Factor 4. Fun and enjoyment cross-loaded with all the other value items and therefore it was dropped from the factor solution.

The LOV has been applied in various market research contexts (Thompson, 2009). It has for instance been used to predict media preferences (Beatty et al., 1985), gift-giving behaviour (Beatty, Kahle & Homer, 1991; Beatty, Kahle, Utsey & Keown, 1993), conformity in dress (Rose, Shoham, Kahle & Batra, 1994), vacation activity (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994), participation in risky sports (Florenthal & Shoham, 2000), alcohol consumption (Shim & Maggs, 2005), shopping behaviours (Cai & Shannon, 2012), and food consumption (Lee et al., 2014).

The LOV has also been implemented extensively in various consumer research settings across a variety of nations (Kahle et al., 2000), including the United States, Venezuela, Germany, Australia, Russia, Norway, France, Denmark, Israel, Japan, Singapore and Taiwan (Kahle et al., 2000; Lee et al., 2007). Moreover, it has been applied to explore cross-cultural differences between values (Shoham et al., 2003). Findings from a variety of studies revealed that cultures differed with regard to which values they considered important (e.g. Keng & Yang, 1993; Razzaque, 1995; Shoham et al., 1998; Shoham et al., 2003).
Marketing and consumer behaviour researchers have presented convincing evidence supporting the superiority of the LOV over its rivals (Kahle et al., 1986; Beatty et al., 1988; Kahle & Kennedy, 1988; Kahle, 1996:138; Sudbury & Simcock, 2009). The LOV scale’s value items are more applicable to consumers’ everyday lives and behaviour (Kahle et al., 1986; Lee et al., 2007) and therefore predict consumers’ behaviour more accurately (Merchand & Khallaayoune, 2010; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). The LOV is also less susceptible to cross-cultural differences (Shoham et al., 2003), making it more transferable across cultures (Lee et al., 2007). This may be due to the fact that it is not culturally biased towards the United States (Kahle & Kennedy, 1988; Lee et al., 2007). Due to the small size of the LOV scale, the measurement (Lee et al., 2007), administration, completion (Kahle et al., 1986; Kahle, 1996:141; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005) and analysis (Valette-Florence in Merchand & Khallaayoune, 2010) can be done with ease. In conclusion, the LOV scale is brief, simple and easy to use (Lee et al., 2007).

Shoham and colleagues (2003) indicate that both the VALS and the LOV methodologies are based on Maslow’s theory and therefore are linked. The LOV has, however, been proven to be superior to VALS for a number of reasons (Kahle et al., 1986; Beatty et al., 1988; Lee et al., 2007). Firstly, compared to the VALS survey where demographics are part of the measurement method, the LOV allows for the separation of the impact of demographics and values on behaviour, making it easier to determine the source of influence (Fall, 2000; Florenthal & Shoham, 2000; Shoham et al., 2003). Secondly, the LOV has proven to be more appropriate for group comparisons, especially when it is used together with demographic data (Novak & MacEvoy, 1990; Lee et al., 2007).

However, the LOV is not without fault as one of its major problems is that respondents tend to allocate high importance scores to all nine personal values (Razzaque, 1995; Florenthal & Shoham, 2000; Shoham et al., 2003). The LOV is also known to suffer from “social desirability effect”. This refers to respondents either choosing the extremes of the scale or allocating similar scores to all nine personal values (Kahle, 1996:142; Razzaque, 1995; Kropp et al., 2005; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014), which makes it hard to determine respondents’ value hierarchy (Razzaque, 1995; Shoham et al., 2003). It has however been mentioned extensively in previous studies that the LOV has acceptable psychometric properties in measuring personal values for explaining a range of consumption behaviours (Kropp et al., 2005; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014).

The above-mentioned discussion highlights that the LOV is an appropriated measuring tool to explain consumers’ personal values in a variety of consumption behaviour contexts.
2.3.2 Application of personal values in a consumer behaviour context

For a long time now, personal values have been considered to be an important variable in understanding consumer behaviour and have been researched in a variety of disciplines (Long & Schiffman, 2000; Lages & Fernandes, 2005; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014), including marketing, social psychology, management, economics, etcetera (Lee, Soutar & Louviere, 2007; Lee, Soutar & Sneddon, 2010). Values have been found to lead to a variety of behavioural phenomena such as travel decisions (Pitts & Woodside, 1986), food consumption (Homer & Kahle, 1988), gift-giving behaviour (Beatty, Kahle & Homer, 1991), travel and tourism decisions (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994), complaint behaviour (Keng & Liu, 1997), internet usage (Long & Schiffman, 2000), mall shopping behaviour (Cai & Shannon, 2012), choice of career paths (Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014), and consumption of Fair Trade products (Ladhari & Tchetgna, 2015).

Values have also been found to predict various attitudinal outcomes such as environmental attitudes (Grunert & Juhl, 1995), attitudes towards retailing careers (Shim et al., 1999), attitudes towards e-shopping (Jayawardhena, 2004), attitudes towards genetically modified and organically grown food products (Dreezens, Martijn, Tenbült, Kok & De Vries, 2005a; 2005b), and attitudes towards reduced meat consumption (Hayley et al., 2014). Along with attitudes, values have also been found to influence personal involvement (Celsi & Olson, 1988; Zaichkowsky, 1994), personal goals (Nelson, 2004), and brand choice (Quester, Beverland, & Farrelly, 2006).

Personal values have also been applied in a number of studies within a South African context. For instance, Burgess and Steenkamp (1998) found that South African consumers’ value priorities affected their lifestyle interests, brand switching behaviour and their consumption of innovative financial products. In another study, Burgess and Harris (1998) established that value priorities and optimum stimulation level were significant predictors of brand loyalty behaviour. Ungerer (2009) determined that satisfaction with life and values, measured by the Portraits Value Questionnaire (PVQ), could be used as multivariate consumer market segmentation discriminators among South African consumers. Moreover, Meyer (2013) found that values, beliefs and norms had a noteworthy effect on female consumers’ clothing disposal behaviour in a South African context.
2.3.3. The link between demographics and personal values

Demographics have been known to influence values (Shoham et al., 1998; Shoham et al., 2003). Rokeach (1973:93) found evidence of the relationships between values and demographic variables including gender, race, income and education. The relationship between age and values and between gender and values has also been established in various studies (e.g. Keng & Yang, 1993; Razzaque, 1995; Shoham et al., 1998; Shoham et al., 2003). In a study conducted by Razzaque (1995) among Bangladeshi consumers, results revealed that older male managers who were more educated and earned a higher income, attached more importance to sense of accomplishment, self-fulfilment and self-respect. Furthermore, Keng and Liu’s (1997) study among Singaporean consumers revealed significant relationships between consumers’ demographics including age, level of income and level of education, and their value orientation. They established that consumers who were younger, better educated and earned higher incomes were more inclined to choose self-oriented values.

In terms of the relationship between age and personal values, Keng and Yang (1993) found that Taiwanese respondents older than 30 attached more importance to values like security, whereas younger consumers (19-29) regarded self-respect and being well respected as essential. Lascu, Manrai and Manrai (1996) also found evidence that values’ importance varies with age. More specifically, a significant relationship was found between Polish consumers’ age and their instrumental values. In a study conducted by Shoham and colleagues (1998) among Israeli consumers, the results revealed that younger consumers valued excitement, self-respect, self-fulfilment and sense of accomplishment more than older consumers. Shoham et al. (2003) found that as consumers mature, they assign a higher level of importance to values under all operationalisations. Specifically, findings revealed that older Israeli consumers ranked sense of belonging, warm relationships with others, self-fulfilment and self-respect higher than younger Israeli consumers. Furthermore, Sudbury and Simcock (2009) found that consumers between the ages of 50 and 79 years of age attached the most importance to self-respect, followed by security, warm relationships with others and sense of accomplishment. They regarded fun and enjoyment in life and being well respected as the least important value. Moreover, Fall (2000) and Arambewela and Hall (2011) both found that the importance of hedonic values (fun and enjoyment in life and excitement) decreased as consumers became older.

Regarding the impact of gender on values, numerous studies conducted in various contexts have established that gender influences the importance of values (Rokeach, 1973:57; McCarty...
McCarty and Shrum (1993), for instance, found that gender differences influenced category preferences which were partly a function of gender. More specifically, they found that females valuing personal gratification were more prone to watch television, while males valuing security watched more news programmes. Shoham et al. (1998) reported significant differences between Israeli males and females concerning the importance they attach to the various personal values of the LOV. Females were found to value excitement, warm relationships with others, being well respected, security and self-respect more than males. Shoham and colleagues (2003) also found significant differences between Israeli males and females and the level of importance they attached to the items of the LOV. Their findings revealed that females considered sense of belonging, warm relationships with others, self-fulfilment and self-respect more important than males. Furthermore, Fall (2000) found that males valued interpersonal values (warm relationships with others, self-fulfilment, sense of belonging and self-respect) more than females, despite the fact that women are traditionally considered to be the more interpersonally-driven sex. Florenthal, Treister and Shoham (1999) noted that warm relationships with others might well be the global female value, the most important value to women all over the world. However, there seems to be a gender bias in value importance as females, compared to males, tend to assign a higher level of importance to all nine values of the LOV (Shoham et al., 2003).

Shoham et al. (1998) and Shoham et al. (2003) also investigated the simultaneous impact of gender and age on value importance. Shoham et al. (1998) found that younger Israeli females placed more importance on fun and enjoyment, being well respected and self-fulfilment. Shoham and colleagues (2003) also found that older Israeli females placed more importance on sense of belonging, warm relationships with others, self-fulfilment and self-respect than younger Israeli males.

Important differences between values within nations have been identified by various researchers (e.g. Beatty, Kahle, Utsey & Keown, 1993; Keng & Yang, 1993; Grunert & Muller, 1996; Kahle et al., 2000; Rose & Shoham, 2000; Lee et al., 2007). For example, Keng and Yang (1993) compared the importance of values among consumers from Taiwan, Singapore, the United States and West Germany. They indicated that Taiwanese and West German consumers valued harmony-based values such as security, sense of belonging, and warm relationships with others. In contrast, US consumers emphasized values of respect (self-respect and being well respected). In a study conducted by Beatty et al. (1993) in the context of gift-giving behaviour among American and Japanese consumers, they found that Japanese respondents considered self-fulfilment as the most important value in their lives, followed by
Since within-nation differences exist between values, it becomes increasingly important to examine possible value differences between various demographic groups or sub-cultures seeing as their views can differ considerably (Kahle et al., 2000). Kahle, Liu and Watkins (1992) for instance determined that different regions in the USA differed quite fundamentally in terms of the values they considered to be most important. Shoham, Florenthal, Kropp and Rose (1997) further determined that in Israel, Jewish respondents considered security to be their most important value, whereas Druze respondents chose self-respect as their most important value.

2.4 ATTITUDES

Multiple definitions have been given for the term attitude (Petty, Wegener & Fabrigar, 1997; Verbeke & Viaene, 1999; Eagly & Chaiken in Petty, Briñol & DeMarree, 2007; Fiske & Taylor, 2013:232). The concept of evaluation is central to the definition of attitudes (Petty et al., 1997; Petty et al., 2007; Fiske & Taylor, 2013:232). Attitudes are commonly referred to as people’s overall evaluations of various objects, issues and people (including the self) (Petty & Wegener, 1998; Petty et al., 2007; Hoyer et al., 2013:128). According to Eagly and Chaiken (In Dreezens, Martijn, Tenbült, Kok & De Vries, 2008), attitude objects can be abstract (customer service) or concrete (appliances) as well as individual (Nelson Mandela) or collective (retailers).

From a marketing perspective an attitude can be defined as a learned predisposition to behave in an enduring favourable or unfavourable manner toward market-related objects, events, situations or ideas (Botha, Brink, Machado & Rudansky in Cant, Brink & Brijball, 2006:147). Attitudes therefore refer to the way people think, feel and act towards some aspect of the
commercial environment, such as a retail store, a product or “market-related issues” (Cant et al., 2006:147).

Values are considered to be the foundation of attitudes (Verplanken & Holland, 2002; Eagly & Chaiken in Dreezens et al., 2005a; De Barcellos et al., 2012). Attitudes are distinguished from personal values in the following ways:

1. An attitude refers to an “organisation of several beliefs around a specific object or situation” whereas a value refers to “a single belief of a very specific kind” (Rokeach, 1973:18).
2. Individuals possess more attitudes than values (Fall, 2000; Cant et al., 2006:147).
3. Attitudes are less abstract than values (Grankvist et al., 2007).
4. Attitudes are generally more susceptible to change than values depending on the situation (Rohan, 2000; Hayley et al., 2014).
5. Attitudes are usually fixed to a specific object or situation whereas values are not (Fall, 2000; Cant et al., 2006:147; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:156).
6. Values are more stable than attitudes and are therefore considered to be more fundamental to an individual’s cognitive system (Rokeach, 1973:18; Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005; Hayley et al., 2014).
7. An attitude’s main feature is its variation on an evaluative dimension (favourable – unfavourable), whereas a value’s distinguishing feature is its variation in importance (Verplanken & Holland, 2002).

2.4.1 Tri-component model of attitudes

An attitude has a cognitive, affective and behavioural component that is represented in what is called the tri-component, the tripartite or the ABC model of attitudes (Breckler, 1984; Jin, 2011; De Barcellos et al., 2012; Mpinganjira, 2013:135). This model can possibly assist researchers with the examination of the structure of attitudes; more specifically, it can help them identify the components that form attitudes as well as the relationships between these components (Cant et al., 2006:147; Mpinganjira, 2013:129; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:160).

The affective component reflects individuals’ feelings and emotions towards an attitude object (Breckler, 1984; De Barcellos et al., 2012; Petzer, 2012). These feelings are usually evaluative in nature and determine a person’s favourable or unfavourable attitude towards the attitude object, and usually capture a person’s overall evaluation of the attitude object (Cant et al., 2006:149; Mpinganjira, 2013:129). An individual’s favourable attitude towards an object may
sometimes be hard to rationalise for the reason that it may be guided by a vague, general feeling developed without the consideration of cognitive information or beliefs regarding the attitude object (Cant et al., 2006:149; Hoyer et al., 2013:11). Individuals usually form affectively based attitudes towards products they utilise to make a statement about themselves (Cant et al., 2006:149).

The cognitive component of attitudes refers to individuals' beliefs concerning an attitude object (Jin, 2011; Petzer, 2012). Beliefs towards objects are formed by individuals’ knowledge, perceptions and thoughts about the object (Cant et al., 2006:148; Mpinganjira, 2013:130). Individuals can hold many beliefs towards attitude objects, regardless of whether these beliefs are true or false (Cant et al., 2006:148; Mpinganjira, 2013:130). Beliefs can either be informational (beliefs associated with the attributes of an attitude object) or evaluative (beliefs associated with the benefits of an attitude object) in nature (Cant et al., 2006:148; Mpinganjira, 2013:130). Cognitively based attitudes are usually developed towards important or complex products, such as appliances, which require objective or technical information processing before a decision can be made (Cant et al., 2006:148).

The behavioural or conative component reflects individuals’ likely response towards an attitude object (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:251; Petzer, 2012). It represents the result of the cognitive and affective components: what individuals decide to do about their knowledge and feelings concerning an attitude object (Cant et al., 2006:150; Mpinganjira, 2013:135; Solomon, 2013:274). This component entails not only individuals’ intention to act but also their actual behaviour with regard to a specific attitude object (Cant et al., 2006:150; Mpinganjira, 2013:135; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:157).

Until recently, the components of attitudes have been perceived as interconnected and internally consistent; it was believed that when an individual had negative feelings towards an attitude object, they also had negative beliefs and behavioural intentions towards that same attitude object (Fiske & Taylor, 2013:23; Mpinganjira, 2013:135). It has however been found that the components of attitudes can be inconsistent at times and as a result the model has lost some of its acceptance (Mpinganjira, 2013:141).

While all attitudes have affective, cognitive and behavioural components, individuals’ attitude towards attitude objects are more heavily weighted towards one of the three attitude components depending on the nature of the product (Cant et al., 2006:148; Zanna & Rempel in Jansson-Boyd, 2010:82). De Barcellos et al. (2012) indicate researchers should use a focused
approach when researching attitudes, and should consider attitudes towards specific attitude objects only. This study therefore focused on measuring the cognitive component of attitude or the beliefs consumers hold towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

2.4.2 Functions of attitudes

Attitude function, in other words, why people hold certain attitudes, facilitates the understanding of how attitudes are formed (Sutton & Douglas, 2013:162). Attitudes serve the broad function of helping individuals adapt to their environment (Eagly & Chaiken in Ajzen, 2001). Various functions of attitudes have been identified of which the utilitarian function, ego-defensive function, value-expressive function and knowledge function are the most widely recognised (Katz in Maio & Olsen, 1995; Ajzen, 2001; Grewal, Mehta & Kardes, 2004; Argyriou & Melewar, 2011; Augoustinos, Walker & Donaghue, 2014:119).

Attitudes that aid individuals in maximising rewards and minimising punishments, serve a utilitarian function (Katz in Maio & Olsen, 1995; Petty & Wegener, 1998; Nilsson et al., 2004; Argyriou & Melewar, 2011; Augoustinos et al., 2014:119). An attitude serves this function to the extent that it sums up the positive and negative outcomes associated with an attitude object (Argyriou & Melewar, 2011). The utilitarian function further emphasizes the social consequences following the expression of certain attitudes (Augoustinos et al., 2014:119).

Attitudes serve an ego-defensive function when they protect individuals’ self-esteem from the truths about themselves as well as the harsh realities of the outside world which may cause feelings of doubt (Katz in Maio & Olsen, 1995; Petty & Wegener, 1998; Cant et al., 2006:151).

Attitudes serving a value-expressive function allow individuals to express their central values (Shavitt, 1990; Katz in Maio & Olsen, 1995; Petty & Wegener, 1998; Argyriou & Melewar, 2011). Value-expressive attitudes thus provide individuals with the opportunity to state what they believe in and identify with (Augoustinos et al., 2014:120) and thus facilitate interpersonal communication (Argyriou & Melewar, 2011).

Attitudes serve a knowledge function when they aid individuals in understanding their environment, thus organising and giving meaning to it (Katz in Maio & Olsen, 1995; Jansson-Boyd, 2010:85; Augoustinos et al., 2014:119). Well-established attitudes are able to guide individuals’ information which helps them to decide which attitude objects to favour or not to favour (Jansson-Boyd, 2010:85).
2.4.3 Attitude formation and change

The development of attitudes takes place over time through a learning process (Karjalouto, Mattila & Pento, 2002). Social learning takes place through classical conditioning, instrumental conditioning, observational learning and cognitive learning (Karjalouto et al., 2002; Cant et al., 2006:153; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246; Mpinganjira, 2013:138; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:166).

Classical conditioning occurs when a neutral stimulus (e.g. a brand name) is associated with an attitude object which then generates a positive (or negative) response (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:166). Instrumental conditioning occurs when a positive (or negative) response follows a certain action (e.g. the purchase and consumption of a product) (Cant et al., 2006:153; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:166). Observational learning occurs when individuals observe others who exhibit responses through classical and instrumental learning (Mpinganjira, 2013:138; Sutton & Douglas, 2013:168). Cognitive learning occurs when individuals seek information or consult their own knowledge and beliefs to solve problems or satisfy needs (Cant et al., 2006:153; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246).

The formation of attitudes is furthermore influenced by past and direct experience (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246), word-of-mouth (Hoyer et al., 2013:11; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246), group influences, personality (Assael in Karjalouto et al., 2002), external authorities (e.g. teachers, friends, parents and other adults), and marketing communications (Cant et al., 2006:153; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246).

Although attitudes are relatively consistent they are not permanent, and they can therefore change with the gathering of new information (Cant et al., 2006:147; Hoyer et al., 2013:11; Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010:246). It is also harder to change attitudes that are strongly held than those that are weakly held (Mpinganjira, 2013:146-147).

2.4.4 Attitudes applied in a consumer complaint behaviour context

An attitude refers to an enduring combination of interrelated beliefs that describe, evaluate, and direct our actions in respect to an attitude object (Cant et al., 2006:147). Consumers’ attitudes therefore relate to specific attitude objects. In a complaint behaviour context, consumers’ attitudes toward businesses have been explored (Keng et al., 1995; Phau & Sari, 2004).
Attitudes toward businesses refer to consumers’ cognitions about the marketplace, firms’ behaviour and the use of products and services (Singh & Wilkes, 1996; Phau & Sari, 2004). The reputation of the seller with regard to quality and service, the pace and devotion with which the seller responds to complaints, and the sales pressure applied by sales personnel are factors that all add to the complexity of the issue (Keng et al., 1995; Phau & Sari, 2004).

