



Roschk, H., Hosseinpour, M. and Breitsohl, J. (2023) Coalitions and their negative consequences: an examination in service failure-recovery situations. *Journal of Service Research*, (doi: [10.1177/10946705231163884](https://doi.org/10.1177/10946705231163884))

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher and is for private use only.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/296090/>

Deposited on 14 April 2023

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of
Glasgow

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Coalitions and Their Negative Consequences: An Examination in Service Failure-Recovery Situations

Abstract. The social nature of customer experiences creates complex and potentially detrimental dynamics in failure situations, such as when other customers side with the complainer or the firm. The present research is the first to analyze such coalitions and their consequences. We conceptualize a triad composed of a complainer, a service employee, and one or multiple others as a third actor. A field study of consumer complaints on social media shows that coalitions occur in 32% of cases, negatively shifting the affective tone of an online conversation from approximately neutral to negative. Both third actor–complainer and third actor–service employee coalitions independently deteriorate the affective tone, their individual effects are not additive, and the third actor–complainer coalition exerts the larger impact of both coalitions. Two experiments reveal that complainers feel betrayed by the third actor when this actor sides with the service employee (vs. the complainer), which strengthens complainers' satisfaction with taking steps as a recovery effort by the firm and weakens satisfaction with an offered apology. This research provides managerial insights into the practical significance of coalition effects, how coalitions impair firm response effectiveness, and under which conditions different responses sustain their effectiveness. It also presents several avenues for future research.

Keywords: service failure and recovery, coalitions, triads, text mining, affective tone, satisfaction

1
2
3 Sarah: *LEGO, I have a complaint!! I bought 3 of the Super Mario Adventure sets for our kids and there is*
4 *no instruction booklet in any box. I am VERY DISAPPOINTED.*

5
6 Eleni: *Sarah, just download the instructions for them, what is your problem? We live in a paperless age,*
7 *get used to it.*

8
9 LEGO: *We're sorry to hear that you were disappointed with us. We use digital booklets because they*
10 *allow us to offer additional features like zooming in. We fully understand that some of our customers*
11 *prefer a physical instructions book, and we apologise for the inconvenience that you and your*
12 *children have experienced.*
13
14
15
16
17

18 The above conversation, taken from LEGO's Facebook page, illustrates how a firm that
19 responds to a complainer is confronted with a scenario in which others take sides with the
20 complainer or, as is the case here, with the firm—that is, they form a coalition. Coalitions remain
21 unexplored in the service failure and recovery domain, although prior research on other
22 individuals who act on the firm's behalf (Weitzl and Hutzinger 2017), present a solution to the
23 complainer (Kim and Baker 2020), or engage in hostility toward the complainer (Bacile et al.
24 2018) already implies the notion of coalitions. From a sociopsychological perspective, coalitions
25 are a pervasive phenomenon with the potential to impact and disrupt social dynamics (Komorita
26 and Chertkoff 1973). Understanding social dynamics that involve others in a service failure
27 context is of scholarly and managerial interest (Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri 2020), and the
28 increasingly social nature of customer experiences creates ample opportunities for coalitions
29 when failures occur (Lemon and Verhoef 2016). In fact, up to 53% of customers complain
30 through social media, reaching an average of 865 connections (Customer Rage Study 2020;
31 Social Media Today 2020). Similarly, others are often part of the experience in brick-and-mortar
32 environments as well, for example in shared spaces (e.g., in a theater) or via continuous social
33 media messaging on mobile devices (e.g., Twitter postings; Grégoire and Mattila 2021).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Figure 1 illustrates how our study of coalitions differs from previous work that has
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 examined additional individuals besides a complainer and a service employee, conceptualized
4 here as a third actor. A key distinction is whether the third actor is studied in a triad or a triadic
5 context, with coalitions occurring in triads. Triads (also referred to as triadic structures) represent
6 an interlinked three-actor system. The focal criterion is that one actor connects two relations so
7 that they influence each other (Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). For example, Kim and Baker
8 (2020) found that complainers who receive help from another customer transfer the positive
9 experience into their interaction with the service employee. The two relations are connected
10 through the complainer, who acts as a conduit. Triadic contexts represent constellations in which
11 a third actor has a bearing on the situation. The focal criterion is the existence of relations
12 between individuals who are not connected; thus, influence is based on a shared context (Vedel,
13 Holma, and Havila 2016). For example, others may observe that firms react with humor to a
14 complaint and assess the firm based on context alone (Béal and Grégoire 2022). Although there
15 is a contextually relevant association, it remains unknown how the relations in that situation
16 depend on each other (i.e., which role the actors play). Therefore, triadic contexts can be viewed
17 as the background in which triads can be formed and evolve.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 [Figure 1 about here]
39

40 The present research is the first to examine how coalitions impact service failure and
41 recovery settings. We conceptualize a triad as composed of a complainer, a service employee,
42 and a third actor who comprises one or more customers. In this triad, two coalitions are
43 conceivable: between the third actor and complainer (TA–CO coalition) and between the third
44 actor and service employee (TA–SE coalition). We study these two coalitions and their
45 consequences in the triad, as well as for the complainer in specific, using a field study and two
46 experiments. Research on triads remains scarce but is needed. Previous work has predominantly
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 focused on dyads, while some other studies have investigated triadic contexts as a background to
4 triads; however, these have not examined triads per se, as done in the present research (Figure 1).
5
6 Furthermore, there is a lack of research on social dynamics in customer experiences and,
7
8 particularly, failure settings (Lemon and Verhoef 2016; Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri 2020).
9
10 Triads offer a means to capture such dynamics, as they account for interrelationships among
11
12 multiple actors. Typically, research focuses on triads because the key conceptual advancement
13
14 lies in extending the actors from two (dyad) to three (triad), while further extensions (e.g., three
15
16 to four actors) offer comparably less (Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016).
17
18
19
20
21

22 As a first contribution, Study 1 shows that coalitions are a pervasive phenomenon and
23
24 provides insight into their effect patterns in a triad. Analyzing retailers' official Facebook pages,
25
26 we find that coalitions occur in 32% ($\pm 3.5\%$) of complaint episodes, shifting the affective tone of
27
28 a conversation from approximately neutral to negative. While both TA-CO and TA-SE
29
30 coalitions deteriorate the affective tone, their effects are not additive in that their joint effect does
31
32 not exceed their individual effects. Comparing the two coalitions, TA-CO exhibits a larger
33
34 negative impact, which might be weakened by TA-SE. By focusing on the triad as a unit of
35
36 analysis and using behavioral field data, Study 1 offers robust insights which have been called
37
38 for in service research (Grégoire and Mattila 2021; Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). Moreover,
39
40 it expands previous work on triads by considering the triad as closed and the third actor as
41
42 multiple individuals.
43
44
45

