



SWANSEA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

PRIFYSGOL FETROPOLITAN ABERTAWE

Swansea Business School, Swansea Metropolitan University

MBA Management Ethics Online customer complaints: getting the balance right or cyber bullying

Tutors:

Steve Griffiths

steve.griffiths@smu.ac.uk

Caroline Jawad

caroline.jawad@smu.ac.uk


On line Consumer Complaints: Task Sheet

1. Read Badaracco, J.L. & Useem, J.V. (1997) The Internet, Intel and the Vigilante Stakeholder, *Business Ethics A European Review*, Vol 6, No 1, pp18-29.
 - What is their advice to Intel on managing online criticisms?
 - You might utilize "Disaster Management" models from Public Relations textbooks, if you were focusing on this sort of case for an assignment or dissertation.
 - It is a dated article but compare it with the more recent ones to see if companies are taking advice or learning from their mistakes.
2. Read Warren, C. (2011) Damage Control, *AA.COM/AMERICANWAY*, pp 38-39.
 - Why are consumers very keen to adopt review sites and feedback for hotels and holiday purchases? How do such sites serve consumers and service providers?
 - Is there a conflict of interest? Is there scope for corruption? See links to www.revinate.com, quoted in the article. Please note the only feedback was from Revinate itself.
 - Also note the source. This article comes close to being an infomercial. What does it mean for VALIDITY and RELIABILITY of the source?
3. Read Tripp, M.T. & Gregoire, Y. (2011) When Unhappy Customers Strike Back on the Internet, *Sloan Management Review*, Spring, pp 37-44.
 - Why should this be a trustworthy source?
 - Why do they say customers complain in a way which costs organizations so much?
 - Can you apply their "Organizing matrix" to a case or company you have studied?
 - How have they evolved their ideas from their research?
 - How can companies adopt their recommendations?
4. See sources on Cyber bullying and Online customer complaints
 - Make a case for the "Internet creates a complainer's paradise".
 - Make a case for the "Internet allows customers parity of power to complain against powerful corporations who give poor service quality".
 - Collect other forms of complaint sites and "Rate my..." sites to evaluate whether your arguments vary with different sites and different industries eg low cost consumer goods to public sector core services.

Related Topics

Bellagio Hotel | San Francisco | YouTube | Las Vegas | Yahoo | Malaysia | Holiday Inn | Central Intelligence Agency | California

Related Articles



Glitter Gulch



Thanksgiving Dinner Is Served


A Big Year

Damage Control

by Chris Warren

Page: 1 2


Share |



Art by Alison Seiffert

In an age where every guest is a potential online critic, hotels get a little help defending their honor.

As far as friendships go, it wasn't exactly the best start. Late last year, Paul Frechette, who is the manager of the Shorebreak Hotel in Huntington Beach, Calif., got an e-mail giving him a heads-up that his boutique property had just gotten slammed in reviews on Yelp.com and the all-important travel site TripAdvisor.com. Turns out, the same disgruntled guest, a Huntington Beach local, had authored both reviews and was



angry about what he felt had been a dirty room and rude staff. Right away, before the reviews were 48 hours old, Frechette acted by posting a heartfelt response on TripAdvisor. "Since I was able to match his user name to his e-mail and last name, I was able to personalize my response to him by addressing him as an HB (Huntington Beach) local," he says. "I went on to explain how the people in the city of Huntington Beach are our most important clients and that it would mean the world to me if he contacted me in person."



Not long after Frechette's response went up on TripAdvisor, the unhappy guest showed up and the manager bought him and his girlfriend dinner. Since then, everything has changed. The once-angry guest has not only been back numerous times, but he has also encouraged friends and business associates to stay at the Shorebreak as well. "He has also gotten to know all my desk clerks by first name and visits frequently just to say hi," he says. "He would be someone I would consider a friend rather than a customer now."

A Contemporary Twist

This happy outcome — for both the guest, who felt respected and well treated, and Frechette, who not only didn't lose a customer but actually gained an evangelist for his hotel — would likely not have happened were it not for the e-mail that alerted Frechette to the fact that someone had just bad-mouthed his hotel online. And that e-mail was no fluke. It was the product of a small San Francisco-based software company called Revinate, which launched in 2009 and has quickly become an intelligence service, a quasi-CIA for the hospitality industry.

Revinate keeps track of — and, just as important, allows hotel owners and managers to quickly act on — the avalanche of public information generated every single day on social media outlets like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Yahoo and TripAdvisor that could potentially impact their reputation. "Their business lives and dies by guest satisfaction and quality service," says Marc Heyneker, who co-founded Revinate with a high school buddy, Jay Ashton, and now serves as vice president of sales and business development. "We realized that traditional guest-satisfaction measurements of comment cards and e-mail surveys after a stay were now being replaced to a certain degree with public domain, public forum tweeting, Facebook and user-generated content on review sites."

Think about it: As a traveler these days, where do you go to get impartial, unvarnished reviews of a hotel, its staff and amenities, like a spa or restaurant? Chances are at least part of your research involves going online and reading what fellow travelers have said, both good and bad, on TripAdvisor, Yelp or any number of other social media platforms. Two things became crystal clear to Heyneker and Ashton as they researched whether to launch their company: Hotel management everywhere, at big and small properties, have been keenly aware of the importance of social media and the impact it has on their reputation and bookings, but

Now You Know: According to Guinness

World Records, the world's largest hotel is the First World Hotel in Pahang Darul Makmur, Malaysia. It has 6,118 rooms.


they've also largely felt impotent in tracking it, let alone managing it.