Keng et al. (1995) developed the “attitudes toward businesses” scale in order to measure consumers’ perception of firms’ responsiveness to complaint action and their opinion about business practices. The scale included the following items:

- Store employees are often quite unpleasant to customers who return unsatisfactory products
- Firms are usually willing to replace faulty products
- Most firms make an effort to ensure good condition of their products
- Firms do not take notice of complaints made
- Most businesses will cheat you if you don’t stand up for your rights.
- Firms are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty products
- Advertisements usually present a true picture of the product
- Firms take a long time to respond to a complaint
- Most stores say they want their customers satisfied but they are not willing to stand behind their words
- Firms are usually willing to provide repairs for faulty products

These items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Upon closer inspection it is evident that the items used to measure consumers’ attitudes toward businesses relate to the consumers’ perception of the fairness of complaint handling (see section 2.2.3.3). Complaint handling entails all of the actions a company implements following a product or service failure in an attempt to reinstate their reliability from the consumers’ perspective (Hart, Heskett & Sasser, 1990; Harris, Thomas & Williams, 2013). Formal complaints to retailers or manufacturers generally lead to service recovery efforts by companies, also known as complaint handling procedures (Davidow, 2003). Inability to handle complaints effectively contributes to dissatisfied consumers’ negative attitudes toward companies (McCollough, Berry & Yadav, 2000; Stauss, 2002; Boshoff, 2005).
2.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter an overview was provided of existing literature pertaining to consumer complaint behaviour, personal values and attitudes towards retailers’ complaint handling to serve as the theoretical background to the study. Consumer complaint behaviour refers to the responses consumers take following a dissatisfactory purchase experience. Following Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour, consumers can take private action (e.g. spreading negative word-of-mouth to family and friends or switching brands/retailers/manufacturers), public action (e.g. complaining directly to retailer/manufacturer, seeking redress, complaining to third parties) or no action. They can also engage in both public and private actions.

Various antecedents to complaint behaviour have been identified and are grouped into three main categories, namely consumer-related variables, product-related variables and redress environment variables. Personal values, attitudes toward businesses and demographics are among some of the consumer-related variables that might influence consumers’ decisions to engage in consumer complaint behaviour.

Personal values guide what is important to people. Various value surveys have been developed to measure personal values, including the RVS, VALS, SVS, PVQ and the LOV. The LOV was considered most appropriate for this study.

Attitudes toward businesses are viewed as consumers’ unfavourable or favourable cognitions towards the behaviour of firms, the marketplace and the use of products and services (Phau & Sari, 2004). Keng et al. (1995) developed the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale to measure consumers’ attitudes toward businesses. Previous studies have successfully applied it in developing countries like Singapore and Indonesia. When inspecting the scale items of the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale, it becomes evident that these items are related to perceptions of the fairness of complaint handling; therefore the items were used to measure consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

A number of researchers have shown evidence of a value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) link where values influence attitudes, which in turn influence consumer behaviour (Jayawardhena, 2004; Cai & Shannon, 2012). This causal relationship is an extension of the social adaptation theory. In the chapter that follows, social adaptation theory along with the VAB link is discussed in detail.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND OBJECTIVES

This chapter presents and explains the theoretical framework chosen for this study and also explains how it was used, together with the above-mentioned literature, to structure the conceptual framework and objectives. Lastly, the conceptual framework is provided and explained, and the objectives of the study are stated.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

It is widely accepted that personal values play a major role in human behaviour (Razzaque, 1995; Chryssohoidis & Krystallis, 2005; Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014). Jayawardhena (2004) proposes two conceptualisations that could be useful in explaining how values affect consumer behaviour. One such framework that integrates values is the means-end chain model. Studies implementing the means-end chain model have consistently found that consumers select products with attributes that deliver consequences or benefits, which in turn contribute to the fulfilment of values (Gutman, 1982; Lotz, Shim & Gehrt, 2003; Chen, 2006). Values function as grounds for behavioural decisions in general, and it has been suggested that consumption behaviours such as product selection and retail shopping patterns, are a means to achieving desired end-states or values (Reynolds & Gutman, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004).

The values-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model has also been suggested as a way to explain the effect of values on behaviour (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004). Homer and Kahle (1988) suggested attitudes as a mediator to “bridge the gap” between values and behaviour, which led to the development of the value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) model. With the VAB model, causality should hypothetically flow from abstract values to mid-range attitudes to specific behaviours (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004; Grankvist et al., 2007; Hayley et al., 2014). This causal sequence stems from social adaptation theory (Kahle, 1996:136).
Therefore, for this study, social adaptation theory and the VAB model served as the theoretical framework.

In this chapter, social adaptation theory is firstly addressed along with its application in a consumer behaviour context. This is followed by a discussion of the VAB model and its application in a consumer behaviour context. Finally, the conceptual framework, the aim and the objectives of the study are presented.

3.2 SOCIAL ADAPTATION THEORY

Social adaptation theory is often portrayed as the neo-Piagetian account of social cognitions, including attitudes and values (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Homer & Kahle, 1986). Social adaptation theory originated in attitude research and has been extended to incorporate values (Kahle, 1983:43; Kahle, 1996:135). It is more specifically rooted in Piaget's theory of the social psychology of attitudes (1976), which suggests that the main purpose of attitudes and other social cognitions is adaptation; thus social cognition helps individuals to adapt to their environment (Kahle, 1983:47; Fall, 2000; Razzaque, 2002; Jayawardhena, 2004).

Social adaptation theory posits that values are a type of social cognition that aids individuals in adapting to their environment (Kahle, 1983:47; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004). Individuals adapt to different life roles through the development and fulfilment of values (Kahle, 1996:135; Fall, 2000; Florenthal & Shoham, 2000; Razzaque, 2002). Value development and fulfilment summarises previous experiences and provides an approach to manage new choices (Kahle, 1996:135; Fall, 2000). Consumers in search of achieving value fulfilment look for, associate with and use products and services that can deliver attributes and consequences associated with certain personal values (Reynolds & Gutman, 1988; Muller, 1991). For instance, an individual valuing fun and enjoyment in life may purchase a computer for recreational purposes like playing games. Someone who values sense of accomplishment, on the other hand, may purchase a computer to achieve work-related outcomes (Kahle, 1996:135).

Social adaptation theory further explains that individuals' value systems develop through life experiences (Kahle, 1996:135; Fall, 2000; Florenthal & Shoham, 2000). Individuals attain life experiences through interaction with their environments so as to create optimal interchanges with their environments (Kahle, 1996). Individuals absorb external information and convert this information as well as themselves so as to facilitate adaptation to their situation or their...
environment (Kahle, 1983:48; Fall, 2000). Individuals therefore assess information based on its adaptive significance (Homer & Kahle, 1986; Fall, 2000).

Kahle (1983:51) asserts that “adaptation implies optimal levels of equilibration under the circumstances”. In view of this, social adaptation theory suggests that individuals want to be in balance with their environment (Homer & Kahle, 1986; Fall, 2000). This is in line with consistency theory that holds that people want to decrease inconsistencies so as to restore balance in their lives (Fall, 2000). Furthermore, Homer and Kahle (1986:52) assert that “persons seek equilibration with their environment by assimilating new information into existing schemata while accommodating mental structures to incorporate new, discrepant information”.

According to Kahle (1983:51), abstraction works together with adaptation. Values and attitudes are similar in that “both are adaptation abstractions that emerge continuously from the assimilation, accommodation, organization, and integration of environmental information in order to promote interchanges with the environment favourable to the preservation of optimal functioning” (Homer & Kahle, 1988:638). Because values are the most abstract of all the types of social cognition, they reflect the most basic features of adaptation (Kahle, 1983:51; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Kropp et al., 2005). To a certain degree, these abstractions provide a prototype from which attitudes and behaviours are produced (Kahle, 1983:51; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Claxton et al., 1996). Values also help individuals choose which situations to enter and what to do in those particular situations (Kahle, 1980; Kahle, 1983:52; Homer & Kahle, 1988).

In light of this, Homer and Kahle (1988) extended the social adaptation theory by proposing that causation should theoretically flow from more abstract values, to mid-range attitudes, to specific behaviours, within a specific situation. This causal sequence of cognitions came to be known as the value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004; Milfont et al., 2010; De Barcellos et al., 2012). Social adaptation theory therefore plays a significant part in shaping our understanding of how values and attitudes affect consumer behaviour (Fall, 2000).

3.2.1 Application of social adaptation theory within a consumer behaviour context

Social adaptation theory has primarily been applied in a social psychology context (Kahle, 1996). For example, Kahle, Kulka and Klingel (1980) studied the causal link between adolescents’ low self-esteem and their interpersonal problems. Kahle, Klingel and Kulka (1981)
investigated the attitudes and self-reported behaviours of outgoingness of adolescents toward other people. Eisert and Kahle (1982) studied the connection between self-evaluation and social comparison in adolescent male subjects throughout their final two years of high school. Furthermore, Kahle and Homer (1985) tested the effect of celebrity-product match-up on consumer attitudes and purchasing intention. In a marketing context, the social adaptation theory has been used by Kahle and Homer (1986) to investigate the impact of surrealism on advertising.

Only a few studies have applied social adaptation theory within a consumer behaviour context. One such study is that of Homer and Kahle (1988), who used social adaptation theory as the basis for testing the value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy in a natural food shopping context. In a study conducted by Fall (2000), the social adaptation theory served as the theoretical framework for exploring the relationship between personal values and tourism destination choice in a vacation planning context. Furthermore, similar to Homer and Kahle (1988), Jayawardhena (2004) applied social adaptation theory as the theoretical foundation for testing the value-attitude-behaviour model within an e-shopping consumer behaviour context.

In the context of social adaptation theory, it could be argued that a product or service failure leads to dissatisfaction (disequilibrium) and that consumers' personal values and attitudes guide their complaint behaviour to restore equilibrium. Guided by their values, consumers who complain privately or publicly could possibly restore the imbalance (correct the wrongdoing) by, for example, obtaining redress, venting their negative emotions or damaging the offending firm’s reputation (Huppertz, 2003, 2014). In a similar vein, depending on their values, consumers who do not take any action could regain cognitive consistency in their lives by accepting the product problem and forgetting about the issue. Values therefore serve as general plans for resolving conflict and making decisions to maintain and enhance self-esteem (Rokeach, 1973:12; Fall, 2000).

3.3 THE VAB MODEL

In the value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model, it is commonly believed that causality flows from values to attitudes and then to behaviours (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Shim et al., 1999; Jayawardhena, 2004). Hence, the strongest causal relationships should be found between values and attitudes, and between attitudes and behaviours (Milfont et al., 2010). Milfont et al. (2010) further asserts that while the VAB model assumes that values may have either a direct
or indirect influence on behaviour, it is mainly focused on the mediating role of attitudes in the value-behaviour relationship.

Kahle (1980) initially hypothesized that values may have an indirect effect on behaviour through abstract mediating factors like attitudes. Later on, Pitts and Woodside (1984) came to a similar conclusion when their study on automobile and personal product purchases revealed a strong link between values and attitudes, but a weak link between values and behaviours. Homer and Kahle (1988) argued that no empirical evidence existed for the argument regarding the nature of values, attitude and behaviours, and therefore they tested this hierarchical relationship in a very specific context, that is, natural food shopping (Shim et al., 1999).

In Homer and Kahle’s (1988) study, 831 food shoppers completed a questionnaire about their values, attitudes and behaviours towards purchasing natural foods. Values were measured by administering the LOV. Factor analyses yielded three underlying dimensions, namely internal values (self-respect, sense of accomplishment, excitement and self-fulfilment), external values (sense of belonging, being well respected and security) and interpersonal values (fun and enjoyment in life and warm relationships with others). Structural equation analysis revealed that self-respect (an internal value) and fun and enjoyment in life (an interpersonal value), were positively correlated to favourable attitudes towards natural food shopping, and sense of belonging (an external value) was negatively correlated to favourable attitudes towards natural food shopping. Values were found to predict between 25 to 50% of the variance in nutrition attitudes, which then predicted about 31% of the variance in natural food shopping behaviour. However, only 4% of shopping behaviour was predicted by values, confirming that values are poor predictors of behaviour and that attitudes mediate the value-behaviour relationship (Homer & Kahle, 1988).

3.3.1 Application of the VAB model in a consumer behaviour context

Homer and Kahle (1988) warned researchers against relying on correlational evidence as confirmation of the VAB connection. They also asserted that the lack of causal analysis in the relationship between values, attitudes and behavioural outcomes is probably more a function of the research design and statistical limitations than the theoretical beliefs underpinning the research. In addition, since Homer and Kahle (1988) tested the VAB model in a very specific context, namely a natural food shopping context, they recommended that the future testing of the VAB model should take place in a variety of situations or contexts.
In response to Homer and Kahle’s (1988) recommendation, a number of studies tested the VAB model by conducting structural equation analysis in various contexts (Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Shim et al., 1999; Vaske & Donnelly, 1999; Jayawardhana, 2004; Milfont et al., 2010). One such study was that of Shim and Eastlick (1998), who investigated the role that Anglo and Hispanic consumers’ personal values played in the patronage of regional shopping malls, by testing the VAB model. Of the three underlying value dimensions that were identified, the self-actualisation dimension and the social affiliation dimension were found to be positively related to favourable attitudes towards regional shopping malls. In turn, individual attitudes towards shopping malls directly influenced mall shopping behaviour and mediated the relationship between personal values and attitudes. Vaske and Donnelly (1999) also investigated the relationship between Colorado consumers’ value orientations, their attitudes towards wildland preservation and their wildland preservation intentions, by adopting a causal methodology of structural equation modelling. They found that the biocentric versus anthropocentric value orientation was directly related to respondents’ attitudes towards preservation of wildlands, which mediated the link between value orientation and behavioural intention to vote for wildland preservation.

Jayawardhana (2004) investigated the role of personal values in e-shopping behaviour by employing the VAB model through a hypothesised model (see Figure 3.1). It was hypothesised that personal value dimensions relate directly to attitude towards e-shopping attributes (H1), and that attitudes towards e-shopping attributes directly influence e-shopping behaviour (H2).

The results yielded a significant relationship between personal values (self-direction values, enjoyment values and self-achievement values) and positive attitudes towards e-shopping. It was further found that individual attitudes towards e-shopping were directly related to e-shopping behaviour. These results supported Homer and Kahle’s (1988) findings, in that attitudes mediated the link between personal values and behaviour.
More recently, Milfont et al. (2010) found support for the VAB model in a cross-cultural context. More specifically, they found that environmental attitudes completely mediated the influence of both altruistic values and self-enhancement values on ecological behaviour across samples from South Africa, Brazil and New Zealand. Cai and Shannon (2012) also found support for the VAB model in the context of mall shopping behaviour in China. In their study, consumers who placed more importance on self-transcendence and self-enhancement values were found to be more likely to have a favourable attitude towards malls than those who placed more importance on openness to change values. In turn, consumers with a favourable attitude towards malls were more likely to visit the mall on a regular basis.

The results obtained in the above-mentioned studies provide ample evidence that values have only an indirect influence on behaviour and that the value-behaviour relationship is mediated by attitudes (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004). It therefore makes sense to adopt the value-attitude-behaviour model as an anchoring theory when investigating the effect of consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour. McCarty and Shrum (1993) also recommended that more complex models with relevant third variables should be implemented to understand the influence of abstract psychological constructs such as values and behaviour.

3.4 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In light of the literature review on consumer complaint behaviour, values and attitudes in Chapter 2 and the above-mentioned discussion on the social adaption theory and the VAB hierarchy model, a schematic conceptual framework of consumers’ personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and complaint behaviour regarding major household appliances is proposed in Figure 3.2. The conceptual framework depicts all of the important concepts of this study as well as possible relationships between these concepts. The reader should please take note that the numbers used in the conceptual framework correspond with the objectives of the study.

The conceptual framework portrays the suggested value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Jayawardhena, 2004; Grankvist et al., 2007; Cai & Shannon, 2012; Hayley et al., 2014). According to the VAB hierarchy model, values influence attitudes, which in turn affect behaviour (Homer & Kahle, 1988; De Barcellos et al., 2012). The sequence portrayed in the conceptual framework therefore progresses from personal values, to attitudes.
towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and then to complaint behaviour. Demographic variables, as possible influencing factors of personal values and complaint behaviour, are also depicted in the conceptual framework.

FIGURE 3.2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THIS STUDY

The personal values mentioned in the conceptual framework above represent nine personal value items, namely self-respect, being well respected, self-fulfilment, a sense of accomplishment, excitement, security, a sense of belonging, fun and enjoyment in life and warm relationships with others, as derived from the LOV.

Kahle (1983) suggested that the LOV should be reduced to a smaller number of underlying dimensions, given the consideration of situational factors which may cause different dimensions to be important in different contexts. A number of studies have identified various dimensions into which the nine value items can be reduced (e.g. Kahle, 1983; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Keng & Yang, 1993; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; Keng & Liu, 1997; Jayawardhena, 2004; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). The specific dimensions represent a specific value orientation. The combination of the dimensions representing the specific value orientation is not indicated in the conceptual framework as it is anticipated that it will manifest in the data analysis.
Day and Landon’s (1977) typology of complaint behaviour suggested that consumers can either engage in behavioural (action) or non-behavioural (no-action) responses to resolve dissatisfaction. Behavioural responses would include private complaint actions (i.e. warning family and friends, switching brand names or companies and/or boycotting the company), and public complaint actions (i.e. obtaining redress, complaining to the retailer or manufacturer and/or contacting third parties) (Kim & Chen, 2010; Kim et al., 2014). Alternatively, consumers might decide to take no action by rationalising or forgetting about their dissatisfaction (Yan & Lotz, 2009; Kim et al., 2014).

Values are the most abstract social cognitions; therefore they reflect the most basic adaptation and serve to guide and shape attitudes and behaviours (Kropp et al., 2005). To determine the influence of values on attitudes and behaviour, a causal relationship is suggested where abstract values shape mid-range attitudes, which in turn guide behaviour (Jayawardhena, 2004; Cai & Shannon, 2012). Not only is a relationship therefore anticipated between consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling (objective 4), but also between consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and their complaint behaviour. Moreover, the VAB model assumes that values have an indirect influence on behaviour through mediating attitudes (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhena, 2004). Attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling are therefore expected to mediate the relationship between consumers’ personal value orientation and their complaint behaviour (objective 5). The VAB model also acknowledges the possibility that values could influence behaviour directly rather than indirectly (Milfont et al., 2010), as there exists evidence of direct values-behaviour relationships (e.g. Rogers & Williams, 1990; Goldsmith & Stith, 1992; McCarty & Shrum, 1993; Manfredo, Fulton & Pierce, 1997). Therefore the effect of consumers’ personal value orientation on their complaint behaviour will also be examined (objective 5).

Demographic variables have been proposed as predictors of personal values and complaint behaviour in past research (e.g. Shoham et al., 1998; Shoham et al., 2003; Fox, 2008). Gender, age, level of education, household income and population group are among some of the most common demographic variables found to influence personal values and complaint behaviour, and it is therefore anticipated that demographic variables will influence consumers’ personal value orientation (objective 6) as well as their complaint behaviour (objective 7).
3.5 **AIM OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

3.5.1 **Aim of the research**

Based on the theoretical background and the conceptual framework above, the aim of this study was to explore and describe the effect of consumers' personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances. In addition, the effect of consumers’ demographic variables on their personal values and complaint behaviour was also explored.

3.5.2 **Research objectives**

As listed in Chapter 1, the following research objectives were formulated for this study:

**Objective 1:** To explore and describe consumers’ personal values

**Sub-objective 1.1:** To explore and describe consumers’ personal value orientation

**Objective 2:** To explore and describe consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling

**Objective 3:** To explore and describe consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

**Objective 4:** To investigate the relationship between consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling

**Objective 5:** To investigate the effect of consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

**Objective 6:** To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers’ personal value orientation
Objective 7: To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers' complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

3.6 CONCLUSION

Social adaptation theory and the VAB hierarchy model were chosen as the theoretical framework and were presented in this chapter to confirm the conceptual framework and the appropriateness of the objectives for this study. Social adaptation theory facilitates the understanding of how values influence behaviour by suggesting a value-attitude-behaviour hierarchy model where abstract values shape mid-range attitudes, which in turn guide behaviour (Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014).

