

FOR REFERENCE

62-65

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED

CONSUMER COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR FOR LOCAL
PUBLIC BUS SERVICE IN ISTANBUL

BY

AYŞE NİLGÜN BOLCAKAN - ERGÜVENÇ

B.A., Boğaziçi University, 1982

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies
in Social Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Business Administration

Boğaziçi University

1984

Bogazici University Library



39001100374787

14

TB

1984

Er38

APPROVED BY

Prof.Dr. Ahmet N.KOÇ

Ahmet Koç

Ass.Prof.Dr.Muzaffer BODUR

M. Bodur

Ass.Prof.Dr. Eser BORAK

Eser Borak

APPROVAL DATE: _____


ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my teacher Eser Borak for her guidance in my career and for her valuable contributions to this study.

I have also benefited greatly from the influence of Muzaffer Bodur and Ahmet N. Koç who read, criticized and made many helpful suggestions.

Thanks to Aydın Yaşarol for his assistance in the computer work.

To Perran Akan I owe for her encouragement and moral support. A special thanks goes to my spouse Mehmet Bolcakan.



ABSTRACT

This is an exploratory study to examine consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior in relation to local public bus service. Reasons for dissatisfaction, levels of dissatisfaction, reasons for not complaining, consumer attitudes toward complaining and toward organizational response to complaints, level of consumer recourse awareness for public services and complainer attributes were investigated.

The study is composed of a literature survey and a field study. The literature survey is composed of a review of services marketing and complaining behavior research in previous areas.

The field study was carried out using a sample of 90 members belonging to various bodies at the University of Bosphorous. The sample was given a self administered questionnaire. Frequency analysis and crosstable analysis was made.

The major findings were that while the degree of dissatisfaction is very high due mainly to crowded busses, inconsistent bus schedules, and unappropriate number of busses the complaining rate was extremely low. The reason was found to be negative attitude toward organizational response to complaints and low recourse awareness. People generally had a positive attitude toward complaining.

The research points out the necessity of consumer orientation in public services and that consumer recourse awareness must be increased.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma memnuniyet, memnuniyetsizlik ve şikayet etme davranışlarını şehir içi kamu otobüsleri çerçevesinde incelemektedir. Memnuniyetsizlik nedenleri ve derecesi, şikayet etmeme nedenleri, şikayet etme ve kamu kuruluşlarının şikayete yanıtına karşı olan tutumlar, tüketicinin kamu hizmetleri ile ilgili olarak şikayet edeceği yeri bilme derecesi ve şikayetçi özellikleri araştırılmıştır.

Çalışma; Kütüphane çalışması ve saha çalışmasından oluşmaktadır.

Hizmet pazarlaması, şikayet etme davranışları ve şikayet davranışları ile ilgili araştırmalar incelenmiştir.

Saha çalışması Boğaziçi Üniversitesinin çeşitli ünitelerinden 90 kişilik bir örnekleme verilen bir anketle yürütülmüştür.

Sıklık analizi ve çapraz çizelge analizleri yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın ana bulguları ise; memnuniyetsizlik derecesi, kalabalık otobüsler, düzensiz kalkış saatleri ve yetersiz sayıda otobüs nedeniyle, çok yüksek olmasına rağmen şikayet oranının son derece düşük olduğudur.

Şikayet davranışının az görülmesinin ana nedenleri kurumsal yanıtla ilgili olumsuz tutum ve şikayet edilecek yerin az kişi tarafından bilinmesidir. Deneklerin şikayet etmekle ilgili tutumlarının ise olumlu olduğu görülmüştür.

Araştırma kamu hizmetlerinde tüketici oryantasyonu ve tüketicinin şikayet edilecek yeri bilmesinin önemine işaret etmektedir.

List of Figures and Tables	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	2
2.1. Marketing of Services	2
2.1.1. Definition of Services Marketing	2
2.1.2. Trends in Marketing of Services	3
2.1.3. Classification of Services	3
2.1.4. Basic characteristics of Services	4
2.2. Public Service Marketing	5
2.2.1. Consumer Orientation in Public Service Marketing	5
2.2.2. Local Public Bus Transportation in Istanbul İ.E.T.T.	5
2.3. Consumer Complaining Behavior	6
2.3.1. Conceptualization of Complaining Behavior	6
2.3.2. Circumstances Leading to Dissatisfaction	8
2.3.3. Replies to Dissatisfaction	8
2.3.4. Costs and Benefits of Complaining	9
2.3.5. Complainer Typology	9
2.4. A Review of Complaining Behavior Research	10
3. A STUDY ON THE COMPLAINT BEHAVIOR OF LOCAL PUBLIC BUS SERVICE USERS	18
3.1. Research Objectives	18
3.2. Data Collection Procedure	19
3.2.1. Sample and sampling Procedure	19
3.2.2. Questionnaire Design	19
3.2.3. Variables Used in the Study	20
3.3. Analysis of Data	21
4. RESEARCH FINDINGS	22
4.1. The Demographic Structure of the Sample	22
4.2. Use Patterns for Public Transportation Modes	23
4.3. Preference Patterns For Alternative Public Transportation	26
4.4. Findings on Complaining Behavior	31
4.5. Demographic Characteristics of Complainers	32
4.6. The Problem Causing the Complaint	38
4.7. Reason for not Complaining	40
4.8. Where to Go and How to Complain	41
4.9. Public and Private Complaining	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS-continued-	PAGE
4.10. Findings on Recourse Awareness	42
4.10.1. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Recourse Awareness for Problems Related With Bus Service	43
4.10.2. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness For Bus Service and Public/Private Complaining	44
4.10.3. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness For Bus Service and Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints	45
4.10.4. Relationship Between Not Complaining and Recourse Awareness for Public Services	46
4.10.5. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness and Demographics	46
4.11. Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints	47
4.11.1. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints and Demographics	49
4.11.2. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response and Attitude Toward Complaining	51
4.12. Attitudes Toward Complaining	51
4.12.1. Relationship Between Satisfaction For Bus Service and Attitude Toward Complaining	52
4.13. Limitations of the Study	55
5. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	55
5.1. Implications of the Study	55
5.1.1. Implications for Future Research	55
5.1.2. Implications for I.E.T.T.	57
5.2. Conclusions	57
6. REFERENCES	
APPENDIX I. Questionnaire	62
APPENDIX II. Frequency Distributions for Demographics	66
APPENDIX III. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Demographic Variables	68

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

	Page
Figure 2.1. An Overview of the Consumer's Postdissatisfaction Alternatives	7
Table 3.1. Consumer Complaint Behavior	16
Table 4.1. Frequencies for Public Transportation Use	23
Table 4.2. Frequency Distribution for Satisfaction With Bus Service	24
Table 4.3. Relationship Between Satisfaction With Bus Services and Frequency of Using Busses	24
Table 4.4. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Number of Problems Mentioned Related to Bus Service	24
Table 4.5. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Public Busses and Problems Mentioned Related to Bus Service	25
Table 4.6. Frequency Distribution for Preference for Transportation Modes	27
Table 4.7. Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and Frequency of Using Local Public Busses	28
Table 4.8.1. Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and the First Problem Mentioned	29
Table 4.8.2. Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and the Second Problem Mentioned	30
Table 4.9. Frequency Distribution for Complaining for Public Utilities	31
Table 4.10. Relationship Between Sex and Complaining Behavior for Public Utilities	32
Table 4.11. Relationship Between Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities and Age	33
Table 4.12. Relationship Between Marital Status and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	34
Table 4.13. Relationship Between Married Years and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	35
Table 4.14. Relationship Between Number of Children and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	35a
Table 4.15. Relationship Between Education and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	36
Table 4.16. Relationship Between Net Monthly Income and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	37
Table 4.17. Relationship Between Mobility and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	37

Table 4.18. Relationship Between Position at Bosphorous University and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities	Page 38
Table 4.19. Frequency Distribution for Problem Situations	38
Table 4.20. Relationship Between Complaining and the Problem Situation Faced	39
Table 4.21. Frequency Distribution for Feelings in Face of the Problem Situation	39
Table 4.22. Frequency Distributions for Reason for Not Complaining	40
Table 4.23. Frequency Distributions for the Place of Complaints	41
Table 4.24. Frequency Distribution for Public and Private Complaining	42
Table 4.25. Relationship Between Not Complaining and Reason for Not Complaining	42
Table 4.26. Frequency Distribution for Responses to Problems Related with Bus Service	43
Table 4.27. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Recourse Awareness	44
Table 4.28. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Public/Private Complaining	45
Table 4.29. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints	45
Table 4.30. Relationship Between Not Complaining and Recourse Awareness for Public Services	46
Table 4.31. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints	48
Table 4.32. Attitudes Toward Organizational Response to Complaints for Public Services	48
Table 4.33. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints related to Bus Service and Demographics	50
Table 4.34. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response and Attitude Toward Complaining	51
Table 4.35. Attitudes Toward Complaining	51
Table 4.36. Relationship Between Satisfaction for Bus Service and Attitude Toward Complaining	52
Table 4.37. Relationship Between Satisfaction for Bus Service and Attitude Towards Complaining	53 54

INTRODUCTION

In this study dissatisfaction and complaining behavior for public bus transportation services in Istanbul will be examined.

Complaining behavior is an area which has been studied a lot but in which relatively little has been obtained. Therefore there is still the need of a considerable amount of research in this area. It is an important area of study as complaining is a response to dissatisfaction. Consumer dissatisfaction is important to the consumer as it represents a negative result from the outlay of scarce resources or unfulfilled needs. While for the marketer it means negative word-of-mouth communication and decrease in the number of loyal customers.

Analyzing consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and complaining behavior is very important in leading to the right policies. Service marketing is very different from the marketing of goods in many respects. Public service marketing must be consumer oriented as much as marketing of goods and services.

Public bus transportation service was chosen as the service to be experimented with. Transportation service is a very vital issue for the commuters of Istanbul and for the decision makers. Inhabitants of Istanbul spend a considerable amount of time everyday on crowded networks. Local public bus service accounts for the 40 per cent of public transportation in Istanbul. It will remain an important service for the inhabitants of Istanbul whose population is increasing by 200.000 every year.

The study is an exploratory research on satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior. Attitudes toward complaining, attitudes toward organizational response to complaints and level of recourse awareness are also investigated.

This study does not offer an indepth investigation of satisfaction, dissatisfaction and attitude formation; The level and direction are examined. There is an indepth analysis of complaining behavior.

Part 2 is a literature review on marketing of services, consumer orientation in public services marketing and on consumer complaining behavior. A review of studies on complaint behavior literature will be presented.

Part 3 is devoted to the explanation of the field study. The study aimed to analyze the consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaining behavior with local bus services, focusing on consumer attitudes toward complaining and toward organizational response, the effect of demographics, frequency of using busses, the level of recourse awareness.

A self administered questionnaire was given to 90 people belonging to various bodies at the university of Boğaziçi chosen on convenience basis.

In part 4 the research findings are given in detail and limitations are stated.

Finally in Part 5 implication of the Field Study will be discussed along with some suggestion for the parties concerned with the topic of this study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW :

To simplify the analysis of public bus transportation services, marketing of services in general and public service marketing will be examined consumer complaining behavior will be studied in detail to clarify the basis this research on consumer complaining behavior for public bus services builds upon.

2.1. Marketing of Services:

In this section definition and classification of services, trends in marketing of services and the basis characteristics of services will be reviewed. Public services will be analyzed within this context.

2.1.1. DEFINITION OF SERVICES MARKETING:

There are many definitions of services marketing. Two most acknowledged definitions are by Kotler and Committee on Definition of the American Marketing Association.

According to Kotler (17) professional services marketing consists of organized activities and programs by service firms that are designed to retain present clients and attract new clients by sensing and satisfying their needs through delivery of appropriate services on a paid basis in a manner consistent with creditable professional goals and norms. Services are defined by the Committee on Definition of the American Marketing Association (5) as activities related to sales benefits or satisfactions which are offered for sale or provided in connection with the sale of goods. Two distinguishing characteristics of services can be observed in the above descriptions. Firstly, service is an intangible thing. Secondly services are done by one individual for the benefit or satisfaction of another individual.

2.1.2. TRENDS IN MARKETING OF SERVICES:

Services have gained increasing importance in the last decades due to higher incomes and increasing affluence. High incomes gave way to growth in population, higher levels of education. Attitudes toward leisure time were also affected by the maturing economies and increasing income. Possession of goods were deemphasized while there was more emphasis on experience and self individualization (28).

Consumers are becoming increasingly more sophisticated in selecting, using and replacing firms. They insist on "client centered" (17) performance rather than "technical-centered" services. Even banks are trying to provide individualized services.

Different groups of consumers are gaining power to influence the market for services. Lately rapid technological changes, widespread inflation, high education and change in income and labor distribution, new living standards, and unions worked toward decreasing the gap between skilled and unskilled workers, with the latter being compensated for unsocial work hours and dangerous work (22). Growing number of women in part time and full time jobs in making woman more of a potential consumer of services.

Business life is becoming more complex as competition increases and large corporations are entering services marketing.

2.1.3. CLASSIFICATION OF SERVICES

Various ways of classifying services is another indicator to the complexity of service marketing.

Firstly we can classify services according to the consumer of the service, as business and consumer services (5,18). Business services are those performed for other businessmen such as pension planning, legal counselling, research services, consumer services are those that are offered to the consumer and these can be further grouped as consumer products are grouped. Convenience services are purchased without too much shopping effort. For example, dry cleaning, shoe repair and our case of public bus transportation services. Services are such as banking and house painting are purchased after considerable shopping effort. High technical services such as legal counselling are specialty services.

Services can be classified into three groups according to the type of activity involved. The first classification involves physical or mental labor(5). Examples to this kind of services are doctors, beauty shops, house repairs, lawyers. The second classification involves the temporary loan of goods and equipment.

Public Transportation services are an example to this group, along with car rentals and telephone services. Finally some services such as hospitals and schools supply both labor and loaning of goods and services.

Another method of classifying services is grouping them in categories that most nearly describe the service (5,18)

2.1.4. BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SERVICES:

There are some basic characteristics of services that distinguish them from tangible products.

First of all, according to Levitt (21), services are "human intensive" Levitt states that " the concept of service evolves from the Opaque recesses of the mind, from the time-worn images of personal ministrations and attendance. It refers to deeds some individual performs for the other. The improvement is based on the person, for him to try harder."

Next, there is the problem of "inseparability" (21). Some services are created and consumed simultaneously and therefore you can not distinguish between the creation of a service and the marketing of it. This also causes a problem for the employee in contact with the consumer for he/she can be torn between the objectives of the firm and the consumer(1).

Furthermore, there is the problem of "heterogeneity" (21). It is difficult to attain uniform standards. Even the output of one seller is not standard. Consistent behavior toward clients is not guaranteed as many employees are in contact with the client(1).

"Perishability" is another characteristic of services (6). One of the advantages services offer is the "consuming, without owning"(5). This is true in cases when ownership can be a burden, such as with the risk of style changes and obsolescence and making the wrong choice. It also decreases the responsibility of maintenance, as in the case of renting a car or a home.

Another advantage of services is the benefits attained from "communal use", such as reducing waste and keeping a balanced production (2).

