

Full Length Research Paper

Customer complaints and complaint behaviours in Turkish hotel restaurants: An application in Lara and Kundu areas of Antalya

Oktaý Emir

School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Afyon Kocatepe University, ANS Campus, 03200-Afyonkarahisar, Turkey.
E-mail: oemir@aku.edu.tr. Tel: +90 (272) 228 1306. Fax: +90 (272) 228 1302.

Accepted 20 April, 2011

The aim of this study is to investigate the level of relationship between the complaints and complaint behaviours of the customers who benefit from the services offered by hotel restaurants and to determine if the complaint behaviours show a difference according to the nationalities. The data necessary for the determination of differences or similarities between the main complaints gathered as a result of literature study (price and payment, tastiness and quality, equipment and atmosphere, staff and service) and complaint behaviours (neutral and switch, private responses, voice responses, third party responses), were collected through questionnaire method from 1,148 customers (Turkish, Russian, German and Dutch) and analyzed. Pearson coefficient of correlation was used for the determination of factors related to complaint behaviours and one way ANOVA test was used for the comparison of factors in terms of nationalities. As the result of analysis, a relationship between the customer complaints and complaint behaviours was found and it is determined that customer complaint behaviours show basic differences between the customers coming from different countries such as Turkey, Russia, Holland and Germany. In the light of results, the reasons for the differences between customer complaints and complaint behaviours were discussed and some recommendations were made in order to contribute to hotel/restaurant managers.

Key words: Customer complaint, complaint behaviour, customer satisfaction, nationality.

INTRODUCTION

In the tourism industry, the main factor influential for choosing an enterprise and/or service is the service offered to the customer. Thus, many customers prefer to stay at hotel enterprises or eat at specific restaurants according to the quality of customer services offered (Blodgett et al., 1995). In this context, hotels should urgently enhance service quality and operational performance, construct unique images, strengthen service standards, and demonstrate their characteristics, styles, and multiple functions in order to satisfy the demands of customers from different backgrounds (Chen et al., 2010). Another factor influential for the customers in the choice of enterprises and has direct relations with it is the attitude of the enterprise personnel (Goodwin and Ross, 1990).

In recent times, tourism industry and researchers are more interested in customer complaints and customer

complaint behaviours which offer opportunities for increasing customer satisfaction and profitability in developing customer management and marketing programs at enterprises/destinations (Rogers et al., 1992; Huang et al., 1996; Singh and Wilkes, 1996; Colgate and Norris, 2001). On the other hand, while the occurrence of customer complaints is inevitable, customer satisfaction carries a vital role in sustaining the existence of hotel enterprises in today's competitive environment (Ngai et al., 2007). Customer complaint behaviours are crucial for hotel restaurants since they offer opportunities for correcting the difficulties faced during service offerings (Lam and Tang, 2003). Similarly, in case of a complaint, customers think of the restaurant and hotel enterprise as a single enterprise (De Franco et al., 2005) and reflect their negative opinions on all services of the hotel. In this context, hotel restaurants working under hotel enterprises

should understand customer complaints and customer complaint behaviours well in order to decrease customer complaints and train their personnel accordingly (De Franco et al., 2005). Nowadays, in restaurants working under hotel enterprises customer complaints are taken into consideration both during a general process or a section of this process which covers the preparation and presentation of services and also for the improvement of overall activities of the hotel (Galicic and Ivanovic, 2008). In this context, the main reason for complaint management in hotel enterprises is to determine the topics of complaints and by finding out the reasons for problems, to rectify and to convert the customer who feels dissatisfaction into a loyal satisfied customer (Su and Bowen, 2001).

Although there are many studies on customer complaints and complaint behaviours in tourism industry, the number of studies on the comparison of different nationalities in hotel restaurants on customer complaints and customer complaint behaviours is very limited (Yüksel et al., 2006). If the studies on this subject are investigated, it is seen that Hui and Au (2001) have studied compliant behaviours of Chinese and Canadian tourists on hotel services; DeFranco et al. (2005) have studied customer complaint behaviours in terms of cultural differences in Hong Kong and Houston; Yüksel et al. (2006) have studied customer complaint behaviours in hotel services through scenario method; Ngai et al. (2007) have studied customer complaint behaviours towards hotel enterprises in Hong Kong in terms of Asian and non-Asian tourists; Kim and Lynn (2007) have classified Asian tourists in terms of restaurant services. These studies show that the number of studies on comparison of restaurant complaints and also the number of studies evaluating the relation between complaint subjects and customer complaint behaviours are very limited. In this context, the main focus of the study is to find out the relation between the topics of customer complaints and customer complaint behaviours and the differences of customer complaint behaviours in terms of nationalities.

Literature review

Complaints and customer complaint behaviour

Consumption evaluation process can be defined as the paradigm of confirmation or disconfirmation (Churchill and Suprenant, 1982). Confirmation/disconfirmation paradigm in general, consists of the evaluation of the performance of the product and the expectations of the customer (Blodgett and Granbois, 1992). In this context, confirmation which contributes to satisfaction, realizes in situations where the product meets the expectations of the customer, while disconfirmation realizes in situations where there is a negative differences between the

previous expectations and performance of the product (Donoghue and De Klerk, 2006). Dissatisfaction arising from the evaluation of the purchase expectations may result in complaint (Snellmann and Vihtkari, 2003; Kau and Serene, 1995). In other words, the more the complaints the lesser the satisfaction would be (Ali et al., 2010). According to this, complaint is a function (Sujithamrak and Lam, 2005) and basic reason of dissatisfaction (Day, 1977; Day et al., 1981; Moven, 1993; Roger et al., 1992; Singh, 1988, 1990; Singh and Wilkes, 1996). In a research made by TARP (Technical Assistance Research Programs) in 20 countries in 1990s covering nearly all the sectors, it is found out that 50% of the customers complain about the front desk personnel, only 1 to 5% of these customers inform their complaints to the directors and complaints rates show differences according to the types of the problems and informing bad experiences to other people is double of the good experiences (Goodman, 1999).

Complaint as one of the methods used in order to express customer dissatisfaction makes up the starting point of complaint behaviours. Customer complaint behaviours are a set of several behavioural or non-behavioural responses, some or all of which are triggered by the perceived dissatisfaction with the purchase episode (Singh, 1988). Behavioural responses within customer complaint behaviours constitute any or all reactions which convey customer dissatisfaction (Landon, 1977). Non-behavioural responses cover the response situations where the customer forgets or does nothing to express dissatisfaction (Day et al., 1981). Jacoby and Jaccard (1981) define customer complaint behaviours as an individual activity which covers transmitting negative perceptions to the enterprise or to the third parties. Customer complaint behaviours have been classified in different ways in literature (Velazquez et al., 2006). It is seen that there has been four attempts to classify customer complaint behaviours up to now (Gürsoy et al., 2003). These attempts to classify customer complaint behaviours can be summarized in Table 1.

The investigation of literature shows that Singh's (1988) classification was preferred more frequently. Singh (1988) grouped complaint behaviours as voice responses (seeking redress from the seller or no action), private responses (word-of-mouth communication) and third party responses (implementing legal action). In the light of grouping made by Singh (1998), the main purpose of voice is to seek restitution or to protect other customers, whereas that of loyalty behaviour is to assist the business in rectifying matters with the intention of returning and purchasing in the future (Kim and Chen, 2010). Informing complaints directly to the authorities is evaluated as a constructive case since it provides the discussion of complaints openly and provides redress proposals (Drigotas et al., 1995). But while some dissatisfied customers complain, a certain fragment chooses not to complain (Stephens and Gwinner, 1998). At the point of

Table 1. Classification of CCB in literature.