The conceptual framework and research objectives presented were structured to indicate the relationships between personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling, demographic variables, and complaint behaviour, as well as the effect of personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling on consumer complaint behaviour.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design and methodology of this research as well as the procedures that were used to ensure ethical conduct and the quality of the research.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the research design and methodology of the study are discussed in detail. “Research design” and “research methodology” refer to two very distinct aspects of a research project. A research design refers to “a plan or blueprint of how the researcher intends conducting the research”, while the research methodology focuses on the “research process and the kind of tools and procedures to be used” (Mouton, 2001:55). Stated differently, the research design provides the overall approach used to conduct the study, while the methodology explains the research instrument used, the data collected, and the data analysis (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:74).

The research methodology section of this chapter provides an overview of the methodologies for studying consumer complaint behaviour, personal values, attitudes toward businesses and the VAB model that served as a backdrop for the methodology chosen for this study. This is followed by an explanation of the sampling plan in terms of the unit of analysis, as well as the sampling technique and sample size as a means to obtain an adequate sample for this study; the questionnaire as the measuring instrument; the data collection methods used to collect primary data; the coding and capturing of the data; the techniques used to analyse the data; the operationalisation of the study according to the objectives of this study; the statistical methods implemented to analyse the data; and finally the validity, reliability and ethical issues to ensure the quality of the research study.
4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A survey research design was implemented by using a structured self-administered questionnaire to collect primary data (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:68, 117). The survey researcher follows a deductive approach by starting out with a research problem and ending with empirical measurement and data analysis (Neuman, 2007:168). A quantitative methodological research approach was therefore used to attain an exact understanding of the problem being researched by using descriptive and inferential statistics (Fouché & Delport, 2011:66).

The research design could also be described as cross-sectional, since the observations were made at a specific point in time and not over an extended period, as is the case with longitudinal research (Mouton, 2001:152; Babbie, 2007:102; Wild & Diggenes, 2009:56). Although cross-sectional research does not account for factors that influence consumers’ behaviour over an extended period of time, it is deemed appropriate for the purposes of this study due to the financial and time constraints.

This study was exploratory and descriptive in nature. Researchers conduct exploratory research to shed light on the research topic, to explain main concepts and to develop the methods to be used in the study (Fouché & De Vos, 2011:96; Babbie, 2007:88). Descriptive research enables researchers to determine and report the frequencies with which certain variables occur in the sample to depict the particulars of a situation or association (Babbie, 2007:89). Descriptive research provides insight into associations or relationships between different variables, which assist researchers with the selection of variables for a causal study (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:67). In this study, the adoption of a combined exploratory and descriptive research design facilitated a better understanding of personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and complaint behaviour, as well as the relationships between these concepts.

4.3 METHODOLOGY

4.3.1 Overview of various methodologies

In the next sections, a discussion follows of the respective methodologies that have been implemented to study consumer complaint behaviour, personal values with specific emphasis
on the LOV, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and the VAB model, as these methodologies provide the backdrop for the methodology chosen for this study.

### 4.3.1.1 Methodologies for studying consumer complaint behaviour

A survey design is typically implemented in studies conducted on consumers’ dissatisfaction with products or services and their subsequent complaint behaviour, and data is usually collected by means of self-administered questionnaires (e.g. Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Liu & McClure, 2001; Lam & Tang, 2003; Phau & Sari, 2004; Donoghue, 2008; Donoghue et al., 2012; Robertson, 2012; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2013; Donoghue).

Typically, a condition for respondent inclusion is that they must have experienced dissatisfaction with a product or a service. Respondents are also typically required to recall a specific dissatisfactory product experience that they remember most clearly. To prevent possible memory decay, the recall period is usually specified (e.g. respondents must have experienced dissatisfaction with a specific product within a specified time limit). Even though memory decay may be a potential source of bias in respondents’ responses, retrospective measurements are regularly used in consumer complaint behaviour studies (Weiner, 2000). In addition, to determine whether respondents qualify for inclusion in the study, appropriate screening questions are usually included in the questionnaire (Singh & Wilkes, 1996; Donoghue, 2008; Donoghue et al., 2012; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2013; Robertson, 2012).

To cite only a few studies, Broadbridge and Marshall (1995), Keng and Liu (1997), Lam and Tang (2003) and Donoghue (2008) implemented Day and Landon's (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour to classify behavioural responses. In these studies, respondents had to indicate what actions, if any, were taken in response to their dissatisfaction. A nominal scale was used to classify the answer to each type of action taken.

### 4.3.1.2 LOV – a measurement approach to values

Research on values has mainly been done by using a survey-based quantitative approach (Watkins, 2010). As was discussed in the literature review (section 2.3.1), various popular methods exist to measure and assess personal values, including Rokeach’s (1973) Value Survey (RVS), Mitchell’s (1983) Values and Lifestyle Survey (VALS), Schwartz’s (1992) Values Survey (SVS) and Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV). Although any one of these four scales
could have been implemented in this study to measure respondents' personal values, the LOV was chosen as the preferred method since it is easier and quicker to administer and complete, it is more applicable to daily life and it is more closely related to consumer behaviour (Beatty *et al.*, 1985; Kahle, 1996:141; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Lee *et al.*, 2007) (see section 2.3.1.5 for a more comprehensive discussion of the LOV’s advantages over other scales).

Although various approaches have been used to implement the LOV (see section 2.3.1.5), rating scales have become the preferred method for measuring the importance of values (Lee *et al.*, 2007), and have been implemented by a multitude of studies (e.g. Fall, 2000; Razzaque, 2002; Kropp *et al.*, 2005; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). Rating scales, however, tend to suffer from "social desirability effect" whereby respondents choose one end of the scale or similar scores for all nine values (Beatty *et al.* 1985; Razzaque, 1995). Munson and McIntyre (1979) also suggested the use of rating scales rather than the ranking of values as the ranking approach produces non-independent data and renders the use of parametric statistics inappropriate. Kahle (1996:142) further concluded that in general the ranking approach fails to generate superior results to the rating approach and explained that in some cases a “rank then rate” procedure supposedly leads to more careful consideration of values by respondents. A “rank then rate” approach, where respondents are required to rate the importance of the nine values and then to rank the two most important values or vice versa, have however only been implemented in a few studies (e.g. Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Merchand & Khallaayoune, 2010). A more common approach, where respondents must rate the nine values on a Likert-type scale and then choose the one value they consider most important (Keng & Liu, 1997; Schiffman *et al.*, 2003; Grankvist *et al.*, 2007; Gurel-Atay *et al.*, 2010; Li & Cai, 2012), is presented in Table 4.1. This question has been developed as a result of extensive methodological research (Kahle, 1996:137; Bearden *et al.*, 2011:151).

The nine items of the LOV have commonly been reduced into a lesser number of underlying dimensions by means of factor analysis to predict attitudes and behaviours, since situational factors cause different value dimensions to be important in different contexts (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Beatty *et al.*, 1991; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhana, 2004). This approach also provides a possible means of overcoming general concerns about the measurement of a single item in value surveys (Kahle & Kennedy, 1988; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhana, 2004).
TABLE 4.1: QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT FOR THE LOV (Bearden et al., 2011:151)

The following is a list of things that some people look for or want out of life. Please study the list carefully and then rate each thing on how important it is in your daily life, where 1 = very unimportant and 9 = very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Excitement</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being well respected</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fun and enjoyment in life</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-respect</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now reread the items and circle the one thing that is most important to you in your daily life.

The relationship between personal values and complaint behaviour has been studied by Rogers and Williams (1990) in the USA, and by Keng and Liu (1997) in an Asian setting. Rogers and Williams (1990) explored whether the values of the RVS were possible antecedents to public complaining behaviour among college students in America. Keng and Liu (1997) investigated the relationship between personal values and complaint behaviour among Singaporean respondents. They employed the LOV scale to measure respondents' personal values, and used Day and Landon's (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour to classify behavioural responses. Respondents were requested to rate the nine items of the LOV on a seven-point Likert-type scale anchored by “not at all important” (1) and “extremely important” (7), after which they were requested to select the value they considered most important from the list.

4.3.1.3 Methodologies for studying attitudes toward businesses

Consumers’ attitudes toward businesses have mainly been researched by using a survey methodology with a self-administered questionnaire as the data collection technique. Keng et al. (1995) developed the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale consisting of ten statements measured on a five-point Likert-type scale to investigate consumers’ attitudes toward businesses (Keng et al., 1995; Keng & Liu, 1997; Phau & Sari, 2004).
Keng et al. (1995) found good internal consistency and construct reliability for most of the scale items in their questionnaire. This scale has also been implemented by Keng and Liu (1997) to determine group-oriented and self-oriented consumers’ attitudes toward businesses, and by Phau and Sari (2004) to profile complainers and non-complainers in terms of their attitudes toward businesses. The latter two studies were conducted in Singapore and Indonesia, respectively.

Although Keng et al. (1995) initially developed the “Attitude toward businesses” scale to measure consumers’ perception of a firm’s responsiveness to complaints and their opinion about business practices, the items of the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale were adapted to measure consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling in this study.

4.3.1.4 Methodologies for studying the VAB model

The VAB hierarchy model has mainly been researched using a survey-based quantitative approach and has been validated by a number of studies within a variety of contexts (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Claxton et al., 1996; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhena, 2004; De Barcellos et al., 2012; Hayley et al., 2014).

Compared to other value scales such as the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) and the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ), the LOV is the preferred value measurement instrument in testing the VAB hierarchy (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Claxton et al., 1996; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Shim et al., 1999; Jayawardhena, 2004). However, the SVS and the PVQ have also been implemented by a number of researchers when examining the VAB hierarchy (e.g. Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Milfont et al., 2010; De Barcellos et al., 2012; Hayley et al., 2014).

Structural equation modelling (SEM) is the preferred data analysis technique among most studies testing the VAB hierarchy (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Claxton et al., 1996; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhena, 2004). Other data analysis techniques can also be used to test the VAB hierarchy. For instance, De Barcellos et al. (2012) used regression analysis to test the relationship between values, attitudes and consumption of pork products, whereas Hayley et al. (2014) used two-tailed Pearson correlation tests to assess the relationship between values, attitudes and frequency of meat consumption.
4.3.2 Sampling plan

4.3.2.1 Unit of analysis

Primary data was collected from consumers who were 25 years or older, who have experienced dissatisfaction concerning the performance of a major household appliance within the last four years, and who resided in the middle- to upper-income suburbs across Tshwane (Pretoria).

Respondents had to be 25 years or older, since it is assumed that by this age they would have gained experience in acquiring and using their own major household appliances. It is further assumed that by age 25 the average person earns enough income to purchase and operate their own appliance.

Respondents had to have experienced dissatisfaction concerning the performance of a major household appliance during a four-year recall period. Since satisfied consumers are unlikely to engage in complaint behaviour, dissatisfaction can be viewed as a prerequisite for complaining. It would therefore be senseless to collect information concerning the failure of major household appliances from satisfied customers (Singh, 1988; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2006). A four-year memory recall period was considered appropriate since consumers’ evaluation of their dissatisfaction with major household appliances is an ongoing process and problems may not manifest until the product has been used for while (Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016).

Respondents had to reside in the middle- to upper-income suburbs across Tshwane (Pretoria), a major metropolitan area in South Africa, making the sample specific to one area. Middle- to upper-income consumers would be able to afford major household appliances, while lower-income consumers would struggle to purchase expensive major household appliances.

Respondents had to be either black or white since these two groups are the primary population groups in the Tshwane area. The Black middle class in South Africa, with a collective spending power of some 400 billion Rands per annum, are optimistic, self-confident, aspiring and future-focussed, with a drive for education (Olivier, 2007; UCT Unilever Institute of Strategic Marketing, 2007, 2012. They are conspicuous consumers with smart cars, clothes, television sets, sound systems and household appliances topping their list of desired and necessary products (Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016).
4.3.2.2 Sampling technique and sample size

Given that a random sample of the general population would be unlikely to result in a significant number of respondents with dissatisfactory experiences (Del Río-Lanza, Vázquez-Casielles & Díaz-Martín, 2009), convenience sampling and snowball sampling were employed. With convenience sampling respondents are recruited based on their availability and accessibility (Zikmund & Babin, 2013:323). With snowball sampling search costs are reduced considerably by requesting initial respondents to identify additional respondents who may be willing to participate (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:397). It should be noted that convenience sampling and snowball sampling cause the results of this study to be limited to this specific sample and therefore the findings cannot be generalised to the larger South African population. Despite this limitation, the implications of this study can, however, still be of importance and should therefore not be ignored.

Intentional effort was made to involve a diverse sample in terms of the demographics. Categories were determined for gender (male and female), age (25-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years; 50 years and older), average monthly household income (R 5 000 – R 9 999, R 10 000 – R 14 999, R 15 000 – R 24 000, R 25 000 and more), level of education (lower than Grade 12, Grade 12, Grade 12 and additional diploma(s)/certificate(s), Bachelor’s degree, postgraduate qualification), and population group (black, white). Respondents also had to reside in the suburbs of Tshwane metropolitan area (City of Pretoria). These attributes were used in the questionnaire to measure demographic variables.

Respondents who met the outlined criteria were approached by eight trained field workers at organisations such as schools, work places and their private homes on the basis of convenience or ease of access. Field workers were trained by the principal investigator (supervisor). A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed of which only 361 were eventually usable. Field workers were remunerated for the questionnaires that were completed in full.

4.3.3 Measuring instrument

The principal investigator compiled the self-administered questionnaire based on the literature review and the methodologies for studying consumer complaint behaviour, personal values, attitudes toward businesses and the VAB model (section 4.5.1), in order to obtain primary data from consumers who were dissatisfied with the performance of their major household appliances. The constructs and variables used in the questionnaire were derived from past
research as discussed in the literature review. Scale items from validated scales were further employed in this study. However, some of the scales required slight modifications.

The questionnaire consisted of five sections, namely Demographic data (Section A), Dissatisfaction, problem severity and attribution of blame (Section B), Consumer complaint actions (Section C), Attitudes towards appliance retailers (Section D), and Personal values and psychographic information (Section E) (see Addendum A). At this point, the reader should be reminded that the current study formed part of a bigger study that measured all of the above-mentioned sections to determine relationships between the various aspects. For the purpose of the current study, only data related to sections A, C, D and part of section E of the questionnaire, was analysed. In Section A, respondents were asked to indicate demographic information including gender, age, level of education, monthly household income, residential area and population group.

Section C dealt with respondents’ behavioural and non-behavioural actions taken in response to their dissatisfaction. Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of consumer complaint behaviour was used to classify the different types of complaint actions respondents could resort to. Respondents firstly had to indicate whether they took action or not. If they took no action, they had to select a reason(s) from the list provided that justified their choice. Alternatively, if they took action, they had to indicate which particular complaint action(s) they took by considering a list provided by the researcher. Answers were indicated on a nominal binary (yes/no) scale.

Section D measured respondents’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on a “strongly agree/strongly disagree” Likert-type scale (coded 1 through 5). The scale items used in this study were adopted from Keng et al.’s (1995) “Attitudes toward businesses” scale. To suit the context of the study, Keng et al.’s (1995) scale items were slightly adapted. The concepts “firms” and “products” were replaced with “appliance retailers” and “appliances”. Since major household appliances usually have product warranties of up to one or two years, the phrase “that are still under guarantee” was added to three of the items: “Firms are usually willing to repair faulty products that are still under guarantee”, “firms are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty products that are still under guarantee” and “firms are usually willing to provide repairs for faulty products that are still under guarantee”. The wording of the item “Most stores say they want their customers satisfied, but are not willing to stand behind their words” was adapted to “Most appliance retailers say they want their customers to be satisfied, but they are not willing to go the extra mile to keep their customers happy”. In addition, the item “advertisements usually present a true picture of the product” was not included in this study as it was considered...
irrelevant in terms of consumers’ attitudes toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling – the reason for this being that all of the other attitude items measured some aspect of consumers’ attitudes toward complaint handling as implied by the wording of the items.

Questions 1 and 2 of Section E measured respondents’ personal values using Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV). Firstly, respondents had to rate each of the nine personal values on a “not at all important/extremely important” Likert-type scale (coded 1 through 7). They then had to indicate which personal value they regarded as most important in their daily lives.

Table 4.2 shows the structure of the questionnaire in terms of the aspects measured and the question numbering per section. Please take note that the structure of the entire questionnaire is indicated for the sake of completeness, although some parts were not applicable to this study.

**TABLE 4.2: THE STRUCTURE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>ASPECTS MEASURED</th>
<th>QUESTION NUMBERING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Demographic data</td>
<td>Question 1 (V2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Question 2 (V3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Question 3 (V4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Question 4 (V5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly household income</td>
<td>Question 5 (V6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential area</td>
<td>Question 6 (V7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction, problem severity and attribution of blame</td>
<td>Question 1 (V8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfactory appliance</td>
<td>Question 2 (V9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand name</td>
<td>Question 3 (V10-V12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of performance failure</td>
<td>Question 4 (V13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarantee</td>
<td>Question 5 (V14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of problem severity experienced</td>
<td>Question 6 (V15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of dissatisfaction experienced</td>
<td>Question 7 (V16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party mostly blamed</td>
<td>Question 8 (V17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention of product failure</td>
<td>Question 9 (V18-V24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consumer complaint actions</td>
<td>Question 1 (V25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/no action</td>
<td>Question 1 (V26-V30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for taking no action</td>
<td>Question 2-9 (V31-V38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific action taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>Question 1 (V39-V47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion of appliance retailers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Personal values and psychographic information</td>
<td>Question 1 (V48-V56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of importance of values</td>
<td>Question 2 (V57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most important value</td>
<td>Question 3 (V58-V94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychographic data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3.1 Pilot testing the measuring instrument

The study leader (principal researcher) pre-tested the questionnaire on eight respondents who had similar demographic characteristics to those who finally took part in the study. Pilot testing was necessary to identify possible errors or ambiguous wording and to explore respondents’ interpretations of questions and scale items to ensure that the intended meaning was clear. After correcting a few language errors, the questionnaire was distributed to respondents.

4.3.4 Data collection

The eight field workers, final year students in the field of consumer science at the University of Pretoria, were informed about the purposes and objectives of the study and were trained to collect the data by means of a questionnaire. The field workers recruited respondents at places that were convenient to them, including their private homes and work places after obtaining permission to do so. Snowball sampling was also employed where additional respondents were selected based on referrals from the initial respondents (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:397). Field workers contacted these prospective respondents to deliver and collect questionnaires upon inquiry of their addresses.

Field workers delivered questionnaires by hand to individual respondents. Upon recruiting the respondents, field workers emphasised that participation in the study was voluntary. Upon completion, field workers collected and checked the questionnaires personally for completeness of data and to ensure that the questions had been answered according to instructions.

The cover letter that accompanied the questionnaire stated the purpose of the research and the criteria for inclusion in the study. The cover letter also indicated the time required to complete the questionnaire and that participation was voluntary. The cover letter provides a guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity, and a plea for the respondents’ cooperation (Delport & Roestenburg, 2011:193; Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:106). Respondents were requested to sign the cover letter in the space provided to indicate their informed consent to participate in the study. The questionnaire was compiled in English only and it was written in simple and clear everyday language to ensure that respondents understood what was expected of them.

The data collection took place during September and October 2010. The questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Of the 500 questionnaires distributed, only 361 were
usable. A questionnaire was considered invalid if it was incomplete, i.e. had too many missing variables.

Field workers were remunerated for their efforts and received R50 for each completed questionnaire. Respondents were also offered an incentive for participating in the study. Respondents that were interested could enter into a lucky draw to win a R1000 gift voucher at the end of the data collection. To enter they were only asked to write their contact details on a separate sheet, guaranteeing that their responses would be kept confidential.

As values are less susceptible to change than attitudes (Rohan, 2000; Hayley et al., 2014), the study at hand could be of value to the South African context although the data was collected in September and October 2010.

4.3.5 Coding and capturing the data

Coding is known as the process of categorising and allocating numeric codes to the different responses to a certain question (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:441). Coding categories were incorporated for closed-ended, open-ended and scaled questions during the construction of the questionnaire to facilitate the processing of data.