The basic difference between goods and services is the "intangibility" of services, In service marketing an idea is sold, therefore there is a lack of appeal to buyers' senses. The consumer can not touch, smell, hear taste and see the services. However satisfaction is defined in terms of satisfying a need.

There is difficulty in judging the quality and value of the services(5). Since the product is intangible high quality service and development of confidence is used by the firm to demonstrate the value. A favorable reputation is more of value than the brand in marketing of services(1).

There are some very important advantages of intangibility of services.

First of all there is the saving due to lack of storage and handling costs. There are also savings from inventory control and possible losses due to reduction in inventory value. As a result of this, firm can easily adjust to new demand. There is also no problem of transportation as there would be in case of a tangible product (5).

Furthermore, there is less of a standardizing and grading function as a result of which the firm can spend more time and effort on the marketing function (5).

2.2. PUBLIC SERVICE MARKETING:

In this section of the study public service marketing and the local bus transportation in Istanbul are examined.

2.2.1. CONSUMER ORIENTATION IN PUBLIC SERVICE MARKETING:

A great deal of time and energy and creative thinking in recent years have been dedicated to broaden the concept of marketing to include the public sector (non-profit).

The consumer in the private sector is the person who buys/uses the products and services. The consumer-client in the public sector is also the person who buys and/or uses the services of the public sector. Clients of the local bus transportation organization are those who take the bus rides. Consumer Orientation in Public Service Marketing (PUSM) is to satisfy the needs of these people (4).

The criteria which will reflect the quality of an organization's consumer orientation are (4):

1. The accuracy and relevance of the organizational information about its positions of peoples at intervals to let them have a view of the problem.
2. Present the personnel with data about the problems.

The views suggested above can also be applied to public organizations dealing with transportation. An example to such an organization is the IETT. (Istanbul Electricity Street Car and Trolleybus Institution) which is a municipal organization giving service in public transportation. In the next section this organization will be examined in more detail.

2.2.2. THE STRUCTURE OF LOCAL PUBLIC BUS TRANSPORTATION IN ISTANBUL:

Since this paper deals only with public bus transportation it is necessary that more information be provided on IETT's local bus transportation services.

With the industrial development in Turkey in the 1950's cities begun to grow at a fast pace. Today in 1983 the population of Istanbul is around five million (15). Transporting such a large volume of people around the city on crowded networks and with insufficient number of vehicles is a difficult mission. Five main modes of transportation are used for public transportation in Istanbul.

- 1. Public bus
- 2. Public boat
- 3. Public railroad
- 4. Subway
- 5. Car pool services and minibus.

The first public transportation organization in Istanbul was developed in 1871. Street cars were first used. They were withdrawn from service in 1966 as the roads were very old and hard to maintain and the city was dispersed in a large area. In 1950 20 buses were also added to the organization. Gradually suburbs were also included in on the routes of the municipal public bus transportation service.

Now IETT had a 1403 vehicle bus fleet and about 1.5 million people use it everyday(15). It serves on 246 different routes and its share in the public transportation of Istanbul is 40 per cent.

Every year the population of Istanbul is increasing by about 200.000-250.000 people (15). Using the same roads for busses, taxis, cars, vans and trucks reduces their commercial speed and gives way to accidents, pollution unnecessary consumption of fuel,time, and various problems. In 1984 300 additional busses will join the IETT fleet. New express routes and new modes of transportation are also being considered by IETT.

Lately to make life easier for the passengers a punishment-reward system is being used to make the drivers treat the passengers better.

2.3.CONSUMER COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR: ✓

Consumer complaining behavior will be examined in detail in this section. Concepts related to complaining behavior circumstances leading to dissatisfaction replics to dissatisfaction, consumer typologies are also analyzed. A table summarizing previous research can be found at the end of this section.

2.3.1. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR: ✓

Consumer dissatisfaction has been defined primarily in terms of confirmation or disconfirmation of the consumer's specific expectations of product performance(2).

Howard and Sheath (13) suggest that costs or "sacrifices" provide the framework of reference for evaluating any gap between expectation and perceived performance when they define a consumer's satisfaction as the "state of being adequately or inadequately rewarded in a buying situation for the sacrifices he has undergone". Engel, Blackwell, Kollat (10) came close to this definition when they said "if consumers have inappropriate expectations they will evaluate the performance less favorably."

Figure 2.1. shows an overview of the consumer's postdissatisfaction alternatives(8). Day(8) states that the consumer chooses among alternative options according to the nature and the importance of the product/service. When dissatisfaction occurs after purchase, consumer may select to overlook the experience or take some action. The consumer may either take public or private action or both. Private actions that may be taken by the consumer are not buying the product or brand or boycotting the seller, and/or warning friends about the product/seller. Public actions that may be taken by the consumer are seeking redress directly from business firms, taking legal action to obtain redress and/or complaining to business, private or governmental agencies.




Figure 2.1. An Overview of the Consumer's Postdissatisfaction alternatives. ./. .

2.3.2. CIRCUMSTANCES LEADING TO DISSATISFACTION

Only the consumer can decide whether he or she is dissatisfied. At least three situations may occur as follows(7).

1. Dissatisfaction is felt and appears to be justified by the circumstances. This is the typical case when defects or poor performance occur and are recognized by the consumer.
2. Dissatisfaction appears to be justified but is not felt. This is characteristic, when defects or poor performance occur but are not recognized by the consumer because of ignorance or inexperience.
3. Dissatisfaction is felt but does not seem to be justified. This occurs when the consumer misuses or abuses or evaluates the performance in terms of totally inappropriate expectations.

Although situation 2 is of concern to the consumerist, it does not result in complaining. Whereas situation one and three can produce complaining behavior and concern the consumerist.

2.3.3. REPLIES TO DISSATISFACTION

Many alternative courses of action are available to the dissatisfied consumer that range from doing nothing to suing for millions of TL in damages. We can divide the alternatives basically in two (7):

1. Private actions: Consist of complaining to friends, family and relatives boycotting the product or service.
2. Public action, is actively complaining in different forms to the firm, press, government and/or taking legal action.

Below is a detailed list of possible actions in case of dissatisfaction(17)

Private Actions:

- Doing nothing
- Deciding not to buy the service again
- Complaining to family and/or friends

Public Actions:

- Complaining to the person who sold the product/service
- Asking for a replacement /refund
- Stopping payment or refusing to pay
- Complaining in a letter to a newspaper or magazine
- Taking legal action
- Consulting or hiring a lawyer to protect ones interest
- Complaining to a public agency or a congressman..

Factors that affect the choice of alternative are basically the marketing aspects, consumer factors and circumstantial factors (7).

Three factors of marketing that influence how consumers react to dissatisfaction are:

1. The seller's reputation for quality and service.
2. The nature of the circumstances for sale.
3. The responsiveness of the marketing channel is providing redress to dissatisfied consumers.

The attributes and skills of the individuals are significant in determining how he/she reacts to an unsatisfactory experience. Being an effective consumer involves both the acquisition of knowledge and skills and a willingness to expand time and efforts in buying and using the service appropriately.

2.3.4. COSTS AND BENEFITS OF COMPLAINING

Numerous circumstantial or environmental factors influence whether or not an unsatisfactory experience will result in an effort to seek redress and register a complaint. Most obvious of these is how essential the product is to everyday life. The amount of money involved is another important factor. Another situational factor is the ease with which redress may be obtained. Degree of public consciousness is also a very important circumstantial factor (7).

There are also the costs of complaining to be mentioned (21).

- Requires a special trip to the store.
- There is the time involved.
- There is trouble finding someone to handle the complaints.
- Personnel are rude or unpleasant.
- Personnel blame the consumer for dissatisfaction.
- There is paperwork involved.
- Most do not like to hassle personnel.
- People do not like to complain to someone who did not cause the problem.
- Do not like to be seen as complainers
- Others think badly of complainers
- It causes embarrassment

However there are some very important benefits of complaining (21). First of all it helps defend rights as a consumer. It also is a help for the supplier to serve others better and prevents other consumers from experiencing similar dissatisfaction. Complaining will help you get a renewal or your money back. Also it is a chance to vent anger.

2.3.5. COMPLAINER TYPOLOGY α

Warland (30) classifies consumers into four groups according to their concern for consumer protection and information seeking.

Type 1. Concerned Complainers and Information Seekers are persons who feel consumers need unity and protection. This group of complainers are active in consumerism and knowledgeable.

Type 2. Unconcerned Complainers: Are a group of consumers who are very active in complaining but are not very idealist and are less active in information seeking.

Type 3. Unconcerned Noncomplainers: are very idealistic in terms of consumer protection and unity but do not know anything about consumerism and they do not complain.

Type 4. Uninformed Noncomplainers are those who do not know anything about consumerism and do not seek information.

Day and Ash (7), classified complainers according to their reaction to dissatisfaction.

1. Rational Decision Maker: Their response to dissatisfaction is mostly: "I did not think it was worth the time and effort".

2. Defeatist Response : "I did not think I could do anything about it".

3. Ignorance Response : "I do not know how to get help".

4. Procrastinator Response: I wanted to do something about it but never got around to it"

2.4. A REVIEW OF COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

This section involves a through analysis of previous research conducted on complaining. The studies will be discussed in chronological order. A table summarizing the literature survey is found at the end of the section.

Day and Bodur (9) conducted a survey on satisfaction with consumer services. A sample of 295 persons were chosen from 600 dwelling units in a mid-western city in the USA. Two hundred categories of products and services were examined. Purchase patterns and importance of the products and services and the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were asked. Respondents who had extremely dissatisfactory experiences completed a detailed set of questions about the cause of the dissatisfaction and complaint. A set of 14 Likert-type attitude scales for government, marketing and business and demographical question were also contained in the questionnaire. Thirty seven per cent of the sample were using the local bus service and 37.6 per cent ranked it as important. Forty four percent of the sample members were always satisfied while 19.2 per cent of the users were dissatisfied. According to the results of the study demographics could not distinguish between complainers and non complainers.

Kraft (19) investigated the characteristics of non complainers and studied the demographic characteristics that distinguish between complainers and noncomplainers.

[Handwritten signature] ./. .

Consumers perception of the business's intent to provide unsatisfactory products and services were also investigated. Kraft used complaint files of a consumer protection agency as the source of the sample. The sample, consisting of 251 persons were interviewed. Kraft also analyzed people who did not complain. Out of a sample of 672 only 180 interviews were put into analysis. Principal findings were:

1. Complainers had more of a negative perception of sellers as purposely deceiving, dissatisfying
2. Money involved has an important effect on complaining
3. Negative opinion change occurred when there was a perception of intentional acts on part of the seller
4. Repatronage is low when there is dissatisfaction

Wall, Dickey and Talarzyk (29) surveyed consumer satisfaction with apparel product performance and the likelihood of consumer communication of clothing performance complaints to retailers, in relation to demographics, AIO's textile product knowledge and experience. A sample of 891 women over 18 years of age, who were chosen from telephone directory were sent questionnaires by mail. Only 543 were taken into analysis, factor, regression, and multiple discriminant analysis were conducted. Major conclusions of the study were:

1. Satisfaction with clothing performance and communication of clothing complaints were observed in this study to be a multifaceted phenomena that is influenced by similar environmental factors (such as income, social class) and internal influences (experience, personality).
2. Product performance problem constituted the most effective predictor and discriminator between consumers who were satisfied/dissatisfied.
3. Consumer's likelihood of complaining is not related to being dissatisfied or experiencing clothing performance problems.

Swan (26) tested the extension of Howard and Sheth model to buyer behavior concerning satisfaction and patronage of a retail department store. A sample was chosen of people who had no shopping experience at the store, on the opening day of a medium sized department store. Completed questionnaires obtained was 167. Initially a personal interview and a telephone re-interview was made. Six store attributes (decor, courtesy of employees, adequacy of number of employees, how informed the employees were, breadth and depth of assortment, brands carried) were stated. Satisfaction was operationalized on a six point Likert scale. Kendall's Tau was used to measure the relationship between expectations and satisfaction. Analysis of covariance was also made satisfaction was found to be related to the fulfillment of expectations in the purchase of an item.

The more favorable the respondents preshopping attitudes, the greater the satisfaction was for the consumer. Another finding was the relation between satisfaction and sex, age, education and income.

Swan and Trawick (27) tested their hypothesis whether satisfaction would be related to initial expectations, disconfirmation of expectations and a comparison of the service to the best alternative service. Using a self administered questionnaire they interviewed 243 people sitting in a certain part of a restaurant. Questionnaire consisted of questions measuring expectations, disconfirmation and comparison with favorite.

Their hypothesis that the relative attractiveness of the best alternative is a predictor of satisfaction beside disconfirmation and expectations was proved.

Bodur, Borak and Kurtuluş (6) investigated the applicability of survey research methods developed in USA, in Turkey. Satisfaction levels of different types of consumer services were compared for Bloomington and Istanbul samples. In Bloomington cluster sampling was used from 44 cluster centers. A sample of 535 people were chosen. Seventy eight per cent of the sample complained. In Istanbul simple random sampling was used from 9 clusters from the city directory. Of the Istanbul sample of 280, 62 per cent complained. In both cities a self administrative questionnaire was given, for the Istanbul sample the interviewer was also present. Use patterns, levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with 14 service categories and responses to dissatisfaction were examined. It was found that more individuals of the Istanbul sample used public goods, although there was more dissatisfaction in Istanbul there was less complaining. Mostly private complaining was observed in Istanbul.

Grabicke, Schaetzle and Staubach (12) investigated an instrument for the prediction of the propensity to complain. A general analysis was made based on complaint files with a sample of 131 people. A factor analysis was conducted. At the second phase a random sample was chosen among people who bought and was dissatisfied with durable electric appliances. Out of a sample of 365 people it was found through personal interview that 72 percent complained.

Kasper (16) conducted a research to find out how well the firms are aware of the actions of dissatisfied consumers will undertake. A random sample of 700 was taken from the members of the Dutch Marketing Institute. A mail survey was made and only 69 answers were received, Graphical analysis was conducted. Complaining at the firm was seen as the most frequent way firms expect their dissatisfied consumers to express their dissatisfaction.

Firms considered types of public action more important than private action.

Levy and Suprenant (23) compared satisfaction/dissatisfaction levels for products versus services and consumer knowledge for how to/where to complain for products and services. Various products and services were compared using a convenience sample formed by graduate business school students at NYU. As will be seen in chapter 3 this research employs a similar sampling technique. Out of 80 interviews 76 were taken, into analysis. Direct, open ended questions were used and frequency analysis was made. There was 53 per cent complaint rate for products and 58 per cent complaint rate for services. Principal findings were that there is no difference in the complaint rates of products and services: That is, intangibility of services did not suppress the frequency of reported complaining. For products there is a clear ability to specify a hierarchy of complaining procedures ('warning friends and family' to taking legal action'). There is no similar hierarchy for services.

Bearden and Crockette (2) investigated the determinants of consumer inclinations to complain. This was done by comparing the extended model of behavioral intentions of Fishbein and the behavioral explanation of Snyder. According to the extended behavioral intention, intentions to engage in behavior are a function of individuals attitude toward the behavior, social norms, moral norms. Intentions are an intervening variable. On the other hand Snyder thinks that self monitoring individual is sensitive in expressing behavior, so that behavior is a function of individual's attitudes interaction of these attitudes and self monitoring.