Author(s)	Subject	Classification of CCB	Contributions
Hirschman (1970)	Exit, voice and loyalty responses to decline in firms, organizations and states	-Exit responses -Voice responses -Loyalty	This study describes the reasons for complaint cases where some the customers leave and others still stay with the enterprise.
Day and Landon (1977)	Towards a theory of consumer complaining behaviour.	a)Take some action - Private action *Boycott seller *Warn friends and relatives - Public action *Seek redress directly *Legal action *Complain to public or private agencies b) Take no action	Includes two phased hierarchical classification in which the first episode includes behavioural (take action) and non-behavioural responses (take no action). In this context, non-behavioural responses were started to be taken into consideration in complaint behaviours.
Singh (1988)	When consumers complain: A path analysis of the key antecedents of consumer complaint response estimates	- voice responses - private responses - third-party responses	Singh criticized the previous classifications based on different foundations and set forward a classification in which every dimension is perceived similarly. Thus, he drew the main frame of CCB.
Roger, Ross and Williams (1992)	Personnel values and purchase dissatisfaction response.	-Do nothing -Change future behaviour -Private complaining -Voice Complaint -Complaint to Third Party	Basically the classification of Day and Landon (1977) was studied in detail and ensured the better understanding of future customer behaviours.
Blodgett and Granbois (1992)	Towards an integrated conceptual model of consumer complaining behaviour	- Redress seeking - Negative word of mouth - Exit (or repatronage intentions) - Third party complaints.	With this study, the relations between independent variables in customer complaints were described and thus the multi-behavioural model was developed.
Sanes (1993)	Complaints are hidden treasure	Unheard complaints	He stated that the greatest pitfall of all complaints is the unheard complaint.
Broadbridge and Marshall (1995)	Consumer complaint behaviour: The case of electrical goods.	They have expanded Day and Landon's classification in the terms of public action	The authors found out that customers not only applied to media but also to customer unions.
Mattila and Wirtz (2004)	Consumer complaining to firms: the determinants of channel choice	They have expanded Day and Landon's classification via channels.	Mattila and Wirtz investigated the impacts of customer aims on the choice of complaint channel and found out that the customers would prefer the interactive channels (face to face, telephone) and distant channels (letter, e-mail).

taking action about complaints or not, customers make benefit cost analysis (Blodgett and Granbois, 1992). In this context, if the cost of a complaint and the time spent for it provides more benefit for the customer, then he or she would take action for the complaint, but if the cost of

the complaint is more than the benefit, he or she would remain silent and would not take action (Day and Landon, 1977). The probability of the success of other factors playing a role in such complaint behaviours depends on the customer's attitudes towards the complaint, the

importance and continuity of the service and the controllability of the event (Singh, 1990; Blodgett et al., 1993). Another important factor influential in the non-behaviour of the customers is that they do not know how to complain or they are diffident about it (Snellman and Vihtkari, 2003). At this point, since the customer would not inform his or her personal complaints directly, such complaint behaviours play an important role on the sales and profitability (Day et al., 1981). Likewise, it is found out in the studies evaluating customer dissatisfaction that two third of the customers do not voice dissatisfaction, or in other words, do not complain (Day and London, 1977; Richins, 1983; Herrman et al., 1975; Goodman, 1999).

The second group in Singh's classification in customer complaint behaviours consists of private responses. If the customers foresee the possibility of the recurrence of unfavourable conditions in the services, then they may boycott the restaurant by not coming again or by telling their negative impressions to their friends (Su and Bowen, 2001). At this point, negative word of mouth which connotes to informing friends about bad experiences is an example of private response and harms the sales of the restaurant badly (Lam and Tang, 2003). Furlong (1993) notices that customers communicate their unfavourable experiences to 9-10 people and warn them not to buy the products of the related enterprise.

The third group of complaint behaviours in customer complaint behaviours is third party responses. Third party responses cover claiming legal rights and bringing the case to the consumer rights offices (Kim and Chen, 2010; Donoghue and Klerk, 2006). Third party response is a behaviour type which is out of the social environment (friends) of the customer and does not have a direct effect on the rise of dissatisfaction (Yüksel et al., 2006). In addition to this, since third party responses require more time and effort, it is seen as the last resort for the dissatisfied customers. Consequently, few people choose this option as the first step towards complaining (Kim and Chen, 2010).

Customer complaint behaviour in hotel restaurants

Hotel or restaurant enterprise managers use feedbacks of the customers in order to determine and rectify the weakness in services or strengthen the strong aspects. In addition to this, managers do not want to deal with the overall experience of the customers at the hotel or the restaurant. In other words, they do not want to spend too much time on the compliments or the complaints of the customers which cover basic features of the product or the service (Cadotte and Turgeon, 1988). This attitude of the managers makes restaurant complaints more abstract than the complaints in other service industries and cover more social subjects (Lyons, 1996). Also, the main aim of a hotel restaurant is to create a satisfied

customer population and to sustain it. Because the future of the restaurant depends on the demand of the satisfied customers and their continuity (Gürsoy et al., 2003) and also marketing concept emphasizes that, the purpose of all activities in a company is to satisfy customers and to build a benefited long-term relationship with them (Lee et al., 2010). In this context, hotel restaurants should please all the customers they provide service. Nevertheless, due to the nature of the services provided at the restaurant, consumption and production happen simultaneously and are influenced from many factors such as service presentation, behaviour of the service personnel, the capacity of the service system and customer behaviours (Hart et al., 1990). Thus, it is impossible to please every customer coming to the restaurant. Restaurant managers cannot always prevent service problems but learn many things from these situations (Gürsoy et al., 2003). So, restaurant managers have to take dissatisfied customers into consideration and rectify the problems for the future of the unit. Kotler et al. (1999) mention that service improvements can turn an angry customer into a loyal customer (Gürsoy et al., 2003). Additionally, existing of good customer management systems which having easy customer complaint systems where customers can forward their complaints easily at any time, attending to customer complaints quickly, and always offering a faster and definite solution for complaints received from the customers, is an another way to provide customer loyalty after complaints (Yaacob, 2010). Also, the managers must ensure that customer complaints are addressed with top most priority (Afsar et al., 2010). In literature, there are many studies handling restaurant complaints from different perspectives (Wildes and Seo, 2001; Su and Bowen, 2001; Johns and Pine, 2002; Gürsoy, McCleary and Lepsito, 2003; Heung and Lam, 2003; Lam and Tang, 2003; Sujithamrak and Lam, 2005; Yang, 2005; DeFranco et al., 2005; Velazquez et al., 2006; Yüksel et al., 2006; Ngai et al. 2007; Kim and Chen, 2010).

Wildes and Seo (2001) who investigated the influence of age, sex, family status and income of the house on ten general customer complaint items (rudeness, lack of product knowledge, slow service, uncleanliness, inattention, forgetfulness, incorrect billing, rushed and over friendly service, unwillingness to correct problems), found out that some special demands of specific customers depend on the demographic features of the customers and the realization of this situation may prevent the occurrence of customer complaints. This study also informs that the problem may be forgiven if the customer complaint is actively and effectively solved, if not, the customer may display complaint behaviours and probably may not come to the enterprise again (68%) and some of the customers may inform authorities about the complaint. The same study shows that the customers generally complain about the miscalculation of the bill and the consequent unwillingness to solve the problem

and not meeting special demands.