Sensing a big opportunity, Revinate developed their software product — which is delivered over the Internet, a phenomenon known as cloud computing — that allows hoteliers to do just that. "We monitor full fire hoses of Twitter content, all public Facebook content, YouTube, everything on Flickr," declares Ashton, who says that Revinate has about 1,000 clients, including hotels from the most widely recognized brands like Peninsula, Radisson, Kimpton, Best Western, Hyatt and Holiday Inn. "We have data partners who send us blog posts, mainstream news articles, forums and comments on content. It's more than 100 million pieces of content every day that we are sifting through to find mentions of our clients."

The Bellagio hotel and casino in Las Vegas just might want to consider becoming a customer of Revinate. As a way to demonstrate how hotel staff can easily use Revinate, whose offices are in a modest 19th-century brick building on the grounds of the Presidio, a centuries-old former military installation in San Francisco, Heyneker takes out his laptop. With a few clicks, he pulls up the "dashboard," which is the web page that summarizes all of the social media mentions relevant to a particular hotel — including such measures as the total number of reviews, overall review rating, percentage of positive reviews, TripAdvisor market rating as well as the same information on competitors, all broken down into time increments, such as the past week or month. As a way to illustrate, Heyneker pulls up the information on the Bellagio — which, although not a client, it monitors because it is a competitor of other Revinate customers in Vegas — and clicks over to another feature on the dashboard, the so-called keyword analysis, which picks out words mentioned in reviews that hotel management would want to know about, like bad or comfortable or bedbugs or even sucks.

Page: 1 2

Share Your Comments



Login

Your name (required)

Share

This Page

ISSUE: Apr 1, 2011

Admin

Echo 1 Items

Michelle Wohl

Chris - Incredible job explaining the importance of reputation management in the hotel industry and thanks for the coverage! Regarding our tips for hoteliers, we just hosted a Webinar yesterday on the topic and would love to share the link with anyone interested in learning how we recommend that hoteliers respond to tough reviews. <http://revinate.me/38D>

01 April 2011, 18:47:33 - Flag - Like - Reply

Liked by Guest

Executive Search meets Personal Matchmaking



Barbie Adler - Founder & President

You're strategic and savvy in everything you do; it's time to apply the same wisdom to the most important search of your life. Allow us to take the labor out of finding the love of your life in a strictly confidential and focused manner - eliminating the pain points involved with random, un-vetted, and disastrous blind dating.

At Selective Search, we serve as our clients very own personal recruiter solely focused on introducing them to the love of their life. Our clientele has no problem dating, but they don't have the time, visibility or access to the caliber of women they are looking to meet. By employing proven executive search methodologies, we hand select the must-meet women for our clients, allowing us to introduce them to the love of their life.

SELECTIVE SEARCH

Taking the Labor Out of Finding Love™

info@selectivesearch-inc.com

www.selectivesearch-inc.com ~ 866-592-1200

New York | Boston | Pittsburgh | Philadelphia | Washington D.C. | Charlotte | Atlanta
Miami | Naples | Cleveland | Detroit | Chicago | Minneapolis | Houston | Dallas | Austin
Denver | Phoenix | Santa Fe | Las Vegas | San Francisco | Los Angeles | Toronto | London

for Selectively Single Men

- Custom tailored search based on your criteria (*preferences such as: physical beauty, personality, intelligence, ethnicity, religion, age, emotional stability, lifestyle, interests, values, etc.*)
- Leverage our access to and trust of the largest network of highly attractive, intelligent, sought-after females
- Sole focus on your search - no quota, no conflict of interest, no plug dates
- As your personal recruiter, all potential candidates are screened in-person
- Highly confidential
- 88% proven success rate
- We will only introduce you to someone who meets all of your criteria

for Selectively Single Women

- We are retained by the most selective, eligible, highly-educated, commitment-minded bachelors in the country
- Our fees have been paid / women join for free
- You will only be introduced to someone who meets all of your criteria
- Your time & preferences will be honored
- 100% confidential
- Completely off-line
- Thoroughly pre-screened, commitment-minded clientele who are ready to meet their future
- You have nothing to lose and an exceptional man to gain

Profiled in "The New York Times", "Forbes", "Fortune", "The Wall Street Journal", "Cosmopolitan", "Marie Claire", "USA Today" and "CNN"
for being the most trusted matchmaking firm to successful, eligible bachelors of all ages and ethnicities

©2009-2011 Selective Search and Personal Recruiter are registered trademarks of Selective Search, Inc. www.selectivesearch-inc.com

When Unhappy Customers Strike Back on the Internet

Companies need to understand and manage the rising threat of online public complaining. There is ample incentive, because the best ways to respond, and to prevent complaints from recurring, apply not just to the Internet.

BY THOMAS M. TRIPP AND YANY GRÉGOIRE

WHEN CUSTOMERS BELIEVE that a company has treated them badly, they may take public action aimed at hurting it. Consider Dave Carroll, a musician who discovered that his \$3,500 Taylor guitar was damaged — its neck had been broken — during baggage handling on a United Air Lines flight. At first he alerted several of the airline's employees at the arrival airport, but none of them had authority to handle his complaint; moreover, they gave Carroll no guidance on how to proceed. Thus began nine months of running the company's customer service gauntlet. Repeatedly passed from one person to the next, Carroll was finally informed that he was ineligible for any compensation.