Following the collection of all the questionnaires, the responses of the completed questionnaires were edge-coded by the principal researcher and the trained field workers. Edge-coding refers to the process of allocating codes to each question in the questionnaire and writing the codes in the suitable space provided on the right-hand side of each page (Babbie & Mouton, 2002:415). This facilitated the data-capturing process which was done by the Department of Statistics at the University of Pretoria. In an attempt to eliminate data-processing errors, data clean-up was performed to ensure that the allocated codes in the questionnaires were captured accurately.

4.4 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis refers to “the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data”, i.e. reducing raw data to an understandable and interpretable form (Fouché & Bartley, 2011:249). A statistician and a research consultant of the Department of Statistics
(University of Pretoria) were consulted to assist with the descriptive and inferential analysis of the data.

Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were calculated and then portrayed in tables and graphs to present the data in a meaningful way (Babbie & Mouton, 2002:458; Salkind, 2012:161-171; Laerd Statistics, 2013). Inferential statistics were furthermore used to draw conclusions from the observations and interpretations (Babbie, 2007:460; Walliman, 2011:412-413; Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:277). Inferential statistics included exploratory factor analysis, Pearson correlation coefficients, multinomial logistic regression, ANOVAs, Pairwise post-hoc tests, and Chi-square significance tests.

4.5 OPERATIONALISATION

Table 4.3 depicts the objectives, constructs, dimensions, measurement of scale items, questions and types of statistical methods used in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Measurement of scale items</th>
<th>Questions (V = Variable)</th>
<th>Statistical analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective 1**  
To explore and describe consumers' personal values | Personal values | Sense of belonging  
Excitement  
Warm relationships with others  
Self-fulfilment  
Being well respected  
Fun and enjoyment in life  
Security  
Self-respect  
A sense of accomplishment | Kahle’s (1983) LOV scale | Section E: Question 1–2 (V48–V56 + V57) | Calculation of frequencies and frequency analysis (SAS) |
| **Sub-objective 1.1**  
To explore and describe consumers' personal value orientation | Personal value orientation | | | | |
| **Objective 2**  
To explore and describe consumers' attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling | Attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling | Cognitive dimension of attitudes related to timely response, friendliness, effort and fairness of redress | Scale items adapted from “Attitude toward businesses” scale of Keng et al. (1995) | Section D: Question 1 (V39–V47) | Calculation of frequencies and frequency analysis (SAS) |
| **Objective 3**  
To explore and describe consumers' complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances | Consumer complaint behaviour | Action (Private/Public)  
No action | Scale based on Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour | Section C: Question 1–9 (V25 + V31–V38) | Calculation of frequencies and frequency analysis (SAS) |
| **Objective 4**  
To investigate the relationship between consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling | Personal value orientation  
Attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling | The same as objective 1  
The same as objective 2 | Kahle’s (1983) LOV scale  
Scale items adapted from “Attitude toward businesses” scale of Keng et al. (1995) | Section E: Question 1 (V48–V56)  
Section D: Question 1 (V39–V47) | Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient (p-value significant at 5% level) |
## TABLE 4.3: OPERATIONALISATION IN TERMS OF OBJECTIVES, CONCEPTS, DIMENSIONS, INDICATORS AND STATISTICAL METHODS
(CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Measurement of scale items</th>
<th>Questions (V = Variable)</th>
<th>Statistical analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;To investigate the effect of consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances</td>
<td>Personal value orientation</td>
<td>The same as objective 1</td>
<td>Kahle’s (1983) LOV scale</td>
<td>Section E: Question 5.1–5.2 (V48–V56 + V57)</td>
<td>Multinomial logistic regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>The same as objective 2</td>
<td>Scale items adapted from “Attitude toward businesses” scale of Keng et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Section D: Question 4.1 (V39–V47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer complaint behaviour</td>
<td>Action (Private/Public) No action</td>
<td>Scale based on Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour</td>
<td>Section C: Question 3.1–3.9 (V25–V38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers’ personal value orientation</td>
<td>Demographic variables</td>
<td>Gender Age Level of education Monthly household income Population group</td>
<td>Kahle’s (1983) LOV scale</td>
<td>Section A: Question 1.1–1.4 (V2–V5)</td>
<td>ANOVA and LSD Pairwise post-hoc tests (p-value significant on 5% level) (SAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal value orientation</td>
<td>Same as objective 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section E: Question 5.1–5.2 (V48 – V56 + V57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 7</strong>&lt;br&gt;To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances</td>
<td>Demographic variables</td>
<td>Gender Age Level of education Monthly household income Population group</td>
<td>Scale based on Day and Landon’s (1977) taxonomy of complaint behaviour</td>
<td>Section A: Question 1.1–1.4 (V2–V5)</td>
<td>Chi-square test (p-value significant at 5% level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer complaint behaviour</td>
<td>Action (Private/Public) No action</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section C: Question 3.1–3.9 (V25–V38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1 Explanation of statistical methods

In the sections that follow, the statistical methods that were used to analyse the data are discussed.

4.5.1.1 Exploratory factor analysis

Factor analysis refers to the process of data simplification and reduction, where a large set of variables are reduced to a smaller set of factors or composite variables through the identification of underlying dimensions of the data (Schmidt & Hollensen, 2006:320; Malhotra, 2010:636; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:560). The objective is therefore to describe a large number of metric variables with a smaller number of factors (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:560). Two types of factor analysis exist, namely exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000:216).

For the purpose of this study, exploratory factor analysis was applicable, as South African consumers’ value orientation in terms of the LOV has not yet been explored in a consumer complaint behaviour context. Exploratory factor analysis focuses on the shared variance of the original variables and it identifies the underlying dimensions (common factors). The common underlying dimensions, which should be meaningful and interpretable, are then used to describe the original variables (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000:216).

Consumers’ personal values (V48–V56) were subjected to oblique rotation to identify various value dimensions. A Scree test was implemented to determine the number of factors to be extracted. Furthermore, only factors with eigenvalues of one or greater were considered to be significant. An eigenvalue indicates a factor’s importance and is determined by its ability to explain variance (Schmidt & Hollensen, 2006:320). Variables that load high on a specific factor indicate that they are representative of that specific factor. As a rule, variables must have a factor loading of 0.33 and higher to meet the minimum level of practical significance (Statistics Solutions: Factor analysis, 2016). Moreover, the higher the factor loading of the variable, the more representative it is considered to be of the factor (Ho, 2006:207). For interpretation purposes, it is preferred that a variable loads highly on one factor alone, as this means that a variable can be explained rather well by that specific factor (Schmidt & Hollensen, 2006:320).
4.5.1.2 Correlation coefficient

The correlation coefficient determines how strongly two variables are related to one another by estimating their joint variation (Schmidt & Hollensen, 2006:583; Aaker, Kumar & Day, 2007:509). The measure of correlation coefficients varies between the intervals of –1, indicating a perfect linear relationship, and +1, indicating a perfect positive relationship (Diamantopoulos & Schlengelmilch, 2000:203; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:526). Negative correlation indicates that as one variable increases, the other variable decreases, whereas positive correlation indicates that as one variable increases, the other variable also increases (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2005:274). Values close to zero or equal to zero indicate that there is little or no correlation between the variables (Diamantopoulos & Schlengelmilch, 2000:203; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:526).

The Pearson product moment correlation is used extensively to calculate correlation, but other correlation statistics, such as Spearman’s rank-order correlation, can also be used (Statsoft, 2014). Pearson’s correlation coefficient measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables (Aaker et al., 2007:509; Hauke & Kossowski, 2011; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:530). It is used when metric data is involved (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:526) and requires that variables be measured on interval scales (Diamantopoulos & Schlengelmilch, 2000:203; Hauke & Kossowski, 2011). Spearman’s rank-order correlation indicates whether there is a monotone relationship between two variables and is used when non-parametric (distribution-free) data is involved (Artusi, Verderio & Marubini, 2002; Hauke & Kossowski, 2011). It is calculated similarly to Pearson’s correlation coefficient but it uses the ranked data and not the original data; therefore it can be used for variables measured at the interval as well as the ordinal level (Hauke & Kossowski, 2011).

Both Pearson’s product moment correlation and Spearman’s rank-order correlation were performed to determine whether a relationship exists between consumers’ value orientation (V48–V56) and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling (V39–V47).

4.5.1.3 Logistic regression

Logistic regression models the influence of one or more categorical or continuous independent (predictor) variable(s) on a categorical dependent (outcome) variable (Peng, Lee & Ingersoll, 2002). There are various types of logistic regression of which the most widely used is binary and multivariate logistic regression. Binary logistic regression is a widely used multivariable
method for modelling dichotomous outcomes, that is the dependent variable has two response categories (e.g. yes/no, dead/alive, action/no action) (Bagley, White & Golomb, 2001). Multinomial logistic regression, on the other hand, is performed when the dependent variable has more than two response categories (e.g. single/married/divorced/widowed, no action/public action/private action) (Bender & Grouven, 1997; Schmidt & Hollensen, 2006:251).

To date most studies have used structural equation modelling (SEM) to test the causal link between values, attitudes and behaviour (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Shim & Eastlick, 1998; Jayawardhena, 2004; Li & Cai, 2012). Jaccard and Wan (1995) assert that SEM produces a smaller bias in estimates than regression analyses. In this study, the dependent behavioural variable of taking a specific complaint action (no action/private action/public action/both public and private action) is non-metric and categorical (Byrne, 2000:72). Byrne (2000:72) states that categorical variables can be treated like continuous variables within SEM analysis, but warns researchers of the risks involved and of the array of difficulties that result from structuring a SEM program to include a categorical variable option. Consequently, multinomial logistic regression was performed rather than SEM to determine whether consumers' value orientation (V48–V56) and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling (V39–V47) had an effect on their complaint behaviour (V25).

4.5.1.4 ANOVA

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to investigate whether the means of two or more independent samples/groups differ significantly. Usually it is used for testing hypotheses concerning variations among numerous independent groups’ means (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:499).

ANOVA only indicates that overall differences exist in the means of different groups, but it does not indicate where those differences are. Post-hoc LSD tests (also known as pairwise comparisons) can therefore be performed in order to isolate where the differences are (Laerd Statistics, 2013). To achieve this, a series of pairwise-tests are calculated for each pair of groups (Field & Miles, 2010:317). Post-hoc tests should only be performed if the results of the ANOVA showed significant differences between group means (Laerd Statistics, 2013).

An ANOVA was performed to determine the relationship between consumers’ demographic characteristics (gender, age, level of education, monthly household and population group) (V2–
V5) and their value orientation. Post-hoc LSD tests were further performed to specify the differences found, if any.

4.5.1.5 Chi-square significance test

The chi-square test examines the association or goodness of fit between variables to establish how closely observed frequencies correspond with expected frequencies (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:301; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:484). It is based on the null hypothesis, where it is assumed that there is no relationship between two variables in the total population, and the alternative hypothesis, where it is assumed that there exists a significant difference between the two variables (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:484). If the p-value is smaller than 0.05, the null hypothesis can be rejected, which indicates that there is a relationship between the variables. The p-value refers to the precise probability of getting a computed test statistic that was largely due to chance (McDaniel & Gates, 2013:503). Thus, the lower the p-value, the smaller the probability of coincidental results (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000:146; McDaniel & Gates, 2013:503).

Chi-square significance tests were performed to determine whether significant relationships exist between consumers’ demographic characteristics (gender, age, level of education, monthly household and population group) (V2–V5) and their complaint behaviour regarding major household appliances.

4.6 QUALITY OF THE DATA

4.6.1 Validity

The validity of data is determined by the degree to which the measurement is correct and accurate (Wild & Diggenes, 2009:6; Zikmund & Babin, 2013:258). There are two main dimensions of validity, namely theoretical validity and measurement validity (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:89). These two dimensions, as relevant to this study, are discussed in the sections that follow to indicate that this study met a high degree of validity.
4.6.1.1 Theoretical validity

Theoretical validity refers to the extent to which theory is used to explain phenomena (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011:181). To ensure theoretical validity, a thorough literature review was compiled of various sources and clear definitions of concepts were provided (Mouton, 2005:111). Methodologies that have produced reliable results in previous studies on complaint behaviour, personal values, attitudes toward businesses and the VAB hierarchy model, guided the current research. These methodologies, along with the relevant literature and the theoretical framework (social adaptation theory and VAB hierarchy model), led to the development of the conceptual framework which provided a schematic view of the logic behind the formulation of the problem and the research objectives.

4.6.1.2 Measurement validity

Measurement validity includes four types of measurements for validity, namely content validity, face validity, construct validity and criterion validity. Content and face validity are determined before data collection, while construct and criterion validity are established afterwards (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:89).

Face validity refers to what a measurement instrument appears to measure rather than what it truly measures (Delport & Roestenburg, 2011:173-174). Concerning the questionnaire, the indicators (questions) of the various constructs were ordered in such a way that they appeared to be relevant measurements of the specific concepts, namely consumer complaint behaviour, personal values and attitudes towards retailers’ complaint handling.

Content validity refers to whether the measuring instrument represents and measures the concepts logically and adequately (Zikmund & Babin, 2013:258). Validity of the study was increased by deriving all the scale items used in the questionnaire from existing studies. Slight modifications were also made to some of the items to fit the context of the study. A pilot study was furthermore conducted to enhance respondents’ level of understanding of the questionnaire and to identify any ambiguities. The principal investigator, a qualified statistician and research consultant, further assessed the questionnaire to ensure that the items in the questionnaire measured the necessary constructs.

Construct validity is concerned with what the measuring instrument measures and how and why it functions in a certain way (Delport & Roestenburg, 2011:174). Construct validity was applied...
by ensuring that the constructs of this study were made clear and that multiple indicators were used to measure respondents’ personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and complaint behaviour (Mouton, 2005:111). The construct validity of this study was further enhanced by validating the scales used (Mouton, 2005:111) and by using known measures of the constructs. The validity and reliability of the LOV have been documented and verified in a large body of research (Kahle, 1996; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005; Stockard, Carpenter & Kahle, 2014). An extensive literature review on attitudes toward businesses also confirmed the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale (Keng et al., 1995) as suitable for measuring consumers’ attitudes. While the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale was appropriate in the context in which it was used in previous studies, the wording had to be slightly adapted to suit the context of this study. From the literature review, it is furthermore clear that Likert-type scales are the preferred and predominant measurement method for measuring both personal values and attitudes.

Criterion validity is established by comparing what has been measured to other standard measures of similar constructs or established and reliable external criteria (Babbie, 2007:147; Zikmund & Babin, 2013:258). Criterion validity was achieved by ensuring that the various scale items used in each question measured the same construct. In addition, existing and established scales, such as the LOV and the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale, were adapted to accommodate the objectives of the study (Zikmund & Babin, 2013:258).

4.6.2 Reliability

Reliability represents how precise and consistent a measuring instrument yields certain results (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:91; Zikmund & Babin, 2013:257). To ensure reliability of the measures, all constructs were clearly defined and each measure indicated only one specific construct. It was also ensured that each indicator measured constructs at the most precise level possible. Each construct had at least two or more indicators and the questionnaire was pre-tested before final distribution to respondents (Delport & Roestenbourg, 2011:177; Neuman, 2007:116-117).

The questionnaire was constructed according to the principles of questionnaire design. Each question in the questionnaire was also checked to ensure that it was relevant, understandable and easy to complete. In addition, the scale items of established scales proven to be reliable were used in the questionnaire (Babbie, 2007:145). The Cronbach’s alpha values of the three value dimensions of the LOV revealed through exploratory factor analysis, and the negatively
stated items of the “Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling” scale exceeded the 0.7 criterion, indicating high reliability.

Field workers were trained regarding the instruction and approach of respondents to ensure reliability of data. They also received proper training regarding the coding process to eliminate error.

4.7 ETHICAL ISSUES

When the object of investigation involves human beings, it is of crucial importance to consider the ethical implications of the research (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013:104). The research was therefore designed and undertaken to ensure integrity and quality (Matthews & Ross, 2010:72).

The survey was conducted in an ethical way by adhering to the following ethical requirements as stipulated by Leedy and Ormrod (2013:105-106) and Wild and Diggenes (2009:22):

- Respondents were provided with the necessary information to make informed decisions concerning participation by means of a cover letter included in the questionnaire containing information about the nature of the study, the respondents’ duties in terms of participation, completion time, the researcher (name and contact details) and the confidentiality of the study. A space was also provided for participants to sign the letter, indicating consent to participate.
- Respondents were at no point forced to participate in the study and they could withdraw at any time.
- Respondents were guaranteed that the information they provided would be kept confidential and that they would stay anonymous. They were only required to provide their contact details if they wanted to participate in the lucky draw, in which case anonymity was assured by providing a separate piece of paper on which they could write their contact details.
- Respondents were not subjected to any form of embarrassment, unusual stress or loss of self-esteem by participating.
- The respondents were not subjected to any physical harm since the data was collected in the safety of the respondents’ work places and private houses.
- The researcher reported the findings with honesty and without any misinterpretation.
4.8 DATA PRESENTATION

The raw data was statistically analysed and the data conversion is available in both hard copy (researcher’s files) and electronically at the Department of Consumer Science at the University of Pretoria. Chapter 5 constitutes a discussion of the results of this study.

4.9 CONCLUSION

After careful consideration, the research design and subsequent methodology were chosen to address the research problem and objectives of this study. The survey research design, based on a quantitative approach and a cross-sectional research strategy, were employed. The research objective was exploratory and descriptive in nature. A self-administered questionnaire was designed to collect primary data by means of convenience and snowball sampling from respondents 25 years or older and residing in the middle- to upper-income suburbs across Tshwane, South Africa. After the questionnaire was pre-tested, a total of 500 questionnaires were distributed during the months of September and October 2010. A total of 361 questionnaires were usable.

The questionnaire consisted of different sections and simple nominal and Likert-type scales were implemented. Established scales, such as the LOV and the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale, were also implemented.

Data was analysed with the help of a qualified statistician and a research consultant. Means, percentages and standard deviations were firstly calculated, after which inferential statistics, including exploratory factor analysis, Pearson correlations, logistic regressions, ANOVAs and Chi-square statistics were conducted.

To ensure that the quality of the study measured up to the acceptable standards, measures were taken to enhance the validity and reliability of the results. Ethical research guidelines were implemented to guarantee that respondents participated freely, to respect the confidentiality of information supplied by the respondents, to respect the respondents’ anonymity, and to avoid any harm to respondents.
CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents the demographic characteristics of the sample, followed by the discussion and interpretation of the results in a sequence that is coherent with the objectives and sub-objectives of the study.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the following sections, the results of the study are discussed to address the problem at hand. The demographic characteristics and other descriptive characteristics are firstly represented by means of descriptive statistics. The results are analysed and discussed in the order of the objectives and sub-objectives of the study, and presented by means of descriptive and inferential statistics. The results are further interpreted in terms of the existing literature.

The results are expressed in terms of frequencies and percentages, and are presented in graphs, charts and tables. All the percentages of the graphical representations and the text are also rounded off to two decimal places.

5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC AND OTHER DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

In the next sections, the sample is described in terms of demographic and other descriptive characteristics.

5.2.1 Demographic profile of the sample

Respondents were asked to indicate their gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group (Questions 1–4 and 6, Section A – Addendum A). The profile of the sample is presented in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1 shows that almost three quarters of the sample (73.96%) were female and only 26.04% were male.

The age of the participants ranged between 25 and 73 years and the sample was divided into four relatively evenly dispersed age categories: Younger consumers between the ages of 25 and 29 years (24.10%), who are probably the least experienced with regard to purchasing major household appliances and thus experiencing dissatisfaction with and complaining about major household appliances; consumers between the ages of 30 and 39 years (22.16%), who have probably purchased more than one major household appliance over time; consumers between the ages of 40 and 49 years (29.36%), who have probably made at least one repeat purchase
over time; and older consumers aged 50 years and older (24.38%), who are probably the most experienced with regard to purchasing major household appliances and therefore are more likely than younger consumers to have experienced product dissatisfaction and to have engaged in complaint behaviour.

The majority of the sample (78.90%) had obtained some form of tertiary education – most of the respondents (32.78%) obtained an additional diploma or certificate as their highest level of education, 23.06% obtained a bachelor’s degree, and 23.06% obtained a postgraduate qualification. In addition, 16.38% possessed a grade 12 certificate, and only 4.42% had an education lower than grade 12.

All five income categories specified in the questionnaire were relatively well represented: 12.89% of the respondents earned less than R5 000 a month, representing the lower-income group; 14.01% earned between R5 000 and R9 999 a month, representing the lower middle-income group; 15.97% earned between R10 000 and R14 999, representing the upper middle-income group; 22.13% earned between R15 000 and R24 999 a month and 35.01% earned R25 000 or more a month, representing the two upper-income groups.