46 As a second contribution, our two experiments (Studies 2 and 3) demonstrate that,
47
48 compared to the TA-CO coalition, the TA-SE coalition increases complainers' feelings of
49
50 betrayal by the third actor. Betrayal impacts complainers' satisfaction with the recovery offered
51
52 by the firm, strengthening the effect of taking steps to solve the problem and weakening that of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an apology. This finding complements Study 1 results for the triad by uncovering coalition
4 effects for the relations within the triad. Hereby, the coalition-induced change in recovery
5 preferences indicates one way in which triad members are connected. Furthermore, our findings
6 on the explanatory value of perceived betrayal in the triad and its novel conceptualization that
7 focuses on the third actor suggest broadening its scope to three-actor systems and entities other
8 than the firm. We also advance the small body of work that connects two or more relations,
9 offering a promising angle for building knowledge on social dynamics.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Since coalitions have so far remained unexplored, our third contribution lies in offering
20 novel insights for practitioners. First, coalitions lead to a downward trajectory of 16%–32% in
21 the affective tone of an online conversation after a complaint. While both TA–CO and TA–SE
22 coalitions are harmful, there also appears a lower limit in the coalition-induced downward shift.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Second, the occurrence of coalitions impairs firms' recovery efforts in online conversations and shifts complainers' recovery preferences. Third, while findings on firm responses in triads are scarce, our results corroborate the effectiveness of accommodative response content and personal, positive response styles in the absence of a coalition. Firm responses might also mitigate some of the detrimental impact of subsequently present coalitions. The results suggest an adaptive recovery approach in line with prior research (e.g., Nazifi et al. 2021). Finally, we present an agenda for future research.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Triadic Structures

We conceptualize triads as a structural phenomenon and begin our discussion with the

1
2
3 focal dyad for which four possible constellations can be distinguished in the business-to-
4
5 customer domain: a customer transgressing against another customer (customer-to-customer
6
7 conflicts; Brief et al. 2005) or against an employee (customer incivility; Henkel et al. 2017), and
8
9 an employee transgressing against a customer (service failure and recovery; Gelbrich and Roschk
10
11 2011) or another employee (employee incivility; Porath, MacInnis, and Folkes 2011). The four
12
13 constellations can be seen as prototypical instances of the focal dyad. In particular, research on
14
15 service failure and recovery—the focus of this study—seeks to integrate different failures (e.g.,
16
17 on part of the firm, service employee, or brand) to unite existing conceptualizations of provider-
18
19 driven negative events (Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri 2020). We define the focal dyad as a
20
21 service firm's failure that impacts the complainer. Next, we discuss the transition from a dyad to
22
23 a triad, the triadic nature of prior research, and other triadic conceptualizations.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Triads are based on (i) the association of three actors and (ii) the connection of at least
30
31 two relations (Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). The association criterion describes the transition
32
33 from a dyad to a triadic context. Association refers to the existence of relations in that the third
34
35 actor influences or is influenced by a dyad; without association, the third actor would have no
36
37 bearing on the situation (Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). To qualify as a triad, the existence of
38
39 relations is not enough; they also need to be connected. Connectedness describes the way in
40
41 which two or more relations influence each other (Ritter 2000). The connectedness of relations
42
43 takes various forms (see Ritter 2000 for a systematization of 10 constellations) and can be
44
45 illustrated through the different roles of the connecting actor. For example, the connecting actor
46
47 may carry the experience of one relation into another (role of a conduit) or use its relation with
48
49 the other two actors to bring them together (role of an initiator; see also Figure 1).¹ Thus, a triad
50
51 is defined as a structure in which at least two relations are connected among the three associated
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actors (Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016).
4

5 Based on this conceptualization, prior research in the service failure and recovery domain
6 is traditionally dyadic, as the third actor is missing. This also applies to analyses of the
7 interaction between a group of customers, as the complaining actor, and the service firm (e.g.,
8 Albrecht et al. 2019). Table 1 provides an overview of the studies that have included the third
9 actor. Using the defining criteria of triads, most studies can be seen as triadic in context in that
10 they analyze how the presence of a third actor affects the complainer–service employee
11 interaction, or is affected by it. These studies are important because they establish the existence
12 of relations between the focal dyad and third actor. To date, triads have been rarely studied.
13 These studies are distinct in that they look at the connectedness of relations, examining the effect
14 of one relation on another (e.g., Kim and Baker 2020) or that of two relations on a third (Pugh,
15 Brady, and Hopkins 2018), as illustrated in Figure 1.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 [Table 1 about here]
32

33 The conceptualization of triadic contexts and triads shares similarities and differences
34 with other approaches, particularly that proposed by Sitaloppi and Vargo (2017). Similar across
35 both approaches is the description of triadic contexts, yet their treatments differ. While the
36 structural definition of triads delineates them from triadic contexts, Sitaloppi and Vargo (2017)
37 did not draw such a distinction. However, to examine coalitions, this distinction is required, since
38 coalitions occur only in triadic structures (Gamson 1961; Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ***Actors and Coalitions*** 47

48
49 The actors of the triad in a failure situation comprise a complainer, a service employee,
50 and a third actor. We define the complainer as the customer who is primarily subjected to a
51 failure and the service employee as the firm's representative to whom the complaint is directed.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The third actor is defined as one or more other individuals, comprising socially and virtually
4 present others (Table 1), who influence or are influenced by the complainer and service
5 employee. This definition includes observers of the failure situation who witness other
6 customers' failure incidents. The term observer needs to be delineated from the term bystander.
7 While an observer implies someone paying attention to a failure, a bystander refers to someone
8 being merely present (Fischer et al. 2011). This means that bystanders may (e.g., when being an
9 observer; Hutzinger and Weitzl 2021) but not necessarily need to represent a third actor (e.g.,
10 when an association does not exist).

11
12 A coalition is a process in which two actors (humans or firms) form a temporary alliance
13 (e.g., joint action, agreement to cooperate, and endowment of another actor) with the aim of
14 exerting influence within a given setting (Gamson 1961; Komorita and Chertkoff 1973; Thibaut
15 and Kelley 1959; Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). Applied to the context of this study, we
16 define a coalition as a process in which another customer takes sides with either the service
17 employee or the complainer during a service failure incident to influence the situation. This line
18 of thought treats coalitions as a phenomenon within a triad. Research has also referred to
19 coalitions as a type of triad, specifying the triad as acting like one entity (Vedel, Holma, and
20 Havila 2016). Considering the entire triad as a coalition includes all triad actors instead of just
21 two. In what follows, we focus on coalitions between two actors as the smallest possible
22 coalition in a triad, which is in line with other research on coalitions (Gamson 1961).

23 ***Hypotheses***

24
25 *Overview.* We discuss the expected negative impact of coalitions (H_1 and H_2) in the triad
26 and how coalitions interfere with the effectiveness of firms' responses to complaints (H_3). We
27 then focus on the complainer and explain how coalitions can impact the complainer's satisfaction

1
2
3 with the recovery offered by the firm (H₄).
4

5 *Coalitions' Impact on the Triad.* Figure 2, panel A, shows the conceptual framework for
6 the effects of coalitions on the valence of the affective tone of the triad within an online context.
7
8 We focus on affective tone as a salient, feeling-based expression of the social dynamics in a
9
10 group (Zaccaro, Rittman, and Marks 2001). Moreover, negative emotions are commonly
11
12 observed among complainers, strongly related to their reactions, and a key factor in failure
13
14 episodes that go viral (Herhausen et al. 2019; Valentini, Orsingher, and Polyakova 2020).
15
16
17

18
19 [Figure 2 about here]
20

21
22 Realistic group conflict theory is widely used to explain how group behavior is shaped by
23
24 conflicts (Sherif et al. 1951), and recent research supports its applicability in online
25
26 environments (Brief et al. 2005; Neubaum and Krämer 2017). The theory suggests that tension is
27
28 created when groups, due to a conflict, experience an opinion imbalance. Such tension leads to
29
30 the group as a whole experiencing negative attitudinal, behavioral, and emotional consequences
31
32 (Jackson 1993). This is because group members are forced to evaluate their own position as a
33
34 consequence of an underlying fear that they will become part of an undesired minority group
35
36 (Vargas-Salfate et al. 2018). In line, research has shown that opinion imbalances in online
37
38 discussions create tensions, and that a homogenous opinion climate reflects the preference for a
39
40 state of harmony (Neubaum and Krämer 2017). In the present context, a voiced service failure
41
42 can be seen as a conflict between a complainer and a service employee. When a third actor joins
43
44 in and takes sides, an opinion imbalance results. This can then lead to tension and force the triad
45
46 members to consider their own standpoint on the failure, which likely increases the expression of
47
48 negative attitudes and emotions.² Thus,
49
50
51

