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Abstract
Consumer complaint behavior (CCB) is closely related to consumer satisfaction and is a behavior of consumers in case of dissatisfaction. In some instances, consumers may remain silent and take no action, even if they are dissatisfied with the product or service they have purchased. However, most of the time, consumers exhibit complaint behavior, and they could take various actions. Because of the differences in their actions, many taxonomies and models have been proposed in the literature. Although CCB has been studied by many researchers, the current state of knowledge and the evolution of CCB are still lacking, and the question as to how much research exists on different actions of CCB remains unanswered. Therefore, this study proposes a systematic, comprehensive, up-to-date, and chronological review of CCB. The systematic review process was conducted by following a keyword approach. Web of Science, Scopus, and EBSCOhost were used as the search databases. 195 articles published between the years 1977-2017 were analyzed to answer the research questions of the study. Those articles have published in journals with various disciplinary backgrounds, and they are mostly empirical studies (178 out of 195 articles). Surveys are the most common data collection method among those empirical studies. Exit/boycott, negative word of mouth (NWOM), and voice are the most frequently studied responses in the literature.
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1. Introduction
The consumer complaint behavior (CCB) is a research area which deals with the analysis and identification of all the aspects regarded in the consumer reaction who gets a bad experience about a product, service or brand, and the consequent perceived dissatisfaction (Butelli, 2007; Richard and Adrian, 1995). In recent years, the development of technology has increased the importance of customer complaints. Traditional customer complaint typically happens in a face-to-face context. However, with customer complaint in online platforms such as discussion forums, product reviews, blogs, and other social sites, participants engage in...
communication with a network of people in online societies where conversations are more effective or visible (King et al., 2014). According to Jasper and Waldhart (2013), using the internet instead of traditional means has increased the likelihood of complaint behavior.

CCB is defined as a function of dissatisfaction (Heung and Lam, 2003) which is any negative expression made by former or actual customers about a product, service or brand (King et al., 2014). Previous research has investigated several types of CCB such as warning friend about product and seller (Johnson et al., 2010; Ndubisi and Ling, 2006), complaining in discussion forums (Andreasen and Streukens, 2009), seeking redress directly from business (Mattila and Wirtz, 2004; Panda, 2014; Weber and Sparks, 2004), boycotting seller or brands (Hirschman, 1970; Kim et al., 2014), and complaint to agencies (Yen, 2016).

CCB has attracted the attention of researchers since the 1970s. One of the earliest taxonomies of CCB was proposed by Hirschman (1970) with three types of responses which called “exit”, “voice” and “loyalty”. "Exit" implies that the customer avoids buying from the firm; "voice" is defined as the circumstance in which the buyer straightforwardly reports his/her disappointment to the firm, and "loyalty" is identified as taking no action. At that point, Ndubisi and Ling (2006) cite Day and Landon's (1977) arrangement of complaint behavior with a two-level progressive order. The primary dimension discriminates action from non-action and the second dimension differentiates between private and public action. Seeking redress directly from business, inducing legal actions, and taking direct complaint actions to the firm or third-party complaint can be considered as public actions (Heung and Lam, 2003). Private activities can be counted as changing brands and firms, boycotting a brand’s items, and NWOM communications to acquaintances (Kitapci and Dortyol, 2009).

Taking it one step further, Singh (1988) proposed another taxonomy by including “Loyalty/No Action” category under voice responses: Voicers who directly complain to the firm or take no action, irates who choose to take private actions, and activists who partake in the formal third-party complaint. There are different taxonomies proposed by other researchers (Boote, 1998; Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017; Mattila and Wirtz, 2004; Ndubisi and Ling, 2006; Panda, 2014; Son, 2008) but most of the empirical and conceptual research on CCB evolved around those basic models mentioned above (Gupta and Sharma, 2015; Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017). Among those basic models, the framework of Day and Landon (1977) is assumed to be a cornerstone because they provided a useful and generally well-received framework to understand the types of complaining actions (Gyasi, 2012; Panda, 2014; Singh, 1988; Stephens and Gwinner, 1998).

Although the literature in this area is rich, and many taxonomies and models are proposed to explain CCB, questions as to how much research exists on different actions of CCB and what are the possible directions for future research remain unanswered. By providing a comprehensive literature review on CCB, it discussed how CCB has evolved from Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy over time and which behavioral activities are heavily mentioned as complaining actions in the CCB literature.

We present a review of CCB research published within the literature in the following pages. First, we introduce the methodology and the organizing framework for the analysis used in the current study. Next, we report the main findings and discussion. Finally, the article ends with limitations and directions for future research.
2. Methodology and Organizing Framework

The systematic review process was conducted to answer the main research questions of this literature review:

RQ1: What is the current state of knowledge of CCB after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy?