Su and Bowen (2001) studied the factors relating to the complaint actions of restaurant customers and revisit intentions and “negative word of mouth” and found out that the degree of dissatisfaction, the importance of the dining occasion and the perceived assurance that the management will resolve the problem are effective whether the customer will complain or not. The study also identified the ways that the effective complaint management could increase a customer's intention to return and reduce negative word of mouth (Su and Bowen (2001) notices that the most important complaint about the meal is about slow/poor service, the second complaint is about the food not properly cooked, the third complaint is overprice of the meal and the fourth complaint is about rude/intolerant service. On the other hand, the study shows that if the customer perceives that the problem will not occur again, the efforts of restaurant management satisfies the customer and in situations where the solutions meet the demands of the customers then the customer is likely to revisit the enterprise again.

Another study on complaint behaviours in restaurant enterprises belong to Gürsoy et al. (2003). In this study, the authors classify the customers according to complaint behaviours and define the socio-demographic elements which make the classification different. In this study made on Chinese, Japanese and Korean international student groups, by the use of factor analysis complaint behaviours were classified as third-party responses, private responses and voice responses. As the result of the study, it was seen that the Asian consumers prefer private responses which shows consistency with the previous studies in literature.

In a study made by Heung and Lam (2003), it is seen that the Chinese customers preferring Hong Kong hotel restaurants primarily expect proper attitudes from the restaurant management for the solution of the problem and secondly expect an apology in cases where the problem is explained to the management. Another similar study made by Lam and Tang (2003) in Hong Kong hotel restaurants, aimed to determine the possibility of several complaints and the relation between the complaint behaviours and the demographic features of the customers. The results of the study showed that four different complaint behaviours (personal and urging, bad-mouthing, complaint to management, publicizing) and the customers who were active and voiced complaints were younger customers with more education and income. In this study, it was found out that stopping visiting the enterprise is the most preferred way for complaint behaviours, following warning other people not to come to the restaurant and negative advertisement of the enterprise.

Another study on restaurant complaints was made by Sujithamrak and Lam in Deadwood, USA in 2005. In this study, they studied the relation between the demographic features and customer complaint behaviours of 250

participants. As the result of the study, it was found out that the customers preferred “private action” more and participants with higher education and more income used private action more than the customers with lower education and less income. The main subjects of customer complaints were defined as food-beverage and factors relating to service and restaurant atmosphere. On the other hand, in a study made by Yang (2005) on effective recovery of service failures at 10 restaurants, the main failures were found as product defects, slow service, cleanliness, payment problems, out of stock food and beverage, meals not cooked properly, seating problems, employee behaviour, lost orders and mischarging.

The general overview of the studies on restaurant complaints shows that many authors have investigated only customer behaviours but ignored the elements subject to complaints in this process. However, the investigation of previous studies shows that although complaints and complaint behaviours were investigated in the same study, the studies investigating the relation between them are very limited. But complaint topics are also effective together with several factors in customer complaint behaviours (socio-demographic, economic, etc.). In other words, complaint behaviours increase with the increase in customer complaint topics. In this context, the first hypothesis of the study is as stated thus:

H₁: There is a positive correlation between customer complaints and complaint behaviours.

Relationships between customer complaint behaviours and nationality in hotel restaurants

Previous studies made on customer complaint behaviours show that culture is a strong factor in complaint behaviours, and may influence customer complaint behaviours motivation (Heung and Lam, 2003; Mueller et al., 2003; Huang et al., 1996). Nationality, as a constituent of culture, has important effects on customer complaint behaviours. Nationality can be defined as qualification of individuals who show similar features depending on a bigger group and national character reflects some unchanging individual features prevalent in a nationality (Legohérel et al., 2009). Thus, previous studies on the subject show that there are differences between nationalities which can be determined and recorded and these differences have an important effect on customer behaviours (Yüksel et al., 2006).

In restaurant services, it is thought that tourists coming from different countries pay different levels of importance to different dimensions of service, such as security, cleanliness and outlook of the staff. The differences between the offered service, and expected service, show that, the satisfaction/dissatisfaction of the customer will be different (Aktas et al., 2009). Previous studies on the

subject show that there are differences in customer complaint behaviours of tourists coming from different nationalities.

Ngai et al. (2007) determined important differences in complaint behaviours of Asian and non-Asian tourist on hotel services. In this study, it was found out that Asian tourists inform their complaints to hotel management less than the non-Asian tourists and are more apt to tell their complaints to their friends. Similarly, Kim and Lynn (2007) studied the differences of customer complaint behaviours in Chinese, Korean and Japanese tourists. Kim and Lynn also noticed that while Japanese tourists preferred voice responses more, Chinese tourists preferred private responses. Lee et al. (2008) studied customer expectations in restaurant service faults and used critical incident technique (CIT) in order to determine the differences between repurchase, loyalty and word of mouth behaviours in context of nationalities. This study, covering American and Korean tourists, determined that the American tourists displayed different attitudes in case of service fault. In this perspective, while Americans demanded for more free meal, Koreans demanded changing the meal. The most important finding of the study is that there are differences between the word of mouth behaviours and revisit intentions in the future, in terms of nationalities. Accordingly, it is found that Korean tourists prefer word of mouth behaviours more, and American tourists are likely to revisit the enterprise in future. Another study about service faults inspected the behaviours of American and Irish tourists about service faults in restaurants (Mueller et al., 2003). As a result of the study, it is found that American tourists will prefer the same establishment more in the future.

Aktaş et al. (2009) studied the satisfaction level of German and Russian tourists in Alanya region and resulted that German tourists are more satisfied with the quality of the food offered, and the hygiene. It is possible to say that the Russian and German tourist may display different customer complaint behaviours in case of dissatisfaction. Similarly, Yüksel et al. (2006) inspected the differences of customer complaint behaviours with Turkish, Dutch, English and Israelite tourists spending their holiday in Bodrum, Kuşadası and Antalya. This study, made with scenario method, showed that Israelite tourists inform their complaints more in comparison to Turkish tourists and the reason for this is while the Israelite tourists have an individualistic culture; Turkish people carry features of collective culture strongly. Another important result of the study was that English tourists inform their complaints to the personnel more than the Dutch tourists because of the wide usage of the English language. On the other hand, English tourists are more apt to speak with the managers in order to solve the problem, and during the redressing period, Turkish, Dutch, English and Israelite tourists have differences for undertaking demands from managers.

In the light of the studies in literature, it is clear that the national differences will lead to different customer

complaint behaviours. In other words, people from different nationalities will have differences in customer complaint behaviours. Also, there have very few cross-cultural studies aiming to explore the influence of cultural differences on customer complaint behaviours (Yüksel et al., 2006). On the other hand, the number of studies investigating the complaint behaviours of Turkish, German, Russian and Dutch tourists are very limited, and apart from the study of Yüksel et al. (2006) realized with scenario method, the lack of studies on complaint behaviours about restaurant services in Turkey have been influential in conducting the present study. In this context, the second hypothesis of the study has been defined thus:

H₂: There are differences between the tourists coming from different nationalities on complaints and complaint behaviours.