Frustrated, angered and feeling that he'd exhausted all customer service options, Carroll wrote a song about his experience and also created a music video, which he posted on YouTube in mid-2009.¹ The lyrics included the lines "I should have flown with someone else, or gone by car, because United breaks guitars." The video amassed 150,000 views within one day, 5 million by a month later and at this writing more than 9 million. The story of the song's success and the public relations humiliation for United Air Lines was reported in media all over the world. Finally, United offered to compensate Carroll for the damage and promised to re-examine its policies.

Another video that made the e-mail forwarding rounds of the Internet featured an unhappy consumer who happened to be a U.S. marine based in Iraq. Dressed in combat fatigues out in the desert and



THE LEADING QUESTION

How should companies respond to, or prevent, irate customers' online public complaints?

FINDINGS

- ▶ "A double deviation" — the initial failure followed by failed resolution attempts — is usually critical.
- ▶ Perceived betrayal (as opposed to dissatisfaction) drives potential online complainers to act.
- ▶ The company's attempt at recovery should be swift and its apology perceived as sincere.



The YouTube video that Dave Carroll made about his experience with United Air Lines has already been viewed over 9 million times.

holding his machine gun, he tells the viewer how Hewlett-Packard demanded to be paid to tell him how to fix his inoperable HP printer. He then aims his weapon and shoots the printer to pieces.²

Admittedly, not every unhappy customer has the wish or the wherewithal to make such graphic statements for a mass audience, but online public complaining does happen every day in diverse forms and varying intensities. The demand is great enough, in fact, that an array of third-party organizations offers preformatted online platforms for customers' convenience. For example, complaint websites (such as complaints.com and riporffreport.com), as well as the sites of consumer organizations (bbb.com and consumeraffairs.com), provide online environments in which customers can post their misadventures as well as compare notes with other people. More general user-generated-content websites such as YouTube, Twitter and Facebook offer venues for complaining, and there are also specifically targeted anti-corporation websites such as starbucked.com.³ Given these and other Internet options, companies whose unhappy customers decide to take revenge can suffer serious consequences. Whereas until a few years ago the damage of negative word of mouth was limited to a fairly small audience, now online reports can go viral, reach millions of people within a short period of time and tarnish a company's brand.

What can companies do, whether in reacting to such negative publicity or in preventing its occurrence? Based on our research (see "About the Research"), we have developed an "organizing matrix" for these purposes. The two rows of this matrix (see "Organizing Matrix: Understanding and Managing Online Public Complaining," p. 40) reflect our *understanding* of the behaviors of online complainers (Row 1), which serves as the foundation of our recommendations for *managing* that behavior (Row 2). The two columns of the matrix reflect the temporal dimension — that is, *before* and *after* the online complaint. In other words, the matrix is designed to help companies formulate appropriate tactics both in prevention and resolution modes, as further developed below.

The matrix (read in a clockwise manner) answers the following questions:

Quadrant 1: Why do customers complain online in the first place?

Quadrant 2: How long will online complainers hold a grudge against the company?

Quadrant 3: How should a company respond after the online complaint?

Quadrant 4: How can a company prevent online complaining?

Quadrant 1: Why Do Customers Complain Online in the First Place?

In order to respond to or prevent online public complaining, one first needs to understand why customers pursue that course. That is, what are the triggers? We find that customers go online because (1) they are victims of a "double deviation"; and (2) they feel betrayed.

Online Public Complaining Almost Always Follows a "Double Deviation."

Most online complainers have been victims not only of a product or service failure (referred to simply as a "service failure" for the rest of this article) but also of a series of failed resolution attempts. In the first case, a product might not have performed as expected, an employee may have been rude or an unanticipated cost, such as a hidden fee, may have been levied. After this initial failure, customers' attempts to resolve the issue — by complaining in-house to the company's customer service representatives, managers or owners — may also have come to naught from the customer's point of view. When such a sequence occurs, customers feel twice violated: First, the company deviated from acceptable practice, and then it deviated again by not satisfactorily addressing the problem. Such "double deviations" can provoke, in effect, a moment of truth for the customer, when the individual concludes that the company does not care about his or her patronage.⁴

Our research shows that online public complaining is almost always preceded by double deviations. Specifically, after codifying and analyzing 431 online complaints posted to riporffreport.com and consumeraffairs.com, we found that approximately 96% of the online complaints followed a double deviation.⁵ Only 4% of the online complaints posted publicly followed a simple service failure.

That is good news for companies because online complainers are not necessarily terrorism-minded

ABOUT THE RESEARCH

Together with colleagues we have developed a stream of research and performed some dozen studies, with results published in outlets such as the *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. We have also presented our work in the book *Getting Even: The Truth About Workplace Revenge—and How to Stop It*.¹

For example, in the *Journal of Marketing* study we surveyed customers who posted online complaints to either of two large U.S. complaint websites: *consumeraffairs.com* and *riporffreport.com*. Customers were sent a first questionnaire two weeks after posting their complaint, and they received three further questionnaires, each after a period of another two weeks. Through these waves, the respondents answered questions related to the prior quality of their relationship with the offending company, their desire for revenge, their wish for avoidance and their

perceived level of betrayal, among other key variables. In addition, two independent coders analyzed the content of all of the online complaints included.