RQ2: How has Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy evolved over time?

More specifically, the sub-questions derived from Day and Landon’s (1977) model were analyzed in detail in this literature review:

RQ3: How is the distribution of articles by journals and years?

RQ4: What is the disciplinary background of the journal publications?

RQ5: What types of articles published about CCB more heavily?

RQ6: What are the data collection methods in those CCB studies?

RQ7: Which behavioral activities are heavily mentioned as complaining actions in the CCB literature?

This study utilized a “keyword” approach consistent with other review studies (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017; King, Racherla and Bush, 2014; Pomirleanu et al., 2013; Rodriguez et al., 2014). The following terms “consumer complaining behaviour”, “consumer complaining behavior”, “consumer complaint”, “negative word of mouth”, “NWOM”, “N-WOM”, “negative consumer review”, “online complaint”, “negative product review”, “negative online review” were used in the search process. Those terms were selected to ensure that as many articles as possible related to CCB would be reached.

In addition to Web of Science, Scopus and EBSCOhost were also selected as the search databases. EBSCOhost is selected because of its extensive coverage of journals and its link to ABI/INFORM articles (Rodriguez et al., 2014), and SCOPUS is selected because of its high coverage of academic texts (approximately 95%) (Salo, 2017). Those key terms were searched in the topic or title of the articles in Web of Science; in the title, keyword or abstract in Scopus; and in the title, abstract or subject in EBSCOhost. Furthermore, to identify the papers inspired from Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy, we circumscribed the study to articles published between the years 1977-2017. We eliminated the articles that do not base on the Day and Landon’s (1977) complaint model.

The literature search was conducted during September of 2017 and yielded 318 articles from Web of Science; 85 articles from Scopus and 505 from EBSCOhost. It was seen that same articles were obtained from different databases, so unique articles were determined for further analysis. Therefore, the same articles were eliminated, and 511 unique articles which were published in peer-reviewed academic journals and written in English were selected.

65 out of 511 articles were not reached. A total of 446 articles were read in full by the authors and structured around the following headings: Study (author and year); Keywords; Based on the Day and Landon’s (1977) basic model (yes/no); Article Type (empirical/conceptual/pure literature review); Data Collection Methods (survey/experimental/secondary data/interview/observation/panel data/more than one
methods) for empirical studies; Types of CCB (no action/exit or boycott/NWOM/ redress seeking/take legal action/complain to agency/complain to firm); New Actions (noted down if new action was discussed in the article). In order to determine the articles related to Day and Landon’s (1977) model, we searched for the Day and Landon (1977) or Singh (1988) in the references; or the actions proposed by those studies.

First, 20 articles were read and analyzed by all authors for comparing the interpretations, analyses, and classification of the authors. They discussed those 20 articles thoroughly and solved the disagreements to ensure consistency in response. The authors carried out all the coding procedure simultaneously via Google Sheets.

Final article set is obtained by eliminating those articles which were not based on the Day and Landon’s (1977) basic model and were not have full-text access. Among 511 articles, 251 of them are not based on the Day and Landon’s (1977) model, and 65 of them do not have full-text access. Therefore, the final article set is composed of 195 articles. The search process is summarized in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Search process to identify articles](image)

3. **Background**

Dissatisfied consumers who are loyal to the seller or not passive may show a range of possible reactions. Those reactions may be classified as public or private complaint actions. In private complaint actions, consumers use their channels to complain to the firm to their friends and relatives (Day and Landon, 1977). This group of consumers is also classified as “voicers” by Singh (1990). They may not voice their complaints to the service provider, but they may “engage in NWOM, which is invisible to the service provider and not easily influenced” (Singh and Wilkes, 1996). Private complaining actions are usually used to convey NWOM communication.

Besides that, complaining channels can also be used for public actions. Public actions include individuals and associations outside the consumer’s gathering in more formal ways such as making a complaint to the dealer or maker, to constitutional agency or public consumer protection association, or to a private consumer agency (Davidow and Dacin, 1997). The main purpose of these complaints is to “recover the economic loss by getting an
exchange or a refund and rebuild self-image” (Krapfel, 1985). These complainers are classified as “irates” according to Singh (1990).

Consumers who perceive the higher overall utility of complaining prefer engaging in public actions rather than private actions (Meng et al., 2010). While public actions can be easily recognized by the firms, private actions are not easily identified (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017). Besides, public actions may lead to resolution of the problems, but private responses may impact the source of dissatisfaction (Bearden, 1983).