52
53
54 **H₁:** The presence (vs. absence) of (a) a TA–CO and (b) a TA–SE coalition leads to a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more negative affective tone of the triad.
4
5
6
7

8 When the third actor comprises multiple individuals, as is the case on social media,
9
10 multiple coalitions may occur in a single complaint episode. Given the opposing nature of the
11 TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions, an important question relates to how both coalitions together
12 affect the triad. Realistic group conflict theory suggests that as the number of conflicts increases,
13 the negative consequences for a group as a whole also increase (Yang, van de Vliert, and Jehn
14 2018). Thus, the joint occurrence of the TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions can intensify the conflict
15 and lead to a more negative affective tone than that of each coalition. Yet, the extent to which the
16 individual effects of both coalitions are additive remains unclear.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Large communities on social media have a strong likelihood of an excessive number of
27 competing standpoints (Walther 2018). Such complex interactions can exceed the cognitive
28 resources of group members and cause discomfort (Fu et al. 2020). In response, group members
29 may engage in selective processing; that is, they deliberately ignore information that surpasses
30 their cognitive resources and creates discomfort (Arceneaux, Johnson, and Murphy 2012).
31 Recent findings have indicated that such behavior can occur on social media (Jeong et al. 2019).
32 In the present context, after being exposed to a coalition, the triad members may process further
33 coalitions only selectively to balance their cognitive effort. In particular, additional coalitions
34 that express competing standpoints may be ignored to avoid discomfort. As a result, the
35 combined effect (or presence) of the TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions on affective tone will be less
36 negative than the sum of their individual effects. Statistically, this represents a positive
37 interaction between the presence of a TA–CO coalition and that of a TA–SE coalition, assuming
38 a negative impact of both coalitions individually on affective tone. Thus,
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **H₂:** The joint presence of a TA–CO and a TA–SE coalition leads to a less negative
4 affective tone of the triad than the sum of both coalitions individually.
5
6
7
8
9

10 From a managerial viewpoint, it is of interest how coalitions interfere with the
11 effectiveness of firms' responses to complaints. Personal response styles and accommodative
12 response content are favorable recovery strategies in online contexts (Abney et al. 2017; Johnen
13 and Schnittka 2019). Therefore, the presence (vs. absence) of a firm response may yield a more
14 positive affective tone. In addition, we propose that the presence of a coalition weakens the
15 effectiveness of a firm response. Similar to our previous reasoning, the formation of either
16 coalition, TA–CO or TA–SE, is likely to increase the complexity of the interaction process
17 (Jeong et al. 2019). As a result, triad members may selectively process the conversation and
18 focus more on negative stimuli, such as coalitions, which also outweigh positive stimuli, such as
19 a firm's response (negativity bias; Rozin and Royzman 2001). Accordingly, a firm's response
20 may lose its effectiveness due to the presence of a coalition. Thus,
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **H₃:** The presence (vs. absence) of a coalition weakens the effectiveness of firm
36 responses to positively influence the affective tone of the triad.
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Coalitions' Impact on the Complainer.* So far, we have theorized the impact of coalitions
43 on the triad as a whole. Next, we discuss how coalitions affect the relations within the triad. We
44 explain the analyzed variables, their conceptual relations, and the expected effects.
45
46
47
48

49 Since coalitions can influence the relations in various ways (Ritter 2000; Thibaut and
50 Kelley 1959), we anchor the coalition effects on the complainer as the actor most directly
51 affected by the failure. We focus on transaction-specific satisfaction, defined as the complainer's
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 evaluation of a firm's failure response (Pugh, Brady, and Hopkins 2018; Albrecht et al. 2019). It
4 aligns with the affective tone from the previous hypotheses by being feeling-based, while also
5 including cognitive elements that are relevant in service failure settings (Khamitov, Grégoire,
6 and Suri 2020). As recovery efforts, we examine taking steps (communication that the firm will
7 try to solve the problem) and apology (an empathic expression of remorse for a failure; Roschk
8 and Gelbrich 2014).³ Taking steps and an apology address different coping strategies of the
9 complainer, being either problem- or emotion-oriented respectively (Duhachek 2005).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Figure 2, panel B, depicts our conceptual framework, illustrating how the recovery–
20 satisfaction link is moderated by whether a coalition is present, and the moderating effect is
21 explained by perceived betrayal. The variable constellation represents a mediated moderation,
22 which is concerned with the process (i.e., perceived betrayal) that is responsible for the
23 moderation (i.e., the effect of coalition; Baron and Kenny 1998; Muller et al. 2005). Mediated
24 moderation, particularly treating perceived betrayal as a moderator, provides an appropriate
25 conceptualization to account for the triadic structure underlying these effects. From the
26 complainer's perspective, perceived betrayal relates to *the actions of the third actor* who
27 accompanies the complainer, while the complainer's satisfaction is expressed toward *the firm's*
28 *actions* (i.e., the recovery offered by the firm). Perceived betrayal is typically researched as a
29 reaction to something that the service provider did (Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri 2020). Thus,
30 employing perceived betrayal as a reaction to something the third actor did presents a novel
31 contextual variable to the recovery–satisfaction link that extends current knowledge.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 Based on the conceptual framework presented in Figure 2, panel B, we propose that a
50 TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition increases complainers' perceived betrayal by the third actor.
51 Perceived betrayal describes the belief that someone has intentionally violated a relationship
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 norm (Grégoire and Fisher 2008). Relativistic group theory suggests that individuals hold a
4
5 normative expectation of getting support from fellow group members (Benard 2012). For the
6
7 complainer–third actor relation, the complainer may perceive such a norm breach when the third
8
9 actor sides with the other party (service employee) rather than with the complainer. Thus,

10
11
12 **H_{4a}:** A TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition increases complainers’ perceived betrayal by the
13
14
15 third actor.
16
17
18

19
20 Furthermore, we propose that a complainer’s perceived betrayal by the third actor
21
22 moderates the complainer’s expressed satisfaction with the firm’s recovery. Realistic group
23
24 conflict theory suggests that when group members fail to support an individual’s opinion, a
25
26 homogenous opinion climate becomes less conceivable and thus incurs emotional stress for the
27
28 individual. The individual then seeks a problem-focused coping strategy since it allows to move
29
30 beyond the emotional processing of the conflict and leave it behind (Benard and Doan 2011). In
31
32 contrast, an emotion-focused coping strategy prolongs the emotional processing, making it
33
34 harder for the individual to move on (Levine, Moreland, and Ryan 1998). In our case, the
35
36 complainer experiences emotional stress when betrayed by the third actor. To the complainer, a
37
38 problem-focused recovery by the firm (taking steps to address the problem) is then likely to be
39
40 more satisfying, while an emotion-focused recovery (an empathic apology) is less satisfying; the
41
42 former shifts the complainer’s focus away from the emotional processing of the conflict, whereas
43
44 the latter prolongs, if not intensifies, the processing. Thus,

45
46
47
48
49 **H_{4b,c}:** Complainers’ perceived betrayal by the third actor (b) strengthens taking steps’
50
51 positive effect on satisfaction and (c) weakens apology’s positive effect.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

H_{4a} and H_{4b,c} theorize the chain of effects of a coalition, through perceived betrayal, on the recovery–satisfaction link. To establish mediated moderation, we follow its core idea of explaining a focal moderation, which in our case is that of a coalition (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005). Therefore, we also expect an interaction between coalition and recovery to follow a similar pattern, so that a TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition strengthens the recovery effect of taking steps and weakens that of an apology. When the perceived betrayal × recovery interaction is accounted for, mediated moderation requires the coalition × recovery interaction to become less or not significant (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005; Baron and Kenny 1986).