METHODOLOGY

The target population of the study consists of customers accommodating in five star hotel enterprises in Antalya, an important tourism destination in Turkey. Apart from Turkish customers, tourists from other nationalities who visit Antalya region mostly (Russian, German, Dutch), have been chosen for the sampling group in accordance with the statics of Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2009). In this region, Lara and Kundu, the mostly preferred parts of Antalya by customers, have been taken into consideration. There are 13 five star hotel establishments in the region (Temirhan, 2009; Kundu Tourism Entrepreneurs Union Foundation, 2009) and 1,400 customers from 7 hotels chosen with random sampling method, make up the sample group. For the choice of customers, the number of tourists residing in the selected hotels was enquired first from Antalya Municipality Culture and Tourism Administration and then from Lara and Kundu Tourism Entrepreneurs Union but no sufficient data was provided. Thus, the sampling group was based on the distribution of incoming tourists' nationalities. In this context, each nationality has been considered as a stratum and by using stratified sampling, nationality numbers have been calculated. In this direction, tourist numbers taking part in the study, and their rate at sampling group has been calculated by taking $\alpha = 0.05$ into consideration, and is shown in Table 2 with details.

Questionnaire method has been used as the data gathering method. In the questionnaire consisting of three sections, the first section aims to find out the demographic features (nationality, sex, age and education level) of customers, the second section consisting of 31 items and four dimensions (price and payment -3-, tastiness and quality -7-, equipment and atmosphere -11-, staff and service -10-) aims to find out customer complaints and the third section with 13 items and 4 dimensions (neutral and switch -2-, private responses -4-, voice responses -3-, third party responses -4-), aims to find out customer complaint behaviours. For the preparation of 5 point Likert scale, the studies of Cadotte and Turgeon (1988), Sue and Bowen (2001), Wildes and Seo (2001), Heung and Lam (2003), Lam and Tang (2003), De Franco et al. (2005), Sujithamrak and Lam (2005), Yang (2005), Yüksel et al. (2006) and Kim and Lynn (2007) have been useful.

Pilot test stage of the questionnaire, which was the data gathering instrument, was implemented in the selected hotels of Lara and Kundu region by distributing 30 questionnaires to each of the seven hotels. Cronbach alpha coefficient of the data analysis after the pilot test stage was calculated as 0.815. In the light of the

Table 2. Sample size of research.

Nationality	Number of tourist in 2009	Planned sample size (*)	Realized sample size
German	2298231	168	208
Russian	2112673	154	524
Turkish	444473	32	241
Dutch	425966	40	175
Total	5281345	394	1148

(*) $\alpha = 0.05$.**Table 3.** Profile of the respondents.

Variables	Groups	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	419	36.5
	Female	729	63.5
Age	24-34	151	13.2
	35-44	369	32.1
	45-54	369	32.1
	55 and over	259	22.6
Nationality	Turkish	241	21.0
	German	208	18.1
	Russian	524	45.6
	Dutch	175	15.2
Education	Primary	47	4.1
	Secondary	232	20.2
	High School	356	31.0
	University and higher	513	44.7

results of the pilot test stage, the questionnaire was implemented in the selected hotels between May and August 2009. The hotel customers coming out of the hotel restaurants were requested to fill the questionnaire in the hotel lobby in order to gain a healthier data. 200 questionnaires have been prepared for each hotel and from the 1,400 questionnaires distributed, a total of 1,193 were returned back, and 45 were taken out because of empty, wrong or inaccurate coding, and thus, 1,148 questionnaires were taken into evaluation. The data gathered have been analyzed with SPSS 14.01 for Windows program.

Confirmatory factor analysis has been used for the behavioural scales of customer complaints and complaint behaviours relating to hotel restaurants and Cronbach's alpha coefficients have been used for the reliability analysis and percentage distribution, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for each item have been calculated. The significance of differences between factor means of complaint and complaint behaviour scales have been tested with one way ANOVA for dependent-related measures. On the other hand, the relation between complaint and complaint behaviours have been defined with Pearson correlation analysis and one way ANOVA has been used for the comparison of these factors between nationalities.

FINDINGS

In our study which aims to investigate the differences

between different nationalities on customer complaints and complaint behaviours, from 1,143 participants, 63.5% of the participants were female and 36.5% were male. On the other hand, the age range of the majority of the participants fall into 35 to 44 years old age group (32.1%) and 45 to 54 years old age group (32.1%). Educational backgrounds of the participants showed that 44.7% were university graduates while 31% were high school graduates. As Table 3 shows, the nationality distribution of the participants was 524 Russian (45.6%), 241 Turkish (21%), 208 German (18.1%) and 175 Dutch (15.2%).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Confirmatory factor analysis relating to customer complaint and complaint behaviours relating to hotel restaurants, the results of reliability analysis and descriptive statistics (percentage distribution, arithmetic mean and standard deviation) have been shown in Table 4. The values gathered from Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's Test (KMO = 0.915; $p = 0.000$) show the adequacy of sampling and applicability of factor analysis.

According to confirmatory factor analysis, 31 items in customer complaint scale have been gathered under four factors describing 76.3% of the total variance and 13 items in customer complaint scale gathered under four factors describing 73.7% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha coefficients relating to customer complaint and complaint behaviour scale factors have been calculated as over 0.750. According to the findings in Table 4, factors averages of hotel restaurant customer complaint scale differentiate between 2.20 and 2.36, the significance between the averages of these differences has not been found important ($p > 0.05$). The options of strongly disagree and disagree are combined and the options agree and strongly agree options are combined as in Table 4.

The inspection of item means and distribution percentages show that the highest subjects of customer complaints are in order as overcharging (items 1; $\bar{x} = 2.88$), no service of some meals on the menu (items 11; $\bar{x} = 2.49$), insufficiency of menu descriptions (items 12; $\bar{x} = 2.48$), the undersize of the portions in a la carte restaurants (items 9; $\bar{x} = 2.45$). 45.82% of the customers stated strongly disagree or disagree for the overcharge of the prices in restaurants (item 1) and 36.15% of the customers showed a positive attitude by stating agree or strongly agree.

The difference between the factor means of complaint behaviours scale has been found significant ($p < 0.01$). According to this, the highest average point was at the "neutral and switch" dimension ($\bar{x} = 3.28$) and lowest average point is calculated at "third party responses" ($\bar{x} = 2.67$). For the complaints about restaurant services, 22.23% of the customers making up the sampling group stated negatively by choosing strongly disagree or agree and 68.03% showed a positive attitude by choosing agree or strongly agree for demanding the change of the food/beverage ($\bar{x} = 3.84$). The item about informing the complaint has been preferred more than the other items ($\bar{x} = 3.25$), and eating not again at the same restaurant was another behaviour preferred ($\bar{x} = 3.19$). The items with lowest preference have been in order as informing the complaint to the customer rights union ($\bar{x} = 2.60$), complaining about the restaurant to the press ($\bar{x} = 2.66$) and distribution of the complaint in electronic environment ($\bar{x} = 2.70$).

Pearson correlation coefficients relating to factors between complaint and complaint behaviours have been given in Table 5. According to this, all the correlation coefficients between the factors of customer complaints and complaint behaviours have been found significant ($p < 0.001$). The inspection of correlation coefficients show that there is a positive correlation between all of the variables and the highest level of relation is observed between the complaint scale factors and complaint behaviour factors with "neutral and switch" and "third party responses". It is seen that these findings support H_1 the hypothesis of the study.