As mentioned above, this paper analyzed which behavioral activities based on Day and Landon’s (1997) model are heavily mentioned as complaining actions in the CCB literature. Specific forms of private and public actions are presented in the following. However, before those actions, we discussed silent consumers who show no action responses.

3.1 No Action

No action responses are separated from action responses in the literature. “No action” term was used by Day and Landon (1977) to describe whether consumers complain or not. Singh (1988) used “non-behavioral” term instead of “no action” to describe non-complaining behavior. When dissatisfied consumers are loyal to the sellers and assume that complaining is fruitless, they take no action (Boote, 1998; Hirschman, 1970; Zussman, 1983). Taking no action is a way of response as controlled coping or mental disengagement (Mattila and Ro, 2008), and forgetting (Ee Kim and Lehto, 2012; Liu and McClure, 2001; Panda, 2014) and repression (Francken, 1983) the experience.

The high cost of the complaint, insufficient ability of the consumer to undertake complaint action, or contextual resources may be the factors of no action behavior (Mikhaylov et al., 2016). Consumers who have favorable feelings toward the company engage in no action (Lee and Song, 2010). Ro (2015) revealed four dimensions of reasons for uncompaining as time and effort, compassionate trust, lack of responsiveness, and social pressure. The terms “inertia” (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017; Mattila and Ro, 2008; Ranaweera and Menon, 2013), “inactivity” (Broadbridge and Marshall, 1995; Kaur and Sharma, 2015), “silence” (Kaur and Sharma, 2015; Kim et al., 2014; Lee and Song, 2010) and “inaction inertia” (Chen et al., 2010) are commonly used to define the responses of those passive consumers (Singh, 1990).

3.2 Private Actions

According to the hierarchical framework proposed by Day and Landon (1977), private actions include boycotting the seller and spreading NWOM.

3.2.1 Exit or Boycott

One of the private actions is boycotting the seller or brand switching, voluntary termination of using product/service or stopping patronage. Consumers may personally boycott the product class and quit using that kind of product (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017). Some consumers can be vocal, and they often engage in NWOM with their friends and relatives before boycotting (Breitsohl and Garrod, 2016). In more extreme cases, they may disseminate their dissatisfaction via the company’s website or social media before boycotting (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017).

Consumers usually boycott the stores/sellers/brands when they have difficulties in problem resolution, such as long delay or poor service and perceive the brand as unreliable
(Broadbridge and Marshall, 1995). Those consumer boycotts and service complaints are the most common form of online complaints and may negatively affect companies’ reputations and brand equity (Beneke et al., 2016; Swinberhe et al., 2009; Tuzovic, 2010). Therefore, response strategies for those boycotting behaviors are important (Lee and Song, 2010), especially when companies encountered with a hostile way of boycotting, sabotage intentions (Jones et al., 2007; Soscia, 2007; Tuzovic, 2010).

3.2.2 Negative Word of Mouth

Another private action proposed by Day and Landon (1977) is NWOM communication to friends and relatives. Unlike Day and Landon (1977), Richins (1983) and Singh (1990) categorized NWOM under possible three categories of complaint behaviors, namely, exit, voice, or NWOM. Angry customers sometimes tend to act in retaliation and engage in vindictive NWOM, which is so aggressive (Gelbrich, 2010). Among the responses due to the dissatisfaction, NWOM communication has taken less attention from the firms because it does not deal directly to the firms (Mardhiyah et al., 2013). However, understanding NWOM behavior of consumers is important for firms because this behavior is common complaining to service failures (Wan, 2013) and similar to exit/boycott, it is invisible to the firms (Gyasi, 2012). Therefore, in addition to exit/boycott behavior, NWOM behavior or “bad-mouthing” is also detrimental for firms because it does not submit easily to influence strategies (Singh, 1990) and have strong effects in the long run (Mardhiyah et al., 2013). However, recent improvements of communication channels empower firms to detect displeased customers who spread NWOM via social channels to their acquaintances, friends, and family (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017).

3.3 Public Actions

According to the hierarchical framework proposed by Day and Landon (1977), public actions include seeking redress from business, taking legal action, or complaining to private or public agencies. As opposed to private actions, the company can notice public actions (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017).