Nearly two thirds of the sample (64.54%) belonged to the white population group, whereas slightly more than a third of the sample (35.46%) belonged to the black population group.

Compared to the City of Tshwane Municipality Household Survey of 2008, the sample of this study were more educated, earned higher monthly household incomes and consisted of more females, more white people and more people between the ages of 40 and 49 years. The current study employed convenience sampling instead of random sampling to ensure that only respondents who have experienced dissatisfaction with a major household appliance were included the study. The sample of this study was representative of consumers who were able to purchase major household appliances and who had experienced dissatisfaction with their appliances.

Although the sample demographics were not representative of the greater Tshwane population, the subsets (specific demographic segments) provided useful information concerning respondents’ personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and complaint behaviour.
5.2.1.1 Residential area distribution

Respondents were asked to indicate their suburbs (Question 5, Section A, Addendum A) to confirm that they resided in the Tshwane area. As the study at hand was conducted in 2010, the data was summarised by organising the suburbs into geographic regions of Tshwane as identified by the City of Tshwane Municipality Household Survey of 2008. The geographic regions included the North-Western region, the North-Eastern region, the Central-Western region, the Southern region and the Eastern region. The distribution of respondents’ area of residency per area of Tshwane is provided in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in Tshwane</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-Western region (NW)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Eastern region (NE)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-Western region (CW)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern region (S)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern region (E)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 361
Missing values: n = 4

Table 5.2 shows that the majority of the respondents (36.13%) resided in the Eastern areas of the City of Tshwane, whereas the minority of the respondents (10.08%) resided in the North-Eastern region. The results from the City of Tshwane Municipality Household Survey of 2008 also show that the majority of the Tshwane population (30.83%) resided in the Eastern region of the City of Tshwane. The minority of the population (13.5%), however, resided in the Central Western region (City of Tshwane, 2008:9). No further statistical analysis was conducted regarding the residential areas of the sample.

For a complete list of all the suburbs listed, refer to Addendum B.

5.2.2 Major household appliances causing the most dissatisfaction

Respondents had to indicate the major household appliance that caused them the most dissatisfaction concerning its performance to assist respondents in memory recall (Question 1, Section B – Addendum). The results are indicated in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3 shows that 14.96% of the respondents were most dissatisfied with their refrigerator, followed by 13.85% of the respondents who were most dissatisfied with their vacuum cleaner. When categorising the appliances in product classes, the following patterns emerged in terms of the categories of appliances causing the most dissatisfaction for the sample:

- Laundry appliances 27.42% [front loader washing machines (10.25%) + top loader washing machines (12.74%) + tumble dryers (4.43%)]
- Cooling appliances 25.49% [refrigerators (14.96%) + freezers (3.05%) + combination fridge-freezers (7.48%)]
- Cooking and baking appliances 18.01% [built-in ovens (4.99%) + built-in stoves (5.82%) + free-standing stoves (7.2%)]
- Vacuum cleaners 13.85%
- Microwave ovens 10.8%
- Dishwashers 4.43%.

From these results it is clear that respondents experienced dissatisfaction with all types of major household appliances. Appliances like refrigerators, freezers, microwave ovens, stoves, ovens and washing machines are prioritised by many households since many people would be unable to function properly without these appliances (Donoghue, 2008:158). As soon as the more essential appliances have been acquired, more luxurious appliances are usually purchased (Nieftagodien & Van der Berg, 2007). Luxury appliances, including dishwashers, tumble dryers...
and free-standing freezers, are considered to be less essential for households to function properly and are thus purchased less frequently (Kachale, 2005:26-32). This serves as a possible explanation for why respondents experienced the least dissatisfaction with dishwashers, tumble dryers and free-standing freezers.

Microwave ovens are in general relatively low-cost items in comparison to other major household appliances such as ovens and stoves (Nieftagodien & Van der Berg, 2007; Donoghue, 2008:158), and as a result these durables are probably purchased more often. This provides a possible explanation for why 10.8% of the respondents were dissatisfied with their microwave ovens and only 5.82% of respondents were dissatisfied with their stoves and 4.99% with their ovens.

5.3 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 1

Objective 1: To explore and describe consumers' personal values

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of Kahle's (1983) nine LOV scale items on a seven-point Likert-type scale, anchored by “not at all important” (1) and “extremely important” (7) (Question 1, Section E – Addendum 1). The results are indicated in Table 5.3.

According to Table 5.4, respondents rated self-respect (mean = 6.65) as the most important value of the nine values. This was followed by security (mean = 6.50), sense of accomplishment (mean = 6.40), warm relationships with others (mean = 6.28), self-fulfilment (mean = 6.27), being well respected (mean = 6.16), sense of belonging (mean = 5.96), fun and enjoyment in life (mean = 5.92), and excitement (mean = 5.26).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal values</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Personal values</th>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>Being well-respected</td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>53.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Excitement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td><strong>Fun and enjoyment in life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Warm relationships with others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>59.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self-fulfilment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td><strong>Self-respect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sense of accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Not at important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Low importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Slightly important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Moderately important</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Very important</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Extremely important</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean: minimum 1 (not at all important); maximum 7 (extremely important)

**Missing values:** Self-fulfilment = 4; sense of accomplishment = 1; self-respect = 3; Sense of belonging = 2; excitement = 3; warm relationships with others = 1; being well respected = 3; fun and enjoyment = 4; n = 361
Overall, the means of the personal value items varied between 5.26 and 6.65 on the seven-point Likert-type scale, indicating that respondents considered all of the nine personal values to be moderately to extremely important in their daily lives. This result is consistent with previous findings where respondents were asked to rate the importance of values (Razzaque, 1995; Shoham et al., 2003; Kropp et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2007). For example, Shoham et al. (2003) found that the mean importance ratings of the nine value items in the LOV tended to average between 6.0 and 8.0 on 9-point scales. A possible explanation for the skewed responses is provided by Razzaque (1995), who asserted that respondents tend to skew their answers upward when they are not required to make trade-offs between the various value items.

In order to overcome this kind of methodological drawback and to ensure consistency of responses, respondents were requested to select the most important value item from the LOV in addition to rating the nine value items (Question 2, Section E – Addendum 1). Table 5.4 shows the distribution of the nine personal values for the sample.

Table 5.5: MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAL VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The one thing that is most important to you in your daily life</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun and enjoyment in life</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being well respected</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 361

Missing values: n = 2

Table 5.5 shows that overall the respondents chose warm relationships with others as the most important value in their daily lives (25.07%). This was followed by 17.55% of the respondents who viewed self-respect as most important, and another 14.76% who valued sense of accomplishment. The responses for the three values represent more than half of the sample. Only 6.96% of the respondents considered sense of belonging as of prime importance and only one respondent chose excitement as the key value in life.
Despite self-respect being the highest rated value, most respondents chose warm relationships with others as their most important value when forced to make a trade-off between the various values. This is in line with a study by Keng and Liu (1997) where it was found that the majority of Singaporean respondents regarded warm relationships with others as their most important value. Kropp et al. (2005) further found that Korean respondents were more likely to choose warm relationships with others as their most important value, whereas Norwegian respondents tended to select self-respect. Gurel-Atay et al. (2010) found that American respondents regarded self-respect as their most important value, followed by warm relationships with others. South Africa, Korea and Singapore are all developing countries while America and Norway are both developed countries. This might explain why South African, Korean and Singaporean consumers mostly consider warm relationships with others as their most important value, and Norwegian and American consumers consider self-respect as their most important value.

When comparing the results of rating and ranking approach, it can be seen that, although not in the same order, the top four personal values selected by respondents were self-respect, warm relationships with others, sense of accomplishment and security. This is in line with studies conducted by Kahle (1986), Fall (2000) and Gurel-Atay et al. (2010), where self-respect, warm relationships with others, security and sense of accomplishment were also found to be the four most important values chosen by American consumers, regardless of the order. America and South Africa are similar in the sense that they are both considered multicultural societies (Schlesinger, 1992; Donoghue et al., 2016). This might possibly explain why these two countries valued the same top four values.

Excitement was the least popular value since it not only received the lowest rating of the nine value items (mean = 5.26), but there was also only one respondent who regarded it as the most important personal value in his/her life. This result provides support for the findings of a number of studies (e.g. Keng & Liu, 1997; Fall, 2000; Kropp et al., 2005; Li & Cai, 2012). For example, in a study conducted by Keng and Liu (1997) only 1.6% opted for excitement as important. Fall (2000) found that among a sample of American consumers, no one chose excitement as their most important value. Kropp et al. (2005) found that excitement was rated the least important value by Australian, Canadian, Korean and Norwegian respondents. Li and Cai (2012) also found that only 5.1% of Chinese tourists selected excitement as their most important value. In conclusion, it seems that very few consumers consider excitement as their most important value, regardless of which culture they belong to.
Kahle (1983) suggested that the LOV could be reduced to internal and external value domains. He regarded warm relationships with others, self-respect and sense of accomplishment as internal values, and sense of belonging, being well respected and security as external values (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Fall, 2000). In terms of Kahle's value domains, it appears that the respondents in the current study valued internal values such as warm relationships with others, self-respect and sense of accomplishment, more than external values. When adding the percentages of the values belonging to the internal value dimension, it becomes clear that the majority of the sample (75.21%) selected one of the internal values as their most important value. Kropp et al. (2005) suggests that individualistic consumers place greater emphasis on internal values than more collectivistic consumers do. The majority of the sample was white (64.54%), and white South Africans are known to be more individualistic in nature (Wissing et al., 2006); this might provide an explanation for the preference for internal values.

According the literature, individuals valuing internal values more than external values are expected to be more self-motivated (Madrigal, 2005) and to possess a strong internal locus of control, i.e. they are self-driven and strive to control all aspects of their lives (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Watkins & Gnoth, 2005). They also believe that they are able to influence or control outcomes (Kropp et al., 2005; Madrigal, 2005; Kopanidis, 2008:39). Internally-oriented individuals are further known to show little concern regarding group interactions and the opinions of other people (Kropp et al., 2005).

**Sub-objective 1.1:** To explore and describe consumers' personal value orientation

In order to identify the respondents' personal value orientation, the means for Kahle's (1983) nine LOV scale items (V48–V56, Question 1, Section E – Addendum A) were subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and an extraction method known as Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) was performed using direct oblimin oblique rotation (assuming that the items are correlated) with Kaiser Normalisation.

A Scree test and Kaiser's criterion were used as a guide for the extraction of factors. Both these analyses were done since it is argued that Kaiser's criterion may lead to an overestimation of the number of factors extracted (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Field & Miles, 2010:553). Two factors emerged based on Kaiser's criterion, which entails retaining factors with eigenvalues greater than one. The point of inflexion on the Scree plot, however, suggested that three factors could be extracted, even though the third factor did not meet the
minimum eigenvalue criterion. Initial eigenvalues indicated that the first three factors explained a total of 63.98% of the variance. Solutions for three factors were each examined, using oblique oblimin rotation of the factor loading matrix. Only items with factor loadings of 0.33 and greater on one factor were retained. All of the nine items had primary loadings above 0.33. The rotated factor pattern showed that self-respect, sense of belonging, security, being well respected and warm relationships with others loaded high on Factor 1, excitement and fun and enjoyment of life loaded high on Factor 2 and self-fulfilment and sense of accomplishment loaded high on Factor 3.

A reliability test with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients was then performed to verify the internal consistency of the three value dimensions generated. The alpha values of the three factors exceeded the 0.70 criterion (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997:91; Statistics Solutions: Factor Analysis, 2016). Therefore no items were deleted.

Table 5.6 shows the factor loadings after rotation, and the eigenvalues and the Cronbach alphas associated with the three factors. The means and standard deviations of the items per factor are also displayed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOV Items</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being well respected</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>−0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>−0.158</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>−0.077</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>−0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>−0.054</td>
<td>−0.949</td>
<td>−0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun and enjoyment of life</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>−0.562</td>
<td>−0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>−0.148</td>
<td>−0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>−0.116</td>
<td>−0.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean: minimum 1 (not at all important); maximum 7 (extremely important)

Table 5.6: Personal Value Dimensions Identified Through EFA

Keng and Yang (1993) identified four theoretical, underlying dimensions of values which they labelled Respect (being well respected by others and self-respect), Harmony (security, sense
of belonging and warm relationships with others), Hedonism (fun and enjoyment in life and excitement), and Achievement (sense of accomplishment, self-fulfilment). The three factors retained in this study correspond with Keng and Yang’s (1993) dimensions, except for the value items of the Harmony and Respect dimensions which loaded on only one factor. Keeping this in mind, Factor 1 was labelled Harmony and Respect, Factor 2 was labelled Hedonism, and Factor 3 was labelled Achievement.

Considering the means of the items per factor, it is clear that respondents regarded the Harmony and Respect value dimension (mean = 6.31) and the Achievement value dimension (mean = 6.33) as very important, and the Hedonism value dimension (mean = 5.58) as moderately important.

5.4 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 2

Objective 2: To explore and describe consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling

The scale items used to measure respondents’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling were adopted from the “Attitudes toward businesses” scale developed by Keng et al. (1995). Respondents had to indicate their level of agreement with nine statements measured on a five-point Likert-type scale, anchored by “disagree strongly” (1) and “agree strongly” (5), (3) being the neutral point on this scale.

The results of the respondents’ responses towards these attitude statements are presented in Table 5.7. It should be noted that the “strongly agree” and “agree” responses, as well as the “strongly disagree” and “disagree” responses were respectively combined. The negative items are indicated in red. Of the nine statements, four statements were positively stated and five statements were negatively stated. Agreement with the positive statements indicated a positive attitude and agreement with the negative statements indicated a negative attitude.

For the purpose of discussion, responses were grouped in terms of respondents’ agreement with the statements (mean, disagreement: < 2.5; indecisive: 2.5 – 3.5; agreement: > 3.5).
TABLE 5.7: RESPONDENTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARDS APPLIANCE RETAILERS’ COMPLAINT HANDLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retailers are usually willing to repair faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</strong></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>Most appliance retailers will cheat you if you do not stand up for your rights.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>71.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most appliance retailers make an effort to sell goods that are in a good condition.</strong></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Appliance retailers take a long time to respond to a complaint.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retailers are usually willing to replace faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</strong></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Store employees are often quite unpleasant to customers who return unsatisfactory appliances.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>65.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retailers are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</strong></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>52.91</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Most appliance retailers say they want their customers to be satisfied, but they are not willing to go the extra mile to keep their customers happy.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>70.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appliance retailers do not take notice of complaints made.</strong></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>51.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean: minimum 1 (disagree strongly); maximum 5 (agree strongly)

n = 361
Two of the four positive statements had means above 3.5, indicating agreement with these statements and thus a positive attitude. Respondents held the strongest positive attitude towards the statement “Retailers are usually willing to repair faulty appliances that are still under guarantee” as 71.39% agreed with this statement. Respondents held neutral attitudes towards the statements “Retailers are usually willing to replace faulty appliances that are still under guarantee” (mean = 3.23) and “Retailers are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty appliances that are still under guarantee” (mean = 2.57).

The means of three of the five negative statements exceeded 3.5, indicating agreement with these statements and thus a negative attitude. Respondents held the strongest negative attitude towards the statement “Appliance retailers say they want their customers to be satisfied, but they are not willing to go the extra mile to keep their customers happy” as 70.84% agreed with this statement. Respondents held neutral attitudes towards the statements “Appliance retailers do not take notice of complaints made” (mean = 3.43) and “Most appliance retailers will cheat you if you do not stand up for your rights” (mean = 3.43).

To determine the overall attitude score, the negative attitude items were reverse coded so that all the attitude items were positively stated. Thereafter, the overall mean of the nine items were computed. The overall mean was 2.8, which indicates that respondents have a neutral attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, implying that they were undecided with regard to their attitudes towards retailers’ complaint handling. A neutral attitude may point to South African consumers’ “spirit of passivity”.

The attitude items are very similar to scale items measuring perceived justice. In a complaint handling context, perceived justice encompasses three dimensions, namely procedural justice (consumers’ assessment of the fairness of the procedures used to resolve complaints), distributive justice (the perceived fairness of the redress offered by the retailer/manufacturer), and interactional justice (the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment received during the complaint handling process) (Blodgett, Granbois & Walters, 1993; Blodgett et al., 1997; Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Ha & Jang, 2009). Perceived justice theory proposes that dissatisfied consumers will assess retailers’ complaint handling according to these three justice dimensions (Tax, Brown & Chandrashekar, 1998).

The three items “Most appliance retailers make an effort to sell goods that are in a good condition”, “Appliance retailers take a long time to respond to a complaint” and “Most appliance retailers will cheat you if you do not stand up for your rights”, correspond with the procedural justice dimension which refers to the perceived fairness of the policies and procedures involved in handling complaints (Blodgett et al., 1997; Maxham III & Netemeyer, 2002; Ha & Jang, 2009; Homburg et al., 2010; Harris et al., 2013).
Procedural justice includes various dimensions, namely “process control”, “decision control”, “accessibility”, “timing/speed”, “flexibility”, “approach”, “right policy and execution”, “responsiveness” and “appropriate method” (Maxham III & Netemeyer, 2002; Stauss, 2002; Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005; Kau & Loh, 2006; Ha & Jang, 2009). It is of vital importance that procedures and policies should be consistent, unbiased and impartial, representative of all parties concerned, and based on correct information and ethical standards in order to be judged as fair (Tax & Brown, 1998; Kau & Loh, 2006).

The three items “Appliance retailers do not take notice of complaints made”, “Store employees are often quite unpleasant to customers who return unsatisfactory appliances” and “Most appliance retailers say they want their customers to be satisfied, but they are not willing to go the extra mile to keep their customers happy”, correspond with the interactional justice dimension which refers to the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment customers receive during the complaint handling process (Lewis & McCann, 2004; Ha & Jang, 2009); that is, the manner in which the complainant is treated by the employees of the retailer during the complaint handling process (Davidow, 2003). The specific elements associated with interactional justice include honesty, friendliness, sensitivity, interest, assurance, empathy, respect, directness and concern. Additional elements include the firm’s willingness to listen and respond to complaints, the firm’s willingness to provide an explanation as to why the failure occurred, common courtesy and politeness exhibited by employees, effort observed in resolving the situation, the acceptance of blame, provision of an apology, and the communication language used (Stauss, 2002; Davidow, 2003; Ennew & Schoefer, 2003; Lewis & McCann, 2004; Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005; Kau & Loh, 2006; Dayan, Al-Tamimi & Elhadji, 2007; Ha & Jang, 2009).

The three items “Retailers are usually willing to repair faulty appliances that are still under guarantee”, “Retailers are usually willing to replace faulty appliances that are still under guarantee” and “Retailers are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty appliances that are still under guarantee”, correspond with the distributive justice dimension that refers to the perceived fairness of the tangible outcome (redress) offered by the retailer (Davidow, 2003; Schoefer & Ennew, 2005; Ha & Jang, 2009; Homburg et al., 2010). Distributive outcomes (redress) include compensation in the form of monetary rewards such as discounts, coupons, refunds, rebates, free gifts, replacements or substitutions, repairs and payment of additional expenses caused by the firm’s failure (Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005; Kau & Loh, 2006; Ha & Jang, 2009; Kim et al., 2010; Homburg et al., 2010).

Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) was used to assess the internal consistency of the scale. The overall alpha value of 0.68 was just short of the 0.7 criterion (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997:91; Statistics Solutions: Factor Analysis, 2016). Respondents might not have rated the items consistently because the mixture of positively and negatively phrased items could have caused confusion. In an attempt to increase the
Cronbach alpha, the four positive items (Retailers are usually willing to repair faulty appliances that are still under guarantee, most appliance retailers make an effort to sell goods that are in a good condition, retailers are usually willing to replace faulty appliances that are still under guarantee, and retailers are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty appliances that are still under guarantee) were omitted from the scale, which increased the Cronbach alpha to a respectable 0.76. A possible explanation for the increase in reliability could be that respondents associated more strongly with the negative items than with the positive items. As a result, only the remaining five negative items were used for further analysis.