Overview of Studies

We conducted one field study and two experiments. Study 1 was a text-mining study on social media, which had three objectives: (1) to gauge the frequency with which coalitions occur in real-life settings, (2) to test the impact of both coalitions on the valence of the affective tone of the triad (H₁ and H₂), and (3) to assess how coalitions interfere with firm response effectiveness (H₃). Study 2 was an experiment to test if the presence of a TA–SE coalition compared to a TA–CO coalition leads to the complainer feeling betrayed by the third actor, which in turn yields a shift in the complainer’s recovery preferences (H₄). Study 3 was a replication study for H₄.

STUDY 1

Method

Database Development. We scraped user comments from Facebook based on reports indicating its status as customers’ preferred choice for complaining about companies (Social Media Today 2020). We collected data from the official Facebook page of 17 international

1
2
3 retailers, including coffee chains (e.g., Costa Coffee), fast-food joints (e.g., McDonalds),
4 groceries (e.g., Tesco), and general retailers (e.g., Marks & Spencer; Table 2). An initial
5 screening suggested these retailers because of their high frequency of consumer activity and
6 retailers' content contribution. Using Python and the scraping modules Selenium and Beautiful
7 Soup, we generated an initial dataset of all comments made on the retailers' Facebook pages in
8 the United Kingdom between December 2020 and March 2021, totaling 17,191 episodes (i.e.,
9 Facebook's predefined comment chains) and 25,374 individual comments. We then combined
10 automated classifiers (i.e., machine-learning classification) and manual coding to identify
11 episodes that contained a complaint. Machine-learning classification allows for the handling of
12 considerable data, and subsequent manual coding uses human reasoning to ensure data accuracy.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 For machine-learning classification, we used a Naive Bayes algorithm to program our
27 classifier (Kowsari et al. 2019). After programming, the classifier had to be calibrated (i.e.,
28 trained), which required data on social media posts categorized into complaints or not. We used
29 the data provided by Preotiuc-Pietro, Gaman, and Aletras's (2019), which contains Twitter posts
30 manually annotated for representing complaints or not. Although the database does not refer to
31 Facebook posts, it provides numerous social media comments (N = 1,971) across different
32 industries (e.g., retail and apparel), making it a suitable choice for training our classifier. For
33 subsequent manual coding, we defined a complaint as an expression of dissatisfaction with a
34 product or service performance that falls below a customer's expectations (Khamitov, Grégoire,
35 and Suri 2020). For training purposes, two independent judges (one research assistant and one of
36 the authors) coded the first 35 episodes, which were identified by the automated classifier, and
37 agreed on 88% of the cases. Disagreements were resolved through discussion.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Applied to the collected Facebook data, the machine-learning classifier identified 1,463
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 episodes as potential complaints in the first step. These episodes served as a pre-selection and
4
5 were manually coded in the second step to identify actual complaints (separated from false
6
7 automated detections). After manual coding and a discussion of disagreements, we identified 681
8
9 complaint episodes. A further data-handling step was necessary. Of the 681 complaint episodes,
10
11 358 were single complaint posts that did not receive any response. Since we were interested in
12
13 the interactions following a complaint, these episodes were excluded. Consequently, the final
14
15 dataset contained 323 episodes, including 1,925 comments.
16
17

18
19 *Variables.* Table 2 shows the definitions, measurement modes, and statistical properties
20
21 of Study 1 variables. We again used manual coding and automated analyses. For the manually
22
23 coded variables, two research assistants coded the data following the definitions in Table 2. Their
24
25 agreement rate ranged from .81 to .99. Coding reliability based on Krippendorff's alpha was .81
26
27 or larger, exceeding the .80 threshold. Coding inconsistencies of categorical variables were
28
29 resolved through discussion with one of the study authors and those of continuous variables by
30
31 calculating the average of the coded values. Study 1 comprised four sets of variables.
32
33

34
35 [Table 2 about here]
36

37
38 First, we captured the valence of the affective tone expressed in a comment. Text-based
39
40 affective sentiments represent naturalistic expressions of positive and negative evaluations of a
41
42 service experience (Berger et al. 2020). We measured affective tone through the bipolar
43
44 emotional tone dimension of the LIWC-22 dictionary (LIWC; Pennebaker Conglomerates, Inc.
45
46 n.d.), an established text analysis tool within social media research (Boyd et al. 2022). The
47
48 emotional tone dimension was defined as the difference between positive and negative emotional
49
50 dimensions and had a value ranging from 0 to 100. Values above (below) 50 indicated a more
51
52 positive (negative) tone, with 50 representing a neutral tone (Boyd et al. 2022).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Second, the coalition dynamics were based on the following coding procedure. Each
4 comment by a user was manually coded if it represented a coalition (i.e., an expression of taking
5 side) with the complainer (TA–CO coalition) or the retailer (including the service employee;
6 TA–SE coalition). To avoid double counts, each user within an episode could form a coalition
7 only once. The variables, number of TA–CO coalitions and number of TA–SE coalitions, were
8 given by the sum of the respective coalitions in an episode. The variables, presence of a TA–CO
9 coalition and presence of a TA–SE coalition, were given by defining the coalition comment and
10 all subsequent comments in an episode as 1 (presence) and the other comments as 0 (absence).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Third, we measured the presence of a firm response analogous to the presence of the
23 coalitions. We further took an exploratory approach, capturing major differences in the response
24 style and content. One difference in style was whether the firm responded in a more (vs. less)
25 personal manner. Compared to generic response statements, personalized responses directly
26 address the receiver as an individual, rendering a response more relatable and valuable for the
27 complainer (Abney et al. 2017). Moreover, we captured the authenticity of the firm’s response.
28 Authenticity refers to the perceived genuineness of a message (Boyd et al. 2022), which likely
29 enhances the credibility of a firm’s response. Based on the idea that a more positive (vs.
30 negative) tone may guard against prolonging the negative failure event, we also assessed the
31 affective tone of the firm’s response itself. Finally, we captured the response content by
32 considering four strategies: taking steps, explanation, deferral, and apology. Table 2 provides the
33 operationalization of the different response styles and contents.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Fourth, we included control variables to account for potential confounding factors that
50 may occur in a field setting (Berger et al. 2020). The first set, failure characteristics, included
51 causal attributions about the failure (controllability and stability), its type (outcome vs. process,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reversible vs. irreversible), and its severity (Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003; Roschk and
4
5 Gelbrich 2014). It further comprised the presence of mediators to account for other customers'
6
7 attempts to fix the complaint (Kim and Baker 2020). Further, industry characteristics included
8
9 the branch and brand buzz of the retailer to account for potential differences in customer
10
11 attitudes toward the retailers. Finally, language metrics contained word count and the percentage
12
13 of words with more than six letters (Javornik, Filieri, and Gumann 2020). We also included
14
15 daytime to capture mood variations across daytime and nighttime.
16
17
18