One way ANOVA results of the comparison between complaint and complaint behaviours scales of customer views and nationalities have been given in Table 6. According to this, all the means of both the customer complaint and customer complaint behaviours factors have been found significant. The inspection of the means of complaint scales factors of tourists from different nations show that in all the factors (price and payment, tastiness and quality, equipment and atmosphere, staff and service), Germans have the highest average and the Russians have the lowest average. In other words, German customers make up the highest complainant group about restaurant services and the Russian customers make up the lowest complainant group. In behaviours after the complaint, it is seen that the Germans have the highest average. In other words, Germans look for ways to demand their rights more about their complaints on restaurants, and display higher levels of complaint behaviours than the other nationalities. These findings support the H_2 hypothesis of the study.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study conducted in Lara and Kundu region of Antalya province, presents a viewpoint that the customers may display different complaint behaviours in case of dissatisfaction experienced in hotel restaurants and there may be a relation between nationality differences and complaint behaviours. As a matter of fact, the findings of the research show that among these mentioned complaint behaviours, the neutral and switch are the most observed complaint behaviours. The second most significant complaint concerning the hotel restaurants is the voice responses which include informing the hotel and restaurant management of the complaint. The complaint behaviour seen less in hotel restaurants when compared to other complaint behaviours is the third party complaints, that is, notifying the customer right union or media about the complaint. Since the complaint behaviours concerning the restaurant services vary, it necessitates the hotel management to follow different strategies in the evaluation of the customer complaints. As long as the hotel/restaurant management handles the customer complaints on time and properly, they will be able to achieve significant information on boosting the service quality (Galicic and Ivanovic, 2008). Another considerable result obtained from the study is that the customers demand a change of their meal. Under the light of these results, it is noticed that customer complaints concerning the restaurant services, mostly centred on food quality, freshness and the size of the portion. Thus, the hotel/restaurant management must attach more importance to food quality so as to reduce the complaints and increase customer satisfaction, and should bear in mind that food quality also contributes to the customer loyalty.

The second most experienced way of behavior in

Table 4. Descriptive statistics, factors loadings and reliability coefficients of complaint and complaint behaviours (n = 1148).

	Factors	Item no.	Items	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Strongly agree and agree (%)	Mean score	Std. Deviation	Factor Loadings	Cronbach's alpha	Factors means	P
Complaint	Price and payment	1	The price at the restaurant was high.	45.82	18.03	36.15	2.88	1.41	0.580	0.761	2.32	0.082
		2	There were problems with the payment by credit card.	71.78	12.63	15.59	2.13	1.18	0.701			
		3	The bill was mischarged.	77.09	8.89	14.03	1.96	1.17	0.736			
	Tastiness and quality	4	The meals offered were not tasty enough.	61.93	14.90	23.17	2.44	1.23	0.759	0.768	2.36	
		5	The meals were not serviced enough hot.	61.67	18.90	19.43	2.43	1.17	0.703			
		6	Nutritional value of the meals were insufficient	62.63	19.77	17.60	2.36	1.15	0.667			
		7	The meals were not fresh enough.	64.02	18.64	17.34	2.32	1.14	0.619			
		8	There was a bad smell at the meals/drinks.	69.43	14.29	16.29	2.20	1.13	0.569			
		9	The portions were small in a la carte restaurants.	58.18	17.07	24.74	2.45	1.28	0.627			
		10	The meals were not cooked enough.	63.59	16.11	20.30	2.35	1.24	0.619			
	Equipment and atmosphere	11	Some meals at the menu were not serviced.	58.62	16.20	25.17	2.49	1.29	0.682	0.784	2.24	
		12	Menu definitions were not enough.	58.71	15.94	25.35	2.48	1.31	0.751			
		13	Hygiene level at the restaurants was insufficient.	68.29	11.93	19.77	2.25	1.23	0.757			
		14	Noise level (voice/music etc.) at the restaurants was high.	69.25	13.15	17.60	2.20	1.18	0.757			
		15	Restaurants were not comfortable enough.	71.87	13.33	14.81	2.12	1.16	0.629			
		16	Restaurant was not decorated well.	72.99	13.24	13.76	2.08	1.13	0.640			
		17	Lighting in the restaurant was not proper.	69.78	11.59	18.64	2.24	1.23	0.629			
		18	Air conditioning system of the restaurant was insufficient.	70.12	12.20	17.69	2.20	1.22	0.640			
		19	Cigarette smoke at the restaurants disturbed us.	72.65	12.37	14.98	2.09	1.15	0.459			
		20	There was a crowd at the table because of unnecessary equipment.	70.21	11.76	18.03	2.22	1.21	0.468			
		21	Food and ménage sets at the tables were incomplete.	69.26	12.37	18.38	2.24	1.24	0.523			

Table 4. Contd.

Staff and service	22	Reception service at the restaurant was insufficient.	69.25	14.11	16.64	2.19	1.17	0.554			
	23	Enough time was not given for meal choice at a la carte restaurants.	66.11	13.5	20.38	2.29	1.24	0.613			
	24	Service period of the ordered food and beverage was long.	64.63	13.15	22.21	2.36	1.29	0.662			
	25	Service personnel were behaving carelessly.	69.69	10.80	19.51	2.26	1.25	0.692			
	26	Service personnel were over concerned and intrusive.	73.08	11.24	15.68	2.12	1.18	0.738	0.802	2.20	
	27	Service personnel were disinterested towards us.	71.95	11.59	16.46	2.16	1.19	0.738			
	28	Service personnel were offering services unwillingly.	73.44	10.89	15.68	2.10	1.17	0.719			
	29	Service personnel had insufficient information about the menu content.	70.56	11.76	17.68	2.19	1.22	0.676			
	30	Service personnel were not polite and respectful enough.	71.34	10.02	18.55	2.17	1.23	0.627			
	31	The orders were brought wrong.	72.56	9.15	18.29	2.15	1.26	0.536			
Neutral and switch	1	I demand changing the food / beverage.	22.03	9.93	68.03	3.84	1.37	0.538	0.751	3.28a	*
	2	I do not do anything.	49.22	16.72	34.06	2.72	1.44	0.483			
Complaint Behaviours Private responses	3	I do not eat at the restaurant in question.	33.45	18.38	48.17	3.19	1.31	0.744			
	4	I do not come to this hotel again.	41.03	22.47	36.50	2.95	1.30	0.747	0.810	2.94b	
	5	I insist my family and friends not to come to this hotel.	47.12	18.38	34.49	2.85	1.29	0.731			
	6	I defame this hotel to people around me.	48.61	18.73	32.67	2.78	1.29	0.721			
Complaint Behaviours Voice responses	7	I inform my complaint to restaurant manager.	35.62	14.29	50.09	3.25	1.39	0.679	0.779	3.07b	
	8	I inform my complaint to hotel management.	41.38	15.07	43.55	3.04	1.41	0.747			
	9	I inform my complaint travel agency / tour operator.	45.64	16.11	38.24	2.92	1.37	0.671			

Table 4. Contd.

Third party responses	10	I complain the restaurant to the media.	53.48	16.64	29.87	2.66	1.37	0.751		
	11	I claim my legal rights.	50.69	16.99	32.32	2.72	1.36	0.600		
	12	I inform my complaint to Customer Rights Union.	54.62	15.94	29.44	2.60	1.33	0.770	0.783	2.67c
	13	I spread my complaint in the electronic environment.	53.57	13.50	32.92	2.70	1.49	0.671		

*p < 0.01; ^{a,b,c} The difference between the factor means consisting different letters is significant.