In a second study described in this article, we conducted an experiment based on a hypothetical double deviation, online public complaint and recovery attempt. Specifically, participants were asked to imagine themselves in the role of a customer who experiences a service failure at a French restaurant and is exposed to subsequent relationship manipulations. They then answered a series of questions about their sense of betrayal, desire for revenge and wish for avoidance. To simulate online public complaining, each participant posted a blog about the restaurant to a fictional newsgroup on French cuisine. Next, they were exposed to different levels of post-complaint resolution. In the "no recovery" condition, the owner offered no apology or compensation. In the "normal recovery" and "high recovery" conditions,

the owner recognized his fault, apologized and offered compensation—a \$50 gift certificate in the first condition and a full reimbursement (\$75) and a bottle of French wine (\$25) in the second. The participants then completed another series of questions to report their reactions.

Over the last eight years we have also conducted other field studies (involving the Canadian Transportation Agency, for example) and a series of other scenario-based experiments in which we recruited nearly 2,000 participants to read various fictional scenarios of double deviations. For the field studies, the respondents answered questions about an actual double deviation they had experienced that led them to complain publicly via the Internet. For each scenario-based experiment, the participants had to read a story, imagine themselves in the role of protagonist and then answer a series of questions about how they likely would feel and what they would do.

individuals who go online at the slightest provocation to impede commercial operations. Instead, they are simply exhausted customers who kept complaining about a serious issue that the company kept failing to address. That is exactly what happened in Dave Carroll's case.

In general, we are not talking about mild failures involving modestly unpleasant, but inconsequential encounters, which have been the most frequent contexts studied. Rather, we consider severe service failures that the customers simply cannot ignore and for which they need to achieve resolution... or, if all else fails, to go online in some dramatic fashion, as the U.S. marine did. Based on our codification of the online complaints we studied, the most common contexts for such complaints appear to be automotive (11%); large retail purchases (10.5%); credit, debt and mortgage services (10.3%); cell phone providers (9.5%); websites and online services (6.3%); appliances (5.3%); and computers (5%).

Betrayal (as Opposed to Mere Dissatisfaction) Drives Online Complainers. Not all customers who are victims of a double deviation make online complaints. What distinguishes those who do invest the requisite time and energy, knowing that their

chances of material gain are limited? We find that they do so because they feel *betrayed* by the company—they believe that the product or service provider has violated the norms of a customer-company relationship.⁶ In a double-deviation context, customers can see betrayal because they believe the company is morally obligated to help them resolve a difficulty that the company itself caused (e.g., Dave Carroll's broken guitar), and this belief is violated when the company keeps failing them (his nine months of fruitless attempts at resolution). This sense of betrayal motivates customers to take all possible means to "get even." Indeed, when they feel betrayed, customers see online public action as justified—even noble, as it may, for example, provide warning to other customers.

It is important to note that betrayal is not simply a case of extreme dissatisfaction. Unlike dissatisfaction, betrayal is associated with anger, which is a strong negative emotion that motivates customers to respond strongly. In contrast, dissatisfaction is related to frustration and annoyance, two relatively mild negative emotions that tend to be short-lived and result in more passive actions, if any at all, such as exiting the relationship. But feelings of betrayal can lead customers to persist in their demands for reparation and, if that fails to

satisfy, to engage in vengeful behaviors, such as on-line public complaining, against a company.


Quadrant 2: How Long Will Online Complainers Hold a Grudge Against the Company?

We examined two forms of grudge-holding: seeking revenge and avoiding the company by not returning

with one's business. We found that after customers had complained online, their desire for revenge dropped in the succeeding four weeks and then stabilized, though never disappearing entirely (at least, not up to eight weeks after the complaint — the point at which we last surveyed them). Moreover, customers' desire for avoidance rose after their on-line complaint and then remained essentially

ORGANIZING MATRIX: UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGING ONLINE PUBLIC COMPLAINING

The first row of the matrix addresses the customer's actions, reflecting the conditions that lead to an online complaint and his or her post-complaint behavior. The second row pertains to the company's actions: its post-complaint recovery attempts and its efforts to prevent future online complaints before they occur.



constant. (See "The Two Forms of Customer Grudge-Holding.") Thus, we found that customers do continue to hold a grudge: Although their desire for revenge diminishes, they are not coming back.


Is a Post-Complaint Recovery Possible in an Online Context? But what if a company were to offer some kind of resolution, after the complaint had been posted online, to try to recover its relationship with the customer? In our survey, we found that 27% of the companies made just such a gesture. But it didn't always help. Customers who received a satisfactory resolution within four weeks after their online complaint reported reductions in their desire for revenge; but resolution offered after that time frame had no impact. It was too late! In any case, such a post-complaint recovery attempt did not seem to bring back the business of the online complainer; it had no significant effect, during *any* time frame, on the ex-customer's desire for avoidance. (See the yellow and green curves of "The Two Forms of Customer Grudge-Holding.") Thus, while a post-complaint recovery attempt may stop the vengeful actions of some complainers, as long as it's done expeditiously, they are no more likely to return as customers.

Do Certain Customers Hold Grudges for a Longer Time? Every company has its "best" customers — those who bring repeat business, show brand loyalty and in the extreme have strong emotional ties to the company. Other customers we call "casual" — those who may make purchases only once or sporadically, have lesser loyalty and have limited bonding with the company.