3.3.1 Seek Redress Directly from Business

One of the public actions is seeking redress (refund) directly from businesses. Consumers who seek redress directly or indirectly from the firms are in the hope of obtaining some form of compensation (Day and Landon, 1977). Dissatisfaction is not a sufficient driver for consumers to seek redress (Yen, 2016). Different factors are effective in the consumer’s intention to seek redress. Perceived likelihood of success (firm’s willingness to remedy the problem) or the customer's estimation of how likely corrective actions are taken by the firms is the major factor that affects the consumer’s decision to seek redress (Blodgett and Anderson, 2000; Day and Landon, 1977; Richins, 1983). Dissatisfied consumer’s general attitude toward complaining (Ashley and Varki, 2009; Stephens and Gwinner, 1998) and level of loyalty (Hirschman, 1970) are other factors. Angry consumers sometimes engage in vindictive complaining, which is defined as an aggressive type of “voice response” of Singh’s (1988) model. Dissatisfied customers may abuse or castigate the employees in this response (Gelbrich, 2010).

It is beneficial for firms to encourage their customers to seek redress because those customers give the opportunity to discover and remedy the problems (Blodgett and Anderson, 2000; Broadbridge and Marshall, 1995). Also, if a firm does not recognize unhappy customer, it could be mean losing that customer forever, and losing his/her future
profit as well which is destructive in the long run (Chebat et al., 2010). Keeping existing customers satisfied is more cost-efficient than finding new ones (Zheng et al., 2009).

3.3.2 Take Legal Action

Another public action provided by Day and Landon (1977) is taking legal action. Taking legal action and complain to public or private agencies are also categorized under third party actions (Singh, 1980). Most of the literature mentioned taking legal action response under third party actions. If the responses of dissatisfied customers compose a continuum, doing nothing and taking legal action becomes the most extreme points. Taking legal action is the final way for a dissatisfied customer because it is the most costly way of complaining (Gyasi, 2012; Huang et al., 1996).

3.3.3 Complain to Public or Private Agencies

Public action is also utilized to express complaints to public and private agencies (third parties) (Day and Landon, 1977). There are several alternatives, such as government, consumer organizations, or mass media. Parties mentioned are not directly involved in the disappointing exchange (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017; Singh, 1988). Similar to redress seeking action, the main aim of the consumers for complaining public or private agencies is to seek the remedy. If the consumer thinks that agencies could assist the consumer, s/he may not seek redress from other parties.

Online complaining is a new way of complaining to public or private agencies and defined as “a form of divorce that is announced publicly” (Grégoire et al., 2009; 2011). An online complaint message can be easily disseminated among other consumers via online complaint sites. Therefore, managing online complaint behavior is essential for firms (Lee and Song, 2010).

4. Results and Discussion

197 studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) were identified to be analyzed. Then, those articles were analyzed around the determined headings. The current state of knowledge of CCB and the distribution of articles by journals and by years were discussed respectively. Then, the types of articles and data collection methods of empirical articles were examined. Finally, heavily mentioned behavioral activities in the CCB literature were argued.

RQ 1: What is the current state of knowledge of CCB after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy?

This study presents a broad understanding of the current state of knowledge of CCB after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy by conducting a comprehensive literature review. 511 scientific articles were reached by searching with the key terms in Web of Science, Scopus and EBSCOhost databases. 65 out of 511 articles were not reached, and 195 out of 446 articles were found related to Day and London’s (1977) dichotomy. The current state of knowledge of CBB after Day and London’s (1977) dichotomy points out that the study of CCB progressed steadily over the years and mentioned heavily by the researchers from marketing and consumer. Answers of the following research questions also contribute to the understanding of the current state of knowledge of CCB after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy.

RQ 2: How has Day and London’s (1977) dichotomy evolved over time?
Distribution of articles by years demonstrated that the investigation of CCB advanced consistently over the years, particularly after 2010, even though the literature is said to be mature (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017). This finding is related to the predominance of web-based social networking and extreme utilization of online channels as a complaining channel. Notably, online CCB has gained more importance recently in the research area.

RQ 3: How is the distribution of articles by journals and years?

The literature search resulted in 195 articles which appeared in 95 different journals with various disciplines (Table 1). The largest number of articles about CCB were related to marketing and consumer studies (44.10%). It is followed by business and management studies (18.97%) and tourism and hospitality (17.95%) disciplines. When the journals are analyzed in detail, it is seen that CCB studies have accumulated in International Journal of Hospitality Management (11) and Journal of Business Research (9). Other five following journals are: European Journal of Marketing (6), International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management (6), Journal of Consumer Marketing (6), Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management (6), Journal of Services Marketing (6), and Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Consumer Studies</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Informatics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of articles by the years showed that the study of CCB progressed steadily throughout the years. Although CCB literature is said to be mature (Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017), it is seen that there are many studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model published in the recent years, especially after the year 2010. This finding is associated with the prevalence of social media and the excessive use of online channels as the complaining medium. Since the customers also use both online channels in addition to offline mediums to disseminate their dissatisfaction today, online CCB which was an ignored research area scholarly (Lee and Cude, 2012; Lee and Song, 2010) gained importance in the recent years.