5.5 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 3

Objective 3: To explore and describe consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

Respondents had to indicate whether they took any action (i.e. complained to acquaintances/friends/family, switched to another brand name, stopped supporting the retailer, contacted the retailer/manufacturer/repair service/consumer protection organisation, wrote a complaint letter and/or contacted a legal representative), or took no action at all following their dissatisfaction (Question 1, Section C – Addendum 1). The results are indicated in Table 5.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/no action</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took action</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>74.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took no action</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 shows that nearly three quarters of the respondents (74.24%) took action, whereas approximately a quarter of the respondents (25.76%) did not take any action. This is in line with Donoghue’s (2008) study on consumers’ complaint behaviour regarding the performance failure of major electrical household appliances in South Africa, where it was found that 20% of the respondents did not take any action. Broadbridge and Marshall (1995) found in their study on consumers’ complaint behaviour regarding electrical goods in central Ireland, that only 10% of the respondents did not take any action. The South African respondents in the present study and in Donoghue’s (2008) study were therefore more passive compared to the Irish respondents in Broadbridge and Marshall’s (1995) study. This passivity towards complaining strongly contradicts the culture of complaining that prevails in most...
developed countries, especially with regard to expensive and durable products (Darley & Johnson, 1993; Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995).

While several reasons have been identified in the literature for consumers’ refraining from taking action, research by Voorhees, Brady and Horowitz (2006) reveals that the most common reason why consumers do not complain is that they do not have the time to complain nor are they willing to expend the effort needed to complain. Hernandez and Fugate (2004) further states that American consumers’ number one reason for not complaining is that they do not think that it is worth the time and effort. Other possible reasons for why consumers do not complain is that they may not know how or where to complain, they may be diffident about complaining (Snellman & Vihtkari, 2003; Emir, 2011), or they may think that their complaint would go unnoticed (Hernandez & Fugate, 2004).

The respondents that took action were required to indicate the type of action(s) they took, in terms of Day and Landon’s (1977) private and public action categories. Respondents engaged in public action if they contacted the retailer/manufacturer/repair service/consumer protection organisation, wrote a complaint letter and/or contacted a legal representative; and they engaged in private action if they talked to acquaintances/friends/family, used another brand name and/or stopped supporting the retailer (Questions 2 to 10, Section C – Addendum). For each one of these questions, respondents had to answer either “yes” or “no”. It should be noted that while 268 respondents took action, the number of responses is shown as 769 since respondents could select more than one response option. The results of the type of public and private actions are indicated in Table 5.9.
TABLE 5.9: ACTIONS TAKEN IN TERMS OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ACTION CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of private and/or public action taken</th>
<th>Number of responses “yes”</th>
<th>% n1 = 769</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>% n1 = 769</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told friends/family/acquaintances about the bad experience</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>62.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided to switch to another brand name</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped supporting the retailer where the appliance was purchased</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted the retailer/ manufacturer to obtain redress (repairs/replacements/refunds)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>37.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer/manufacturer</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted a consumer protection organisation/department</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote a letter to the press (newspaper, magazine etc.) or to a consumer complaint website</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted a legal representative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>769</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 268 (number of respondents who took action)

n1 = total number of responses

Table 5.9 shows a significantly lower public-to-private complaint ratio (38:62) for major electrical household appliances. This contradicts Day and Landon’s (1977:430) original assertion that complex and expensive products like durable goods encourage more public complaining. These findings also contradict those of Broadbridge and Marshall (1995) where a higher public-to-private complaint ratio (57:43) for domestic and major electrical appliances emerged among consumers visiting a large shopping centre in Central Scotland. However, the findings of this study are in line with a South African study conducted by Donoghue (2008), where a lower public-to-private complaint ratio (44:56) was found for major household appliances. The results of this study therefore confirm Donoghue, Van Oordt and Strydom (2016) assertion that South African consumers are passive with regard to public complaining. These findings therefore imply that South African consumers are passive with regard to public complaining. This may be because many South African consumers are still ill-informed about their consumer rights and lack the necessary knowledge to pursue redress when they are dissatisfied, despite
the existing consumer legislation and efforts of consumer protection organisations to promote consumers’ rights (Donoghue, Van Oordt & Strydom, 2016).

Concerning private action, the most popular response option among respondents was to tell others about their bad experience (negative word-of-mouth). Respondents also rather switched to another brand than to boycott the retailer. Concerning public action, respondents rather complained to secondary parties (contacted the retailer or manufacturer to obtain redress or contacted a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer or manufacturer) than to engage in more formal complaint action to third parties (to contact a consumer protection organisation/department, or to write a letter to the press or to contact a legal representative). These findings are consistent with Donoghue (2008) and Van Oordt’s (2015) studies that were conducted in South Africa.

Overall, the majority of the responses were obtained for engaging in negative word-of-mouth, as 243 of the 268 respondents (31.6% of the responses) told friends, family and/or acquaintances about their dissatisfaction. It is further evident that of the 268 respondents, 141 (18.34% of the responses) decided to use another brand name, 133 (17.29% of the responses) contacted a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer, 132 (17.17% of the responses) contacted the retailer or manufacturer to obtain redress, and 94 (12.22% of the responses) stopped supporting the retailer. Very few responses were obtained for contacting third parties, with 5.15% of the responses for contacting a consumer protection organisation, 3.09% for writing a complaint letter to the press or a consumer complaint website, and 0.69% for contacting a legal representative.

The high response rate for negative word-of-mouth among respondents in this study is supported by a number of other studies conducted in various contexts (e.g. Day & Landon, 1976; Richins, 1983; Liljander, 1999; Donoghue, 2008; Van Oordt, 2015). Day and Landon (1976), for instance, reported that negative word-of-mouth to friends and family was the most frequently reported action taken by consumers who were dissatisfied with a purchase of a durable product. Richins (1983) found that 57.2% of consumers who were dissatisfied with clothing or appliances engaged in negative word-of-mouth. Liljander (1999) reported that almost half of consumers (48%) engaged in negative word-of-mouth when they were dissatisfied with a car repair service. Additionally, Donoghue (2008) and Van Oordt (2015) found that negative word-of-mouth was the most popular complaint response option among South African respondents. The high incidence rate of negative word-of-mouth among dissatisfied consumers can possibly be explained by the fact that word-of-mouth does not require a lot of effort, whereas public complaints do (Richins, 1983; Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue, 2008:172).
The relatively low response rate for contacting the appliance retailer to complain in order to obtain redress might be because consumers perceive that the product failure is not severe enough to justify complaints (Maute & Forrester, 1993; Donoghue, 2008:30), or doubt that the firm is able and willing to resolve the situation (Schlesinger, Mitchell & Elbel, 2002; Kim, Wang & Mattila, 2010).

The even lower response rate for contacting third parties confirms empirical research suggesting that complaints are rarely made to third parties (Feick, 1987; Kritzer, Bogart & Vidmar, 1991; Kucukarslan & Pathak, 1994; Liu, Watkins & Yi, 1997). However, the very low rate of third party complaining is startling since there are multiple forums and authorities in South Africa such as the National Consumer Forum (NRF) and the South African National Consumer Union (SANCU) to which consumers can formally complain. Consumers might not want to complain to third parties because they may possibly be uninformed as to where and how to complain or they may simply have a laissez-faire attitude toward third-party complaint action (Donoghue, Van Oordt & Strydom, 2016). Another possible explanation might be that complaining to a third party requires a substantial amount of time and effort and it is usually seen as the last resort (Kim & Chen, 2010; Emir, 2011).

It has been found that consumers’ likelihood of complaining decreases as the cost and time of complaining increases (Day & Landon, 1977:434; Emir, 2011). The very low incidence rate of public complaining in the present study may therefore point to the fact that respondents perceived the trouble and cost of public complaining to be very high. This finding supports Chelmsinski and Coulter’s (2007) assertion that consumers from less developed countries – in this case South Africa – are not as involved in consumer litigation as consumers from first-world countries, who tend to engage in public complaint behaviour, for instance complaining directly to the retailer/manufacturer or contacting a legal representative.

For the purpose of additional analysis, respondents’ complaint actions were grouped into private action only, public action only, and both private and public action. The results are indicated in Table 5.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of consumer complaint behaviour</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private action only</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public action only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both private AND public action</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>76.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 361
Table 5.10 shows that of the 268 respondents that engaged in consumer complaint behaviour, 20.15% took private action only, whereas 3.73% took public action only. The majority of the respondents (76.12%) engaged in both private and public action, confirming the findings of Broadbridge and Marshall (1995) and Van Oordt (2015).

Some researchers found that consumers tend to engage in multiple complaint options instead of engaging in only one complaint option (e.g. Richins, 1983; Singh, 1990a; Halstead, 2002). For example, Singh and Pandya (1991) found that word-of-mouth can be a complementary action to voicing a complaint to a firm. Halstead (2002) found that the consumers who voiced their dissatisfaction to the retailer or manufacturer engaged in more word-of-mouth than consumers who did not complain. Halstead (2002) explained that this may be due to the fact that the consumer’s product experience expands when they complain to the seller and therefore they have more to tell others about than just their initial dissatisfaction with the product. For example, they may now tell others about how they were treated by the employees or about the company’s service policies and complaint handling procedures (Halstead, 2002).

5.6 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 4

Objective 4: To investigate the relationship between consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling

The Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to determine the strength of the linear relationship between respondents’ personal value dimensions and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. The Spearman correlation coefficient, which does not assume that data is normally and linearly distributed (Artusi et al., 2002), was also computed. However, it was decided to only report the results of the Pearson correlation coefficient since the two tests yielded similar results.

Only the negative attitude items were included in this analysis. Therefore, an increase in consumers’ attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling means that they have a more negative attitude toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

For interpretation purposes, a 95% confidence level leading to a p-value of 0.05 or less was used to point out significant differences or correlations. Also, a correlation coefficient of 0.1 to 0.3 indicated a weak correlation; a correlation coefficient of 0.3 to 0.5 indicated a moderate correlation; and a correlation coefficient of 0.5 and more indicated a strong correlation (Eiselen, Uys & Potgieter in Petzer, 2012).
Table 5.11 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients obtained between the three value dimensions and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

### TABLE 5.11: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONAL VALUE ORIENTATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS APPLIANCE RETAILERS’ COMPLAINT HANDLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal value orientation</th>
<th>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony and Respect value dimension</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement value dimension</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.01

The results show a weak positive correlation between all three personal value dimensions and respondents’ attitude towards retailers’ complaint handling. This implies that where the score of any one of the three value dimensions increases, the attitude score also tends to increase. That is, the more importance consumers attach to any one of the three value dimensions, the more negative their attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling will be. It should also be noted that all three personal value dimensions had a relatively equal impact on attitudes.

Although the correlation coefficient (r) of all three of the value dimensions were significantly different from zero (p-values < 0.05), the strengths of the correlations were weak as the Harmony and Respect value dimension explained only 1.94% \([(r^2 \times 100) = (0.1394)^2 \times 100 = (0.0194) \times 100]\) of the variability in attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, whereas the Hedonism value dimension explained only 1.97% \([(0.1403)^2 \times 100]\) and the Achievement value dimension explained only 1.89% \([(0.1376)^2 \times 100]\).

Overall, the three value dimensions accounted for only a low 5.8% of the total variation in attitudes. In a study conducted by Dreezens et al. (2005a) on the relationship between values and attitudes towards genetically modified and organically grown food products, they also found that the values power and universalism accounted for only a low variation (more or less 10%) in attitudes. Significant but weak correlations were found in a follow-up study conducted by Dreezens et al. (2005b) concerning the relationship between attitudes, attitude characteristics and values.

There are a few possible theoretical explanations for the lack of correspondence between values and attitudes. Dreezens et al. (2005a) provided two likely explanations for the weak relationships between values and attitudes. They firstly acknowledged that values are not the only concepts that influence and form attitudes, as other concepts such as emotions (Giner-Sorolla, 1999) and past behaviour (Albarracín
& Wyer, 2000) might also have an impact on attitudes. However, they noted that values should still be considered of interest in their relationship with attitudes. Secondly, they explained that the levels of specificity of values and attitudes differ. That is, values are more abstract and universal constructs compared to attitudes, making it difficult to observe a direct relationship between values and attitudes (Vaske & Donnelly, 1999; Dreezens et al., 2005a; Honkanen, Verplanken & Olsen, 2006). In addition, Maio and Olsen (1995) assert that a weak value-attitude relationship can be expected if the attitude under investigation does not serve to express values. They found that the strength of value-attitude relationships were stronger if the attitude under investigation served a value-expressive function.

Dreezens et al. (2008) conducted a study to identify ways in which the value-attitude link can be strengthened, and concluded that values were more likely to have a significant effect on attitudes when a specific value related to an attitude is identified, along with the way in which the specific value and the attitude is related.

5.7 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 5

Objective 5: To investigate the effect of consumers’ personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliance

A multinomial logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict whether respondents would engage in complaint behaviour (private action only/public action only/both private and public action) or not, using respondents’ personal value dimensions and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling as predictors. The interaction effect between the three personal value dimensions and consumers’ attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was also included as possible predictor of complaint behaviour to test whether attitude mediated the relationship between personal value orientation and complaint behaviour. For modelling purposes, complaint behaviour was dummy-coded as follows: 1 = private action only, 2 = public action only, 3 = both private and public action, thus providing “no action” as the reference category.

The Private Action Only category entailed spreading negative word-of-mouth to acquaintances, friends and/or family, switching to another brand name and/or boycotting the retailer. The Public Action Only category entailed contacting the retailer or manufacturer to obtain redress, contacting a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer or manufacturer, contacting a consumer protection organisation, writing a letter to the press and/or contacting a legal representative. The Both Private and Public Action
category entailed consumers engaging in one or more private actions as well as one or more public actions.

Only the negative attitude items were included in the logistic regression analysis. An increase in respondents’ attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling therefore means that they have a more negative attitude toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

A full regression analysis was conducted in which all the predictor variables producing either a direct or interaction effect were included. The goodness-of-fit statistics and the parameter estimates and indices are presented in Table 5.12.
TABLE 5.12: MULTIPLE LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS ON COMPLAINT BEHAVIOUR TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action category</th>
<th>Parameter estimates</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (β)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Action Only</strong></td>
<td>Intercept (Complaint behaviour)</td>
<td>-23.535</td>
<td>9.937</td>
<td>5.610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and respect value dimension</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>5.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement value dimension</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>6.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>5.278</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>4.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>**0.039</td>
<td>195.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and Respect*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.420</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Action Only</strong></td>
<td>Intercept (Complaint behaviour)</td>
<td>-15.151</td>
<td>14.858</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and respect value dimension</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>33.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>-2.272</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>**0.042</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement value dimension</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>2.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>4.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and Respect*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.869</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>3.642</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*0.056</td>
<td>2.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private and Public Action</strong></td>
<td>Intercept (Complaint behaviour)</td>
<td>-4.263</td>
<td>5.773</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and respect value dimension</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>1.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement value dimension</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>2.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony and Respect*Attitude</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: No action.

LLV\text{initial} = 667.391; \quad LLV\text{post} = 637.335; \quad \text{sig} = 0.091; \quad \text{Cox and Snell } R^2 = 0.085; \quad \text{Nagelkerke } R^2 = 0.096

* Significant at 0.1

**Significant at 0.05
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It is clear from Table 5.12 that the Hedonism value dimension ($\beta = -2.272$; sig = 0.042; $\text{Exp}(\beta) = 0.103$) and attitude towards retailers’ complaint handling ($\beta = 5.278$; sig = 0.039; $\text{Exp}(\beta) = 195.903$) significantly influenced respondents’ choice of complaint behaviour. Furthermore, the Hedonism*Attitude interaction was on the brink of being significant at the 5% level ($\beta = 0.743$; sig = 0.056; $\text{Exp}(\beta) = 2.102$).

In order to conserve degrees of freedom and not clutter the picture unnecessarily, all the insignificant predictors were removed and the analysis was rerun with only the significant and nearly significant predictors. Table 5.13 reports the final logistic regression analysis, in which only the Hedonism value dimension, attitude towards retailers’ complaint handling and the Hedonism*Attitude interaction are included in the model.

### Table 5.13: Logistic Regressions on Complaint Behaviour Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action category</th>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (β)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Action Only</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-6.312</td>
<td>4.172</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Action Only</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>8.694</td>
<td>5.366</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>-1.258</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>-4.099</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.048</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Public Action</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-4.228</td>
<td>2.856</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism value dimension</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>2.884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism*Attitude</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: No action.

LLV<sub>initial</sub> = 474.923; LLV<sub>post</sub> = 457.190; sig = 0.038; Cox and Snell $R^2 = 0.050$; Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.057$

* Significant at 0.1

**Significant at 0.05

Table 5.13 shows that the only significant relationship was found between attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and public complaint action ($\beta = -4.099$; sig = 0.048; $\text{Exp}(\beta) = 0.017$). Since attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was not a significant predictor of private action, this suggests that attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling are primarily related to complaints to retailers and third parties.
It should be noted that log likelihood [Exp (β)] values above 1 indicate a positive relationship and values below 1 indicate a negative relationship (Fox, 2008). Attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was thus negatively related to public complaint action, since the log likelihood value was smaller than 1 (Exp (β) = 60.273). That is, the more negative respondents’ attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, the less likely they are to complain publicly. More specifically, for a one-unit increase in respondents’ negative attitude score, the odds of taking public action compared to taking no action (reference category) decreases by 98.3% [(0.017–1) x 100% = –98.3%]. This confirms the research suggesting that consumers are less likely to voice their complaints when they doubt that the retailer will respond to and handle their complaints (Richins, 1983; Sheth, Mittal & Newman, 1999:550; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2006, 2009).

There was no evidence of a direct relationship between personal values and consumer complaint behaviour, contradicting the findings of a number of researchers who confirmed the existence of a direct values-behaviour relationship (e.g. Rogers & Williams, 1990; Goldsmith & Stith, 1992; McCarty & Shrum, 1993; Keng & Liu, 1997; Manfredo, Fulton & Pierce, 1997). Furthermore, since none of the interaction effects between the personal value dimensions and attitude toward appliance retailers’ complaint handling was significantly related to any of the complaint actions, the indirect relationship between personal values and behaviour could also not be confirmed and as a result the VAB hierarchy model could not be verified in the context of this study.

5.8 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 6

Objective 6: To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, level of education, monthly household income and population group) and consumers’ personal value orientation

One-way ANOVA tests were performed to compare the mean scores for the three personal value dimensions across the demographic variables of the sample. This was followed by post-hoc LSD tests to do multiple comparisons between various demographic groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal value orientation</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>p-value ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony and Respect value dimension</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.09&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>6.39&lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25–29 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30–39 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40–49 years</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 years and older</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly household income</td>
<td>R 5 000 – R 9 999</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 10 000 – R 24 999</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 25 000 or more</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Grade 12 or less</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional certificate(s)/ diploma(s)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree/ Postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population group</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.47&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>6.22&lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hedonism value dimension | Gender | Male | 94 | 5.71 | 1.24 | 0.4746 |
| | | Female | 261 | 5.54 | 1.13 | |
| | Age | 25–29 years | 86 | 5.96<sup>a</sup> | 1.17 | **0.0001 |
| | | 30–39 years | 80 | 5.68<sup>a</sup> | 1.06 | |
| | | 40–49 years | 103 | 5.62<sup>a</sup> | 1.21 | |
| | | 50 years and older | 86 | 5.07<sup>a</sup> | 1.28 | |
| | Monthly household income | R 5 000 – R 9 999 | 95 | 5.62 | 1.43 | 0.5645 |
| | | R 10 000 – R 24 999 | 136 | 5.67 | 1.13 | |
| | | R 25 000 or more | 124 | 5.50 | 1.16 | |
| | Level of education | Grade 12 or less | 75 | 5.50 | 1.46 | 0.9541 |
| | | Additional certificate(s)/ diploma(s) | 117 | 5.53 | 1.32 | |
| | | Bachelor’s degree/ Postgraduate qualification | 163 | 5.66 | 1.01 | |
| | Population group | Black | 126 | 5.77 | 1.37 | 0.1605 |
| | | White | 229 | 5.48 | 1.12 | |

| Achievement value dimension | Gender | Male | 94 | 6.33 | 1.02 | 0.6146 |
| | | Female | 261 | 6.33 | 0.89 | |
| | Age | 25–29 years | 86 | 6.56 | 0.77 | 0.0949 |
| | | 30–39 years | 80 | 6.31 | 0.88 | |
| | | 40–49 years | 103 | 6.33 | 0.87 | |
| | | 50 years and older | 86 | 6.12 | 1.10 | |
| | Monthly household income | R 5 000 – R 9 999 | 95 | 6.38 | 0.96 | 0.9647 |
| | | R 10 000 – R 24 999 | 136 | 6.35 | 0.86 | |
| | | R 25 000 or more | 124 | 6.27 | 0.95 | |
| | Level of education | Grade 12 or less | 75 | 6.23 | 1.06 | 0.2626 |
| | | Additional certificate(s)/ diploma(s) | 117 | 6.25 | 1.02 | |
| | | Bachelor’s degree/ Postgraduate qualification | 163 | 6.43 | 0.75 | |
| | Population group | Black | 126 | 6.42 | 0.98 | 0.4798 |
| | | White | 229 | 6.28 | 0.88 | |

Missing values: Harmony and Respect = 5; Hedonism= 5; Achievement = 6
* Significant at 0.01
**Significant at 0.001
n = 361
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An ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference between the gender groups with regard to the Harmony and Respect value dimension (p-value = 0.0002). The mean scores indicate that female respondents (mean = 6.39) rated the Harmony and Respect value dimension (self-respect, sense of belonging, security, being well respected and warm relationships with others) slightly higher than males (mean = 6.09). This result partially supports Shoham and colleagues’ (1998) finding that females rated the values of warm relationships with others, being well respected, security, self-respect and excitement to be of more importance in their daily lives than males in an Israeli population rated them. This finding also provides partial support to that of Shoham and colleagues (2003), who found that Israeli females valued sense of belonging, warm relationships with others, self-respect and self-fulfilment more than Israeli males did. This result also confirms Kahle’s (1996:139) assertion that warm relationships with others and sense of belonging are social values favoured more by females than men. According to Bocsi (2012), the values of females are more rooted in society and the community, and they aim to build personal relationships. Females also have a tendency to evaluate themselves based on the opinions of people around them (Bocsi, 2012). This may provide a possible explanation for why women value warm relationships with others, sense of belonging, being well respected and security more than men do.