Does type of customer matter in the context of online public complaining? That is, do a company's best customers become its worst enemies, or are they more forgiving than casual customers? On the one hand, after a service failure the best customers may give the company the benefit of the doubt, perhaps feel grateful for prior service or even expect to continue receiving good service in the future. If so, they should be more motivated to forgive the company and might not hold a grudge over time. On the other hand, because the best customers may expect special treatment, when they receive bad service instead they are more surprised and shocked. Having

THE TWO FORMS OF CUSTOMER GRUDGE-HOLDING

The yellow curves represent the customer's desires for avoidance and revenge in the absence of company post-complaint action. The green curves reflect these two desires following company attempts at recovery. Such attempts have little impact on desire for avoidance, though they do affect desire for revenge during the first two time periods (four weeks) after the online complaint.



Y-axis units are on a 1-7 scale, where 1 represents an extremely low level of intensity, 4 a moderate level and 7 is the highest possible level of intensity; X-axis units are two-week survey intervals.

felt entitled to more, when they don't get it they may feel *betrayed* all the more acutely.

So, which is it: Are the best customers more forgiving or more vindictive? The data from our study are clear: A company's best customers are the most likely to become its worst enemies in an online context — at least, in the absence of a proper recovery attempt, about which we will have more to say below. Compared with casual customers, the best customers feel more betrayed, which makes them much more persistent and vengeful in their complaining efforts. And not only do the best customers maintain a greater desire for revenge over time, they also seek to exit their relationship with the company much sooner than do casual customers.

Quadrant 3: How Should a Company Respond After the Online Complaint?

Now we turn to the "managing" part of our matrix. As in their other commercial activities, companies should be methodical when trying to recover their relationship with a customer after his or her online complaint. That is, they should craft their recovery attempts by: (1) accounting for the type of cus-

tomers (based on the prior relationship); (2) timing the response; and (3) carefully selecting the content of the apology.

Tailor the response to the customer. The post-complaint recovery depends on the type of customer involved. Our research shows that the best (relationship-focused) customers are more amenable to recovery efforts, regardless of the recovery's size or monetary value, than are casual customers. For the best customers, the company's admission of wrongdoing and the perceived sincerity of its apology could be more important than restitution. As the old saying goes, "It is the thought that counts." In other words, for those steady customers who value a relationship with the company, recovery may take only a statement of contrition and a symbolic financial act, which communicate that the company values the relationship as well.⁷

Regardless of the content of the recovery, companies should pay special attention to their best customers because they not only are the most amenable to sincere recovery attempts but also are generally the biggest spenders and feel most betrayed after a double deviation. At the same time, companies don't want customers to feel that they are so big that they are indispensable. One determinant of whether people will act on their desires for revenge is the power they believe they wield to exact such revenge and get away with it.⁸ Therefore, it is important for managers to achieve balance — to make their best customers feel special without making them feel *too* special.

For casual customers, the situation is different. Not necessarily interested in affirming their relationship with the company, they may be less won over by evidence that the company values the relationship with them. Instead, such customers typically care only about financial repayment, with the size of the monetary compensation being most important to them.

These results suggest that companies' responses should depend on what kind of customer experienced poor treatment. However, two points remain. First, companies should not expect that all of these customers are coming back; many are likely to be irretrievably going away. Keep in mind, though, that getting avenging customers to go away can be

good riddance, if not good short-term business. Second, giving restitution to all customers who complain on the Internet could in the long run be counterproductive. That is, if companies rewarded customers for complaining online, then eventually even more, not fewer, customers might do so.

Whatever you do, do it quickly. Many companies now instruct employees to search the Internet for complaints so as to react swiftly and judiciously, thereby reducing the likelihood of a toxic aftermath. For example, a feature article in the *Wall Street Journal* detailed how hotels search online for complaints. A major aim is to identify complainers who still are staying at the hotel and to have employees resolve the matter immediately, if possible, but at least before the guest checks out. For example, one guest posted on Twitter that he had "the crappiest room in the hotel," only to receive within a few hours a note of apology slipped under his door that also offered him a better room.⁹

In any case, as discussed earlier, there is little point in responding beyond four weeks after the online complaint, as apologies and restitutions will then have very little impact on complainers' passion for revenge and avoidance.

Include this in an apology after the online complaint. Common experience suggests, as do psychological and marketing research, that for most customers to feel betrayed following a service failure, and to become sufficiently angry to seek revenge, they have to blame the company for what has happened. How much blame customers assign depends on their inferences regarding the nature of the company's service failure: Was the failure intentional and motivated by greed? Was the failure intentional but motivated by kindness? Or was the failure unintentional? Obviously, inferences of greed lead to more anger than do inferences of lack of motive, and inferences of kindness lead to even less anger. But how critical are such inferences?

We ran an experiment to find out.¹⁰ As expected, participants who were presented with the negative motive had a significantly greater desire for revenge than for reconciliation; participants who were presented with no motive had nearly equal desires for revenge and reconciliation; and participants who

were presented with the positive motive had a much lower desire for revenge than for reconciliation. Further analysis of the experiment's and a survey's results showed that inference of motive was the *key* belief that drove anger and any consequent desires for revenge or reconciliation.

It thus makes sense that the apology should include a statement aimed at making customers' worst-case inferences (of greed) unlikely. For instance, airlines' apologies for delayed or canceled flights should include statements that explain the underlying motives. It's not, say, that the airline wanted to combine two flights to the same destination because each one was less than half full (a negative inference of greed); it was concerned enough about a plane's mechanical problem that it canceled the flight to keep passengers safe (a positive inference of looking out for customers' safety).