In the first study a random sample of 199 were mail surveyed. The study was replicated by a random sample of 857 members of University of South Carolina Consumer panel through mail. Multiple regression was made to examine the models predictive components on respondents inclinations to complain. Respondents attitudes were operationalized using bipolar nine point evaluative scales while the behavioral intentions to complain were operationalized using three item bipolar adjectives. The major findings are that no direct support between self monitoring and attitudes was found. It was found that complaining also depends on the attitudes of firm and government. Attitudes and moral norms were found to be the most significant predictor of intentions to complain.

Gilly and Gelb (11) used complaint files to analyze satisfaction /dissatisfaction and complaining behavior by examining the attitudes following the organizational response to complaints. A stratified sample based on the seriousness of the complaint of a major oil company was used.

Sample size was 964 persons and the response rate was 54 per cent. Level of reimbursement, degree of seriousness of the complaint, monetary loss, time and response to resolve the complaint were operationalized by 4 point Likert scale. A mail survey was conducted and chi square analysis was made. The principal finding was that responses to complaints that do not involve monetary loss will bring about lower levels of satisfaction than responses to complaints involving monetary loss.

Bearden and Teel (3) examined the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction for automobile repairs and services. A random sample of 749 people were chosen from a consumer panel. A mail survey was conducted and the response rate was 50 per cent (375) expectations were operationalized using seven point bipolar scale. Attitudes toward complaining were also operationalized using a bipolar scale. Intentions, satisfaction and complaint reactions were also examined. A complaint behavior index of responsiveness was made, containing responses to personal and direct complaining alternatives. These actions ranged from "warned family and friends" to "contacted lawyer or look legal action." The major finding of this study was that expectations and disconfirmation of expectations are the determinants of satisfaction.

Richins (21) investigated word-of-mouth communication (WOM) as a response to dissatisfaction. In this study the effects of severity of dissatisfaction a problems caused by dissatisfaction, attribution of blame for the dissatisfaction, and perceptions of retailer responsiveness to complaints of WOM were examined. Another objective was to identify variables determining which response to take to dissatisfaction. Depth interviews with eight adult consumers constituted Richins' exploratory work, which was followed by exploratory questionnaires consisting of open end item administered to 201 individuals. The WOM communication was defined as telling one friend or acquaintance about dissatisfaction. Complaining was defined as complaining to retailers, manufacturers and third parties. Results show that the more severe the dissatisfaction, the more is the tendency for negative WOM communication. It was also observed that when consumers blame factors other than there inspection at the purchase point (external attributions) WOM increases. Richins also found that individuals having low confidence in the effectiveness of making complaints are likely to tell others than those expecting remedy.

Legal know how and personality characteristics were studied. Factor analysis was used to reduce 47 statements to 27. Four dominant factors describing complainer characteristics were observed to be.

1. Extraversion and sociability
2. Aggression
3. Calmness (versus irritability-anxiety)
4. Practical, thrusting (versus theoretic, dogmatic, mistrusting)

A discriminant analysis with dependent variables complainer and noncomplainer and independent variables spontaneous aggressiveness, sociability inhibition, and 16 PFM and 16 PFO was run. Percent of a grouped cases correctly classified were 76.4 percent.

The reviewed literature basically focuses on satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior. Determinants of these variables and the outcomes of satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior for consumer and marketers were examined. Demographic variables are experimented with as to their effect on complaining. The role of attitudes on complaining were also examined.

This study builds upon the literature in the sense that it focuses on satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior for public bus services. The effects of demographic variables on complaining frequency of using the service, attitudes toward complaining and toward the organization are similar areas of study.

Researcher	based on	Product or Service	Sample Type	Sample Location	Sample Size	No of responses	%of complaint	Methodology	Analysis
Day and Bodur	Random samples	200 categories of products and services	Geographical sampling	600 dwelling units of a US city	295	295		Self administered Questionnaire	Tabular
Kraft	Files Random		Random	1.Consumer Protection Agency files 2.People who did not complain	251	251		Interviews	Frequency
Wall,Dickey and Talarzyk	Random	Clothing	Women over 18 years of age	Telephone Directory	891	543		Mail Questionnaire	Factor Analysis
Swan	Random Sample	Department Store	Convenience Sample	1st.day of the opening of a medium size dept. store	184	167		1.Personal interview 2.telephone reinterview	Kendall's Tau Discriminate Analysis Analysis of variance
Swan and Trawick	Random Sample	Services of a restaurant	Random Sample	People sitting in a certain part of the restaurant	346	243		Self administered questionnaire	Pathanalysis simple correlation stepwise regression test for reliability
Bodur, Borak Kurtuluş	Random Sample	Services	1.Cluster 2.Simple random	1.Bloomington 44 cluster centers 2.9 clusters from city	1.535 2.280	.80 .95	.782 .622	Self administered Questionnaire 11(with interviewer Present)	Frequency Analysis Crosstabs
Grabicke Schaetzle Staubach	Complaint Files Random	General Durable	Random Sample	People who bought and was dissatisfied with the product	131 345		.72	Files Interview	Factor Analysis Factor and Discriminant Analysis

Researcher	Based on	Product or Service	Sample Type	Sample Location	Sample Size	No of responses	%of complaint	Methodology	Analysis
Kasper	Random	Percieved Behavior of the Consumer	Random	Members of Dutch Marketing Institute, NMA	700	69	-	Mail Survey	Graphical
Levy Suprenant	Random	Various Products and services	Convenience Sample	Graduate Business school students	80	76	.53 Products .58 Services	Personal interview	Frequency Analysis
Bearden Crockett	Random Sample Random Sample	Automobile Repairs	Random	Local phone Directory University of SC Panel	258 857	199 857		Mail survey Mail survey	Regression Regression
Gilly Gelb	Complaint Files	A Major Oil Co. Products and Services	Stratified Random sample based on seriousness of complaint	Files of the Company	964	521	100	Mail survey	Che-square
Bearden Tell	Random Sample	Automobile Repairs Service	Random	Consumer Panel	749	375	50	Mail survey	Chi-square Construct indicator Intercorrelations
Richins		WOM as a response to dissatisfaction			8 201	8 201		Depth Interview Self Administered Questionnaire	Frequency Factor Discriminant Analysis

3.2. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE:

In previous studies on complaining behavior methodologies have ranged from surveys to experiments and have been conducted on groups ranging from student subjects to consumer subjects. In this section of the study sample and the sampling procedure and questionnaire design are explained.

3.2.1. SAMPLE AND THE SAMPLING PROCEDURE:

The questionnaire was given to 15 teaching numbers, 52 students, and 23 staff members of Bosphorous University.

The sampling method used in the study was convenience sampling. A self administered questionnaire was given to the sample out of 93 questionnaires given out 90 were received back. It was a drop and pick-up method.

The results of the study does not reflect the opinion of the population, the local bus users.as the sample and the population are not similar in terms of demographic structure. The sample consists mostly of highly educated,young unmarried people of high income groups. However time limitations and cost consideration of using an off campus sample and the time limitations and bureucratic barriers in using the complaint files available at IETT as the sampling frame were other reasons for choosing a sample only from Bosphorous University.

3.2.2. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN:

Data was collected using a self administered questionnaire.(see Appendix¹ for the questionnaire) Many open ended questions were asked since this was on exploratory study.

Question 2 was asked to determine the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with bus service.It is in four point rating scale ranging from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied.

Question 3 determines the basic problems of the bus service. Only the first three problems mentioned were taken into analysis. It was in open ended form.

Question 4 determines the preference for alternative transportation modes. This preference was used to determine the effect of alternatives transportation modes on satisfaction.

Question 5- a determines the specific problem cases related with bus service. Question 5-b was asked to determine the reaction and feelings of the Consumer in face of this situation. Both were open ended questions.

Question 6 determines complainers and noncomplainers (Dichotomously) and the reason for not complaining (Open Ended).

Question 7 asked The place the complaint was made and the type of complaint. It was in the open ended form. Whether the complaint was resolved a not was asked in a dichotomous form.

Question 8 was asked to determine the attitude of complainers toward organizational response.

Question 8b determines the complaint acknowledgement and 8c determines the complaint settlement both in dichotomous form.

Question 9 was in four point rating scale. It determines the satisfaction of the complainers with the response to his/her complaint.

Question 10 determines the level of recourse awareness and is asked in an open ended form so as not to make any suggestions to the respondent.

Question 11 was asked to determine the attitude toward organizational response to complaints related with bus service. It was in open ended form.

Question 12 is asked in open ended form to determine if the sample member is a private complainer.

Question 13 is in four point rating scale form. Here the respondent evaluates the attributes related to bus service according to perceived importance. Respondent is also asked to mention any other opinion and comments related with bus service.

Question 14 a was asked to determine complaining behavior for public services using both dichotomous and open ended questions.

3.2.3. VARIABLES USED IN THE STUDY:

Frequency of using public bus transportation and alternative modes were operationalized by using the mode everyday, 4-5 days a week, 2-3 days a week, once a week. In analyzing the findings it was found necessary to recode the data as heavy users and light users. Heavy users of the bus service are the sample members who use the bus 4-5 days a week and more.

Satisfaction with public bus is a function of expectations, disconfirmation of expectations and the satisfaction for available alternatives. Analyzing the components of satisfaction is not one of the objectives of this study. However the effects of available alternatives on satisfaction will be studied. Satisfaction/dissatisfaction was measured by four point rating scale. However during final analysis of the results satisfaction was operationalized dichotomously.

Complaining behavior is defined as complaining publicly rather than privately. It is operationalized dichotomously.

Private complaining is talking about problems related with public services with other people such as friends, family, colleagues, other consumers. Private complaining is dichotomously operationalized.

Complaint acknowledgement is either the acknowledgement or the immediate settlement of the complaint. It is operationalized dichotomously. Because there was no previous data available on the subject, there is no basis to compare the complaint acknowledgement time. It is asked in direct form with open ended response categories.

Complaint settlement was the final solution of the complaint. It is operationalized dichotomously. Complaint settlement time is an open ended question because there is no previous data available to compare the results with.

Recourse awareness is knowing where to go to complain for problems related with public services. For bus service (question 10) and for the other public services (question 15) it is initially operationalized in the open ended form, but later the responses are classified as: I don't know, the correct recourse, misinformed. Recourse awareness is also supported by the frequency of reading daily newspapers (question 16).

Attitude toward complaining is the attitudes of the consumer toward the complaining process itself. It is operationalized in Question 17 as open ended and in Question 18 seven four point Likert Scale statements.

Attitude toward organizational response to complaints is the perception of the consumers toward the way they will be received by the authority where they complain and their expectations as to the resolution of the complaint. For the complainers it is operationalized in open end form in question 8a. For the sample it is operationalized by Question 11 and by Question 15, both in open ended form.

3.3. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data was analyzed using an SPSS program. Frequency runs were made and cross tabulations were obtained for various variables.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this part of the study the research findings will be explained in detail. Beginning with the demographic structure of the sample, use patterns for public transportation modes, the effect of distance between home and the university on satisfaction with bus service, attributes related to bus service, preference patterns for alternative public transportation modes, findings on complaining behavior recourse awareness, attitudes toward organizational response to complaints and attitudes toward the act of complaining will be examined.

4.1. THE DEMOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLE

The sample consists of 15 members, 52 students 23 staff members of the Bosphorous University. 57.8 per cent of the sample members are students. (See Appendix 2/j)

Both sexes are about equally represented in the sample 51.7 per cent of the sample members are female and 48.3 per cent of the sample members are men.(see Appendix 2/a)

The sample consists mostly of young people 76.7 per cent is between the ages 21 and 29 followed by a 11.1 per cent in the 30-39 years category. (See Appendix 2/b)

The majority of the sample members, 75.6 per cent are unmarried, while 23.3 per cent of the sample are married. Only one person is divorced. Only 18.9 per cent of the sample have children. Of those who have children, 47 per cent have one child. (See Appendix 2/c,e)

The sample consists of people with higher education 64 per cent of the sample has university education and 15.8 per cent of the sample have education at the graduate level. Only 19.2 per cent of the sample members have education at highschool level and below. (See Appendix 2/f)

The sample members are mostly in higher income brackets.27 per cent of the sample is in the highest income bracket which is 150.000.-TL and more 67.7 per cent of the sample members are in the last three income brackets, which are TL.81.000.-; TL.110.000.-; TL.111.000.-; TL.150.000; TL.151.000. and more. The mean income for the sample is around TL.110.000.- (See Appendix 2/g).

Majority of the sample members are not mobile.67.8 per cent of the sample have not moved their homes in the last five years. 60.7 per cent of those who did move their homes, have moved within İstanbul, 12.4 per cent have moved into İstanbul from other cities or towns. (See Appendix 2/l)

Percentage of people having homes close to the university and those having homes that are at a distance are about the same. 38.2 per cent member have homes that are very close to the university. 13.5 per cent of the sample members have homes that are very far from the university. (See Appendix 2/i).

4.2. USE PATTERNS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODES

Local public bus is the most frequently used transportation mode for commuting around the city. (See Table 4.1) Ninety four per cent of the sample members use the local public bus. Only five persons of the sample do not commute by bus. The local public bus is used everyday by 37.8 per cent of the sample. In the study people who use the local public four or more days are defined as heavy users of the bus. About half of the sample are heavy users of the bus service.

Table 4.1. Frequencies for Public Transportation Use

Transportation Modes	Train		Local Bus		Fery		Subway	
	Absolute Frequ.	Adjusted Frequ.	Absolute Frequ.	Adjusted Frequ.	Absolute Frequ.	Adjusted Frequ.	Absolute Frequ.	Adjusted Frequ.
Everyday	1	1.1	34	37.8	5	5.6	1	1.1
4-5 days a week	0	0	11	12.2	2	2.2	1	1.1
2-3 days a "	0	0	29	32.2	9	10.0	2	2.2
1 day a week	1	1.1	11	12.2	13	14.4	3	3.3
Does not use it	88	97.7	5	5.5	61	67.7	83	92.2
Total	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0

The second most frequently used transportation mode is the ferry. The ferry was used by 29 sample members. Only seven people use the ferry everyday and on workdays. Overall 92.2 per cent of the sample use the ferry for commuting around the city.

Subway is used by only seven sample members. Majority of the sample 92.2 per cent do not use the subway. The subway is used less than or equal to three days a week by 71.4 per cent of the users of subway.

The train is the least used transportation mode by the sample. Only two people use the train.

A significant relationship between the frequency of using local public busses and satisfaction with bus service was found. (χ^2 , 6.94; d.f:2; 0.05; Cramer's V: 0.4448). This relationship shows that light users of the bus services are slightly more dissatisfied with local bus service than nonusers and heavy users. Of the light users 46.6 per cent are dissatisfied with the bus service while 61.7 per cent of the heavy users and 60.0 per cent of the nonusers are dissatisfied. Overall 35.89 per cent of the sample are satisfied with the bus service. (See Table 4.2 and Table 4.3)

Table 4.2. Frequency Distribution for Satisfaction with Bus Service

Frequency Satisfaction	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
Extremely Satisfied	2	2.2	2.2
Satisfied	27	30.3	32.6
Dissatisfied	42	47.2	79.6
Extremely Dissatisfied	18	20.2	100.0
Missing	1	Missing	
Total	90	100.0	

Table.4.3. Relationship Between Satisfaction with Bus Services and Frequency of Using Busses

Satisfaction Use Frequency	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Row Total
Heavy User	13	21	34
Light User	13	26	39
Non User	2	3	5
Column Total	28	50	78
Statistics	$\chi^2: 6.94; d.f: 2; \alpha: .05; Cr.V: 0.4$		

It can be seen from Table 4.4 that frequency of using local bus service and number of problems mentioned related to the bus service are significantly related. ($\chi^2: 12.21; d.f: 4; \alpha: 0.09; Cr.V: 37$). Heavy users of the bus mostly mention two and three problems (73.4 per cent), whereas the light users mention mostly one and two problems (65.9 per cent). Majority of the sample has mentioned two problems (37.1 per cent).