Table 5. Correlation analyses between complaining and behaviours (n = 1148).

Factors	Complaint behaviours			
	Neutral and switch	Private responses	Voice responses	Third party responses
Complaints Price and payment	0.418*	0.215*	0.299*	0.350*
Tastiness and quality	0.428*	0.246*	0.293*	0.324*
Equipment and atmosphere	0.384*	0.173*	0.284*	0.332*
Staff and service	0.382*	0.137*	0.275*	0.321*

*p < 0.001

Table 6. Comparison of complaint and complaint behaviour factors in relation to nationalities.

Scale	Factors	Turkish		German		Russian		Dutch		p
		Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	
Complaint	Price and payment	2.32 ^a	0.88	2.71 ^b	1.10	2.13 ^c	0.86	2.42 ^a	1.04	*
	Tastiness and quality	2.36 ^a	0.82	2.64 ^b	1.08	2.24 ^c	0.89	2.41 ^a	1.00	*
	Equipment and atmosphere	2.28 ^a	0.79	2.62 ^b	0.95	2.04 ^c	0.79	2.33 ^a	0.93	*
	Staff and service	2.24 ^a	0.84	2.60 ^b	1.04	2.00 ^c	0.87	2.29 ^a	1.02	*
Complaint	Neutral and switch	3.02 ^a	1.05	3.50 ^b	1.22	3.28 ^c	1.01	3.36 ^c	1.22	*
Behaviours	Private responses	2.75 ^a	0.96	3.15 ^b	1.19	2.99 ^c	1.12	2.85 ^a	1.13	*
	Voice responses	3.04 ^a	1.10	3.54 ^b	1.21	2.87 ^c	1.18	3.13 ^a	1.04	*
	Third party responses	2.80 ^a	1.00	3.07 ^b	1.24	2.53 ^c	1.13	2.44 ^c	1.02	*

*p < 0.001 ^{a,b,c} The difference between the group averages including different letters in the same line are significant

customer compliant is the nonbehaviour of the customer. The initial reason why the restaurant

customers choose this kind of behaviour is that their complaint level in general is low, in other

words, the problems they face with are not worth complaining. Gürsoy et al. (2003) explained this

way of behaviour in the frame of cost-profit. In this context, the customers will put some effort in complaining provided that they believe they will get some kind of profit as a result of their complaint. Otherwise, they will not behave in any way (Gursoy et al., 2003; Richins, 1979). Thus, in a study on American citizens by Su and Bowen (2001), it was determined that 20% of the participants did not behave in any way. As a result of the studies done on customer dissatisfaction, Stephens and Gwinner (1998) pointed out that almost two-third of the customers did not report their complaints. This way of behaviour is not a preferred customer complaint behaviour for the hotel/restaurant administrators as the behavioural expectations of the customers are not learnt and it is not possible improve these complaint issues in question (Lam and Tang, 2003). Another important point in such behaviours is that the service personnel need to understand the feeling and thoughts of the customer. A service personnel who possesses the ability to understand the feeling and thoughts of the customer may behave proactively and prevent the probable concerns, and may serve the customer of his requests accordingly, in the shortest time (Yang, 2005). In this scope, it can be recommended that the hotel and restaurant administrators should employ service personnel who possess the ability to behave proactively and should train the personnel in the restaurant on this issue.

The study findings set forth that the second most preferred customer behaviour way is the third party responses. The customers show such kind of behaviour since they have no trust in the business (restaurant) in terms of solving the problem (Kim and Chen, 2010). One of the reasons why they do not use third party responses is that some customers do not wish to make a direct face to face contact with the restaurant administrators. Like it was discussed in literature, the customers that fit into that typology generally reported that they felt uneasy when stating their complaints to the management, so they decided on an indirect way instead, which is notifying their complaints to the customer rights union or media. On the other side, in the studies done earlier on customer complaint behaviours concerning the restaurant services, while the third party responses were in general, less or the least preferred behaviour way (Kim and Chen, 2010; DeFranco et al., 2005; Sujithamrak and Lam, 2005; Heung and Lam, 2003), in the study, the third party responses was elected as the second option. This determination is an important respect of the study. Under the light of the related findings, it can possibly be said that the tourists visiting the region were able reach the customer rights association and/or used the internet frequently.

Another finding obtained from the study is that a positive correlation between complaint issues and complaint behaviour was determined. The analysis of the correlation shows the result that all the complaint issues comprised of 4 basic dimensions: price and payment,

tastiness and quality, equipment and atmosphere, staff and service- have been very effective on the complaint behaviour. In this context, the complaint factor that has the greatest effect on the customer's neutral and switch behaviour (a demand for a change of meal, do not show any reaction) is composed of the quality and taste of the meal. The second complaint issue that has the greatest effect on the neutral and switch behaviour is the price and the way of payment. The related results show that in the hotel restaurants where the study was conducted the basic concerns that led to complaint behaviour were in the dimension of the quality of meal and payment. Hence, the hotel/restaurant administrators should primarily do some improvement work concerning meal quality along with determining the price of meal consistent with the food quality. In the payment of the meal, in particular, credit cards should be accepted and transferring the payment to room account should be allowed. When the payment is made by foreign currency, the tourists should be provided with more convenience. One of the most significant effects of the complaint issues on the complaint behaviour is that the price level in hotel restaurants and the difficulties faced with during payment along with restaurant equipment and the problems with atmosphere lead to third party responses in the customers.

Consequently, the customers notify the related situation in the hotel restaurant to the consumer rights associations or to the media. This leads to a negative effect on the image of the hotel restaurant together with the hotel enterprise, decrease concerning the potential sales of the hotel enterprise in the future, experience a loss of customers especially in the a la carte units. Within this context, the hotel and restaurant managers should stipulate that the customers who are not satisfied with the services may produce much more negative effect for the enterprise than may be thought of. In addition, they need to set the prices, facilitate payment and prepare the atmosphere in the restaurant. Customer satisfaction can be gained, on the condition that the problems that lead to third party responses are eliminated, will improve the behaviour of "positive word of mouth" concerning the restaurant services. In one study done on restaurant customer complaint behaviour by Su and Bowen (2001), it was accentuated that the 56% of the customers who did not make any complaints talked to other people about their experience and this situation, in fact, is a significant factor in the customer satisfaction and loyalty.

One of the important findings of this study is that Turkish, German, Russian and Dutch tourists made complaints about different issues. According to one way ANOVA test results, in which customer views concerning the complaint issues were compared with respect to nationalities, it was noted that the most complaints were made by Germans while the least complaints were made by Russians. The inspection of the customer complaint differences with regards to nationalities in detail showed that German tourists complained the most about price

and payment, Turkish and Dutch tourists complained less about price and payment compared to Germans, the Russians complained the least about price and payment. Similarly, the German tourists form the most complainant group concerning the issues such as taste and quality, equipment and atmosphere, personnel and service. While, Turkish and Dutch tourists form the less complainant group, the Russian tourists form the least complainant group. In a study made by Aktaş et al. (2009) on the satisfaction levels of the Russian and German tourists in Antalya-Alanya region, the authors found out that the German tourists were satisfied with hotel services, and in this context they were much more satisfied with food quality and service quality. Thus, the mentioned points make the findings of this study more important. Under the light of the findings, it will not be wrong to say that compared to the tourists staying in Lara and Kundu, the tourists staying in Alanya region were provided with more quality food and quality service, or the businesses in Alanya region met the needs of the German tourist much better. Within this context, the hotel and restaurant administrators in Lara and Kundu regions need to make some amendments in restaurant services, especially in taste and quality issues.