Note that simply providing *no* information about the reasons behind the failure does not help customers rule out worst-case inferences. Faced with ambiguity, people tend to err on the sinister side when inventing explanations. That is, in the absence of information, customers don't necessarily come to a neutral "I don't know"; they often connect dots that perhaps should not be connected and become convinced that the company is just plain greedy. Don't allow customers to go down this road; give them an explanation instead.

Other research on apologies suggests additional elements that need to be included.¹¹ First, apologies should be sincere and truthful. An insincere apology can be worse than no apology at all. Second, effective apologies are not about the company assigning blame elsewhere. Doing so can actually backfire, at least when it's clear to the customer that the service failure was caused by the company's own negligence or incompetence.

Not assigning blame at all in an apology may not be any safer either. Consider the research on doctors' apologies to patients.¹² Many doctors will not apologize when they make medical mistakes out of fear that such admissions of guilt could result in malpractice lawsuits. The research, however, suggests that these doctors have it backward; in reality, patients are *more* likely to sue for malpractice when they receive no apology or an insincere apology. That is why some states have recently passed "I'm

sorry" laws that allow physicians to admit to a mistake without it being used against them in court.

Basically, we advise companies to own up to honest mistakes when they make them and not to let the customer believe that they are motivated by greed.

Quadrant 4: How Can a Company Prevent Online Public Complaining?

Even better is to respond so quickly after the initial service failure that the second element of the double deviation does not occur, with the result that most customers do not complain publicly and online. Good prevention, after all, is usually preferable to a good cure. In that spirit, we recommend that companies design their recovery efforts (1) based on a triage system; and (2) by focusing on the process and not just the outcomes.

Develop a triage system. Clearly, different customers often need to be handled differently. For that reason we suggest that companies, in pursuing recovery processes, emulate the triage that doctors perform during medical emergencies involving multiple casualties.¹³ For example, in a natural disaster where injuries are many but medical resources are few, physicians must decide who to treat immediately, who can wait for treatment and who will receive no treatment at all. The main principle that guides triage is to first treat the most life-threatening injuries of people who can be saved, second the non-life-threatening injuries and last the life-threatening injuries of people who cannot be saved.

Service failures are analogous to such medical situations in three ways. First, companies have limited financial and human resources to deal with service failures, much as aid stations in natural disasters have limited medical supplies and physicians to treat multiple patients. Second, not all customers can be "saved" — that is, recovered — just as not all patients can be saved. And third, some service failures, being more threatening to the customer and to the customer-company relationship, are more likely to motivate the customer to seek revenge against the company, just as some injuries are more severe than others and carry greater risks of suffering and death.

This analogy suggests some recommendations. Companies should identify those customers who

have suffered the most severe service failures and who can also be recovered. Fortunately, such identification should be relatively easy, given that the most recoverable customers are typically a company's best customers. Moreover, like severely injured patients who can be healed, these customers should be attended to very quickly. Wait too long — some four weeks or more — and the chances of recovering them drop steeply.

The Process Matters More Than the Outcomes.

We describe this commercial version of triage as preventive, not just curative, because it should be performed before the second element (recovery failure) of the double deviation occurs. More preventive still, perhaps, is a system in which customers may not mind service failures so much because they perceive a fair process for complaining about them. In fact, the "fair process effect" — a well-known psychological phenomenon, particularly in labor-management settings — demonstrates that employees will tolerate disappointing outcomes as long as they perceive the decision-making processes surrounding these outcomes to be fair. In other words, for employees to become very angry and challenging, they have to believe that *both* the outcome and process are unfair.

In our research, we have found that the fair-process effect may apply in the consumer setting as well. Specifically, we have measured how the perception of fairness of the systems that companies put into place to address complaints — systems characterized by parameters such as voice, control, speed, waiting time and flexibility — can substantially reduce customers' sense of betrayal. Thus, as long as the company uses such fair processes, and as long as it makes customers aware of them, customers will tolerate the occasional service failure.

Thomas M. Tripp is a professor of management at Washington State University. Yany Grégoire is an associate professor of marketing at HEC-Montréal. Comment on this article at <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/x/52303>, or contact the authors at smrfeedback@mit.edu.