19 *Analysis*

20
21 For testing hypotheses H₁–H₃, the extraction of user comments within a complaint
22
23 episode yielded a nested data structure, for which hierarchical linear models (HLMs) are the
24
25 preferred method. Before running the HLMs, we checked three data properties. First, the amount
26
27 of variance in the affective tone that resulted from complaint episode membership was 9.0%
28
29 ($p < .001$), formally requiring a hierarchical approach (Huang 2018). Second, to ensure model
30
31 robustness, the major restriction is often the higher-level sample size, for which our data with
32
33 323 episodes exceeded the recommended threshold of 50 (Maas and Hox 2005). Moreover, the
34
35 sample size of each level offered sufficient power ($\geq 80\%$) to detect small effects ($r = .08$) of the
36
37 coalition and firm response variables (Arend and Schäfer 2019). Third, we checked for
38
39 multicollinearity as another threat to model robustness. Because there is no direct diagnostic in
40
41 an HLM, we regressed the affective tone on the presence of a TA–CO coalition, the presence of
42
43 a TA–SE coalition, the presence of a firm response, and the control variables in a conventional
44
45 model, yielding a maximum variance inflation factor of 1.99.
46
47
48
49
50

51 We specified two-level HLMs, distinguishing between variables measured at the
52
53 comment level (Level 1) and episode level (Level 2; Table 2). We estimated three models. To
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 test H_1 and H_2 , we regressed the affective tone on the presence of a TA–CO coalition, the
4 presence of a TA–SE coalition, their interaction (formed through multiplication), and the control
5 variables (Model 1). Since the coalition variables were dummy coded, the main effects denoted
6 the effect of each coalition in the absence of the other coalition, allowing us to assess the
7 coalition effects (H_1) independent of their interaction (H_2) (Cohen et al. 2003). Because the
8 affective tone of the initial complaint comment and the firm responses might differ from the
9 remaining comments, we included two dummy variables to control for these potential confounds.
10 To test H_3 , we added in the first step the variable presence of a firm response to the model
11 estimations (Model 2). In the second step, we distinguished the presence of a firm response
12 based on whether a coalition was present or absent (Model 3) and tested whether its effect
13 differed across the coalition conditions, assessing H_3 . Theme 1 in the Web Appendix provides
14 the formulaic representations of the models and further details.

30 **Results**

31
32
33 *Occurrence of Coalitions.* Across the 1,925 comments, we observed 646 instances in
34 which a user formed a coalition with the complainer (213 coalitions) or the service employee
35 (433 coalitions). Next, we estimated the frequency at which a complaint episode contained a
36 coalition. Across the 323 complaint episodes, at least one coalition occurred in 218 episodes. As
37 a comparator, we used the total number of complaints from the Facebook data ($N = 681$); this
38 included the 323 analyzed complaint episodes and the 358 complaints, which were single posts
39 and thus without any coalition. The frequency was 32.0% ($=218/681$) and the error margin was
40 $\pm 3.5\%$ (at 95% confidence), yielding a population estimate between 28.5% and 35.5% for the
41 complaints made on the retailers' Facebook pages.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 *Impact of Coalitions.* Table 3 presents the HLM results. In Model 1, the presence of a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 TA–CO coalition ($\beta = -14.51, p < .001$) and a TA–SE coalition ($\beta = -7.16, p = .034$) led to a
4 more negative affective tone, supporting H_{1a} and H_{1b}. The effect of a TA–CO coalition was
5 larger than that of a TA–SE coalition ($p_{\Delta\text{coeff}}^4 = .007$). The results also indicated a positive
6 interaction between both coalitions ($\beta = 12.12, p = .002$). As shown in Figure 3, panel A, the
7 presence of a TA–CO coalition shifted the affective tone from 44.95 to 30.44 ($d = -.41$) and that
8 of a TA–SE coalition from 44.95 to 37.80 ($d = -.20$), both in the absence of the respective other
9 coalition. As expected, the presence of both coalitions yielded an affective tone of 35.41
10 ($d = -.27$), which is similar to each coalition alone, supporting H₂. In addition, the affective tone
11 tended to be less negative in the presence of both coalitions compared to a TA–CO coalition
12 alone (35.41 vs. 30.44, respectively; $p = .071$), indicating a partial buffering effect of a TA–SE
13 coalition.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 [Table 3 about here] [Figure 3 about here]
29

30
31 *Impact of Retailers' Responses.* The results of Model 2 showed that the presence of a firm
32 response did not influence affective tone ($\beta = 2.92, p = .231$). Yet, conditional on the absence
33 versus presence of a coalition (Model 3), the results indicated that the presence of a firm
34 response led to a more positive affective tone in the absence ($\beta = 8.46, p = .079$), but not
35 presence, of a coalition ($\beta = 0.32, p = .896$), with the coefficients differing from each other
36 ($p_{\Delta\text{coeff}} = .057$). The positive effect in the absence condition requires some caution, given the
37 relatively high p -value.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 To gain further insights, we explored the potential negative impact of a coalition on firm
48 response effectiveness across different response styles and contents. First, we checked which
49 response styles (less personal, less authentic, and negative) and content (deferral) did not exert a
50 positive effect on affective tone in the presence or absence of a coalition (p -values $> .2$). Next, we
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tested the impact of a coalition on the remaining responses using Model 3 as a template for each
4
5 test. The presence of a coalition impaired the positive effect of more personal responses
6
7 (coalition absence: $\beta = 12.28, p = .024$; coalition presence: $\beta = 3.31, p = .275$; $p_{\Delta\text{coeff}} = .053$),
8
9 positive responses (coalition absence: $\beta = 10.46, p = .045$; coalition presence: $\beta = 0.58, p = .817$;
10
11 $p_{\Delta\text{coeff}} = .039$), and responses offering to take steps, an explanation, and/or an apology (coalition
12
13 absence: $\beta = 9.43, p = .050$; coalition presence: $\beta = 0.47, p = .853$; $p_{\Delta\text{coeff}} = .042$). We found a
14
15 similar pattern for more authentic responses (coalition absence: $\beta = 11.35, p = .099$; coalition
16
17 presence: $\beta = 0.75, p = .823$; $p_{\Delta\text{coeff}} = .102$). The results largely support H₃.