Another important result of the study is that customer complaint behaviours varies according to nationalities. As the result of the one way ANOVA test conducted to determine the relationship between the nationalities and customer complaint behaviours, it was seen that Turkish and German tourists preferred voice responses more while the Russian and Dutch tourists preferred neutral and switch behaviour more. An ordering in customer complaint behaviours shows that neutral and switch behaviours were chosen the most by German and Dutch tourists and private responses were chosen by German and Russian tourists the most. In addition, voice responses and third party responses were preferred the most by the German tourists. It was also concluded that in the customer complaint behaviours context, there are differences statistically among all nationalities. It was determined that the German tourists have the highest scores in terms of customer complaint behaviours. The greatest factor that customer complaint behaviours vary according to nationalities is that the nationalities in question own different cultural characteristics. In a study on organizations and cultures by Hofstede (1991), the author mentioned that there were behavioural differences between the eastern cultures that possess collective culture and the western cultures that possess individualist culture. Customer complaint behaviours of the tourists coming from different cultures show remarkable differences compared to other cultures (Kim and Lynn, 2007). For the tourists coming from a collectivist culture where the "we-feeling" is dominant; expressing negative feelings is regarded as rudeness especially in the public. In this context, the tourists that own the collectivist culture refrain more from the voice responses and third party

responses (Liu and McClure, 2001, in Kim and Lynn, 2007). The results gained from the study support this case. According to the study results, the Russian tourists that own the collectivist culture and relatively the Turkish tourists, compared to German and Dutch tourists, preferred the voice responses less. For nationalities which possess individualist culture, everyone is expected to take care of themselves (Yüksel et al., 2006) and these people who own individualist culture are expected to complain more to warn their friends and relatives (Huang et al., 1996, in Yüksel et al., 2006). Thus, the Dutch and German tourists coming from an individualist culture are in general expected to complain more and use the private responses and voice responses more. The findings of the study, showing that the German and the Dutch tourists use voice responses and private responses behaviours, also support this case. On the other hand, although the German tourists possess an individualist culture, they are in the first place in third party responses, which can be explained by the fact that German culture is masculine. However, the study on complaint behaviours by Yüksel et al. (2006) supports the notion that the German tourists use third party responses behaviour more and it was related with masculinity. Under the light of these results, the hotel/restaurant administrators need to develop new models taking the cultural differences into the basis in the evaluation of customer complaint behaviours and in the figuring out the problems. On the other side, they need to train the service personnel on managing the cultural/national differences. By this way, it will be possible to build an effective solution mechanism to customer complaints, and in the restaurant enterprise, it will be easier to convert the customer complaints into customer satisfaction and customer loyalty.

When the results of the study are evaluated in general, for the classification of customer complaint behaviours in terms of nationalities, cultural differences can be useful. However, when the related literature is searched, it is generally seen that the five dimension model, by Hofstede, that shows the cultural differences was used. The study done in Antalya in Kundu region is, too, expected to make a contribution to clear out the differences in customer complaint behaviours on the basis of Hofstede model. In addition to this, since this study in question concerning the restaurant services in Turkey is one of the few studies about customer complaint behaviours, there will be a need to conduct an applied study in the future, which investigates the differences according to nationalities. In this context, by choosing the nationalities of various cultural characteristics, the role of cultural differences in customer complaint behaviours and the similarities among the different cultures should be put forward more clearly.

Just like other studies done in social sciences, this study has some limitations. The first limitation is that as the size of the sampling used in this study is relatively small, it limits the generalization of the research results.

Within this scope, it should be remembered that while the study results will make a contribution to the related literature and to the administrators, it will be more proper to make an evaluation towards the study results. On the other hand, as the studies done in Turkey concerning the restaurant complaints are few in number, the comparison of similar study results was impossible and thus, the results were evaluated by mainly comparing the studies done in other countries and taking theory into consideration. Another limitation of this study is that the application of the questionnaire concerning complaint behaviours was conducted in a certain time period so that the data obtained may have taken a shape of the personal characteristics of tourists that came to Antalya in this mentioned time period. However, in some certain periods of the tourism season (for example, high season and low season) the tourist profile coming to Antalya may differ both in dimensions of age and family structure (married-single). As a result, it cannot be claimed that the obtained results utterly reflect the features of the country where the tourists came from. If we take the limitations faced in this study into account, it can be said that the current study will contribute to the literature and managers on customer behaviours.