REFERENCES

1. Sons of Maxwell, "United Breaks Guitars," youtube.com.
2. Magic1962, "Printer Dissatisfaction Has Been Resolved See Description," youtube.com.
3. J.C. Ward and A.L. Ostrom, "Complaining to the Masses: The Role of Protest Framing in Customer-Created Complaint Web Sites," *Journal of Consumer Research* 33, no. 2 (September 2006): 220-230.
4. Y. Grégoire and R.J. Fisher, "Customer Betrayal and Retaliation: When Your Best Customers Become Your Worst Enemies," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36, no. 2 (June 2008): 247-261; and N. Bechwati and M. Morrin, "Outraged Consumers: Getting Even at the Expense of Getting a Good Deal," *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 13, no. 4 (November 2003): 440-453.
5. Y. Grégoire, T.M. Tripp and R. Legoux, "When Customer Love Turns into Lasting Hate: The Effects of Relationship Strength and Time on Customer Revenge and Avoidance," *Journal of Marketing* 73, no. 6 (November 2009): 18-32.
6. Grégoire, "Customer Betrayal and Retaliation."
7. Grégoire, "When Customer Love Turns into Lasting Hate."
8. K. Aquino, T.M. Tripp and R.J. Bies, "Getting Even or Moving On? Power, Procedural Justice, and Types of Offense as Predictors of Revenge, Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Avoidance in Organizations," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91, no. 3 (May 2006): 653-668; Y. Grégoire, D. Laufer and T.M. Tripp, "A Comprehensive Model of Customer Direct and Indirect Revenge: Understanding the Effects of Perceived Greed and Customer Power," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 38, no. 6 (December 2010): 738-758.
9. S. Nassauer, "'I Hate My Room,' The Traveler Tweeted. Ka-Boom! An Upgrade! The New Ways Hotels Track You and Your Complaints," *Wall Street Journal*, June 24, 2010.
10. B. Devezer, Y. Grégoire, J. Joireman and T.M. Tripp, "Can a Firm Get Away with Double Deviation? The Role of Inferred Motive in Revenge and Reconciliation," working paper, Washington State University, September 2010.
11. P.H. Kim, K.T. Dirks, C.D. Cooper and D.L. Ferrin, "When More Blame Is Better Than Less: The Implications of Internal vs. External Attributions for the Repair of Trust After a Competence- vs. Integrity-Based Trust Violation," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 99, no. 1 (January 2006): 49-65; P.H. Kim, D.L. Ferrin, C.D. Cooper and K.T. Dirks, "Removing the Shadow of Suspicion: The Effects of Apology Versus Denial for Repairing Competence- vs. Integrity-Based Trust Violations," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, no. 1 (February 2004): 104-118.
12. A.W. Wu, "Handling Hospital Errors: Is Disclosure the Best Defense?" *Annals of Internal Medicine* 131, no. 12 (December 1999): 970-972.
13. Grégoire, "A Comprehensive Model of Customer Direct and Indirect Revenge."
14. T. Tripp and R.J. Bies, "Getting Even: The Truth About Workplace Revenge — and How to Stop It" (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009).

Reprint 52303. For ordering information, see page 8.

Copyright © Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2011. All rights reserved.

<http://www.revinate.com/> Accessed 3 August 2011

Quoted in Warren (2011)

Revinate

Why Revinate


Customers


Best Practices

Blog

About

Deep Competitive Intelligence





Custom Alerts & Notifications

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
NBC
The New York Times



Turn Social Media into Guest Satisfaction & Bookings

The first intuitive, enterprise-grade social media solution 100% for hotels. Revinate brings order to the chaos of guest reviews, online reputation and social media marketing. Online reviews are now the critical measure of guest satisfaction and the key influence on where travelers decide to stay. Hotels can now harness online reviews and social media as the ultimate measures of guest satisfaction and drivers of demand.

Revinate brings structure, performance tracking & actionable guidance to today's stream of social media, which is now more influential than traditional marketing. Our "Social Media Scorecard" (just one of our many features) is the hospitality industry's only social media

report card, identifying key metrics, saving significant time, and driving profitable results. Contact us today for more information.

- **Track Everything**

Reviews are now more influential than price or brand. Revinate collects every review, news story, blog post, photo, video and social media mention of your hotel. Everything is presented in a single, intuitive dashboard, accessible anytime via your web browser.

- **Intuitive Analytics**

Revinate is the ultimate social media solution for hotels. Our powerful analytics give you real-time, easy-to-use reports that highlight exactly what you need to know. Beautiful charts, exportable data, competitive intelligence & flexible options. 100% for hotels.

- **Decisive Action**

You need to do more than listen. Revinate makes it easy to join the conversation, implement your social media strategy, respond to reviews, collaborate with colleagues, and enhance your reputation. Revinate is designed to help hotels drive measurable results.

- **Profit from Social Media**

Revinate is designed to produce measurable results. We'll help you lower costs and increase revenue, driving bottom-line profit. We're here to partner with great hotels, and provide leading best practices and world-class support. Contact us today.

Rate My..... Sites

<http://uk.ratemyteachers.com/> Accessed 3 August 2011

Enter your school

United Kingdom Schools

© 2011 RateMyTeachers.com All Rights Reserved. This site is dedicated to Nancy Lynn Davis 1945-2006 & Brian Timothy Davis 1981-2003

<http://blog.ratemyprofessors.com/> accessed 3 August 2011

Rate My Professors - Find and rate your professor, campus and more - RateMyProfessors.com

Hi, Guest! [[create account](#) | [login](#)]

Find a Professor

- Find a School

-

Enter Last Name

-

Enter School

Or find school by state.



Rate My Professors - Top Lists



Each year Rate My Professors, the internet's largest destination for professor ratings, compiles a list of the top professors based ratings and comments from students.


Find out who the highest rated and hottest professors are and if your school made the highest rated schools list.

[CLICK HERE](#)

[DROP IT](#)



Cyber bullying- Is it a new version of an old problem or does the Internet make bullying more dangerous?



Orbitz Worldwide Responds to Anti-Consumer Bullying Tactics and the Baseless Lawsuit Filed by American Airlines

CHICAGO, April 13, 2011 /PRNewswire/ --

The following statement by Orbitz Worldwide (NYSE: OWW) is in response to a lawsuit filed yesterday in Texas by American Airlines against Travelport and Orbitz:

"American Airlines' baseless claims against Orbitz are the latest in a series of tactics to force Orbitz to adopt an airline ticket distribution model that limits consumer choice and inhibits competition.

It is important to keep the facts straight. American Airlines made the decision to play the role of the marketplace bully and pull its fares from Orbitz. Having failed to force Orbitz to adopt unproven technology that does not meet the needs of our customers, American Airlines is now resorting to groundless litigation in a desperate attempt to revive an unsuccessful strategy.