RQ4: What is the disciplinary background of the journal publication?

As it could be inferred from Figure 2, the distribution of articles by journals implied that complaint behavior is mostly in scope of the marketing and consumer, business and management, and tourism and hospitality disciplines, however; there are few articles about CCB in the field of communication and informatics (17), psychology (8) and economics (2).

RQ5: What types of articles published about CCB more heavily?

The articles are categorized into three types, namely, empirical, conceptual, and pure literature review. Among 195 articles, there are 178 empirical works (please see appendices
for more details), 14 conceptual studies (Birim et al., 2016; Blodgett and Anderson, 2000; Boote, 1998; Bradley et al., 2015; Breitsohl et al., 2010; Donoghue and De Klerk, 2009; Gyung Kim et al., 2010; Halstead, 1993; Hunt, 1991; Huppertz, 2003; Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017; Jacoby and Jaccard, 1981; Krapfel, 1985; LaForge, 1989) and 3 pure literature review studies (Panda, 2014; Richins, 1984; Zavrsnik, 2013).

Figure 2: Distribution of article topics by years

Those conceptual models are built upon the model of Day and Landon (1977) and Singh (1988); and some of them aim to propose a new taxonomy for consumer complaining behavior (Boote, 1998; Istanbulluoglu et al., 2017). Some conceptual models are proposed to consider online complaint management (Bradley et al., 2015; Breitsohl et al., 2010). Antecedents of CCB are discussed by some conceptual papers (Huppertz, 2003; Jacoby and Jaccard, 1981; Krapfel, 1985). Blodgett and Anderson (2000) also discussed the antecedents of CCB by considering the perceived likelihood of successful complaining. Besides, Birim et al. (2016) proposed a business performance model by linking the antecedents of consumer complaints to business performance in the airline industry. Halstead (1993) criticized consumer satisfaction programs by emphasizing the linkage between consumer complaint rates and satisfaction. LaForge (1989) explained the elderly consumer complaint behavior by considering the theory of learned helplessness. Donoghue and De Klerk (2009) proposed a theoretical, conceptual framework to understand CCB and its ways to manage in emerging economies. Finally, Gyung Kim et al. (2010) and Hunt (1991) proposed a framework to deal with dissatisfied customers.

**RQ 6: What are the data collection methods in those CCB studies?**

Data collection methods associated with empirical CCB studies were analyzed. Over fifty percent of articles (100 out of 178) were prepared with the data gathered by face-to-face, administered, or mail/online surveys. In 28 articles (15.7%), experimental research was conducted. Secondary data was used in only 14 articles (7.9%), and interviews were used in only 4 articles (2.2%). 32 articles (18%) utilized more than one of the data collection methods.
methods. Surveys were accompanied by experimental design in 16 articles, by interviews in 8 articles, by secondary data in 7 articles and by observational research in one article (Figure 3 and appendices shows the articles’ data collection methods in detail).

**RQ 7: Which behavioral activities are heavily mentioned as complaining behavior actions in the CCB literature?**

The results showed that 63 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “no action” responses of consumers. 38 out of 63 studies conducted surveys to gather data. This finding showed that “no action” response is studied less than other responses in the literature (compared to public or private actions, see appendices). Boote (1998) and Voorhees et al. (2006) also mentioned that no action responses are not commonly discussed in the CCB literature.

58 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “decide to stop buying product or boycott seller” responses of consumers. 29 out of 58 studies conducted surveys to gather data. Similar to “no action” response, this private action took little attention of the researchers and proposed as a future research area (Fan et al., 2015; Soscia, 2007). Exit/boycott is the least costly way of expressing dissatisfaction, among other responses from the consumer’s side (Chebat et al., 2010). However, from the firm’s side, this action is invisible and very dangerous and brings about decreases in sales and profits in the long run (Soscia, 2007).