Table 4.4. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Number of Problems Mentioned Related to Bus Service.

No of Problems Use Frequency	0	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	Row Total
Heavy User	1 2.2%	4 8.9	17 37.8	16 35.6	4 8.9	2 4.4	1 2.2	0 0.0	5 50.6
Light User	0 .0%	13 29.5	16 36.4	9 20.5	1 2.3	4 9.1	0 .0	1 2.3	44 49.4
Column Total	1 1.1%	17 19.1	33 37.1	25 28.1	5 5.6	6 6.7	1 1.1	1 1.1	84 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2: 12.21; d.f: 7; \alpha: .09; Cr.V: .37$								

As can be seen in Table 4.5 the most frequently mentioned problem is the crowdedness of the busses. Fifty per cent of the sample state crowdedness of the busses as the first problem. Bus schedule is mentioned as the first problem by 15.7 per cent of the sample. For 10.1 per cent of the sample, first mentioned problem is the number of the busses being too few.

Of the second mentioned problems bus schedule is mentioned by 24.7 per cent of the sample. Crowdedness of the busses is mentioned by 18.0 per cent of the sample while 10.1 per cent mentioned the behavior of the driver as their second problem with bus service.

Table 4.5. Relationship Between Frequency of Using Public Busses and Problems Mentioned Related to the Bus Service.

Order of Problems Mentioned	1st Problem Mentioned			2nd Problem Mentioned			3rd Problem Mentioned		
	Heavy User	Light User	Row Total	Heavy User	Light User	Row Total	Heavy User	Light User	Row Total
Don't Know	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 2.2%	5 29.4%	12 70.6%	17 19.1%	21 43.8%	27 56.3%	48 53.9%
Crowded Busses	19 42.2	26 57.8	45 50.6	8 50.0	8 50.0	16 18.0	3 50.0	3 50.0	6 6.7
Behavior of the Driver	5 71.4	2 28.6	7 7.9	5 55.6	4 44.4	9 10.1	6 50.0	6 50.0	12 13.1
Schedule/Waiting Time	16 52.2	13 44.8	29 32.6	21 60.0	14 40.0	35 34.3	8 53.3	7 46.7	15 16.1
Bus stops, Ticket Machines, Bus Maintenance	4 66.7	2 33.3	6 6.7	6 50.0	6 50.0	12 13.5	7 87.5	1 12.5	8 9.0
Column Total	45 50.6	44 49.4	89 100.0	45 50.6	44 49.4	89 100.0	45 50.6	44 49.4	89 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2:3.3$; df:4 $\alpha:50\%$ Cr.V.:.19			$\chi^2:4.38$; df:4 $\alpha:.356$; Cr.V.:.221			$\chi^2:5.306$; df:4 $\alpha:.257$; Cr.V.:.244		

The behavior of the drivers is most frequently mentioned as the third problem followed by 10.1% of the sample stating the bus schedule.

Even though no significant relationship was found between frequency of using local buses and problems mentioned related to the bus service, most frequently mentioned problems will be stated here.

Of the people who mention the crowd of the busses, 59.1 per cent are light users and 42.2 are heavy users. Bus schedule, waiting time is mentioned first by 35.6 per cent of the heavy users and 29.5 per cent of the light users.

./...

Second problem most frequently mentioned by heavy users of the bus service is the bus schedule waiting time; mentioned by 60.0 per cent of the heavy users. 40.0 per cent of the light users mention the bus schedule waiting time problem.

Most frequently mentioned third problem by the heavy users of the bus service is again the bus schedule waiting time problem. 17.8 per cent of the heavy users mention this problem followed by 15.6 mentioning problems such as the distance between bus stops, number of ticket booths and maintenance of the buses. 15.9 per cent of the light users mention the bus schedule waiting time and 13.6 per cent mention the behavior of the driver.

4.3. PREFERENCE PATTERNS FOR ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODES:

Sample members were asked to rank the three transportation alternatives according to preference. This preference patterns was used to determine the effect of alternatives on satisfaction.

Commuting by bus is the least preferred public transportation alternative. Only 16.7 per cent of the sample state the bus as their first choice transportation alternative, even though it is the most frequently used transportation mode. (Table 4.6)

Commuting by the ferry is preferred by the majority of the sample over public bus and train transportation. The ferry is the most preferred transportation mode for 60.0 per cent of the sample.

The train is the second public transportation alternative. The train is preferred by 22.2 per cent of the sample.

When the relationship between use patterns and preference patterns is analyzed the following results are obtained.

Heavy users of the bus prefer the ferry among the alternative transportation modes. (See Table 4.7). For 66.6 per cent of the heavy users ferry is the most preferred transportation mode. Bus and train are the second alternative for the heavy users of the bus service.

Light users of the bus service also prefer the ferry by majority. The second alternative is the train for the light users. Of the light users 27.7 per cent have stated train as the most preferred alternative and for 47.5 per cent of the sample train is the second alternative.

The local public bus is the last choice of public transportation mode for the light users of the bus. Of the light users 53.8 per cent state busses as the third choice of the public transportation.

Table 4.6 Frequency Distributions for Preference for Transportation Modes

Frequency Preference	TRAIN		BUS		FERRY	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
0	35	38.9	33	36.7	22	22.2
First choice	20	22.2	15	16.7	54	60.0
Second choice	24	26.7	15	16.7	8	8.9
Third choice	11	12.2	27	30.0	6	6.7
Totals	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0

Table 4.7. Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and Frequency of Using Local Public Buses

Preference Use Frequency	TRAIN				BUS				FERRY			
	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total
Heavy User	8 57.1%	5 35.7%	1 7.0%	14	7 38.8%	5 27.7%	6 33.3%	18	12 66.6%	3 16.6%	3 16.6%	18
Light User	11 27.5	19 47.5	10 25.0	40	8 20.5	10 25.6	21 53.8	39	42 84.0	5	3 6.0	50
Column Total	19	24	11	54	15	15	27	57	54	8	6	68
Statistics	$\chi^2:3.67; d.f.:2$ $\alpha: .1$ Cr.V: .033				$\chi^2:2.75; d.f.:2$ $\alpha: .1$ Cr.V: .024				$\chi^2:3.85 ; d.f.:2$ $\alpha: .1 ;$ Cr.V: .0022			

Table 4.8.1 Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and the First Problem Mentioned

Preference Problems	TRAIN				BUS				FERRY			
	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total
1 Crowded Busses	7 35.0%	14 58.3%	8 72.7%	29 32.6	6 40.0%	10 66.7%	15 55.6%	45 50.6%	32 60.4%	13 37.5%	4 66.7%	45 50.6
2 Behavior of the driver	1 5.0	2 8.3	0 10	3 3.4	1 6.7	1 6.7	3 11.1	7 7.9	3 5.7	2 25.0	0 .0	7 7.9
3 Schedule / waiting time	7 35.0	6 25.0	3 27.2	16 17.9	7 46.7	4 26.7	7 25.9	29 32.6	16 30.2	2 25.0	2 33.3	29 32.6
4 Bus stops, Ticket booths, Maintenance	4 20.0	1 4.2	0 .0	5 5.6	0 .0	0 .0	2 7.4	6 6.7	2 3.8	1 12.5	0 .0	6 6.7
Column Total	20 22.5	24 27.0	11 12.4	89 100.0	15 16.9	15 16.9	27 30.3	89 100.0	53 59.6	8 9.0	6 6.7	89 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2: 20.5$; d.f: 6 $\alpha: .05$ Cr.V: .07677				$\chi^2: 142.02$; d.f: 6 $\alpha: .05$ Cr.V: .53258				$\chi^2: 6.84$; df: 6 ; $\alpha: .10$ Cr.V: .025			

Table.4.8.2. Relationship Between Preference for Alternative Transportation Modes and the Second Problem Mentioned

Preference Problems	TRAIN				BUS				FERRY			
	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total	First	Second	Third	Row Total
1. Crowded Busses	1 5.0%	7 29.2%	3 27.3%	29 32.6%	4 26.7%	3 20.0%	6 22.2%	16 18.0%	9 17.0%	3 37.5%	1 16.7%	16 18.0%
2 Behavior of the driver	2 10.0	1 4.2	1 9.1	3 3.4	0 .0	2 13.3	1 3.7	9 10.1	7 13.2	0 .0	1 16.7	9 10.1
3 Schedule Waiting time	9 45.0	10 41.7	5 45.5	16 17.9	6 40.0	6 40.0	13 48.1	35 39.3	20 37.7	4 50.0	2 33.3	35 39.3
4 Bus Stops Ticket Booths Maintenance	3 15.0	4 16.7	0 .0	5 5.6	1 6.7	1 6.7	4 14.8	12 13.5	8 15.0	0 .0	1 16.7	12 13.5
Column Total	20 22.5	24 27.0	11 12.4	89 100.0	15 16.9	15 16.9	27 30.3	89 100.0	53 59.6	8 9.0	6 6.7	89 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2:7$; d.f:6; $\alpha:.1$ Cr.V: .0267				$\chi^2:5.28$; d.f:6; $\alpha:.1$ Cr.V: .0197				$\chi^2 : 6.72$; d.f:6 ; $\alpha=0.1$ Cr.V: .0176			

Tables 4.8.1. and 4.8.2 show the relationship between preference for alternative transportation modes and the problems mentioned related to the bus service.

For those who have commuting by bus as the first choice transportation, bus schedule/waiting time is the most frequently stated problem. It is mentioned by 46.7 per cent of the people who mention bus as the first alternative. Second problem stated is again related to the schedule/waiting time.

Of those who have the local public bus as the second choice transportation 66.7 per cent mention the crowdedness of the bus first and 40 per cent mention the bus schedule/waiting time as the second problem.

Crowded buses is the first mentioned problem. For 55.16% of the people who have buses as the last choice of transportation second mentioned problem is the bus schedule/waiting time.

60.4 of the people who prefer ferry crowded buses is the first mentioned problem followed by 30.2 mentioning schedule/waiting time. Second problem which is most frequently stated is schedule/waiting time.

For people who have train as first choice transportation mode, crowded buses and schedule waiting time are both mentioned by 7 people.

4.4. FINDINGS ON COMPLAINING BEHAVIOR:

A very small proportion of the sample complained for bus service and public utilities. Eight people complained publicly for the local services, only 8.8 per cent of the sample. For the water supply 14.4 per cent of the sample complained while 4.4 per cent complained for the gas supply, 6.6 per cent for the power supply, 5.5 per cent garbage collection service and 24.4 per cent of the sample complained for telephone service. Majority of the complaints were for the telephone communication while the gas supply service received the smallest number of complaints.

(See Table 4.9)

Table 4.9. Frequency Distributions for Complaining for Public Utilities

Frequency Complaining	Water Supply		Gas Supply		Power Supply		Garbage Collec.		Telep.Co	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Abs. Freq.	Adj. Freq.	Abs. Freq.	Adj. Freq.	Abs. Freq.	Adj. Freq.	Abs. Freq.	Adj. Fre
Complained	13	14.4	4	4.4	6	6.6	5	5.6	22	24.
Did not Complain	77	85.6	86	99.95	84	93.3	85	94.4	68	75.
Totals	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.

4.5. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC OF THE COMPLAINERS

The relationship between complaining for bus service and public utilities and demographic variables will be studied in this section.

a. Sex: relationship between sex and complaining for utilities can be seen in Table 4.10. Four of the complainers for bus service are female and four are male. For the water supply there are seven female and six male complainers. Three female and one male sample member complained for the gas supply. For the power supply four female and two male sample members complained. Three female and one male sample member complained for garbage collection service. For telephone service fifteen female and seven male sample members complained.

Table 4.10 Relationship Between Sex and Complaining Behavior for Public Utilities

Sex Service	Female	Male	Total
Local Public Bus	4	4	8
Water Supply	7	6	13
Gas Supply	3	1	4
Power Supply	4	2	6
Garbage Collection	3	2	5
Telephone Communication	15	7	22
Total	36	22	58

B. Age:

There is no significant relationship between complaining for bus service and age, as seen in Table 4.11. For complaining for gas supply, and garbage collection there is no significant relationship with age. However there is a significant relationship between age and complaining for water supply, power supply and telephone communications.

For the bus service four of the complainers are between ages 21-29 and four are between 30-39 years of age. For the water supply twelve complainers are between the ages 21-29 and one person is between 50-59. For the gas supply three out of four complainers are between the ages 21-29 and one is between the ages 30-39 and two are between the age 50-59. Eighteen people of ages between 21-29 complained for telephone communications. Three people of ages 30-39 and one person of age between 50-59 also complained for telephone communication service.

Table 4.11 Relationship Between Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities and Age.

Age Complained for	20 & Under	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	0	4	4	0	0	8	$\chi^2: 8.4; d.f:4$ $\alpha: 0.1$
Water Supply	0	12	0	0	1	13	$\chi^2: 42.76; df:4$ $\alpha: .05$
Gas Supply	0	3	0	0	1	4	$\chi^2: 8.5 ; d.f:4$ $\alpha: .05$
Power Supply	0	4	2	0	0	6	$\chi^2: 10.7; d.f:4$ $\alpha: .05$
Garbage Collection	0	3	1	1	0	5	$\chi^2: 3; d.f:4$ $\alpha: 0.1$
Telephone Communi- cation	0	18	3	0	1	22	$\chi^2: 48.6; d.f:4$
Total	0	44	10	1	3	58	

Three of the complainers for garbage collection are of ages 21-29; one is between ages 30-39 and one is of ages 40-49.

There are 44 complaint cases for ages 21-29 followed by 10 complaints for ages 40-49.

c. Marital Status:

Relationship between complaining for bus service and public utilities and marital status is shown in Table 4.12.

For bus service there is no significant relationship between complaining behavior and marital status. ($\chi^2:3.9$; d.f:2; $\alpha:0.1$) Four of the complainers are unmarried and four are married.

Ten married, two married and one divorced sample member complained for the water supply. Two married and two unmarried sample members complained for the gas supply. Four unmarried and two married sample members complained for garbage collection. Sixteen unmarried and six married sample members complained for the telephone services.

Table 4.12 Relationship Between Marital Status and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Marital Status Complained for	Unmarried	Married	Widow/Divorced	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	4	4	0	8	$\chi^2:3.9$; d.f:2 $\alpha:0.1$
Water Supply	10	2	1	13	$\chi^2:5.998$; d.f:2 $\alpha: .05$
Gas Supply	2	2	0	4	$\chi^2 :2.1$; d.f:2 $\alpha : 0.1$
Power Supply	4	2	0	6	$\chi^2 :4$; d.f.:2 $\alpha :0.1$
Garbage Collection	3	2	0	5	$\chi^2 :2.79$; d.f:2 $\alpha : 0.1$
Telephone Communications	16	6	0	22	$\chi^2 :17.7$; d.f:2 $\alpha :0.1$
Total	39	18	1	58	

d. Married Years:

Table 4.13 shows the relationship between complaining behavior and married years. Four unmarried and one married for 2-5 years, two married for 11-15 years and one sample member married for 16-20 years complained for bus service.