18
19
20
21
22 Comparing the results across the models, another interesting finding emerged. While the
23
24 coalition effects remained robust across Models 1 and 2, they were somewhat reduced in Model
25
26 3. This tentatively indicates that a firm's response in the absence of a coalition mitigates the
27
28 subsequent impact of coalitions.
29

30 31 ***Discussion of Study 1***

32
33 Study 1 was a text-mining study of the official Facebook pages of 17 retailers, where we
34
35 observed actual behaviors in a naturalistic field setting. Our results showed that a coalition
36
37 occurred in 32.0% of the complaint episodes, substantiating the notion of coalition formation as
38
39 frequent dynamic in three-actor failure settings. Consistent with our hypotheses, we found that
40
41 the presence (vs. absence) of both coalitions negatively impacted the affective tone of the online
42
43 conversation, yielding a negative shift from an approximately neutral toward a negative tone (H_{1a}
44
45 and H_{1b}). The effects of both coalitions were not additive (H₂), suggesting a lower limit to the
46
47 coalition-induced downward trajectory. The presence (vs. absence) of a coalition impaired firm
48
49 response effectiveness (H₃). In addition, our results showed a larger impact of a TA–CO than a
50
51 TA–SE coalition and a partial buffering effect of a TA–SE coalition; moreover, they indicated
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that a firm response might mitigate some of the detrimental impact of subsequently present
4 coalitions. Study 1 also identified personal and positive response styles and accommodative
5 response content (i.e., taking steps, explanation, and/or apology) as favorable firm responses.
6
7
8
9

10 To gain further insights, we next examined the coalition effects for the relations in the
11 triad, specifically how coalitions impact complainers' appraisal of the actions by the third actor
12 and how this influences complainers' satisfaction with the recovery offered by the firm (H₄). To
13 ensure equivalence in the settings, we used similar contexts in Study 1 and Study 2.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **STUDY 2** 23

24 25 26 ***Method*** 27

28 *Experimental Design.* This study used a 3 (coalition: TA–CO coalition, TA–SE coalition,
29 no coalition) × 3 (recovery: no recovery, taking steps, apology) between-subjects design. The no-
30 recovery condition served as a control condition to rule out differences in satisfaction by the TA–
31 CO and TA–SE coalitions in the absence of a recovery; similar was the case for the no-coalition
32 condition and taking steps and apology. The scenarios for Study 2 were based on actual
33 Facebook episodes captured in Study 1. We chose Tesco, one of the largest grocery retailers in
34 the United Kingdom, as the service firm for our scenarios. Grocery retailing is an
35 underrepresented industry that needs further research (Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri 2020).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Using photographic illustrations, we simulated interactions on a Facebook page. The
48 participants were asked to put themselves in the shoes of a customer who complained about his
49 daughter getting sick after eating from one of Tesco's Butternut Squash baby food jars. We
50 manipulated the coalition formation by another user replying, "I would feel the same mate. Tesco
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 needs to be more transparent, this sounds really serious” (TA–CO coalition) or “Move on, your
4 child might be sick from something else. I buy Tesco’s baby food all the time, never had a bad
5 experience” (TA–SE coalition). In the no-coalition condition, the other user made an irrelevant
6 post. The participants then imagined checking the Facebook page again a little later, moving on
7 to the recovery scenarios in which they saw one of the following: a Tesco employee who replied
8 by advising not to use the baby food jars and offering to test them (taking steps), apologizing for
9 what has happened and expressing empathy (apology). In the no-recovery condition, they saw
10 three unrelated user comments. Details can be found in Theme 2 in the Web Appendix.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Data Collection.* A power analysis (G*Power; 80% power, $\alpha = .05$) with a small-to-
23 medium effect size ($d = .35$) suggested a cell size of 65 for an interaction between coalition (TA–
24 CO, TA–SE) and recovery (taking steps, apology). Data were gathered from a crowdsourcing panel
25 (Clickworker) in November 2021. The subjects included United Kingdom residents and were
26 paid 1 pound sterling each for participation. Upon completion, we excluded 28 of the 560
27 respondents because they had provided suspicious answers (failed attention checks, responded at
28 extreme speed, and gave uniform answers). The final sample included 532 participants (mean
29 age 37.9 years, 59.8% females), who were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The cell sizes were adequate, ranging from 55 to 63.

Measures. We measured the complainers’ transaction-specific satisfaction (e.g., “Judging
this particular service encounter, I am satisfied”; $\alpha = .97$) and perceived betrayal by the third
actor with three items each (e.g., “I feel betrayed by [name of the other user]”; $\alpha = .95$) by using
a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). As control
variables, we included perceived failure magnitude, attitude toward complaining, age, gender,
prior experiences with Facebook, failure attributions, and the extent of customer contact in the

1
2
3 participants' daily work, all of which could affect customer reactions in failure situations (Hess,
4 Ganesan, and Klein 2003; Pugh, Brady, and Hopkins 2018). We also measured self-efficacy and
5
6 empathic concern as control variables to capture potentially relevant personal characteristics.
7

8
9
10 Theme 3 in the Web Appendix provides all items, sources, and reliability estimates.
11

12 *Analysis.* To test mediated moderation, we ran three models (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt
13 2005; Baron and Kenny 1986). First, satisfaction was regressed on coalition (TA–SE, TA–CO),
14 recovery (taking steps, apology), and their interaction. This established the unmediated coalition
15 \times recovery interaction (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005). Second, perceived betrayal was
16 regressed on coalition, recovery, and their interaction. We expected a positive effect of a TA–SE
17 (vs. TA–CO) coalition on perceived betrayal. The other effects were included for
18 comprehensiveness, since mediated moderation may also be based on the interaction during this
19 step (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005). Third, satisfaction was regressed on coalition, recovery,
20 coalition \times recovery, perceived betrayal, and perceived betrayal \times recovery. We expected the
21 perceived betrayal \times recovery interaction to be significant, and the coalition \times recovery
22 interaction to be non-significant (or to reduce in effect; Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005; Baron
23 and Kenny 1986). Comparing the third and the first model represents a hierarchical approach that
24 reflects the proposed causal priority of the variables (Cohen et al. 2003).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Furthermore, we contrast-coded coalition (+.5 = TA–SE, –.5 = TA–CO) and recovery
43 (+.5 = taking steps, –.5 = apology) and mean-centered perceived betrayal to meet the statistical
44 requirements for the specified models (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005). We included the control
45 variables as independent variables in all regressions. Finally, we used percentile bootstrapping
46 and a path model to estimate the combined effect of coalition \rightarrow perceived betrayal and perceived
47 betrayal \times recovery \rightarrow satisfaction (see Theme 4 in the Web Appendix).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Manipulation Checks. To validate the coalition manipulation, the participants were asked to indicate who they thought the other user sided with by using a scale from 1 (the complainer) to 7 (Tesco), with 4 (nobody) as the neutral point. The participants correctly indicated that the other user took the complainer's side (1.15) in the TA–CO coalition, Tesco's side (6.56) in the TA–SE coalition, and nobody's side (4.26) in the no-coalition condition ($F[2, 523] = 1271.15, p < .001, \eta^2 = .829$). Post-hoc tests showed significant differences among the three groups ($p < .001$). The no-coalition group scored slightly over the scale midpoint, which was significant but minor in scope ($t(174) = 3.97, p < .001, \eta^2 = .022$). To validate the recovery manipulation, the participants indicated how Tesco responded and correctly identified the recovery (i.e., no recovery, taking steps, or apology) in 96% of the cases; the recovery manipulation did not affect whom the participants thought the third actor sided with. The participants rated the scenarios as realistic ($M = 5.76$) on a scale from 1 (unrealistic) to 7 (realistic), which was higher than the scale midpoint in all conditions ($ps < .001$). The manipulations performed as intended.

Coalition, Recovery, and Satisfaction. We first examined the satisfaction ratings, as shown in Figure 3 (panel B). An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the manipulations and control variables as independent variables revealed a main effect of recovery ($F[2, 514] = 229.40, p < .001$), such that no recovery yielded lower satisfaction ratings (1.81) compared to taking steps (4.41, $p < .001$) and apology (4.16, $p < .001$). It also indicated a main effect of coalition ($F[2, 514] = 2.84, p = .060$) and its interaction with recovery ($F[4, 514] = 3.49, p = .008$).