![Figure 3: Number of articles according to action type and data collection method](image)

102 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “NWOM” responses of consumers. 59 out of 102 studies conducted surveys to gather data. Consistent with our results, other studies (Chelminski and Coulter, 2007; Joireman et al., 2015) also mentioned that NWOM response is intensively studied in the literature and one of the most prevalent modes of complaining. In addition, the main use of private complaining channels is usually conveying NWOM communication (Gyasi, 2012).
The reasons behind this situation are as follows: First, the effect size of NWOM is greater than other responses. According to Blodgett et al. (1995), 77% of all non-complainers engaged in NWOM, whereas only 48% of complainers engaged in NWOM, and dissatisfied customers may communicate NWOM to more than five people. Second, the likelihood of NWOM is higher than the likelihood of voicing among consumers (redress seeking directly from business). Third, the dissemination of NWOM becomes online and more extensive (Mardhiyah et al., 2013; Podnar and Javernik, 2012; Weitzl and Hutzinger, 2017). Fourth, NWOM is one of the least effort-intensive responses among the various complaint behaviors (Moon et al. 2017). NWOM is also mentioned as an action after complaining to the firm (Williams and Buttle, 2011).

The results showed that 84 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “seeking redress directly from business” responses of consumers. 40 out of 84 studies conducted surveys to gather data. It is seen that “seeking redress directly from business” is used interchangeably with “complaint” in some studies. Furthermore, in daily life, when one talks about “complaints”, it is the first to think about the direct complaint to the firm.

15 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “taking legal action” responses of consumers. 8 out of 15 studies conducted surveys to gather data. This action took little attention of the researchers because it is one of the least observed response among dissatisfied customers.

The results showed that 43 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated the response of “complaining to public or private agencies”. 17 out of 43 studies conducted surveys to gather data, and 9 out of 43 studies used secondary data. For the analysis of “complain to public and private agencies” response, secondary data such as databases of public agencies (Cornwell et al., 1991) or online platforms (Durão, 2011; Memarzadeh and Chang, 2015; Tuzovic, 2010) were used. However, this response is also studied less than other responses such as seeking redress from businesses or private responses because it is difficult to access the documented complaints of agencies and third-party organizations (McAlister and Erffmeyer, 2003). Finally, 32 papers among 178 empirical studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model investigated “all actions” in one paper (See appendices for all possible responses, the studies investigated those responses and the data collection method of those studies).

5. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive literature review on CCB to show the current state of knowledge and evolution of CCB after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy. 511 articles about CCB were obtained from Web of Science, Scopus, and EBSCOhost databases by adopting a keyword searching approach. 65 articles were not reached, and 446 articles were read in full to determine whether the article is related to Day and Landon’s (1977) model. As a result, 195 articles were analyzed to answer the sub-questions of the study: the distribution of articles by journals and years, types of articles (conceptual, empirical or pure literature review), data collection methods and heavily mentioned behavioral activities as complaining actions.

CCB is heavily mentioned in the journals of marketing and consumer, and business and management studies. The largest number of articles about this issue is published in the journals of International Journal of Hospitality Management and Journal of Business
Research. It is concluded from journal distribution that the research articles were distributed over journals from different disciplinary backgrounds which shows that CCB is a research area which has an interdisciplinary character, ranging from marketing and consumer studies to psychology and economics. There are many studies based on Day and Landon’s (1977) model published in recent years, especially after the year 2010, which is the effect of online CCB on the literature.

The categorization of articles in three types, namely, empirical, conceptual, and pure literature review showed that there is a lack of literature review studies in this area. More than 90% of the articles (178 out of 195) are empirical studies. Those empirical studies generally conducted research by collecting data from surveys (100 out of 178). Other data collection methods of the studies are experimental research, secondary data, interviews, and observation.

Possible complaining behavior actions of Day and Landon’s (1977) model are “no action”, “exit or boycott”, “NWOM”, “seeking redress directly from business” and “taking legal action” and “complaining to public or private agencies”. The analysis of which behavioral activities are heavily mentioned as complaining actions in the CCB literature illustrated that similar to the findings Marquis and Filiatrault (2002), exit/boycott, NWOM, and voice are the CCB types that appear most frequently in the CCB literature. The results also showed that “taking legal action” is the least studied action in the literature.

Complaining may be in different forms other than Day and Landon’s (1997) actions. Dissatisfied and angry consumers may engage in retaliation, which is a form of revenge (Boote, 1998). There are various types of retaliation such as vindictive complaining (Gelbrich, 2010; Grégoire et al., 2009; Harris, 2013; Tuzovic et al., 2014), vindictive NWOM (Gelbrich, 2010), illegal actions such as theft, threat, and vandalism (Johnson et al., 2010). From the firms’ perspective, silent consumers are the most destructive dissatisfied ones for the firms because they can be transformed into silent killers. Silent killers are reluctant to voice their dissatisfaction and changes firm or brand and spread NWOM (Hamzelu et al., 2017).