For the water supply eleven unmarried, one sample member married for 2-5 years and one sample member married for more than 20 years complained. For the gas supply two unmarried, one married for 2-5 years, and one married for more than 20 years complained. For the power supply four unmarried and one sample member married for 2-5 years and one for 6-10 years complained. For garbage collection three unmarried and one sample member married for 6-10 years, and one married for 11-5 years complained. Sixteen unmarried, one married for 2-5 years and one each for 11-15, 16-20, 20 and above years of marriage complained for telephone service.

Table 4.13 Relationship Between Married Years and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Married yrs Complained for	Unmarried	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20and above	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	4	0	1	0	2	1	0	8	$\chi^2:11.219$ d.f:6; $\alpha:.1$
Water Supply	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	$\chi^2:53.21$ d.f:6; $\alpha:.05$
Gas supply	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	$\chi^2:6.49$ d.f:6; $\alpha:0.1$
Power supply	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	6	$\chi^2:14.98$ d.f:6; $\alpha:.05$
Garbage Collection	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	$\chi^2:9.92$ d.f:6; $\alpha:0.1$
Telephone Communication	16	0	1	2	1	1	1	22	$\chi^2:61.96$ d.f. 6; $\alpha:.$

e. Number of Children:

Table 4.14 shows the relationship between number of children and complaining behavior for bus service and public utilities. Most of the complainers are unmarried and have no children. Of people who are married majority of the complainers have one child followed by those with two children.

Table 4.14. Relationship Between Number of Children and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Complained for \ No of children	0	1	2	3	4	5 and more	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	5	0	1	1	1	0	8	$\chi^2 = 12.4$ d.f:5; : .05
Water Supply	12	0	0	0	1	0	13	$\chi^2: 53.76$ d.f:5; =.05
Gas Supply	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	$\chi^2: 10.99$ d.f:5; :0.1
Power Supply	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	$\chi^2: 13$ d.f:5; :.05
Garbage Collection	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	$\chi^2: 10.5$ d.f:5; :.1
Telephone Communication	17	4	0	0	0	1	22	$\chi^2: 61.47$ d.f: 5; :.05

f. Education:

Table 4.15 shows the relationship between complaining behavior and education. For The bus service majority of the complainers had university education. People with university education and graduate studies account for most of the complaints for public utilities.

Table 4.15 Relationship Between Education and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Education complained for	Elementary	Middle School	High School	University	Graduate	Total	Statisciss
Local Public S	1	1	0	5	1	8	$\chi^2: 9.5$ d.f:4; $\alpha:.1$
Water Supply	0	0	1	8	4	13	$\chi^2: 16.6$ df:4; $\alpha:.05$
Gas supply	0	0	1	2	1	4	$\chi^2: 3.5$ df:4; $\alpha:.1$
Power supply	0	0	1	2	3	6	$\chi^2: 5.66$ df:4; $\alpha:.1$
Garbage collection	0	0	2	2	1	5	$\chi^2: 4$ df:4; $\alpha:.1$
Telephone communication	1	0	0	14	7	22	$\chi^2: 30.76$ d.f:4; $\alpha:.05$

g. Net Monthly Income:

For the local public bus service five of the complainers are of the highest income group, which is TL.151.000 and more. Two people of income TL 51.000-80.000 and one person of income TL111.000-150.000 also complained for public bus service, as seen in Table 4.16.

For the water supply six of the complainers are of the highest income bracket. Three people of TL.81.000-110.000 and three people of TL.110.000-150.000 and one person of income less than TL.20.000 complained for the water supply. Two people of highest income and one person each of income levels TL.51.000-80.000 and TL111.000-150.000 complained for gas supply. One, two, three people respectively of the last three income brackets complained for the power supply. One person each in income groups TL21-50.000, TL.51.000-80.000, TL.151.000 and more; and two persons in income group TL 111.000-150.000 complained for garbage collection. Sixteen of the complainers for telephone service are in the highest income group followed by four complainers with TL110.000-150.000 income and one person each for income groups TL.20.000 and less and TL.81.000-110.000.

It can be seen from Table 4.16 that most of the complainers are in the highest income groups.

Table 4.16 Relationship Between Net Monthly Income and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Income Complained for	20.000 and less	21.000 50.000	51.000 80.000	81.000 111.000	111.000 150.000	151.000 and above	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	0	2	0	0	1	5	8	$\chi^2: 4.4$ d.f.:5; $\alpha: .0$
Water Supply	1	0	0	3	3	6	13	$\chi^2: 13.099$ d.f.:5; $\alpha: .0$
Gas Supply	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	$\chi^2: 4.99$ d.f.:5; $\alpha: .1$
Garbage Collection	0	1	1	0	2	1	5	$\chi^2: 4.54$ d.f.:5; $\alpha: .1$
Telephone Communication	1	0	0	1	4	16	22	$\chi^2: 51.311$ df:5; $\alpha: .0$

h. Mobility:

There is no significant relationship between complaining for bus service and mobility. ($\chi^2: 3.246$; $df: 2$; $\alpha: .1$) Five of the complainers for bus service have not changed their homes in the last five years, one moved within Istanbul and two moved into Istanbul. (See Table 4.17).

Eight of the complainers for water supply did not move their homes in the last five years, while four moved within and one into Istanbul. Two of the complainers for gas supply did not move their homes and two moved within Istanbul. Four of the complainers for power supply did not move and two moved within Istanbul. Three of the complainers for garbage collection did not move while one moved within Istanbul and one into Istanbul. For telephone service 14 people did not move while six complainers moved within and two moved into Istanbul.

Majority of the people who complained are those who did not move their homes in the last five years, followed by sample members who moved within Istanbul.

Table 4.17 Relationship Between Mobility and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Mobility Complained for	Did not move	Moved within Istanbul	Moved Into Istanbul	Total	Statistics
Local Public Bus	5	1	2	8	$\chi^2: 3.246$ df:2; $\alpha: .1$
Water Supply	8	4	1	13	$\chi^2: 47.826$ df:2; $\alpha: .05$
Gas Supply	2	2	0	4	$\chi^2: 2$ df:2; $\alpha: .1$
Power supply	4	2	0	6	$\chi^2: 4$ df:2; $\alpha: .1$
Garbage Collection	3	1	1	5	$\chi^2: 1.59$ df:2; $\alpha: .1$
Telephone Conver.	14	6	2	22	$\chi^2: 22.834$ df:2, α

g. Position at Bosphorous University:

There is no significant relationship between complaining for bus service and position at Bosphorous University, as seen in Table 4.18 ($\chi^2:1.0$; $df:2$; $\alpha:0.1$). Two teaching members, four students and two staff members complained for bus service.

Nine students, three teaching members; and one staff member complained for water supply. Two students, one teaching member and one staff member complained for gas supply. Three teaching members, two students, one staff member complained for power supply. One teaching member, one student and three staff members complained for garbage collection. Five teaching members, 15 students and two staff members complained for telephone services.

Table 4.18 Relationship Between Position at Bosphorous University and Complaining for Bus Service and Public Utilities

Complained for	Position	Teaching Member	Student	Staff	total	Statistics
Local Public Bus		2	4	2	8	$\chi^2:1$ $df:2$; $\alpha:.1$
Water Supply		3	9	1	13	$\chi^2:6.96$ $df:2$; $\alpha:.05$
Gas Supply		1	2	1	4	$\chi^2:20.4$ $df:2$; $\alpha:.05$
Power Supply		3	2	1	6	$\chi^2:1.0$ $df:2$ $\alpha:.1$
Garbage Collection		1	1	3	5	$\chi^2:2.54$ $df:2$; $\alpha:.05$
Telephone Communication		5	15	2	22	$\chi^2:18.39$ $df:2$; $\alpha:.05$

4.6. THE PROBLEM CAUSING THE COMPLAINT:

Majority of the sample mention the behavior of the driver as the basic source of an unpleasant problem situation. Of the sample members 31.8 per cent mention the driver: 19.8 per cent mention the behavior of the passengers; 14.8 per cent mention the crowded busses as the source of the problem (see Table 4.19)

Table 4.19 Frequency Distribution for Problem Situations

Source of Problems	Absolutely Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
Don't Know	21	23.8
Crowded Busses	13	14.8
Driver	28	31.8
Passengers	17	19.3
Bus Schedule	6	6.8
Other items	3	3.4
Totals	88	100.0

As seen in Table 4.20 fifty per cent of the complainers mentioned the crowd and fifty per cent mentioned the driver as the source of the problem. Of the noncomplainers 46 per cent mentioned the crowded busses and passengers as the source of problem and 42 per cent of the noncomplainers mentioned the behavior of the driver as the source of the problem, while 12 per cent mentioned other attributes such as the bus stops, maintenance and ticket booths.

Table 4.20 Relationship Between Complaining and the Problem Situation Faced

Problem Situation	Complained	Did not Complain	Row Total
Crowded Busses/ Passengers	4	23	27
Driver	4	21	25
Bus Schedule/ Services	0	8	8
Column Total	8	52	60

Feelings in Face of The Problem Situation:

Majority of the sample felt anger when they had on unpleasant situation. Of the sample members 42.9 per cent stated that they felt anger, 8.3 per cent were bored, 7.1 per cent felt sad, 4.8 per cent had mixed feelings, 6 per cent felt helpless, 3.6 per cent shouted or swore. (See Table 4.21)

Table 4.21 Frequency Distribution for Feelings in Face of the Problem Situation

Feelings	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
Angry	36	42.9
No Response	23	27.4
Bored	7	8.3
Sad	6	7.1
Helpless	5	6.0
Multiple	4	4.8
Shouted/ Swear	3	3.6
Missing	6	MISSING
	90	100.0

4.7. Reason for Not Complaining:

Table 4.22 shows the frequency distributions for reasons for not complaining. It is important to note that 64 people, 71.1 per cent of the sample did not state their reason for not complaining. Eight persons who complained actively is included in this number.

Sample members who stated that they did not know which authority to apply form 7.8 per cent of the sample and 2.2 per cent of the sample members stated that they did not know where to go and what to do. Only 2.2 per cent of the sample members stated that they did not have time to complain, while another 2.2 per cent thought complaining was not worth the trouble. Some 3.3 per cent of the sample members did not regard their problem serious enough for complaining. Whereas 5.6 per cent of the sample members stated they did not complain because it would not have changed anything and 5.6 per cent were afraid to complain in case the authorities would not regard the complaint seriously.

Table 4.22 Frequency Distributions for Reason for Not Complaining

Reason \ Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
No Answer	64	71.1%
Related Authority Unknown	7	7.8
Afraid of not being regarded seriously	5	5.6
Nothing would have changed	5	5.6
Not regarding it serious enough	3	3.3
Did not have time	2	2.2
Did not think it was worth the trouble	2	2.2
Did not know where to go	2	2.2
Total	90	100

4.8. WHERE TO GO AND HOW TO COMPLAIN:

Table 4.23 shows the frequency distributions for the place of complaint. Out of eight complainers three complained to the ground authorities; two complained to the driver, one complained to the central authority and one complained to the passenger causing the complaint.

Seven out of eight complainers made personal complaints. Only one complainer complained with a letter.

Table 4.23 Frequency Distributions for The Place of Complaint

Place \ Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
No Answer	82	91
Ground Authority	3	3.4
Driver	2	2.2
Passenger	1	1.1
Control Authority	1	1.1
Other	1	1.1
Total	90	100.0

4.9. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COMPLAINING:

Ten members of the sample stated that they would go to the related authorities when asked who they would complain to about their problems with public services.(See Table 4.24) Fourteen people said they would mention their problems to no one. Six people, 6.7 per cent said they would tell everyone and two people said they would tell their problems to the people who might be around at the time the problem occurred. Thirteen people said they mention their problems to friends and colleagues and two people said they talk with their family. Multiple answers such as stating both family and friends, were given by 35.6 per cent of the sample.

Table 4.24 Frequency Distribution for Public and Private Complaining

Who do you complain	Absolute Freq.	Adjusted Freq.
Multiple Answers	32	35.5
No one	23	25.6
Related authority	20	22.2
Everyone	6	6.7
Friends/Colleagues	3	3.3
Family	2	2.2
People around at the time	4	4.4
Total	90	100.0

4.10. FINDINGS ON RECOURSE AWARENESS:

In this section recourse awareness for bus service and its effects on complaining, frequency of using bus service, attitudes toward organizational response and type of complaining will be examined.

Table 4.25 shows the responses given for not complaining.

It can be observed from the table that 19.4 per cent of the sample members did not know the authority responsible with handling problems related with bus service and 6.5 per cent did not know where to go. The largest cell is composed of noncomplainers who did not mention any reason for not complaining.

Table 4.25 Relationship Between Not Complaining and Reason for Not Complaining

Reason	No. Answer	Responsible Authority Unknown	Did not know where to go	Did not have time	Not worth trying	Authorities would not pay attention	Complaining unimportant	Total
Non Complainer	32 61.5%	6 11.5	2 3.8	2 3.8	2 3.8	5 9.6	3 5.7	52

It can be seen in Table 4.26 that 11.8 per cent of the sample members did not know what to do/where to go if they have a problem with bus service. Twenty per cent of the sample members mentioned the IETT and related offices. Only 1.1 per cent mentioned writing a letter to be published in a newspaper.

The greatest proportion stated that they would not do anything. This will be explained in attitudes toward organizational response to complaints. Seven per cent stated that they would solve problem immediately by talking with the driver or anyother person in easy reach some 9.4 per cent of the sample members state that they would search for the right authority and complain while 22.5 state that they would complain to "authorities" researcher believes that these "authorities" is not clear to the respondent.

Table 4.26 Frequency Distribution for Responses to Problems Related with Bus Service

Responses Catégories	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency
Don't know	10	11.8%
Would not do anything	24	28.2
Complain to authorities	19	22.5
Register a complaint to IETT	17	20.0
Would search for an authority to complain	8	9.4
Would solve it personally through shortest way	6	7.0
Complain in a letter to the newspaper	1	1.1
Total	85	100.0

4.10.1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF USING BUS SERVICE AND RECOURSE AWARENESS FOR PROBLEMS RELATED WITH BUS SERVICE:

There is a significant relationship between frequency of using bus service and recourse awareness for problems related with bus service.

(See Table 4.27 $\chi^2:6.674$; $df:2$; $\alpha:.0355$; $Cr.V:.2723$)

most of the light users of the bus do not know where to go to complain for bus service, 46.7 per cent. This percentage is lower for the heavy users of bus, 28.9 per cent. Of the heavy users, 28.9 per cent state a spesific action while 35.6 per cent of the light users were able to state a spesific action.

A greater propation of the heavy users, 42.2 per cent, stated that they would seek an authority to complain should need arise while only 17.8 per cent of the light users stated that they would seek an authority.

Table 4.27 Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Recourse awareness.