REFERENCES

- Afsar B, Rehman ZU, Qureshi JA, Shahjehan A (2010). Determinants of customer loyalty in the banking sector: The case of Pakistan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(6): 1040-1047.
- Aktaş A, Çevirgen A, Toker B (2009). Assessing holiday satisfaction of German and Russian tourists visiting Alanya. *Tour. Hosp. Manage.*, 15(1): 1-12.
- Ali JF, Ali I, Rehman K, Yılmaz AK, Safwan N, Afzal H (2010). Determinants of consumer retention in cellular industry of Pakistan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.* 4 (12): 2402-2408.
- Blodgett JG, Granbois DH (1992). Toward an integrated conceptual model of consumer complaining behaviour. *J. Consum. Satisfact. Dissatisfact. Complain. Behav.*, 5: 93-103.
- Blodgett JG, Granbois DH, Walters R (1993). The effects of perceived justice on complainants' negative word of mouth behaviour and repatronage intentions. *J. Retail.* 69(4): 399-428.
- Blodgett JG, Wakefield KL, Barnes JH (1995). The effects of customer service on consumer complaining behaviour. *J. Serv. Mark.*, 9(4):31-42.
- Broadbridge A, Marshall J (1995). Consumer complaint behaviour: The case of electrical goods. *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manage.*, 23(9): 8-18.
- Cadotte ER, Turgeon N (1988). Key factors in guest satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel Restaurant Adm. Q.*, 28(4): 44-51.
- Chen C, Hu J, Liao J (2010). Tourists' nationalities and the cost efficiency of international tourist hotels in Taiwan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(16): 3440-3446.
- Churchill GA, Suprenant C (1982). An investigation into determinants of customer satisfaction. *J. Mark. Res.*, 19: 491-504.
- Colgate M, Norris M (2001). Developing a comprehensive picture of service failure. *Int. J. Service Ind. Manage.*, 12 (3): 215- 233.
- Day RL (1977). Extending the concept of customer satisfaction. *Adv. Consum Res.*, 11: 496-499.
- Day RL, Grabick K, Schaetzle T, Staubach F (1981). The hidden agenda of consumer complaining. *J. Retail.*, 57 (3): 86-106.
- Day RL, London EL (1977). Toward a theory of consumer complaining behaviour. In Woodside A, Steh J, Bennet P (Eds.), *Consumer and industrial buying behaviour*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- DeFranco A, Wortman J, Lam T, Countryman C (2005). A Cross-cultural comparison of customer complaint behaviour in restaurants in hotels. *Asia Pac. J. Tour.*, 10 (2): 173-190.
- Donoghue S, De Klerk HM (2006). Dissatisfied consumers' complaint behaviour concerning product failure of major electrical household appliances- a conceptual framework. *J. Fam. Ecol. Consum. Sci.*, 34: 41-55.
- Drigotas S, Whitney G, Rusbult C (1995). On the peculiarities of loyalty: a diary study of responses to dissatisfaction in everyday life. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 21(6): 596-609.
- Furlong C (1993). *Marketing for Keeps: Building your business by retaining your customers*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Galacic V, Ivanovic S (2008). Using the eLearn Modelé to resolve guest complaints. *Tour. Hosp. Manage.*, 14(2): 241-250.
- Goodman J (1999). Basic facts on customer complaint behaviour and the impact of service on the bottom line. Originally published in *Competitive Advantage June 1999*. TARP website. Accessed 25 June. 2010. <http://www.newtoncomputing.com/zips/basicfacts.pdf>
- Goodwin C, Ross I (1990). Consumer evaluations of responses to complaints: what's fair and why. *J. Serv. Mark.*, 4: 53-61.
- Gursoy D, McCleary KW, Lepisto LR (2003). Segmenting restaurant customers based on their complaining response styles. *J. Foodserv. Bus. Res.*, 6(1): 325-375.
- Hart CWL, James LH, Earl WS (1990). The profitable art of service recovery. *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 68: 148-156.
- Herrman RO, Warland RH, Willits J (1975). Dissatisfied consumer: who gets upset and who takes actions. *J. Consum. Affair*, 6: 148-68.
- Heung VCS, Lam T (2003). Customer complaint behaviour towards hotel restaurant services. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.*, 15(5): 283-289.
- Hirschman AO (1970). *Exit, Voice and Loyalty Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hofstede G (1991). *Organisation and cultures: software of mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huang JH, Huang CT, Wu S (1996). National character and response to unsatisfactory hotel service. *Hosp. Manage.*, 15(3): 229-243.
- Hui MK, Au K (2001) Justice perceptions of complaint-handling: A cross-cultural comparison between PRC and Canadian customers. *J. Bus. Res.*, 52(2): 161-173.
- Jaacob Z (2010). Performance of local authorities: Analysis on two different levels of quality adoption. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4 (14): 3169-3177.
- Jacoby J, Jaccard JJ (1981). The sources, meaning and validity of consumer complaint behaviour: a psychological analysis. *J. Retail.*, 57(3): 4-23.
- Johns N, Pine R (2002). Consumer behaviour in the food service industry. *Rev. Hosp. Manage.*, 21: 119-134
- Kau AK, Serene DR (1995). Determinants of consumer complaint behaviour: a study of Singapore consumers. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.*, 8(2): 59-76.
- Kim J, Lynn J (2007). Classification of complainers in restaurant services. *Asia Pacific J. Tour. Res.*, 12(4): 365-375.
- Kim JH, Chen JS (2010). The effects of situational and personal characteristics on consumer complaint behaviour in restaurant services. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.*, 27: 96-112.
- Kotler P, Bowen J, Makens J (1999). *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism* (2nd Edition), New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kundu Tourism Entrepreneurs Union Foundation (2009). Uye tesisler. <http://www.kuyab.com/uyeler.htm>
- Lam T, Tang V (2003). Recognizing customer complaint behaviour: The case of Hong Kong hotel restaurants. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.*, 14(1): 69-86.
- Landon LE (1977). A model of consumers' complain behaviour. *Indiana University*: 31-35.
- Lee K, Khan MA, Ko J (2008). A cross-national comparison of perceptions of service recovery. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.*, 24(1): 1-16.
- Lee W, Chen CW, Chen TH, Chen CY (2010). The relationship between consumer orientation, service value, medical care service quality and patient satisfaction: The case of a medical center in Southern Taiwan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(4): 448-458.
- Legohérel P, Daucé B, Hsu CHC, Ranchhold A (2009). Culture, time

- orientation, and exploratory buying behaviour. *J. Consum. Mark.*, 21: 93-107.
- Liu RR, McClure P (2001). Recognising cross-cultural differences in consumer complaint behaviour and intentions. *J. Consum. Mark.*, 18 (1): 54-74.
- Lyons J (1996). Getting customers to complain: a study of restaurant patrons. *Austr. J. Hosp. Manage.*, 3 (1): 37-50.
- Mattila AS, Wirtz J (2004) Consumer complaining to firms : the determinants of channel choice. *J. Serv. Mark.*, 18 (2): 147-155.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism, (2009). Turizm İstatistikleri. <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/TR/Genel/BelgeGoster.aspx?F6E10F8892433CFF657B96472CD892038020F3B0746F34B3>
- Moven J (1993). *Consumer Behaviour*. New York: MacMillian Publishing Company.
- Mueller RD, Palmer A, Mack R, McMullan R (2003). Service in the restaurant industry: an American and Irish comparison of service failures and recovery strategies. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.*, 22: 395-418.
- Ngai EWT, Heung VCS, Wong YH, Chan KY (2007). Consumer complaint behaviour of Asian and non-Asians about hotel services. *Eur. J. Mark.*, 41 (11/12): 1375-1391.
- Richins ML (1979). Consumer perceptions of cost and benefits associated with complaining. In Day RL (Ed.), *Refining concepts and measures of consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behaviour*. (4th ed.,) Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 50-53.
- Richins ML (1983). Negative word-of-mouth by dissatisfied consumers: A pilot study. *J. Mark.*, 47: 68-78.
- Rogers JC, Ross SC, Willams TG (1992). Personal values and purchase dissatisfaction response. *J. Consum. Satisf. Dissatisf. Compl. Behav.*, 5: 81-92.
- Sanes C (1993). Complaints are hidden treasure. *J. Qual. Participat.*, 16 (5): 78-82.
- Singh J (1988). Consumer complaint intentions and behaviour: Definitional and taxonomical issues. *J. Mark.*, 52(1): 93-107.
- Singh J (1990). A tphology of consumer dissatisfaction response styles. *J. Retail.*, 66 (1): 57-97.
- Singh J, Wilkes RE (1996). When consumers complain: A path analysis of the key antecedents of consumer complaint response estimates. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.*, 24(4): 350-365.
- Snellman K, Vihtkari T (2003). Customer complaining behaviour in technology-based service encounters. *Int. J. Serv. Ind. Manage.*, 14(2): 217-231.
- Stephens N, Gwinner KP (1998). Why don't some people complain? A cognitive- emotive process model of consumer complaint behaviour. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.*, 2 (3): 172-189.
- Su W, Bowen JT (2001). Restaurant customer complaint behaviour. *J. Restaurant Foodserv. Mark.*, 4(2): 25-65.
- Sujithamrak S, Lam T (2005). Relationship between customer complaint behaviour and demographic characteristics: A study of hotel restaurants' Patrons. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.*, 10(3): 289-307.
- Temirhan M (2009). Tesis İstatistikleri. Lara Tourism Entrepreneurs Union Foundation. Antalya, Turkey.
- Velazquez BM, Contri GB, Saura IG, Blasco MF (2006). Antecedents to complaint behaviour in the context of restaurant goers. *Int. Rev. Retail Distrib. Consum. Res.*, 16(5): 493-517.
- Wildes VJ, Seo W (2001). Customer vote with their forks: Consumer complaining behaviour in the restaurant industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Tour. Adm.*, 2(2): 21-34.
- Yang TC (2005). The development of an effective recovery programme after service failures: a case study of restaurants in Glasgow. *Tour. Hosp. Plan. Dev.*, 2(1): 39-54.
- Yüksel A, Kılınç UK, Yüksel F (2006). Cross-national analysis of hotel customers' attitudes toward complaining and their complaining behaviour. *Tour. Manage.*, 27: 11-24.