6. Directions for Future Research and Limitations

Since online complaint behavior has gained much attention by academic research in the recent years (Yen, 2016), there are many studies that include online consumer responses such as online NWOM, or online complaints to public or private agencies in the literature. Therefore, future research may focus on the development of online complaining behavior after Day and Landon’s (1977) dichotomy. The findings also indicated that many studies empirically examined a theoretical framework stemming from conceptual works. Furthermore, there is a lack of literature review studies on this topic. Thus, future studies may conduct a meta-analysis to summarize findings from empirical research about consumers’ various responses to dissatisfaction.

From the management point of view, future work may focus on detecting which kind of complaint behavior is the most damaging for a business and how it differentiates from one industry to another. So, there could be a way for firms to take precautions accordingly. Besides, future studies may carry out another analysis to classify the relationship between the consumer type, their demographic features, and their choice of complaint channel. It would be essential to detect this relationship; in this way, firms can monitor and strengthen their communication channels according to their target group.

As mentioned in the discussion section, ‘taking legal action’ behavior is the least studied one among other complaint behaviors. Future studies may investigate this type of
action and may also try to understand the reasons behind why consumers choose exit/boycott behavior rather than taking legal action. Since exit/boycott behavior is the most critical response for the firms, it is crucial to find ways for persuading consumers not to exhibit this behavior.