Recourse Use Frequency	Don't know	Would learn where to go	Specific action	Row Total
Heavy User	13 28.9%	19 42.2%	13 28.9%	45 50.0%
Light User	21 46.7%	8 17.8%	16 35.6%	45 50%
Column Total	34 37.8	27 30.0%	29 32.2%	90 100.0

4.10.2. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Public/Private Complaining:

Table 4.28 shows the relationship between recourse awareness for bus service and public/private complaining. There is no significant relations but some directions. Sample members who do not complain to anyone mostly do not know where to go; 40.7 per cent of people who complain privately to many people, know where to complain. A large proportion of the sample a total of 39.5 per cent gave multiple answers.

Of the sample members who stated a specific recourse taking action 40.7 per cent gave multiple answers; 14.8 per cent complain to no one; 14.8 per cent complain to everyone; 22.2 complain to friends and family and 7.4 per cent stated that they complain to the responsible authority.

Thirty six per cent of the sample members who stated that they would seek an authority to complain gave multiple answers. Sixteen per cent complained to friends/family while another 11 per cent did not complain to anyone. Twentyfour per cent stated that they would complain to the related authority. Eight percent stated that they complained to everyone.

Table 4.28 Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Public/Private Complaining

Public/ Private complaint	No One	Everyone	Friends Family	Multiple	To the Responsible Authority	Row Total
Recourse Don't Know	6 20.7%	4 13.8%	5 17.2%	12 41.4%	2 6.9%	29 35.8%
I'll go to the Authorities	4 16.0	2 8.0	4 16.0	9 36.0	6 24.0	25 30.0
Specific Course of Action	4 14.8	4 14.8	6 22.2	11 40.7	2 7.4	27 33.3
Column Total	14 17.2	10 12.3	15 18.5	32 39.5	10 12.3	81 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2:5.27$		df:8			

4.10.3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECOURSE AWARENESS FOR BUS SERVICE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS

Table 4.29 shows a significant relationship between recourse awareness for bus service and attitude toward organizational response to complaints.

($\chi^2:14.75$; d.f:4; $\alpha:0.05$).

Of the sample members with positive attitude toward organizational response to complaints 42.8 per cent state a specific course for action, 42.8 per cent said they would go to the authorities, 14.4 per cent said they did not know where to go. Of the people with negative attitude 48.3 per cent did not know where to complain; 18.3 per cent said they would go to authorities; 33.3 per cent stated a specific course of action.

Even though they consider complaining a difficult procedure 12.9 per cent of the sample members are still for complaining of those who would complain anyway 63.6 per cent state they would complain to authorities. 18.2 per cent do not know where to go and 18.2 per cent state a specific course of action.

Table 4.29. Relationship Between Recourse Awareness for Bus Service and Attitude Toward organizational Response to Complaints.

Attitude	Positive Attitude	Negative Attitude	Would complain Anyway	Row Total
Recourse Awareness Don't Know	2 14.4	29 48.3	2 18.2	33 36.8
I'll go to the Authorities	6 42.8	11 18.3	7 63.6	24 28.2
Specific course of Action	6 42.8	20 33.3	2 18.2	28 32.9
Column Total	14 16.5	60 70.6	11 12.9	85 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2:14.75$		d.f:4	$\alpha:.05$

4.10.4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NOT COMPLAINING AND RECOURSE AWARENESS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES:

Table 4.30 shows the relationship between not complaining for public services and recourse awareness. The greatest recourse awareness is for telephone communications service; 80.4 per cent of the noncomplainers reported the right recourse. A great proportion of noncomplainers are also aware of the right recourse for garbage collection, 72.3 per cent. Nearly 69 per cent of the non complainers know how to take recourse for water supply. Noncomplainers are least familiar with recourse taking for the gas supply. Almost 49 per cent do not know where to go. Majority of the wrong institutions stated are for the power supply, a 40.4 per cent of the noncomplainers gave a wrong address for complaining.

Table.4.30 . Relationship Between Not Complaining and Recourse Awareness for Public Services

Public services	Don't know	The right recourse	Wrong answer	Total
Water Supply	8 6.7	33 68.8	7 14.6	48
Gas supply	23 48.9	18 38.8	6 12.8	47
Power Supply	6 12.8	22 46.8	19 40.4	47
Garbage Collection	10 21.3	34 72.3	3 6.4	47
Telephone Communication	6 12.8	38 80.9	3 6.4	47

4.10.5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECOURSE AWARENESS AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Appendix 3 shows the relationship between recourse awareness for bus service and demographic variables.

Female sample members are more recourse aware than male sample members. Nearly 47 per cent of the male members could not state a course of action, while only 30.4 per cent female sample members could not state the right recourse. Thirty seven per cent of the female member could state a spesific course of action while only 25.6 per cent of the male members could give a spesific recourse action.

Fifty per cent of the sample members between ages 30-39 were able to state a spesific course of action, while only 33.3 per cent of people of ages 4.0 and above and 29.7 per cent of people of ages 29 and below could state a spesific course of action. Fifty per cent of the age group 40 and above did not know what to do whereas 40 per cent of 30-39 age group and 36.5 per cent of the 29 and below age group did not know what to do.

No direction was observed for the relationship between recourse awareness and marital status. Sample members with university level of education mostly did not know the right recourse. There is a general statement of willingness to try to complain, even though the recourse is unclear to the respondent, for all education levels.

People in the higher income levels are more recourse aware. Overall they do not give vague answers. They either state that they do not know where to go or state a specific course of action. Whereas people in the first three income groups TL.20.000.- and less to TL.80.000 mostly give an unclear recourse and say that they will try to complain should need arise.

People who moved into Istanbul could state the right recourse 17.3 per cent of the time. This per centage is 11.9 for people who did not move and 7.7 for the sample members who moved within Istanbul.

Sample members who live very neary to the school are the group with the lowest level of recourse awareness. Fourty four per cent of the people who live very near to the school do not know where to go. Fourty one per cent of the sample members who live far from school stated a spesific recourse action.

Fourty per cent of the teaching members stated a spesific recourse action; 34.8 per cent of the staff and 28.9 per cent of the students stated a spesific recourse action. Students had the lowest degree of recourse awareness. Fourty two per cent of the students, 33.3 per cent of the teaching members, 30.4 per cent of the staff do not know where to go.

4.11. ATTITUDE TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS

This section will be about the findings in the area of organizational response to complaints, which is the perception of the consumer of how the organization will treat incoming complaints.

There is no significant relationship between frequency of using busses and attitude toward organizational response to complaints related with bus service. ($\chi^2:4.95$; d.f:2; $\alpha :0.1$; Cr.V:0278). It can be seen from Table 4.31 that 16.5 per cent of the sample have a positive attitude toward organizational response and 75.6 per cent have a negative attitude, while 8 per cent stated that even though it is hard to complain and get results they would still complain.

Fifty seven per cent of people with positive attitude are heavy users and 43 per cent are light users of bus service. Fourty nine per cent of the sample members with negative attitude are heavy users and 57 per cent are light users of bus service.

It must be noted that of the eight public complaints made related to bus service seven got positive results.

Table 4.31 Relationship Between Frequency of Using Bus Service and Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints:

Use Frequency \ Attitude	Heavy User	Light User	Row Total
Positive	8 57.1	6 42.9	14 16.3
Negative	32 49.2	33 50.8	65 75.6
Would complain even though it is hard to	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 8.1
Column Total	42 48.8	44 51.2	86 100.0

When the attitudes toward organizational response for other public services are examined, in Table 4.32 it can be seen that there is a positive attitude for telephone communication, power supply and garbage collection and a negative attitude toward water and gas supply services. For the telephone communications 74.6 per cent, for the power supply 60.6 per cent and for the garbage collection service 52.4 per cent of the sample have a positive attitude toward organizational response to complaints. For the water supply 63.6 per cent and for the gas supply 57.78 per cent of the population have a negative attitude.

table 4.32 Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints for Public Services

Attitude \ Service	Positive	negative
Water supply	24 36.4	42 63.6
Gas Supply	19 42.2	26 57.8
Power supply	40 60.6	26 39.4
Garbage collection	32 52.5	29 47.5
Telephone Communication	47 74.6	16 25.4

4.11.1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDE TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS AND DEMOGRAPHICS:

Following demographics were studied in relation to attitude toward organizational response to complaints. Sex, age, marital status, education, income, mobility, distance between home and school, position at Bosphorous University. Except for position at Bosphorous University ($\chi^2:10.7019; df:4; \alpha :0.05$) and education ($\chi^2:16.7369; df:4; \alpha :0.05$) no significant relationship was found between the demographic variables and attitude toward organizational response to complaints (See Table 4.33)

Male and female sample members have a similar mainly negative attitude toward organizational response to complaints for bus service. Overall 70.5 per cent of the sample have a negative attitude.

Unmarried sample members have a more negative attitude. Seventy five per cent of the unmarried members have a negative attitude compared to the 40.00 per cent for the married sample members.

Sample members with high school education and below have mostly a positive attitude toward organizational response to complaints for bus service. Fourty seven per cent of the people in this education level have positive attitude compared to 7.4 per cent for university education and 14.3 per cent of sample members with graduate education.

It can be observed that as income decreases percentage of people with positive attitude increase sample members in the last three income groups have more negative attitude toward organizational response.

Mobile people have a more positive attitude toward organizational response. Thirty per cent of people who moved into Istanbul in the last five years have a positive attitude.

People who live very far to the school have the most positive attitude followed by sample members who live near.

Teaching members have less of a negative attitude toward organizational response to complaints for bus service.

Only 28.6 per cent of the teaching members have a negative attitude; 14.3 have a positive attitude and 57.1 per cent would complain even though it is hard to complain.

Table 4.33 Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response to Complaints Related to Bus Service and demographics

	Attitude	Positive	Negative	Would try to	Row
	Demographics			complain even if it is hard	Total
Sex	Female	1	31	5	37
	Male	1	28	6	35
	Column Total				
Age	29 and below	11 15.9%	48 69.6	10 14.5	69 81.2
	30-39	2 20.0	7 70.0	1 10.0	10 11.7
	40 and up	1 16.7	5 83.3	0 .0	6 7.1
	Column Total	14 16.5	60 70.5	11 13.0	85 100.0
Marital Status	Unmarried	8 12.5	48 75.0	8 12.5	64 76.2
	Married	5 25.0	12 60.0	3 15.0	20 23.8
	Column Total	13 15.5	60 71.4	11 13.1	84 100.0
Education	High school and below	8 47.1	6 35.3	3 17.6	17 20.0
	University	4 7.4	44 81.5	6 11.1	54 63.5
	Graduate	2 14.3	10 71.4	2 14.3	14 16.5
	Column Total	14 16.4	60 70.6	11 13.0	85 100.0
Income	tl. 20.000 and under	2 66.7	1 33.3	0 .0	3 3.5
	21.000-50.000	3 27.3	6 54.5	2 18.2	11 12.9
	51.000-80.000	2 16.7	7 58.3	3 25.0	12 14.1
	81.000-110.000	3 14.3	17 81.0	1 4.7	21 24.7
	111.000-150.000	1 6.7	12 80.0	2 13.3	15 17.6
	151.000 and above	3 13.0	17 74.0	3 13.0	23 27.1
	Column total	14 16.5	60 70.5	11 13.0	85 100.0
Mobility	Did not move in the last five years	9 15.0	42 70.0	9 15.0	66 70.5
	Moved within Istanbul	2 13.3	11 73.3	2 13.4	15 17.6
	Moved into Istanbul	3 30.0	7 70.0	0 10	10 11.8
	Column Total	14 16.5	60 70.5	11 13.0	85 100.0
Distance Between Home and School	Very near	5 15.1	25 75.8	3 9.0	33 38.8
	Near	2 14.3	8 57.1	4 28.6	14 16.5
	Far	3 10.7	23 32.1	2 7.1	28 32.9
	Very far	4 40.0	4 40.0	2 20.0	10 11.8
	Column Total	14 16.5	66 70.5	11 13.0	85 100.0
Position at B.U.	Teaching member	2 14.3	4 28.6	8 57.1	14 16.5
	Students	11 18.3	39 65.0	10 16.7	60 70.5
	Staff	1 9.0	7 63.6	3 27.7	11 13
	Column Total	14 16.5	50 58.8	21 24.7	85 100.0

4.11.2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDE TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPLAINING

There is no significant relation between attitude toward organizational response to complaining and attitude toward complaining, which is the attitudes of the consumers toward the complaining process itself. (χ^2 :4.26; df:4; α : 0.1

Table 4.34. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Organizational Response and Attitude Toward Complaining

Complaining Organization	Normal	Positive Attitude	Negative Attitude	Row Total
Positive Attitude	2	9	2	13
Negative Attitude	17	25	13	55
Would complain Anyway	2	4	4	9
Column Total	21	38	19	77
Statistics	χ^2 : 4.26 χ^2_T : 7.78 d.f α :0.1			

Table 4.34. Shows that 69.2 per cent of the people with positive attitude toward organizational response have positive attitude toward complaining for public services and 23.6 per cent have a negative attitude. Of those people who stated that they would complain even though complaining is a difficult procedure and results are not guaranteed two persons have a neutral attitude and four persons have positive and four have negative attitude.

4.12. ATTITUDES TOWARD COMPLAINING:

Table 4.35 shows the frequency distribution for attitude toward complaining process in general about any product and services. Elevent per cent of the sample state that you should complain fourty eight per cent have positive and 22.8 per cent have negative attitude toward complaining while 16.5 per cent give neutral answers such as it is a normal way of action and everyone thinks differently.

Frequently	Absolute	Frequently	Adjusted Freq.
Attitude			
Positive	38		55.9
Negative	8		11.8
You should complain	9		13.2
It is not important	7		10.3
Everyone think differently	6		8.8
Total	68		100.0

Table 4.36 shows the relationship between satisfaction per bus service and attitude toward complaining. ($\chi^2:5.625$; $df:2$; $\alpha:0.05$) of those who have a positive attitude toward complaining 78.9 per cent were dissatisfied with bus service and 70.59 per cent of those with negative attitude were dissatisfied.

Table 4.36. Relationship Between Satisfaction for Bus Service and Attitude Toward Complaining

Attitude \ Satisfaction	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Row Total
	Neutral	11 50.0	11 50.0
Positive	8 21.1	30 78.9	38 48.7
Negative	5 29.4	12 70.6	17 21.8
Column Total	24 30.8	54 69.2	78 100.0
Statistics	$\chi^2:5.625$; $d.f:2$; $\alpha: .05$		

4.12.1 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION FOR BUS SERVICE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPLAINING:

The relationship between attitude toward complaining and satisfaction for bus services were also analyzed to see if satisfaction influences attitudes towards complaining.

A significant relationship was not found between satisfaction for bus service and attitude toward complaining (See Table 4.37)

Of those who agree/strongly agree with the statements "Complaining is not worth the time and effort" 36.1 per cent is satisfied and 63.9 per cent is dissatisfied with bus service. Of those who disagree/strongly disagree with this statement 29.79 per cent is satisfied and 70.7 per cent is dissatisfied with bus service.

Thirty six per cent of the people who agree/strongly agree with the statement "I don't have time to complain are satisfied with bus service while 27.27 cent of the disagree/strongly disagree group are satisfied.