Simple analyses showed that taking steps yielded higher satisfaction ratings in the presence of the TA–SE coalition compared to the TA–CO coalition (4.82 vs. 4.19, respectively;

1
2
3 $F[1, 112] = 6.05, p = .015, d = .46$) and no coalition (4.82 vs. 4.21, respectively; $F[1, 112] =$
4
5 4.67, $p = .033, d = .41$). An apology yielded higher satisfaction ratings in the presence of the
6
7 TA–CO coalition compared to the TA–SE coalition (4.54 vs. 4.06, respectively; $F[1, 110] =$
8
9 4.07, $p = .046, d = .39$) and no coalition (4.54 vs. 3.88, respectively; $F[1, 104] = 6.16, p = .015, d$
10
11 $= .49$). In addition, the TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions yielded similar satisfaction ratings when
12
13 there was no recovery ($p = .975$), as did taking steps and apology when there was no coalition
14
15 ($p = .281$), ruling out satisfaction differences due to the coalitions and recoveries only. We found
16
17 no further effects.
18
19

20
21 *Mediated Moderation of Perceived Betrayal.* Table 4, column Study 2, presents the
22
23 results of the mediated moderation analysis. As expected, the results showed an interaction
24
25 between coalition and recovery in Model 1 ($\beta = .20, p = .002$), and that the TA–SE compared to
26
27 the TA–CO coalition increased perceived betrayal in Model 2 ($\beta = .74, p < .001; H_{4a}$). Model 3
28
29 indicated a significant perceived betrayal \times recovery interaction ($\beta = .22, p = .024$), while the
30
31 coalition \times recovery interaction was no longer significant ($\beta = .05, p = .636$). In addition, the
32
33 joint effect of coalition \rightarrow perceived betrayal and perceived betrayal \times recovery \rightarrow satisfaction was
34
35 significant ($\beta = .16, p = .024$). The results supported perceived betrayal as a mediator of the
36
37 moderation effect of coalition. Figure 3, panel C, shows the perceived betrayal \times recovery
38
39 interaction. As perceived betrayal increased, taking steps yielded larger and apology lower
40
41 satisfaction values. For values ≤ 1.49 , the effect of apology was larger than that of taking steps,
42
43 and for values ≥ 3.76 , the effect was the opposite, supporting H_{4b} and H_{4c} .
44
45
46
47
48

49 [Table 4 about here]
50

51 *Discussion of Study 2*

52 In Study 2, we examined how a TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition shifts the recovery
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preferences of the complainer. As expected, the complainers felt betrayed when the third actor
4 sided with the service employee (compared to the complainer), consistent with H_{4a}. The
5
6 complainers' feelings of betrayal by the third actor, in turn, impacted their satisfaction with the
7
8 firm's recovery, strengthening the recovery effect of taking steps and weakening that of apology,
9
10 consistent with H_{4b} and H_{4c}. Complementing Study 1, the results revealed coalition effects on the
11
12 relation level, showing an effect cascade that connected the service employee–third actor relation
13
14 (coalition) to the complainer–service employee relation (shift in recovery preferences) through
15
16 the third actor–complainer relation (perceived betrayal). The results also supported the notion of
17
18 broadening the scope of perceived betrayal, which so far has largely focused on complainers'
19
20 perceived betrayal by the service firm. We conceptualized perceived betrayal by focusing on the
21
22 third actor in the multi-actor structure and found that it explains the moderation effect of a
23
24 coalition. For managers, the satisfaction ratings for the hypothesized conditions indicated upward
25
26 deviations from the otherwise average ratings, highlighting that adapting to the coalitions can
27
28 improve recovery effectiveness. We designed Study 3 on these findings by offering a replication
29
30 with different adjustments, as outlined next.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **STUDY 3**

41 ***Method***

42
43
44
45 *Experimental Design.* To broaden the scope of Study 2 findings and assess their
46
47 robustness, we added three variations in Study 3. It comprised an offline setting to expand the
48
49 findings beyond the previous online context. The third actor represented a friend, rendering a
50
51 stronger tie between the complainer and the third actor than before. We assessed whether the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proposed shift in recovery preferences would occur when taking steps and apology are
4
5 components within a multi-component recovery approach. This study used a 2 (coalition: TA–
6
7 CO coalition, TA–SE coalition) × 3 (recovery: compensation only, compensation plus taking
8
9 steps [i.e., taking steps], compensation plus apology [i.e., apology]) between-subjects design. We
10
11 did not include a no-coalition condition, since our aim was to replicate Study 2 results. We used
12
13 an apparel shopping episode because it represents an under-researched setting (Khamitov,
14
15 Grégoire, and Suri 2020) and chose Zara as a well-recognized firm in the United Kingdom.
16
17

18
19 The participants read a scenario of a customer who went to Zara to shop for summer
20
21 apparel together with a friend. The customer was charged the full price for a jacket, although it
22
23 had been promoted with a 20% discount. Upon realizing the mistake, the customer told the friend
24
25 of their intention to complain to the store, and we manipulated the friend's reply as "I feel for
26
27 you; Zara needs to pay more attention. Such failures are really annoying not only from a
28
29 financial point of view but as a matter of principle too" (TA–CO coalition) or "Move on; this is
30
31 not the end of the world. The price is low; just be grateful for the good deal that you got from
32
33 Zara, which also cannot offer discounts for every item in store" (TA–SE coalition). After that,
34
35 the participants read the store manager's response, explaining that the jacket was wrongly
36
37 promoted and offering a 20% discount on the original price (compensation only), a 20% discount
38
39 plus taking steps (i.e., ensuring that there are no other wrongly promoted items and discussing
40
41 this issue with the quality department), or a 20% discount plus an apology (apology). Theme 2 in
42
43 the Web Appendix provides the scenarios.⁵
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Data Collection, Measures, and Analysis.* Data collection, measures, and analysis were
50
51 the same as those in Study 2, with some adaptations. Data were gathered in spring 2022 from the
52
53 crowdsource panel Prolific, offering each subject 80 pence sterling for participation. Upon
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 completion, we excluded 11 of the 517 respondents because they had provided suspicious
4
5 answers. The final sample included 506 United Kingdom residents (mean age 38.6 years, 49.2%
6
7 female), with cell sizes ranging from 81 to 87. The items for measuring satisfaction were adapted
8
9 to the new context of measuring satisfaction with complaint handling.
10

11 **Results**

12
13
14 *Manipulation Checks.* Manipulation checks similar to those used in Study 2 indicated that
15
16 all of our manipulations performed as intended.⁶ The participants rated the scenarios as realistic
17
18 (M = 6.03) and above the scale midpoint in all conditions ($ps < .001$).
19
20

21
22 *Coalition, Recovery, and Satisfaction.* Figure 3, panel B, depicts the satisfaction cell
23
24 means. An ANCOVA with the manipulations and the control variables as the independent
25
26 variables showed a main effect of recovery ($F[2, 491] = 32.88, p < .001$), and simple analyses
27
28 indicated higher satisfaction ratings in the apology condition (6.13) compared to all other
29
30 conditions ($ps < .001$).⁷ The ANCOVA also revealed a main effect of coalition ($F[1, 491] = 4.62,$
31
32 $p = .032$) and its interaction with recovery ($F[2, 491] = 2.70, p = .068$).
33
34