This review is exposed to some limitations, like with most of the research. First, the articles not written in English, and articles without access to full texts were excluded. Second, conference papers, contributions in books, and articles on journals that are not listed in predetermined databases were not included in the analysis.
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### APPENDIX A: PUBLIC ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Take Legal Action</th>
<th>Complain to Public or Private Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek Redress Directly From Business</td>
<td>Bavik and Bavik (2015); Chelminsiku and Coulter (2007); Cui et al. (2008); Garín-Muñoz et al. (2016); Mukherjee et al. (2009); Oh (2004); Rahman et al. (2017); Su and Bowen (2000)</td>
<td>Balaji et al. (2017); Bavik and Bavik (2015); Bijmolt et al. (2014); Casado-Díaz and Nicolau-Gonzálbez (2009); Garín-Muñoz, et al. (2016); Gronhaug (1977); Gyasi(2012); Kuo et al. (2015); Moon et al. (2017); Rahman et al. (2017); Singh et al. (2016); Souiden and Ladhari (2011); Su and Bowen (2000); Swimberghe et al. (2009); Tuzovic et al. (2014); Yen (2016); Zeithaml et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Huppertz (2007); Lee and Cude (2012)</td>
<td>Huppertz (2007); Jayasimha and Billore (2016); Lee and Cude (2012); McQuilken and Robertson (2013); Priluck and Wisenblit (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang and Chin (2011); Chelminsiku and Coulter (2011); Chiu et al. (1998); Dietrich et al. (2014); Fan et al. (2016); Gelbrich (2010); Hocutt et al. (2006); Huang et al. (2014); Huppertz (2007); Jayasimha and Billore (2016); Kim et al. (2014); Lee and Cude (2012); Malc and Pisnik (2016); Mattila and Ro (2008); McQuilken and Robertson (2011); McQuilken and Robertson (2013); Meng et al. (2010); Priluck and Wisenblit (2009); Soscia (2007); Wei et al. (2012); Yang and Mattila (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A: Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Data</th>
<th>Cronin and Fox (2010)</th>
<th>Chen et al. (2010); Chiu et al. (1998); Cornwell et al. (1991); Cronin and Fox (2010); Durão (2011); Einwiller and Steilen (2015); Hesapci Sanaktekin et al. (2012); Kim et al. (2014); Lee and Song (2010); Malc and Piskik (2016); Mattila and Ro (2008); McAlister and Erffmeyer (2003); Memarzadeh and Chang (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than one methods</td>
<td>Bonifield and Cole (2008); Jahandideh et al. (2014); Shi et al. (2011); Zussman (1983)</td>
<td>Adjei et al. (2016); Grégoire et al. (2011); Johnson et al. (2010); Lee-Wingate and Corfman (2011); Li et al. (2016); Shi et al. (2011); Singh (1990); Söderlund (1998); Tripp and Grégoire (2011); Volkov et al. (2002b); Zussman (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjei et al. (2016); Blodgett et al. (1997); Bonifield and Cole (2008); Cobb Walgren (2016); Evanschitzky et al. (2011); Gruber et al. (2008); Jahandideh et al. (2014); Kim et al. (2003); Lee-Wingate and Corfman (2011); Li et al. (2016); Mattila et al. (2013); Richins (1983); Shi et al. (2011); Singh (1990); Söderlund (1998); Volkov et al. (2002b); Weitzl and Hutzinger (2017); Zussman (1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: PRIVATE ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Decide to Stop Buying Product or to Boycott Seller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chan and Cui (2011); Hocutt et al. (2006); Malc and Pisnik (2016); Mattila and Ro (2008); McQuilken and Robertson (2011); McQuilken and Robertson (2013); Priluck and Wisenblit (2009); Von der Heyde Fernandes and dos Santos (2007); Wei et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan and Cui (2011); Hocutt et al. (2006); Malc and Pisnik (2016); Mattila and Ro (2008); McQuilken and Robertson (2011); McQuilken and Robertson (2013); Priluck and Wisenblit (2009); Von der Heyde Fernandes and dos Santos (2007); Wei et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romaniuk (2013); Wildes and Seo (2001)</td>
<td>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Data</th>
<th>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildes and Seo (2001); Zheng et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Warn Friends About the Product and/or Seller and/or Brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX B: Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>ALL ACTIONS</th>
<th>NO ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjei et al. (2016); Blodgett et al. (1997); Cobb Walgren (2016); Evanschitzky et al. (2011); Gebauer et al. (2013); Jahandideh et al. (2014); Johnson et al. (2010); Kim et al. (2003); Lee-Wingate and Corfman (2011); Li Qiu and Liu (2016); Mattila et al. (2013); Podnar and Javernik (2012); Richins (1983); Shi et al. (2011); Singh (1988); Smith and Vogt (1995); Söderlund (1998); Tsai et al. (2014); Walton and Hume (2012); Weitzl and Hutzinger (2017); Zhan and Lloyd (2014)</td>
<td>Adjei et al. (2016); Blodgett et al. (1997); Bonifield and Cole (2008); Evanschitzky et al. (2011); Gebauer et al. (2013); Jahandideh et al. (2014); Johnson et al. (2010); Kim et al. (2003); Lee-Wingate and Corfman (2011); Li Qiu and Liu (2016); Mattila et al. (2013); Podnar and Javernik (2012); Richins (1983); Shi et al. (2011); Singh (1988); Smith and Vogt (1995); Söderlund (1998); Tsai et al. (2014); Walton and Hume (2012); Weitzl and Hutzinger (2017); Zhan and Lloyd (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX C: ALL ACTIONS AND NO ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>ALL ACTIONS</th>
<th>NO ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bearden and Mason (1984); Broadbridge and Marshall (1995); Chapa et al. (2014); Chebat et al. (2010); Defranco et al. (2005); Donoghue et al. (2016); Defranco et al. (2005); Donoghue et al. (2016); Donoghue et al. (2016); Gahan (2012); Garin-Munoz et al. (2016); Grapp et al. (2013); Hernandez et al. (1991); Hogarth and Hilgert (2004); Huang and Chang (2008); Huang et al. (1996); Kaur and Sharma (2015); Kim and Chern (2010); Lam and Tang (2003); Liu and McClure (2001); Mikhaylov et al. (2016); Moutinho and Nisei (1989); Oh (2006); Singh (1988); Son and Kim (2008); Yamaguchi et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Bearden and Mason (1984); Bearden (1983); Bijmolt et al. (2014); Blodgett et al. (1995); Bolfing (1989); Breitsohl and Garrod (2016); Broadbridge and Marshall (1995); Casado-Diaz and Nicolau-Gonzalbe (2009); Charlett et al. (1995); Chebat et al. (2010); Chelminske and Coulter (2007); Cronin and Fox (2010); Defranco et al. (2005); Donoghue et al. (2016); Donoghue et al. (2016); Gahan (2012); Garin-Munoz et al. (2016); Grégoire et al. (2009); Hamzelu et al. (2017); Hernandez et al. (1991); Hogarth and Hilgert (2004); Huang and Chang (2008); Huang et al. (1996); Kaur and Sharma (2015); Kim and Chen (2010); Lam and Tang (2003); Liu and McClure (2001); Marquis and Filiatrault (2002); Mikhaylov et al. (2016); Moutinho and Nisei (1989); Ngai et al. (2007); Nikbin et al. (2015); Nyer and Gopinath (2005); R. Swanson et al. (2014); Ro (2015); Romani et al. (2012); Su and Bowen (2000); Voorhees et al. (2006); Yamaguchi et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C: Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Type</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Lwin et al. (2017); Vázquez-Casielles et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuzovic (2010); Wildes and Seo (2001); Yang and Mattila (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Data</td>
<td>Hogarth and English (2002); Wildes and Seo (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stephens and Gwinner (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one methods</td>
<td>Gupta and Sharma (2015); Singh and Wilkes (1996); Volkov et al. (2002a); Volkov et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>