Out of 61.1 per cent of the sample who agree/strongly agree with the statement complaining does not change anything 34.6 per cent are satisfied while 27.27 per cent of those who disagree/strongly disagree with this statement are satisfied.

Thirtyseven per cent of the people who agree/ strongly agree with the statement. I don't know what to do/where to go are satisfied whereas 29.63 per cent of those who disagree/strongly disagree are satisfied.

Of those who agree with the statement "Complaining is necessary to defend our rights", 34.56 per cent are satisfied. Only one person who disagreed is satisfied.

Those who agree/strongly agree with the statement "Complaining is our responsibility" are 90.58 per cent of the sample. Of these, 36.36 per cent are satisfied with bus service.

Of those who agree with the statement that complainers are busy bodies one person is satisfied. While 95.12 per cent of the sample disagree with this statement.

Table 4.37. Relationship Between Satisfaction for Bus Service and Attitude Towards Complaining

	Attitude	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Row Total
It's not worth the time and trouble	Strongly agree	13 42	4 57.1	7 8.4
	Agree	10 34.5	19 65.5	29 34.1
	Disagree	7 43.8	9 56.8	26 19.3
	Strongly disagree	7 22.6	24 77.4	31 37.3
	Column Total	27 32.5	56 67.5	83 100

I don't have time	Strongly Agree	7 41.2	10 58.8	17 20.5
	Agree	11 33.3	22 66.6	33 39.8
	Disagree	7 30.4	16 69.6	23 27.7
	Strongly Disagree	2 20.0	8 80.0	10 12.0
	Column Total	27 32.5	56 67.5	83 100.0

Table 4.37 Continued

	Attitude	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Row Total
Trouble does not change anything	Strongly Agree	3 28.0	12 80.0	15 17.6
	Agree	15 40.5	22 59.5	37 43.5
	Disagree	5 29.4	12 70.6	17 20
	Strongly Disagree	4 25.0	12 75.0	16 18.8
	Column Total	27 31.8	58 68.2	85 100.0

I don't know what to do/ where to go	Strongly Agree	1 33.3	2 66.7	3 3.7
	Agree	9 37.5	15 62.5	24 29.6
	Disagree	7 23.3	23 76.7	30 37.0
	Strongly disagree	9 37.5	15 62.5	24 29.6
	Column Total	26 32.1	55 67.9	81 100

Complaining is necessary to defend our rights	Strongly Agree	22 33.8	43 66.2	65 75.6
	Agree	6 37.5	10 62.5	16 18.6
	Disagree	1 25.0	3 75.0	4 4.7
	Strongly disagree	0	1 100	1 1.2
	Column Total	29 37.7	57 66.3	86 100.0

Complaining is our responsibility	Strongly Agree	20 36.4	35 63.6	55 64.7
	Agree	4 27.3	16 72.7	22 25.9
	Disagree	2 40.0	3 60.0	5 5.5
	Strongly disagree	10	3 100.0	3 3.5
	Column Total	28 32.0	57 67.1	85 100.0

Complainers are Busy bodies	Strongly Agree	0	2 100.0	2 2.4
	Agree	1 50.0	1 50.0	2 2.4
	Disagree	2 15.4	11 84.6	13 15.9
	Strongly disagree	24 36.9	41 63.1	65 79.3
	Column Total	27 32.9	55 67.1	82 100.0

4.13. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Administering the questionnaire did not present too many problems. Basically there was no problem related to the comprehension of the questions. Some sample members had difficulty with the response categories for Question 4. A large proportion, 22.2 per cent of the sample only marked their first preference for the mode of transportation. This did not result in any bias but, has limited more detailed information. Among the sample members with low education level, a hesitancy to criticize public organizations was observed.

Operationalization of complaining behavior question was also limited because it was in nominal form.

The sample size was restricted because of time and recourse. The size of the sample created some problems. Due to a very few number of complainers, sound statistical analysis was not possible in studying relations between complainers and noncomplainers. Basing the sample partly on complaint files could solve this problem. More information on complainers could be obtained through using complaint files.

This sample was initially chosen because the people in the university environment were assumed to be more recourse aware for public services. This was done to get more information about complaining behavior. Because of this the results of the study can not be generalized for the population. Generalization is also difficult for the sample does not represent the population demographically.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the contributions of this study to public service institutions and research and the final conclusions will be stated

5.1. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Despite its limitations, the study has some implications for the public administration in reviewing its policies in regard of consumer demands and for the researcher interested in complaining behavior.

5.1.1. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Those who are to study the topic further are suggested to note the following:

1. There is a very low complaining rate for public services. If this is expected for a study to be undertaken instead of complaining/ notcomplaining, another variable, such as, modes of private complaining could be used.

2. The effect of available alternative modes of transportation on satisfaction was supported in this study. The effect of the alternatives on satisfaction should also be tested for other public services.
3. It was observed that people who did not complain even privately were also in the recourse aware group. A psychographic analysis of private complainers and people who do not complain to anyone can be carried out.
4. Despite the expectations, a positive attitude towards complaining was found. A new approach would be to test the effect of social norms on complaining.
5. There was a negative attitude towards organizational response to complaints related with bus service, water supply, and gas supply. An indepth study could reveal what lies at the bottom of the consumers' perception. Is bureucracy the reason for stopping the consumer from complaining? Or, is it because they have low recourse awareness for the services? Do the consumers think that they can not individually solve anything.
6. A study of complaint handling by public service organizations could be made. An analysis of how the complaints are made and how the responses to these complaints are given and satisfaction of the consumers with the result could be made.
7. The findings show that people who read more newspapers everyday, private complainers with high education, nonmobile, riding the bus at longer distance are more recourse aware. An analysis could be made to determine the type of information consumer wants to get, the information available to him, and where he gets the information he needs from, in relation to public services.
8. This sample consisted mostly of unmarried university student. The results could be compared with the results of a sample consisting mostly of people in their middle ages or of elderly consumers.
9. Further analysis is possible with the available data. Discriminant analysis could be carried between complainers/noncomplainers, sample members satisfied/dissatisfied with bus services, heavy users/light users of the bus service, private complainers/people who do not complain to anyone.
Regression analysis could be made to see the effect of various variables on satisfaction, complaining behavior. Recourse awareness attitudes toward organizational response and toward complaining.
10. While consumer is not aware of the authority to apply, most public service institutions have complaint departments, the response to complaints by these institutions and the effectiveness of these organization in solving problems could prove an interesting study area.

5.1.2. IMPLICATIONS FOR IETT:

The study also has been some implications for the local public bus organization of Istanbul IETT:

1. The major problem with the bus service was observed to be over crowding. IETT has to solve this problem by increasing the number of busses in its fleet or by making available the ferry or the trains on more routes.
2. The IETT should create a positive image in terms of organizational response to complaints to evaluate the needs of the users of its services better. Complaint are always a valuable feedback for an institution for improving its image.
3. IETT should create a effective complaint handling procedure and make use of the incoming data.
4. IETT accounts for 40 per cent of public transportation in Istanbul. The economic weight of private transportation on the state will be diminished by increasing the capacity of the public transportation in Istanbul. More people should be persuaded to travel by the public bus.

Overall, this was an exploratory research. A more indepth study of the afore mentioned variables could provide valuable insight on the subject matter.

5.2. CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

In this study the objectives were to provide exploratory information on satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaining behavior for local bus services. Effects of recourse awareness, alternative public transportation modes, frequency of using the bus and demographics on consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction and complaning behavior were also analyzed. Comparison was made with other public services as a check on complaining related behavior. Attitudes of consumers toward the complaining process and organizational response was also examined.

It was observed in this study that the majority of the sample use the local public bus for commuting around the city. This is also the case for the population of Istanbul as the public bus has the largest transportation capacity and offers transportation on more varied routes than the alternative public transportation modes.

Although bus services is used by 94 per cent of the sample, only 32.6 per cent of the sample are satisfied with the bus service. The main reason for the dissatisfaction is the crowd in the busses, followed by the bus schedule, the number of busses in the service, the behavior of the driver, in that order. Sample members when asked to evaluate the importance of a set criteria for public bus service mentioned the crowd and the waiting time for busses. Keeping up with the schedule, not stopping at bus stops, maintenance of the busses, and the behavior of the bus drivers are considered as the most important issues related with bus service. Distance between bus stops, availability of ticket booths, outlook of the bus stops, knowledgeability of the consumer were thought to be the least important attributes related to bus service.

The fact that there was a higher degree of dissatisfaction and complaining behavior on behalf of light users of bus service, could actually explain the reason for their being light users. The heavy users of the bus service mention more problem related with bus service than the light users. Problem like the distance between bus stops, ticket booths, maintenance of the busses are less frequently mentioned by the light users of bus service.

Distance between home and school/work has an effects on the satisfaction with the bus service. People riding the bus for a shorter duration, that is living near the school/work place are more satisfied with the bus service.

It is interesting to note also that the, public bus transportation is the least preferred public transportation alternative when compared with the ferry and the train. The ferry boat is the most preferred transportation alternative, followed by the train. This is the case for both the heavy and the light users of the bus service. The major problem of the bus service emphasized by those who prefer the ferry is the crowd of the bus. Those who prefer the train emphasize the bus schedule at on equal weight to the crowd. The ferry is less disturbing in terms of crowd and the train usually arrives on time, with more services at rush hours. This explains that satisfaction with the public bus transportation is also effected by the available alternatives.

A very low rate of complaining was observed for both bus service and the other public services under discussion. Although there was a great amount of dissatisfaction with bus service, only 8.8 per cent of the sample complained. This was due to lack of recourse awareness and negative attitude toward organizational response to complaints.

Although significant relations could not be found in relation to all demographics the distribution of the frequencies leads us to make some conclusions on demographics.

Sex does not play a role in complaining about the bus service, whereas, for other services more women complained than men. For all public services more married people complained than unmarried people. People with low education and high income complained for bus service while people with low education and income complained for the gas supply, power supply and garbage collection. Sample members with high income and education complained for water supply and telephone services. Mobile people complained more than people who did not move their homes in the last five years. Teaching members complained more than staff who in turn complained more than students, except for the garbage collection service where the staff members complained the most.

The complaints for the bus service were made mostly to the ground services and the bus drivers. Only one complaint was registered to IETT and the rest of the complainers made personal complaints to the bus driver or another IETT employee. Majority of the sample members stated that if they have a problem with bus service. They will try to resolve it by personally complaining to an authority related with IETT at close reach. Only one sample member mentioned writing a letter to the newspapers. Although there is a positive attitude toward complaining, complaining does not occur very often. Consumer has a negative attitude toward organizational response to the complaints and is not familiar with the authority responsible with complaint handling. Consumer is also not familiar with the set of complaining as he does not have many examples set in front of him so he complains at lower ranks of authority, sometimes just to relieve himself/herself of the tension caused by the problem.

Although consumers do not register complaints to the authorities, a great majority of the sample, 74.4 per cent, talk about service related problems with their friends, colleagues, family and other people they happen to meet at the time.

Out of eight complainers six were light users of the bus service. It was mentioned earlier that light users were more dissatisfied with bus service. This could be interpreted as light users of the bus service as being persons using the bus service less frequently because they are more dissatisfied by bus service than heavy users.

Of the eight sample members who complained for bus service, four complained because of the crowded busses, and the other four complaints were caused by the behavior of the drivers. Bus schedule was considered "very important" by more people in comparison to the behavior of the driver.

But, evidently the behavior of the bus driver induces greater reaction.

It is interesting to note that many people did not answer the question relating to the reason of not complaining and did not report their feelings when they faced a problem situation the fact that seven people felt bored and five people felt helpless when they faced a problem situation is also important. This points out, as the sample members after mentioned, that the problem is repetitive and an everyday issue. The consumers feel that complaining for such an issue is out of place, will not be taken seriously, and will not get any results.

Twenty six per cent of the sample members did not complain for they did not know the authority responsible with complaint handling or did not know what to do for bus service. More of light users of the bus service mentioned a specific recourse taking action than heavy users. More of the heavy users stated unclear authorities to complain, most of the time indicated as "I would go to the authorities". The heavy users, since they were more familiar with bus service thought they knew what to do/ where to go if they had a problem with bus service but they actually did not know.

Those who are recourse aware for bus service are also private complainers for public service problems. Those who do not talk about their problems with anyone have a lower degree of recourse awareness.

Although no significant relationship was found between demographics and recourse awareness, some conclusions can be reached by observing the cells where the majority of the respondents are gathered. Female, married, high educated, people living in Istanbul for the last five years, living at a far/very far distance from the university are more recourse aware for bus service. Teaching members are the most recourse aware group within the sample.

It was also observed that a greater proportion of the complainers read newspapers everyday.

Sample members with positive attitudes toward organizational response to complaints related to bus service are more recourse aware than people with negative attitude.

According to the findings there is a higher level of recourse awareness for services other than public bus service. The highest level of recourse awareness was observed for telephone communications followed by garbage collection and water supply services. For telephone communication and garbage collection there is highly positive attitude towards organizational response for gas supply and power supply there is lower recourse awareness.

This could be because recently there has not been problem with power supply. This was also supported by majority of the sample having a positive attitude toward organizational response for power supply. There is a negative attitude toward organizational response for complaints related with gas supply.

Majority of the sample have a negative attitude toward organizational response to complaints for bus service and water supply. It is because usually problems related with these services can only be solved in the long run. Problems such as crowded busses and water shortage need a long time to resolve.

Heavy users of the bus service have a more positive attitude toward organizational response than light users of the bus service. This could be because light users are more dissatisfied, complain more and are more recourse aware. It could also be due to the heavy users being more committed to the bus service, as they do not really have an alternative.

Sample members between ages 30-39 married, with education level of high school and below, in lower income groups and peoples who moved into Istanbul in the last five years, living at a far/very far distance from school/work have a more positive attitude toward organizational response to complaints for bus service. Students have a more positive attitude while staff members have the most negative attitude toward organizational response to bus service complaints.

Majority of the sample have a positive attitude toward complaining for public services. A large proportion of people with positive attitude toward complaining have a negative attitude toward organizational attitude to complaint.

Organizations should recognize the fact that their first responsibility is to satisfy consumers. In doing this it would be instrumental to set up a body to deal with consumer affairs. Studies by public organizations on consumers perception of their image and finding out problems considered most important by the consumer would help improve their services.

Finally, the consumers must be educated as to their rights and how to defend them.

APPENDIX I.QUESTIONNAIRE

BELEDİYE OTOBÜSLERİ HİZMETLERİ ANKETİ

1. Aşağıda belirtilen kamu araçlarını kullanım ihtiyacınızı (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz

	Tren	Belediye otobüsü trolleybüs	Vapur	Tünel
Her gün				
Haftada 4-5 gün				
Haftada 2-3 gün				
Haftada 1 gün				
Diğer(belirtiniz)				

2. Belediye otobüslerinden memnuniyet dereceniz

Çok memnunum	memnumum	memnun değilim	hiç memnun değilim
--------------	----------	----------------	--------------------

3. Belediye otobüsü hizmetlerinde karşılaştığınız sorunlar nelerdir?

.....
.....
.....

4. Aynı yolda aşağıda belirtilen üç taşıma aracını kullanabilme olanağınız olsa, tercih sıranız ne olurdu?(En çok tercih edilen (1,2.)