The unfortunate truth is that American Airlines is attempting to deprive consumers of the ability to compare prices across competing airlines.

Orbitz gives consumers access to powerful tools that allow them to search across hundreds of airlines and millions of itinerary options to easily book the trip that best meets their needs.

Since it was launched in 2001, Orbitz has been at the forefront of improving the travel experience for consumers.

Orbitz will defend itself with vigor and is leaving open all possible options to seek relief from American Airlines' predatory actions."

About Orbitz Worldwide

Orbitz Worldwide is a leading global online travel company that uses innovative technology to enable leisure and business travelers to research, plan and book a broad range of travel

products. Orbitz Worldwide owns a portfolio of consumer brands that includes Orbitz (<http://www.orbitz.com>), CheapTickets (<http://www.cheaptickets.com>), ebookers (<http://www.ebookers.com>), HotelClub (<http://www.hotelclub.com>), RatesToGo (<http://www.ratestogo.com>) and the Away Network (<http://www.away.com>). Also within the Orbitz Worldwide family, Orbitz Worldwide Distribution (<http://corp.orbitz.com/partnerships/distribution>) delivers private label travel solutions to a broad range of partners including many of the world's largest airlines, and Orbitz for Business (<http://www.orbitzforbusiness.com>) delivers managed corporate travel solutions for corporations. For more information on partnership opportunities with Orbitz Worldwide, visit corp.orbitz.com. Orbitz Worldwide uses its Investor Relations website to make information available to its investors and the public at <http://www.orbitz-ir.com>. You can sign up to receive email alerts whenever the company posts new information to the website.

(Logo: <http://photos.prnewswire.com/prnh/20070813/AQM125LOGO>)

Distributed by PR Newswire on behalf of Orbitz Worldwide

PR Newswire Europe Ltd.

209 - 215 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NL
Tel : +44 (0)20 7490 8111
Fax : +44 (0)20 7490 1255
E-mail : info@prnewswire.co.uk

Copyright © 2011 PR Newswire Europe Limited. All rights reserved.
A United Business Media Company.
Terms and conditions of use apply

<http://consumer-warning.org/cyber-bullying/text-and-cyber-bullying-%e2%80%93-the-new-threats/>

Text and Cyber Bullying - The New Threats

Posted by Kim on Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 6:37 pm

Due to advancements in technology, children and teens are finding far more creative ways to bully others. In the past, bullies were limited to verbal or physical abuse. You may think text or cyber bullying really isn't that big of a deal. Let us look at the evolution of bullying and some frightening statistics.

The Evolution of Bullying

In generations past, bullies had only their words and physical size to intimidate others. Today, bullies are a new kind of coward. They can hide behind a keyboard or a cell phone. In a matter of seconds, the new cyber bully, under the cover of anonymity, can completely destroy the reputation of another adolescent. And, there is a multitude of ways to wage war upon their helpless victims. Instead of the playground or school cafeteria, they can use Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, text messages, instant messages, emails, chat rooms and more.

Unlike the playground bullies of the past, there is nowhere to hide from the new cyber bullies. Home is normally a refuge from bullying but cyber bullies follow their victims wherever they go. There is no escape from the psychological war they wage. Text and cyber bullies tend to be a far meaner type of

bully since they do not have to confront their victims in person. In many cases, the victim may have no idea who is bullying them, which is far more frightening.

An old-fashioned word of mouth rumor might reach 20 other adolescents. A message sent via text or cyberspace will spread like wildfire. A post on the Internet has the potential to reach millions of readers. Whether it does or doesn't, the victim of cyber bullying will feel as though everyone in the world has seen it. In days gone by, rumors written on the bathroom wall could be painted over. Once something is posted on the Internet, it could be there forever.

The Sad Statistics

Did you know that approximately 160,000 children miss school every day due to fear of intimidation or attack by other students? [1] There are approximately 2.1 million bullies and 2.7 million victims in American schools today. [2] That means one in every seven students in grades K-12 is either a bully or a victim of bullying.

While cyber and text bullying can have the same effects as in person bullying, there is typically no escape from cyber and text bullying. The school day ends at 3:00 p.m., but the Internet and cell phones are open 24 hours a day. And, there is no getting away from bullying on weekends, holidays or summer breaks. Far too many victims never report the bullying and suffer in silence due to the embarrassment and shame they feel.

According to bullying statistics, one out of every ten students who drops out of school does so because of repeated bullying. Statistics show that the effects cyber and text bullying have on its victims can be devastating. Being a victim can lead to a dramatic drop in grades, poor self-esteem, depression, emotional ups and downs, repeated absences from school and in some cases it can lead to the unthinkable, suicide.

In A future article, we will show you how to identify the warning signs and become more involved in your children's online lives. And, we will also address the issues of how to deal with cyber and text bullying.

Sources:

1. National Education Association
2. Dan Olweus, National School Safety Center

<http://www.americanconsumernews.com/2011/01/cyber-bullying.html>

For this consumer site

<http://www.socialmedialawupdate.com/2010/10/articles/consumer-protection/cyberbullying-does-not-happen-in-a-vacuum/print.html>

Social Media Law Update

Posted at 12:15 PM on October 18, 2010 by Sheppard Mullin

Cyber-Bullying Does Not Happen In a Vacuum

By Michelle Sherman

It takes a lot of bullying and cruelty to push someone to kill themselves. And, usually there are