A statistically significant difference also exists between the black and white groups concerning the Harmony and Respect value dimension (p-value = 0.0069). The mean scores indicate that black respondents (mean = 6.47) rated the Harmony and Respect value dimension slightly higher than white respondents (mean = 6.22). According to Yang (2004), collectivistic consumers tend to be more focussed on group harmony, respect, interdependence and connectedness. Since blacks tend to be more collectivistic in nature (Wissing et al., 2006), this may serve as a possible explanation for why black respondents allocated more importance to self-respect, sense of belonging, security, being well respected and warm relationships with others, compared to white respondents. However, it should be noted that black respondents rated the Harmony and Respect value dimension only slightly more important than white respondents and that both population groups allocated a high rating to this value dimension.

The results of the ANOVA further revealed a statistically significant difference between the age groups concerning the Hedonism value dimension (p-value = 0.0001). A post-hoc LSD test indicated that respondents aged 25–29 (mean = 5.96), 30–39 (mean = 5.68) and 40–49 (mean = 5.62) rated the Hedonism value dimension (excitement and fun and enjoyment in life) significantly higher than the respondents aged 50 years and older (mean = 5.07). In all, these results suggest that consumers over the age of 50 might allocate less importance to excitement and fun and enjoyment in life than consumers younger than 50 years. These results partially support the findings of Cleaver and Muller (2002) and Sudbury and Simcock (2009), namely that the value fun and enjoyment in life becomes less important to consumers as their cognitive age increase. In addition, the result lends full support to Fall’s (2000) and Arambewela and Hall’s (2011) findings that consumers’ ratings of hedonic values (fun and enjoyment in life and excitement) decrease as they become older. Fall (2000) suggests that the explanation for this
finding may be maturity-based. People are less likely to place emphasis on fun, enjoyment and excitement and more emphasis on values such as security and income as they age and become wiser and more seasoned (Fall, 2000). Young adults, on the contrary, are in that phase of their life where they are able to lead a relatively carefree life with minimal work and family responsibilities, and are therefore more likely to place emphasis on values such as adventure and fun and enjoyment in life (Vincent, 2014).

The results of the ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences between the various demographic groups concerning the Achievement value dimension (self-fulfilment and sense of accomplishment). Scores of relatively equal importance were allocated to the Achievement value dimension by all five demographic groups (means ranging between 6.12 and 6.56).

5.9 RESULTS OF OBJECTIVE 7

Objective 7: To investigate the relationship between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, monthly household income, level of education and population group) and consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

A chi-square significance test was performed to determine whether significant differences existed between the demographic variables of respondents and their complaint behaviour. The results are presented in Table 5.15.
TABLE 5.15: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND CONSUMER COMPLAINT BEHAVIOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Complaint behaviour (row %)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Chi-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None (n/%)</td>
<td>Private (n/%)</td>
<td>Public (n/%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years and older</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; R 5 000 – R 9 999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 10 000 – R 24 999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 25 000 or more</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 or less</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional certificate(s)/diploma(s)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree/Postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing values: monthly household income = 4; level of education = 1
n = 361

The chi-square significance test revealed that no statistically significant relationships existed between the demographic profile of respondents (gender, age, monthly household income, level of education and population group) (p-values > 0.05) and their complaint behaviour. These results are in line with those of Bolfing’s (1989) study involving hotel guests, in which no significant differences were found between respondents’ age, education, income or marital status on the one hand, and their complaint behaviour on the other. The results also partially confirm Broadbridge and Marshall’s (1995) findings in which a significant relationship was found between non-complainers and age and gender, but no significant relationship was found between complainers and any demographic variables. The results also provide some support for Chelminski and Coulter’s (2011) finding that demographic variables were not significant predictors of complaining either by voicing or engaging in negative word-of-mouth.
It is clear from Table 5.15 that the most popular response option among all five demographic groups was to engage in both private and public action, and the least popular response option was to take public action. Of all the demographic groups, more or less 25% of the respondents took no action. These results confirm the results under objective 3, where it was also found that the majority of the respondents engaged in both public and private action, the minority of the respondents engaged in public action only, and that a quarter of the respondents did not take any action.

5.10 CONCLUSION

The chapter provided an overview of the results of the study according to the specified objectives. The use of non-probability, convenience and snowball sampling techniques precludes the statistical generalisability of the results to the larger South African population. However, the study does provide valuable insights into the relationship between personal values, attitudes towards retailers' complaint handling, and consumer complaint behaviour.

The results described in this chapter involved descriptive and inferential data analysis techniques and the interpretation of the results was substantiated on the basis of existing empirical evidence. In the following chapter the overall conclusions drawn from the results are discussed, and the implications of the study, the limitations of the study, and some recommendations for future research are provided.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions of the study. Theoretical contributions, practical implications, limitations and recommendations for future research are also discussed.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In the sections that follow, conclusions are drawn in terms of the literature reviewed and the objectives of this study. The conclusions are presented in the order of the objectives and the results are summarised based on the sample’s personal value orientation, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, and complaint behaviour. Conclusions are drawn with regard to the relationship between the sample’s value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, as well as the combined effect of the sample’s value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on their complaint behaviour. In addition, conclusions are made based on the relationship between the sample’s demographic characteristics and their value orientation and complaint behaviours.

The chapter continues with a discussion of the study’s contribution to the theory, after which the implications for the relevant parties are indicated. Finally, the limitations of the study are indicated and some recommendations for future research are provided.

6.2 CONCLUSIONS TO THE OBJECTIVES

6.2.1 Consumers’ personal value orientation

The first objective was aimed at exploring and describing the selected sample of South African consumers’ personal values. When respondents were asked to choose the one value they regarded as most important in their lives, they mostly chose warm relationships with others. Warm relationships with others also emerged as the number one value in value studies conducted in Singapore (Keng & Liu, 1997) and Taiwan (Kropp et al., 2005).
Overall, the findings indicated that respondents showed a clear preference for warm relationships with others, self-respect, sense of accomplishment and security. This is in line with former findings by Kahle (1986), Fall (2000) and Gurel-Atay et al. (2010) where these four terminal values emerged as the most important values among American consumers. As was pointed out earlier, America and South Africa are similar in the sense that they are both considered multicultural societies (Schlesinger, 1992; Donoghue, Strydom, Andrews, Pentecost & De Klerk, 2016), which could possibly explain why these two countries valued the same top four values.

The findings further revealed that respondents considered excitement as the least important value in their lives, confirming the findings of a number of other studies conducted in countries around the globe (e.g. Keng & Liu, 1997; Fall, 2000; Kropp et al., 2005; Li & Cai, 2012). This finding implies that regardless of culture, most consumers valued excitement the least.

Considering Kahle’s (1983) internal and external distinction, the results revealed that the majority of the respondents in this study (75.21%) valued internal values, such as warm relationships with others, self-respect and sense of accomplishment, more than external values.

Sub-objective 1.1 was aimed at exploring and describing consumers’ value orientation. To determine the respondents’ value orientation, the value items were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The exploratory factor analyses produced three underlying dimensions that were labelled Harmony and respect, Hedonism, and Achievement. The respective Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the three factors indicated acceptable internal consistency within the three dimensions. It was also clear from the means of the items per factor that respondents valued Achievement values (mean = 6.33) only slightly more than Harmony and Respect values (mean = 6.31). Moreover, they regarded Hedonism values of moderate importance (mean = 5.58).

6.2.2 Consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint behaviour

Objective 2 determined consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Keng et al.’s (1995) “Attitudes toward businesses” scale was slightly adapted to fit the context of the study. In the current study, a five-point Likert-type scale was used to measure nine statements related to appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Overall the findings revealed a neutral attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling (mean = 2.8), implying that respondents were possibly undecided with regard to their attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. This may also indicate that they were unconcerned in terms of their attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, pointing to South African consumers’ passive mind-sets with regard to complaining to retailers. Consumers may feel that it is useless to complain to retailers since nothing will be gained, or they may not be prepared to go through the trouble and effort of complaining formally (Donoghue, 2008:207). Consumers’ may also have
felt that the problem was not severe enough to justify taking complaint action (Maute & Forrester, 1993; Donoghue, 2008:30).

6.2.3 Consumers' complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

Objective 3 was aimed at determining which types of complaint actions consumers resort to when they are dissatisfied with the performance of a major household appliance. Despite the fact that South African consumers experience a substantial amount of problems with their major household appliances (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2006), a quarter of the respondents in this study did not complain at all. Of the 74.24% respondents who did complain, 62% complained privately (i.e. spread negative word-of-mouth to friends/family/acquaintances, switched to another brand name, or stopped supporting the retailer), and the other 38% complained publicly (i.e. contacted the retailer/manufacturer to obtain redress, contacted a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer/manufacturer, contacted a consumer protection organisation/department, wrote a letter to the press, contacted a legal representative). The dominance found in this study of private actions over public action should be of great concern to retailers since private action, especially (negative) word-of-mouth, is almost impossible to control, difficult to measure and represents a distinct threat to firms with dissatisfied consumers (Halstead, 2002).

Negative word-of-mouth was the most popular response option among the respondents, possibly because it requires less effort and time compared to formal complaints to retailers and/or third parties (Richins, 1983; Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995; Donoghue, 2008:172). Only 17.17% of the responses were obtained for complaining directly to the retailer, possibly indicating that respondents are not confident about retailers' complaint handling and as a result perceive the possibility of successful complaint handling to be very low (Blodgett & Granbois, 1992; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009).

An insignificant amount of responses were obtained for third-party complaining (8.93%), indicating a "spirit of passivity" towards third-party complaining. Consumers from developed countries like America tend to be more involved with consumer litigation than consumers from developing countries such as South Africa. American consumers are therefore more likely to complain directly to the seller or to take legal action (Chelminski & Coulter, 2007). The respondents' passivity towards complaining observed in this study therefore strongly contrasts with the culture of complaining that prevails in most developed countries, especially with regard to expensive and durable products like major household appliances (Darley & Johnson, 1993; Broadbridge & Marshall, 1995).

The study further revealed that more than three quarters of respondents engaged in both private and public action, implying that dissatisfied respondents engaged in a variety of complaint behavioural responses to cope with product dissatisfaction. In addition, the respondents who did not complain employed avoidance coping, a non-behavioural coping mechanism, whereby they cope with dissatisfaction by rationalising and forgetting about the problem.
6.2.4 The relationship between consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling

Objective 4 determined the relationship between consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling. The findings point to a weak positive correlation between the respective value dimensions (Harmony and respect, $r = 0.1394$; Hedonism, $r = 0.1403$; Achievement, $r = 0.1376$) and attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling. This implies that the more consumers value any one of the three value dimensions, the more negative their attitude towards appliance retailers' complaint handling will become. The findings also showed that all three personal value dimensions had a relatively equal impact on respondents' attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling.

Although correlations were highly significant, they were very weak. Other studies have also found disappointingly low correlations between values and attitudes (Kristiansen & Hotte, 1996; Dreezens et al., 2005a, 2005b; Honkanen et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the results confirmed findings from previous studies (e.g. Homer & Kahle, 1988; Fulton, Manfredo & Lipscomb, 1996; Shim et al., 1999; Vaske & Donnelly, 1999; Honkanen et al., 2006; Hayley et al., 2014) that consumers' values influence their attitudes towards specific objects.

6.2.5 The effect of consumers' personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling on their complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

This section captures the essence of this study, as the principal purpose of this research was to determine the effect of consumers' personal values and their attitudes towards appliance retailers' complaint handling on their complaint behaviour. By implication, the VAB sequence was also tested by including the interaction effect between the three personal value dimensions and consumers' attitude towards appliance retailers' complaint handling as possible predictors of complaint behaviour.

The final multinomial logistic regression analysis revealed that only attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was negatively related to public complaint handling ($\beta = -4.099$; sig = 0.048; Exp ($\beta$) = 0.017). In conclusion, the more negative respondents’ attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling, the less likely they are to complain publicly. This strengthens the idea that consumers are less likely to engage in formal complaining if they believe that the retailer or manufacturer will fail to respond to and handle their complaints (Richins, 1983; Sheth, Mittal & Newman, 1999:550; Donoghue & De Klerk, 2006, 2009). This finding therefore confirms the existence of a attitude-behaviour connection.
Since none of the interaction effects between the personal value dimensions and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was significant predictors of any of the complaint actions, the mediating role of attitudes in the value-behaviour relationship could not be confirmed and thus the study could not verify the VAB hierarchy model in the South African complaint behaviour context. There was also no evidence of a direct relationship between personal values and consumer complaint behaviour.

### 6.2.6 The relationship between demographic variables and consumers’ personal value orientation

Objective 6 determined the relationship between the demographic variables of gender, age, monthly household income, level of education and population group on the three personal value dimensions, that is, Harmony and respect, Hedonism, and Achievement. Empirical evidence shows that demographic variables such as gender, age, income, education and population group influence personal values (e.g. Rokeach, 1973; Keng & Yang, 1993; Keng & Liu, 1997; Fall, 2000; Shoham et al., 2003; Sudbury & Simcock. 2009). In the current study, a significant relationship exists between gender and the Harmony and Respect value dimension (self-respect, sense of belonging, security, being well respected and warm relationships with others), as females valued this value dimension slightly more than males. This might be because women are more concerned with building personal relationships and care more what other people think of them (Bocsi, 2012).

A significant relationship also exists between population group and the Harmony and Respect value dimension, based on the findings that black respondents consider this value dimension slightly more important than white respondents. A possible explanation for this result was that black consumers tend to conform to more collectivistic values (Wissing et al., 2006) of group harmony, respect, interdependence and connectedness (Yang, 2004; Zourrig et al., 2009). However, white respondents rated this value only slightly less than black respondents, suggesting that white consumers are becoming more collectivistic (e.g. Wissing et al., 2006). This might be an indication of cultural swapping taking place, not only among blacks but also among whites in South Africa. Due to the constant cultural integration of South Africa’s multicultural society, cultural synergy based on shared values, may be taking place (Rousseau, 2003b:411), which may explain why blacks are becoming more individualistic and whites more collectivistic.

The study has found a significant relationship between age and the Hedonism value orientation (excitement and fun and enjoyment in life), based on the findings that respondents aged 50 years and older allocated less importance to the values excitement and fun and enjoyment in life than younger consumers. This confirms previous studies that suggest that as consumers become older, the importance of hedonic values (enjoyment and fun and enjoyment in life) decreases (Fall, 2000; Arambewela & Hall, 2011). This might be because consumers as they age become more judicious and
experienced and as a result tend to place more emphasis on values like security and less on hedonistic values (Fall, 2000).

6.2.7 The relationship between demographic variables and consumers’ complaint behaviour concerning major household appliances

Objective 7 determined the relationship between consumers’ demographics (gender, age, monthly household income, level of education and population group) and their complaint behaviour. The results yielded no significant relationships between the demographic variables of respondents and the four types of complaint behaviour. Therefore demographic variables do not seem to be a useful and significant predictor of South African consumers’ complaint behaviour. Thus, consumers could not be profiled based on their consumer complaint behaviour.

6.3 CONTRIBUTION TO EXISTING THEORY

In a South African context, a limited body of research has addressed the antecedents of consumer complaint behaviour, specifically concerning major household appliances. This research study broadens our understanding of consumer complaint behaviour by introducing the constructs personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and demographics as possible influential drivers of consumer complaint behaviour. This study also serves as an attempt to explore social adaptation theory and the relevance of the value-attitude-behaviour (VAB) hierarchy model in the emerging context of South Africa. Although the VAB hierarchy model could not be confirmed, this study did confirm the existence of a value-attitude link and an attitude-behaviour link among South African consumers.

Also, as part of the VAB link, the influence of consumers’ personal values and attitudes towards retailers’ complaint handling makes a significant contribution to research in South Africa, as the results contribute to understanding the relationship between culturally diverse consumers’ personal values, their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and their complaint behaviour. Therefore, this study may provide evidence that may encourage researchers in other emerging and culturally diverse countries to explore the relevance of personal values and attitudes in predicting complaint behaviour.

This study provides further proof of the applicability of Kahle’s (1983) List of Values (LOV) scale across various settings, specifically within a South African emerging market context. Moreover, the LOV proves to be a useful measure to segment South African consumers based on their specific personal value orientation. In addition, this study provides evidence of a link between personal values and demographics.
This study presents practical implications for a variety of specialists such as retailers, manufacturers, marketers, brand managers, policy makers, consumer scientists, consumer advisors, consumer protection organisations and the government.

An understanding of South African consumers’ personal value orientation will facilitate retailers and marketers to further develop and fine-tune their market campaigns about appliances without creating false expectations about product performance. Self-respect, sense of accomplishment, warm relationships with others and security emerged as the four most important personal values of the sample. Given this insight, these terminal values can be incorporated by manufacturers and marketers in their product design, development, positioning and promotional campaigns (Vincent, 2014). More specifically, the promotion, brand names, colours and designs of major household appliances should emphasise and enhance these four important personal values. For example, marketers can position major household appliances in a social context or they can emphasise deal proneness and patriotism to appeal to consumers valuing warm relationships with others (Kahle, 1996:139). Marketers can further promote appliances to consumers who value security by emphasising the safety, quality and convenience (ease of use) of the appliances. Another example is to emphasise self-identity to target consumers valuing self-respect or to emphasise status and self-indulgence to target consumers valuing sense of accomplishment (Kahle, 1996:139).

Among these four values, warm relationships with others was regarded as the most important value by the majority of the respondents. International companies should note that the value “warm relationships with others” was not only the most important value for South African consumers but also for Singaporean and Korean consumers, according to previous research (e.g. Keng & Liu, 1997; Kropp et al., 2005). Thus, marketing strategies incorporating warm relationships with others can possibly be applied in all these countries. International companies should further note that excitement has emerged as the least important value, not only in this study, but in several countries around the world.

The results of this study revealed that respondents’ gender, population group and age were related to their personal value orientation. Females valued warm relationships with others, sense of belonging, security, self-respect and being well respected more than males did. These values should be emphasised in the development, targeting and positioning of products and services that appeal to females and the black consumer population. Moreover, the findings revealed that respondents older than 50 years valued hedonism values less than consumers younger than 50. Advertising strategies based on the need for excitement and fun and enjoyment may therefore be a mistake when marketing products like household appliances to older consumers. According to Sudbury, Kohlbacher & Hofmeister (2011), marketers should rather emphasise values such as security, warm relationships with others and self-respect when targeting older consumers.
Consumers’ overall neutral attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling possibly points to South African consumers’ passive mind-sets with regard to complaining. This implies that retailers, consumer organisations and the media should inform and educate consumers on their consumer rights and should focus on creating a more proactive mind-set towards complaining.