Tren	Belediye otobüsü/trolleybüs	Vapur
------	-----------------------------	-------

5.a. Belediye otobüsleri hizmetleri ile ilgili karşılaştığınız tatsız bir olayı anlatırmısınız?

.....
.....

b. Bu durumda ne hissettiniz?.....

6. Bu durumda şikayet ettiniz mi? Evet hayır

Nedenini belirtiniz:.....

(Yanıtınız hayır ise 10. soruya geçiniz)

7. Şikayet edilen yer:.....

Nasıl şikayet ettiniz (yazılı,sözlü, vb)

Sonuç: Olumlu Olumsuz

8. a. Şikayetiniz nasıl sonuçlanacağını bekliyordunuz?.....

b. Şikayetinize yanıt aldınız mı? Evet Hayır

Yanıt almanız ne kadar sürdü?.....

c. Şikayetinizle ilgili sorun çözüme ulaştırıldı mı? Evet Hayır

Şikayetinizin çözüme ulaştırılması ne kadar süre aldı?

9. Şikayetiniz sonuçlandırılma şeklini ne derece yeterli buluyorsunuz?
 Çok yeterli Yeterli Yetersiz Çok yetersiz
10. Belediye otobüsleri hizmetleri ile ilgili bir sorunuz olsaydı nasıl çözümlerdiniz?.....
11. Belediye otobüsü hizmetleri ile ilgili şikayetçi olsanız sonuç alacağınızı düşünür müsünüz?.....
12. Şikayetçi olduğunuz konulardan kimlere bahsedersiniz?.....
13. Otobüs hizmetlerini ilgilendiren aşağıdaki hususların derecesini (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz:

	Çok önemli	Önemli
Bekleme süresi	_____	_____
Kalkış programlarına uyulması	_____	_____
Durakların sıklığı	_____	_____
Durakların görünümü	_____	_____
Bilet satış yerlerinin sıklığı	_____	_____
Bilet parası	_____	_____
Mavi kart uygulaması	_____	_____
Otobüslerin temizliği	_____	_____
Otobüslerin kalabalıklığı	_____	_____
Duraklarda durmama	_____	_____
Sürat/fren	_____	_____
Yolcuların bilgisizliği	_____	_____
Yolcuların davranışları (nazik,kaba,vb)	_____	_____
Şöförün davranışları	_____	_____
Plantonluk(yer hizmetleri) görevlilerinin davranışları	_____	_____
Diğer (belirtiniz);	_____	_____

14.a. Aşağıdaki hizmetlerle ilgili son bir yıl içinde bir sorununuz oldu ise ilgili sütuna (X) işareti koyunuz.

Su Havagazı Elektrik

b. Bu durumda şikayetçi oldunuz mu?

Evet

Hayır

c. Nedenini belirtiniz.....

d. Şikayet edilen yer.....

Nasıl şikayet ettiniz(yazılı, sözlü,vb).....

Sonuç : Olumlu
Olumsuz

15. Aşağıdaki durumlarda kime/nerelere başvururdunuz?

Suların kesilmesi

Havagazının az gelmesi

Elektrik faturasında yanlışlık

Telefon hatlarında karışıklık

Çöplerin toplanmaması

16. Okuduğunuz gazeteler ve okuma sıklığı

Cumhuriyet Günaydın Güneş Hürriyet Milliyet

Her gün

Haftada 4-5 gün

Haftada 2-3 gün

Haftada bir gün

Diğer(belirtiniz)

17. Sizce başkaları kamu hizmetleri (otobüs/trolleybüs,su. vb.) ile ilgili şikayet edenler hakkında ne düşünürler ? Zannediyorum haklı oldukları şikayet sorunlarında haklılar gibi düşünceler oluşur kanısındayım.

18. Haklı nedenlerle olursa şikayet etmek,

	Tamamen aynı fikirdeyim	Kısmen aynı fikirdeyim	Kısmen karşıt fikirdeyim	Tamamen karşıt fikirdeyim
--	-------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

- Zaman ve çaba harcamaya değmez

- İçin zamanım yok

- Uğraşmak hiç bir şeyi değiştirmez

- İçin ne yapacağımı,nereye başvuracağımı bilemem.

- Haklarımızı korumak için gereklidir. X

- Yurttaşlık sorumluluğumuzdur. X

- Ukalalık ve işgüzarlıktır. X

X

X

X

19. Yanıtlayıcı Özellikleri:

- a. Cinsiyet Kadın Erkek
- b. Yaş grubu 20 ve altı 30-49
21-29 50-59
30-39 60ve üstü
- c. Medeni durum: Bekar Evli (kaç yıldan beri): _____
Dul/Boşanmış
- d. Çocuk sayısı :
- e. Eğitim durumunuz İlkokul Ortaokul Lise
Yüksek okul/üniversite Lisans üstü
- f. Ailenizin toplam geliri
20.000 ve altı 51.000-80.000 111.000-150.000
21.000 - 50.000 81.000-110.000 151.000- üstü
- g. Son beş yılda oturduğunuz semt/il.....
- h. Oturduğunuz semt
- i. Boğaziçindeki fakülteniz / göreviniz.....

APPENDIX 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEMOGRAPHICS

	Response Categories	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
V105	a. Sex			
	1. Female	46	51.7	51.7
	2. Male	43	48.3	100.0
		<u>89</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V106	b. Age			
	1. 20 and under	5	5.6	5.6
	2. 21-29	69	76.7	82.2
	3. 30-39	10	11.1	93.3
	4. 40-49	3	3.3	96.7
	5. 50-59	3	3.3	100.0
		<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V107	c. Marital status			
	1. Unmarried	68	75.6	75.6
	2. Married	21	23.3	98.9
	3. Divorced/boşanmış	1	1.1	100.0
		<u>90</u>	<u>100</u>	
V108	d. Married years			
	o. Not married	69	77.5	77.5
	1. 0-1	3	3.4	80.9
	2. 2-5	4	4.5	85.4
	3. 6-10	4	4.5	89.9
	4. 11-15	3	3.4	93.3
	5. 16-19	1	1.1	94.4
	6. 20-up	5	5.6	100.0
	9. Missing	1		
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>		
V109	e. Number of Children			
	0. 0	73	81.1	81.1
	1. 1	8	8.9	90.0
	2. 2	4	4.4	94.4
	3. 3	3	3.3	97.8
	4. 4	1	1.1	98.9
	5. 5 and up	1	1.1	100.0
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>		

APPENDIX 2 CONTINUED

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC

Response Categories	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
V110 f. Education			
1. Elementary school	4	4.5	4.5
2. Middle school	2	2.2	6.7
3. High school	12	13.5	19.2
4. College/University	57	64.0	83.2
5. Graduate	14	15.8	100.0
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V111 g. Net monthly income(TL)			
1. 20.000 under	2	2.3	2.3
2. 21.000-50.000	13	14.5	16.8
3. 51.000-80.000	12	13.5	30.3
4. 81.000-110.000	22	24.7	55.0
5. 111.000-150.000	16	18.0	73.0
6. 151.000 and above	24	27.0	100.0
	<u>89</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V112 h. Mobility			
1. not moved in the last five years	61	68.5	68.5
2. Moved in Istanbul	17	19.1	87.6
3. Moved into Istanbul	11	12.4	100.0
9. Missing	1	Missing	100.0
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V113 i. Distance between home and the university			
1. Very near	34	38.2	38.2
2. Near	14	15.7	53.9
3. Far	29	32.6	86.5
4. Very far	12	13.5	100.0
9. Missing	1	Missing	
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
V114 j. Status at the university			
1. Teaching member	15	16.7	16.7
2. Student	52	57.8	74.4
3. Staff	23	25.6	100.0
	<u>90</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

APPENDIX:3: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECOURSE AWARENESS FOR BUS SERVICE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:

	Recourse Awareness	Don't know	Unclear Recourse	Specific Recourse	Row Total
Sex	Female	14 30.4%	15 32.6%	17 37.0%	46 51.7%
	Male	20 46.5	12 27.9	11 25.6%	43 48.3
	Column Total	34 38.2	27 30.3	28 31.5	89 100.0
Age	29 and below	27 36.5	25 33.8	22 29.7	74 82.2
	30-39	4 40.0	1 10.0	5 50.0	10 11.1
	40 and above	3 50.0	1 16.6	2 33.3	6 6.6
	Column total	34 33.3	27 30.0	29 32.0	90 100.0
Marital Status	Unmarried	25 36.8	22 32.4	21 30.8	68 76.4
	Married	9 42.8	4 19.1	8 38.1	21 23.6
	Column Total	34 55.0	26 29.2	29 32.6	89 100.0
Education	High school and below	6 17.6	24 70.6	5 14.8	34 37.7
	University	7 25.6	16 59.3	4 4.8	27 30.0
	Graduate	6 20.7	17 58.6	6 20.7	29 32.2
	Column total	18 20.0	57 63.3	15 16.6	90 100.0
Income	Il 20.000 and less	1 33.3	1 33.3	1 33.3	3 3.3
	21.000-50.000	3 23.1	7 53.8	3 23.1	13 14.4
	51.000-80.000	4 33.3	5 41.6	3 25.0	12 13.3
	81.000-110.000	10 45.5	5 22.7	7 31.8	22 24.4
	111.000-150.000	6 37.5	4 25.6	6 37.5	16 17.7
	151.000 and above	10 41.6	5 20.8	9 37.6	24 26.6
	Column total	34 37.7	27 30	29 32.3	90 100.0
Distance	Very near	15 44.1	7 20.5	12 35.4	34 38.2
	Near	5 35.7	6 42.8	3 21.5	14 15.7
	Far	10 34.5	7 24.1	12 41.4	29 32.6
	Very near	4 33.3	6 50	2 16.7	12 13.5
	Column total	34 38.2	26 29.2	29 32.6	89 100.0
Mobility	Did not move in the last five years	22 64.7	8 23.5	4 11.9	34 38.2
	Moved within Istanbul	18 89.2	6 23.1	2 7.7	26 29.2
	Moved into Istanbul	21 33.4	3 10.3	5 17.3	29 32.6
	Column total	61 68.6	17 19.1	11 12.3	89 100.0
Position at B.U.	Teaching member	5 33.3	4 26.6	6 40.1	15 16.6
	Student	22 42.3	15 28.8	15 28.9	52 57.8
	Staff member	7 30.4	8 34.8	8 34.8	23 25.6
	Column total	34 37.7	27 30.0	29 32.3	90 100

6. REFERENCES

1. Bateson, John E.G. "Do We Need Services Marketing". Marketing Consumer Services: New Insights. Marketing Science Institute. USA 1977 pp 1-29
2. Bearden, William O. and Melissa Crockett. "Self-Monitoring Norms and Attitudes as Influencing on Consumer Complaining". Journal of Business Research. 9, 1981 pp. 255-266
3. Bearden, William O. and Jesse E. Teel. "Selected Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction and Complaint Reports". Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. XX February 1983. pp. 21-28
4. Beltramini, Richard F. "Consumer-Client Orientation and Public Service Marketing". European Journal of Marketing. Vol. 15, 4. pp. 17-25
5. Bodur, Muzaffer, Working Paper, Marketing Department, Indiana University, Indianapolis, 1976.
6. Bodur, Muzaffer; Borak, Eser and Kemal Kurtuluş. "A Comparative Study of Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior with Consumer Services: Bloomington and İstanbul". New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University, Missouri, 1980, pp. 73-80
7. Day, Ralph L. and S. Ash. "Comparison of Patterns of satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior for Durables, Nondurables and Services." New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Consumer Behavior. Indiana University, Illinois, 1978 pp. 190-198.
8. Day, Ralph L. and E.L. London, Jr. "Toward A Theory of Consumer Complaining Behavior". Consumer and Industrial Buying Behavior. Woodside, A.G. Sheath J. and Peter D. Berret (eds.) Elsevier, USA. 1977 pp. 427-437
9. Day, Ralph L. and Muzaffer Bodur "A Comprehensive Study of Satisfaction with Consumer Services" Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Consumer Behavior. Indiana University, Indianapolis, 1977 pp. 64-74
10. Engel, James F; Blackwell, Roger D. and David T. Kollat. Consumer Behavior. Dryden Press, Illinois, 1978 pp. 491-489
11. Gilly, Mary C. and Betsy D. Gelb. "Post Purchase Consumer Processes and The Complaining Consumer" Journal of Consumer Research. Vol. 9. December, 1982 PP
12. Grabiske, Klaus; Schaetzle, Thomas and Fritz Staubäch. "The Influence of Personality Factors on Complaining Behavior" New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University, Missouri, 1980, pp. 73-80

13. Howard, John A. and Jagdish N. Sheath. The Theory of Buyer Behavior. John Willy and Sons. Inc. Columbia University, 1969
14. Hunt, H. Keith. "Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction: Bits and Pieces" Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior. Indiana University, Indianapolis, 1977 pp.38-42
15. İETT, unpublished article 1983
16. Kasper, Hans. "Corporate Perceptions of Dissatisfied Consumers' Behavior: An Empirical Study" New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University, Missouri, 1980 pp. 32-36
17. Kotler, Philip and R.A. Connor, Jr. "Marketing Professional Services" Journal of Marketing. January 1977. pp. 71-76.
18. Koç, Ahmet N. Hizmetlerin Pazarlanması Bosphorous University, İstanbul, 1981, Unpublished Thesis.
19. Kraft, Frederick B. "Assessing Research in Organizational Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior." New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University, Missouri, 1980. pp 112-116
20. Lawther, Karen; Krinshnan, S. and Valerie A. Valle. "The Consumer Complaint Process: Directions for Theoretical Development." New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Consumer Behavior. Indiana University, Illinois 1978. pp 10-15
21. Levitt, T. "Production Line Approach to Service" Harvard Business Review. Sept-Oct., 1972 pp.41-53
22. Lewis, Barbara R. "The Personal Account Sector" European Journal of Marketing. Vol. 16. No.3, 1983 pp. 14-22
23. Levy, Danna and Carol Suprenant. "A Comparison of Responses to Dissatisfaction with Products and Services." New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University, Missouri, 1980. pp.73-80
24. Richins, Marsha L. "Negative Word-of-Mouth by Dissatisfied Consumers: A Pilot Study" Journal of Marketing, Winter 1983, Vol.47, pp.68-78
25. Robinson, Larry M. "Consumer Complaint Behavior: A Review with Implications for Future Research." New Dimensions of Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior. Indiana University, Illinois, 1978. pp 41-50
26. Swan, John E. "Consumer Satisfaction with Retail Store Related to the Fulfillment of Expectations on an Initial Shopping Trip." Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Consumer Behavior. Indiana University, Indianapolis, 1977.

- 71
27. Swan, John E. and Grederick Trarwick. "Satisfaction and Alternatives:"
New Findings on Consumer Satisfaction and Complaining. Indiana University,
Missouri, 1980. pp 17-23
 28. Taylor, Thayer C. "Selling the Services Society". The Marketing Magazine.
March 6, 1972. pp. 23-38
 29. Wall, M.; Dickey, L.E., and W.W. Talarzyk. "Predicting and Profilling Consumer
Satisfaction and Propersity to Complain." Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfac-
tion and Complaining Behavior Indiana University, Indianapolis, 1977 pp. 91-102
 30. Warland, H. Rex. " A Typology of Consumer Complaints." Consumer Satisfaction/
Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior. Indiana University, Indianapolis,
1977 pp. 144