There were a large number of consumers in this study who refrained from taking action or who engaged in private actions, particularly negative word-of-mouth. These results indicate that firms are only being made aware of a small percentage of consumers’ dissatisfaction with major household appliances. This should be of special concern to retailers and manufacturers since they are not able to rectify problems and to retain customers if they are unaware of product failures (Andreassen & Streukens, 2013). Negative word-of-mouth is especially detrimental to firms since it may lead to the formation of negative attitudes toward a specific firm (Grönroos, 1995; Brown, 2014), which may put them at risk of losing customers (Chelmski & Coulter, 2011). Retailers, consumer protection organisations and the media should therefore encourage consumers to complain directly and formally, so as to prevent similar product failures from occurring in the future and to create a “culture of complaining” rather than a “spirit of passivity” among South African consumers (Donoghue & De Klerk, 2009).

All three personal value dimensions had a relatively equal effect on consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Retailers should therefore pay equal attention to consumers valuing any one of the three value dimensions when trying to enhance consumers’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling.

Respondents’ attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling was found to predict whether they take public action or not. Personal values, however, had no effect on respondents’ decision to engage in public action or not. Retailers should therefore pay special attention to how consumers perceive the company’s responsiveness to complaints and the effectiveness of their complaint handling procedures, and do everything in their power to create and retain a positive attitude towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling among consumers.

6.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Despite the special care that was taken to ensure the validity, reliability and ethicality of the study, the results of this study should still be viewed with caution since a number of limitations were recognised in the data collection and interpretation of the results.

The findings of this study cannot be generalised to the whole South African population for a number of reasons. First, due to time and financial constraints, the sample of the study was relatively small and non-probability convenience and snowball sampling were used to recruit respondents. These non-
probability sampling techniques were used since a random sample of the general South African population would probably not have resulted in a substantial number of respondents with dissatisfactory experiences. Due to the sampling technique, the research cannot be generalised to the South African population.

In addition, compared to the City of Tshwane Municipality Household Survey of 2008, the respondents in this study were more educated, received a higher monthly income and consisted of more White people and more females than the Tshwane population. These groups were thus overrepresented. The results are also limited to the geographical scope of the Tshwane metropolitan area as respondents from rural areas were not recruited. This poses a limitation since black people who reside in urban areas may have adapted more to the Western way of living due to exposure to this culture by means of the media, the work environment, schools, neighbourhoods and social interaction with other people in the community (Smit, 1998:85). On the other hand, black people residing in rural areas and small towns are not as exposed to the Western culture as black people living in urban areas, and therefore they would tend to practise traditions and values associated with the African culture (Smit, 1998:85; Pillay, 2002). Consequently, the results of the personal values may differ for black and white consumers when rural consumers are also included in the sample.

A prerequisite for inclusion in the study was that respondents had to recall an appliance failure within the last four years along with their real-life reactions to that failure. This approach is known as the Critical incident technique (CIT) and while it is seen as a more realistic method than using imaginary scenarios, it has been criticised on aspects of reliability and validity (Chell in Sharma et al., 2010). More specifically, since CIT relies on the memory of participants to correctly recall incidents that might have occurred quite some time ago, such methods may suffer from recall bias, memory lapses, reinterpretation and misremembering of the incident (Sharma et al., 2010).

Although the LOV does not require that descriptions of values should be added in the survey, the lack of such descriptors may pose a limitation to this study since respondents tend to interpret certain value items in various ways leading to possible measurement bias/error (Lowe & Corkindale, 1998; Thompson, 2009). For example, Kamakura and Novak (1992) assert that some respondents may interpret warm relationships with others as long-term, enduring, deep emotional relationships, while other respondents may interpret it as the excitement one shares with close friends or even sexual relationships. The LOV also presents the nine values outside a specific context in surveys, which may pose a limitation in terms of the comparability of the data (Grunert-Beckmann & Askegaard in Ungerer, 2011:139).

Measurement error which may result from using simplified measuring instruments, such as the LOV, to measure personal values, is another possible limitation of this study. The difficulty of measuring attitudes and personal values due to the abstractness of these constructs, might also have contributed to a larger error variance. For instance, consumers from less literate populations such as South Africa tend to
struggle to interpret values since it requires a high degree of abstract thinking (Schwartz et al., 2001; Ungerer, 2011:123). It should further be acknowledged that the strength of the relationships between the various constructs may have been overstated to a degree, since a single questionnaire was used to measure all of the constructs included in the study.

It is important to stress that while data analysis uncovered relationships and associations between various variables, causation could not be assumed from these relationships. This implies that the findings of the study do not pretend to contain an answer to the sequence in the hierarchy of effects of personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and complaint behaviour.

It should also be noted that the conceptual framework proposed in this research study to understand and predict consumers’ complaint behaviour was in no way a comprehensive model. It is acknowledged that understanding consumers’ complaint behaviour is a complex task and that there are other variables that could also have served as antecedents to complaint behaviour that were not presented in the study. For example, various consumer-related factors (e.g. personality, prior complaining experience, culture, etcetera), redress environment factors (e.g. perceptions of firms’ responsiveness to complaints, inconvenience of complaining and likelihood of successful complaining), and product-specific factors (e.g. price of the product, the severity of the dissatisfaction, etcetera) identified in previous research could also have been effective in explaining consumers’ complaint behaviour. Furthermore, it is suggested that other mediating factors such as behavioural intention (Cai & Shannon, 2012) or beliefs (De Barcellos et al., 2012) can be added to the VAB model.

6.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In light of the conclusions and limitations of the study, some recommendations and possibilities for future research are given below.

The sampling size and method of this study present an array of opportunities for future research. Since respondents’ gender, population group and age were found to have an effect on their personal value orientation, a representative sample of the various demographic groups in South Africa is of crucial importance to allow for the possibility of generalising the findings to the larger South African population. In order to obtain a more representative sample, future research should focus on acquiring a larger sample since this would decrease the amount of measurement error apparent in the study. Future researchers could also expand the geographical scope of the study beyond Tshwane to various urban and rural areas across the whole of South Africa. Another possibility is to employ probability sampling instead of non-probability sampling to produce a more representative sample of the South African population. However, since a random sample is unable to produce a sample consisting of only dissatisfied consumers, researchers should conduct experimental studies in which they depict imaginary
appliance failure scenarios to determine consumers’ hypothetical reactions to that specific situation. It should be mentioned that imaginary scenarios only allow researchers to measure consumers’ intention and not their actual complaint behaviour.

The present study verified the application of the LOV in a South African context. However, further verification of the validity and reliability of the LOV in a South African context is still needed. This can be done by conducting a quantitative study in which the meanings, nuances and usage associated with the nine LOV items are explored for South African consumers. It is further recommended that future studies implementing the LOV should add a short descriptor for each value item of the LOV so that subjective or multiple interpretations can be avoided, as this may lead to misleading results with regard to the ranking and rating of the LOV (Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Thompson, 2009).

Future researchers should possibly consider measuring consumers’ values using the Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ) rather than the LOV, since the PVQ is particularly appropriate in developing countries with emerging consumer markets and less literate populations such as South Africa, due to the fact that this method does not require a high level of abstract thinking and is less demanding than more abstract surveys (Burgess & Harris, 1998). The fact that values are usually interpreted differently by various consumers and that values are usually represented outside of a specific context is also overcome by the PVQ (Ungerer, 2011:124).

There is a lack of research concerning the antecedents of complaint behaviour in a South African perspective. Any further research on the effect of personal values and attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling on complaint behaviour would therefore help to fill this hiatus in available research. This study explored the VAB hierarchy model in a South African complaint behaviour context by implementing correlation analysis and logistic regression analysis. Although evidence was found of a value-attitude connection and an attitude-behaviour connection, this study was unable to provide causal evidence for the VAB hierarchical sequence. Future studies could test the causal relationship between personal values, attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling and intention to complain. Since intention is a continuous variable and not a categorical variable like complaint behaviour, structural equation modelling (SEM) can be performed. Researchers should however take note that intention to complain does not equate to actual complaint behaviour.

This study provides a platform for further application of the proposed model to understand consumers’ complaint behaviour in terms of their personal value orientation and their attitudes towards appliance retailers’ complaint handling. Although the results of this study cannot be generalised to the larger South African population, the approach proposed in this study could be transferred to another product failure or emerging market context since it provided useful managerial and theoretical insights.
This study can also be extended by adding an additional mediating variable such as beliefs or intention to the VAB model. Cai and Shannon (2012) propose that intention should be added to the VAB model as it is suggested in existing literature that intention is a closer cognitive antecedent to behaviour than attitudes (Fisher & Fisher, 1992; Gollwitzer, 1993). Future studies could therefore possibly examine a value-attitude-intention-behaviour link or a value-belief-attitude-behaviour link.

6.7 CONCLUSION

Conclusions of the research findings are presented in this final chapter of the study. The findings of the study not only made a theoretical contribution to the body of research on values, attitudes and complaint behaviour, but it also presented various practical implications for retailers, manufacturers, marketers, consumer scientists and third parties, such as consumer protection organisations, court or legal representatives. A number of limitations were also identified even though care was taken to ensure the validity, reliability and ethicality of the study. Finally, recommendations a few were made for future research.
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Dear respondent,

Major household appliances (i.e. kitchen appliances, laundry appliances and vacuum cleaners) are used as time-saving devices to reduce workloads and to increase efficiency. However, many people are dissatisfied with their appliances when they do not perform according to expectation. The aim of this research is to investigate consumers’ behaviour following their dissatisfaction with major household appliances. In addition, information about the things that are important to you in life is needed to create a better understanding of consumers’ thinking. The result of this study may aid manufacturers and retailers in understanding why consumers behave the way they do following appliance failures.

To be part of this study you must answer “yes” to each of the following two questions:

Have you been dissatisfied with an appliance item that you own or have owned within the last four years? (Please note that the term dissatisfaction refers to problems or unhappiness with the product itself. Problems or unhappiness because of poor shop service, delivery, installation or advertising, fall outside the scope of this study.)

YES/NO

Do you live in the Pretoria region (Tshwane)? YES/NO

If you have answered “yes” to both of the above questions and are willing to participate in the study, please sign this form to show your consent to participate.

Signed: ______________________________

Questionnaires will be completed anonymously to ensure confidentiality of the information. As a token of appreciation for your participation, a lucky draw will be held closer to the end of the data collection, and one of the participants will win a gift voucher to the value of R 1000.00 for shopping at a mall of their choice. Should you wish to enter in this lucky draw, please provide your cell number only on the slip that is provided and place your entry in the envelope that is supplied by the field worker. Field workers (people who will be handing out and collecting questionnaires) will be remunerated for their efforts. It is therefore important that the questionnaires be completed in full.

There are no correct or incorrect answers to the questions. Please provide your honest opinion throughout. Thank you for taking time out of your busy day to participate in this study. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or the study, please feel free to contact me at the e-mail address or telephone number below.

Yours sincerely

Dr Suné Donoghue (Lecturer)
E-mail address: sune.donoghue@up.ac.za
Work telephone number: 012 420-2488
QUESTIONNAIRE

Respondent number

Please answer the questions by indicating with a cross (X) the most appropriate number from the options listed. There are no correct or incorrect answers! Just give honest answers.

Section A:
Demographic information. Please make a cross (X) in the relevant box.

1 What is your gender?

Male 1
Female 2

2 What is your age?

[ ] years

3 What is your highest level of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower than grade 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 and additional diploma(s)/certificate(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 What is your household's approximate total monthly income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than R 5 000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 5 000 – R 9 999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 10 000 – R 14 999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 15 000 – R 24 999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 25 000 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 In which suburb of the Pretoria area (Tshwane) do you live?


6 To which cultural group do you belong?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section B**

Information about the dissatisfactory appliance item, parties responsible for appliance failure and emotions experienced in response to dissatisfaction. Please make a cross (X) in the relevant box.

1. Which **ONE** of the following major household appliances that you own (or owned) has caused you the most dissatisfaction concerning its poor/faulty performance within the last four years?
   - Refrigerator
   - Freezer
   - Combination fridge-freezer
   - Built-in oven
   - Built-in stove
   - Free-standing stove (plates plus oven combination)
   - Microwave oven
   - Washing machine: front loader
   - Washing machine: top loader
   - Tumble dryer
   - Dishwasher
   - Vacuum cleaner

2. What is the **brand name** of the dissatisfactory appliance that you indicated in Question 1 (Section B)?
   - Aim
   - AEG
   - Bosch
   - Bauer
   - Defy
   - Gaggenau
   - Kelvinator
   - KIC
   - LG
   - Miele
   - Samsung
   - Siemens
   - Speed Queen
   - Whirlpool
   - Other (specify)

3. Please describe the appliance’s **faulty or poor performance.** (Describe what happened/went wrong.)

4. Was the appliance still under guarantee when it performed poorly or when the product failure occurred?
   - Yes
   - No

5. How severe (serious) was the appliance’s faulty or poor performance mentioned in Question 3 (Section B)?
   - Not severe at all
   - Somewhat severe
   - Very severe
   - Extremely severe
6 Indicate the level of dissatisfaction that you experienced when the appliance performed poorly or the appliance failure occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slightly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Moderately dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Indicate (X) the party whom you blamed most (held responsible) for the appliance’s performance failure (poor performance), or provide another party, if none of the given options applies. (Mark only one party.)

- The manufacturer (e.g. provided poor workmanship, or used inferior materials, or provided an appliance with poor styling and design features)
- The retailer (stocked poor quality appliance, or shop assistants did not provide adequate information on appliance)
- Other people (e.g. the person who purchased the appliance did not do enough research before purchasing it; or the person who operated the appliance abused it)
- Myself (e.g. I did not do enough research before purchasing it; or I did not know how to operate the appliance)
- The appliance item itself (e.g. flaws/defects are inevitable with complicated appliances)
- Other (specify):

8 Do you think that the party responsible for the appliance’s failure (poor performance) could have prevented the failure (poor performance)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 For each of the following emotions, please indicate (X) the number that best describes your feelings about the appliance’s poor/faulty performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not angry at all</th>
<th>Reasonably angry</th>
<th>Very angry</th>
<th>Extremely angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not surprised at all</td>
<td>Reasonably surprised</td>
<td>Very surprised</td>
<td>Extremely surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ashamed at all</td>
<td>Reasonably ashamed</td>
<td>Very ashamed</td>
<td>Extremely ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not guilty at all</td>
<td>Reasonably guilty</td>
<td>Very guilty</td>
<td>Extremely guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sad at all</td>
<td>Reasonably sad</td>
<td>Very sad</td>
<td>Extremely sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not frustrated at all</td>
<td>Reasonably frustrated</td>
<td>Very frustrated</td>
<td>Extremely frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly stressed</td>
<td>Moderately stressed</td>
<td>Very stressed</td>
<td>Extremely stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C:
**Behavioural actions taken in response to dissatisfaction**

1. Did you take any action? (Action refers to talking to friends and family, switching to another brand name, stopping your support of the retailer, contacting the retailer/manufacturer/a repair service/a consumer protection organisation, writing a complaint letter, and/or contacting a legal representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If NO, indicate (X) the applicable reason(s) for not taking any action. Indicate (X) as many blocks as apply and you may provide other reasons if relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not think it was worth the time and effort/hassle to take action.</td>
<td>V26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to do something about it but I never did.</td>
<td>V27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appliance’s guarantee had expired.</td>
<td>V28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know what I could do about it.</td>
<td>V29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>V30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, please answer Questions 2 – 9 (Section C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you tell your friends, family and/or acquaintances about the bad experience?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you decide to switch to a brand name other than the one you were dissatisfied with?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you stop supporting the retailer from whom the appliance had been purchased?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you contact the retailer/manufacturer to obtain redress (repairs/replacement/refund)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did you contact a repair service other than that supplied by the retailer or manufacturer?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did you contact a consumer protection organisation/department?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did you write a letter to the press (newspaper, magazine etc) or to a consumer complaint website?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you contact a legal representative?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete Sections D and E below.
### Section D: Your opinion of appliance retailers

Please indicate (X) to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the statements concerning your opinion of appliance retailers. (Please make a cross (X) for each of the statements listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appliance retailers take a long time to respond to a complaint.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most appliance retailers say they want their customers to be satisfied, but they are not willing to go the extra mile to keep their customers happy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance retailers do not take notice of complaints made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store employees are often quite unpleasant to customers who return unsatisfactory appliances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers are usually willing to repair faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers are usually willing to replace faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers are usually willing to provide refunds for faulty appliances that are still under guarantee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most appliance retailers make an effort to sell goods that are in good condition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most appliance retailers will cheat you if you do not stand up for your rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn over for the last section.
**Section E: Important things in your life**

1. The following is a list of things that some people look for or want from life. Please study the list carefully and then rate each thing on how important it is in your **daily life**, where 1 = not at all important, and 7 = extremely important. (Please make a cross (X) for each one of the things listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being well respected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun and enjoyment of life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Now read the list of items and indicate (X) the **one thing** that is **most important to you in your daily life**.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm relationships with others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfilment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being well respected</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun and enjoyment of life</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn over for the last question.
Please read the following list of statements and indicate (X) the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements.
(Please make a cross (X) for each one of the statements listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like taking chances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always listen to advice given by people who have more experience than me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things are changing too fast nowadays.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone than do a job where I have to work with others in a group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to receive attention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to stick to the usual way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members should stick together even if they do not agree.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to be different from others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success is the most important thing in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always stand up for what I believe in.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to leave everything to fate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather struggle through a difficult problem by myself than discuss it with my friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like people who take risks in life without fear of what will happen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to be different rather than do things the way other people do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you want something done right, you have got to do it yourself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining about unsatisfactory products is my duty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you want big gains, you must be prepared to take risks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like products that are different and unique.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It bothers me if I do not complain about an unsatisfactory product.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that I perform better than other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have a responsibility to inform the retailer about a defective product.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining is a consumer’s right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unable to determine my future and destiny.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing parents should live at home with their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always complain when I am dissatisfied because it is my right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining is done by people with little else to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not buy anything that my friends dislike.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my duty to take care of my family members, whatever it takes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an assertive person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important thing in my life is to make myself happy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining about anything is distasteful to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following social norms (rules) is very important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it embarrassing to complain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more self-confidence than most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on myself most of the time, rarely on others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that winning is important in both work and games.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in a group is better than working alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking time to participate in this study.
Consumers were recruited in various suburbs in the Tshwane metropolitan area. Respondents (n = 361) had to indicate the suburb in which they resided in an open-ended question. The suburbs were based on the 2008 City of Tshwane Survey (See Tables 1 and 2 below). This survey listed all 71 suburbs of Tshwane and then assigned the suburbs to a specific region of Tshwane.

**Table 1: Tshwane Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 City of Tshwane Survey</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-Western region (NW)</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Eastern region (NE)</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Western region (CW)</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern region (S)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern region (E)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the suburbs that the respondents indicated on the questionnaires as well as their corresponding regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of residency per geographic area of Tshwane</th>
<th>2008 CoT Survey</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Area of residency per geographic area of Tshwane</th>
<th>2008 CoT Survey</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Hazeldean</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlea Gardens</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Heuwel Oord</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergtuin</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>Highveld</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Park</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>Kilnerpark</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubview</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>La Montagne</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clydesdale</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Laudium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbyn</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Lucasrand</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantia Park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daspoort</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>Lynnwood Glen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Wilgers</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Olievenhoutbosch</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorandia</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Pierre van Ryneveld</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lynne</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Pretoria North</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldersus park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Pretoria East</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldoraigne</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Pretoria Central</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestria</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>Pretoria Gardens/Tuine</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Lynnwood Ridge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmusrand</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Lyttleton</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearie gien</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Magalieskruiun</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garsfontein</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gezina</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Mayville</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groenkloof</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Menlo park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammanskraal</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>Meyerspark</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Gardens/Tuine</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Pretoriuspark</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Park</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Proclamation Hill</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Park</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Queenswood</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooikloof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Randtjiesfontein</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreletapark</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>Rietfontein</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Rietfontein</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Park</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Rietfontein</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Park</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Rietfontein</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Rooihuiskraal</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieu Muckleneuk</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>Shere</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverlakes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Soshanguve</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Waterkloof Glen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Waterkloof Ridge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterrewag</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Waterkloof Park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orchards</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Weavind Park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Park</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>Wierda Glen</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valhalla</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Willow Park</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeria</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
<td>Wonderboom</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallmansthal</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Zandfontein</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterkloof</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Zwartkops</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria West</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>Zwavelpoort</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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