35
36 Simple analyses for the taking steps and apology conditions illustrated the coalition \times
37
38 recovery interaction more clearly ($F[1, 320] = 6.41, p = .012$). The taking steps condition yielded
39
40 higher satisfaction ratings in the presence of the TA–SE compared to the TA–CO coalition (5.48
41
42 vs. 4.95, respectively; $F[1, 156] = 6.86, p = .010, d = .42$), and the apology condition yielded
43
44 similar satisfaction ratings in the presence of both TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions (6.18 vs. 6.08,
45
46 respectively; $F[1, 156] = 0.40, p = .528, d = -.11$). In addition, the satisfaction ratings in the
47
48 compensation-only condition did not differ from each other ($p = .308$).
49
50

51
52 *Mediated Moderation of Perceived Betrayal.* The results, shown in Table 4 (column
53
54 Study 3), indicated an interaction between coalition and recovery in Model 1 ($\beta = .13, p = .012$),
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and that the TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition increased perceived betrayal in Model 2 ($\beta = .84$,
4 $p < .001$; H_{4a}). In Model 3, we found a significant perceived betrayal \times recovery interaction ($\beta =$
5 $.20$, $p = .034$), while the coalition \times recovery interaction was no longer significant ($\beta = -.04$, $p =$
6 $.663$). In addition, the joint effect of coalition \rightarrow perceived betrayal and perceived betrayal \times
7 recovery \rightarrow satisfaction was significant ($\beta = .17$, $p = .027$). The results supported the proposed
8 mediated moderation. Figure 3, panel C, plots the perceived betrayal \times recovery interaction. As
9 perceived betrayal increased, taking steps yielded larger satisfaction values, while the effect of
10 apology decreased only slightly, the difference being significant for values ≤ 5.43 in perceived
11 betrayal. These results supported H_{4b} but not H_{4c} .

22 *Discussion of Study 3*

23
24 The objective of Study 3 was to replicate Study 2 results. For this purpose, we used an
25 offline setting in Study 3, a strong tie between the complainer and third actor, and a multi-
26 component recovery approach in which taking steps and an apology were offered alongside a
27 compensation. The TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition increased the complainer's perceived betrayal
28 by the third actor, as we expected in H_{4a} , which strengthened the recovery effect of taking steps,
29 consistent with H_{4b} . Contrary to H_{4c} , increased levels of perceived betrayal did not weaken the
30 recovery effect of an apology. This result remains inconclusive and might have stemmed from
31 individuals generally expecting an apology in such a shopping context.

32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

48
49
50
51 Recently, a small body of research on triads in the service failure and recovery domain
52 has started to investigate social dynamics in service failure situations (Table 1). We expand this
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 body of work and introduce coalitions as an impactful phenomenon, contributing theoretically
4 and managerially to the literature in three ways.
5
6

7 ***Theoretical Implications***

8
9
10 As a first contribution, we demonstrate that coalitions are a pervasive phenomenon and
11 provide insights into the effect pattern in the triad (Study 1). We found that coalitions occurred in
12 32.0% ($\pm 3.5\%$) of the complaint episodes on retailers' official Facebook pages. The complaint
13 episodes expressed a slightly negative affective tone (45.0; neutral = 50), which deteriorated to a
14 more negative tone in the range of 30.44–37.80 in the presence of a coalition. The effect sizes
15 were absolute in a .20 to .41 range. Smaller effect sizes were expected, as they were based on
16 actual behaviors. The coalition-induced negative shift of the affective tone of the triad supports
17 the idea that coalitions create an opinion imbalance, yielding tensions that are reflected in the
18 greater negative attitudes of the triad members (Neubaum and Krämer 2017; Sherif et al. 1951).
19 Our study of coalitions expands the scope of the triadic structures examined to date in that the
20 analyzed triad was closed and considered the third actor as multiple individuals (Table 1).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In terms of the effect pattern, both the TA–CO and TA–SE coalitions led to a more
36 negative affective tone of the triad. The effects of both coalitions were not additive in that their
37 joint effect did not exceed their individual effects. This suggests a potential lower limit to the
38 downward trajectory of coalitions. Possibly, the triad members engaged in selective information
39 processing, disregarding an opposing standpoint (Jeong et al. 2019). We obtained two
40 unexpected findings. The TA–CO coalition yielded a larger negative shift, which indicates a
41 collective rumination about the failure. The TA–SE coalition acted as a partial buffer, reducing
42 the negative impact of the TA–CO coalition. While this buffering effect requires some caution
43 ($p = .071$), it indicates that other customers defending the retailer are somewhat successful.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Given that our findings focus on the triad as a unit of analysis and use field data, they may
4
5 inform other failure situations that can be represented by the examined triad (i.e., an individual
6
7 complainer and service employee plus one or multiple others), such as a group of friends visiting
8
9 a restaurant, a gym class, or corresponding experience-sharing on social media channels.
10
11

12 As a second contribution, we show that the TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition increased
13
14 complainers' feelings of betrayal by the third actor, which impacted complainers' satisfaction
15
16 with the firm's recovery in that it strengthened the recovery effect of taking steps and weakened
17
18 that of an apology (Studies 2 and 3). This finding complements our results obtained for the triad
19
20 by revealing coalition effects for the triad relations. Having conceptualized the triad as a
21
22 structure of connected relations, the coalition-induced change in recovery preferences shows one
23
24 way in which the relations in the triad are connected, reflecting an effect cascade from the
25
26 service employee–third actor (coalition) to the complainer–service employee (shift in recovery
27
28 preferences) through the third actor–complainer (perceived betrayal) relation.
29
30
31
32

33 Our results also expand prior research on triads (Table 1). First, we uncover the
34
35 explanatory value of perceived betrayal and offer a novel conceptualization that focuses on
36
37 betrayal by the third actor. This suggests broadening its applicability to multi-actor structures,
38
39 speaking to efforts for an integrated framework of process variables (e.g., Khamitov, Grégoire,
40
41 and Suri 2020). Second, this study enhances the small body of research on triads. By exploring
42
43 how two or more relations are connected, this stream of research offers novel insights into social
44
45 dynamics (i.e., conduit, initiation, and coalition effects; Figure 1) and, as such, provides a
46
47 promising angle for understanding multiple co-existing relations (Khamitov, Grégoire, and Suri
48
49 2020). Finally, while mediated moderations seem underutilized in the research stream, our
50
51 findings illustrate their value for a better understanding of moderation effects.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Managerial Implications

Firms are likely to be confronted with failure situations in which others take sides with the complainer or the service employee. Such coalitions present a challenge as they occur outside of a firm's sphere of influence. However, research-based insights to guide managers about the prevalence of coalitions, the nature of their effects, and potential remedial strategies are lacking. As a third contribution, this article addresses two key managerial questions.

How pervasive are coalitions and are their effects always harmful? We find that coalitions occur in approximately one-third of the complaints made on retailers' official Facebook pages and that the presence of a coalition yields a substantial downward trajectory of 16%–32%, shifting the affective tone of the online conversations from neutral to negative. Both types of coalitions—others siding with the complainer (TA–CO) or the service employee (TA–SE)—are harmful. Yet, there is also room for encouragement. The joint impact of the two coalitions is not more harmful than that of each coalition individually. Moreover, the TA–SE coalition tends to partially mitigate the comparably larger impact of the TA–CO coalition.

How do coalitions interfere firm responses and when are they effective? In our sample, the retailers responded between 0% (e.g., Asda) and over 67% (e.g., Tesco) of times when a complaint was made on Facebook. Coalitions render firm responses that aim to create a more positive affective tone in online conversations ineffective and shift complainers' recovery preferences. Given that triads remain under-researched, our results corroborate that, in the absence of a coalition, personal and positive response styles, as well as accommodative response content (taking steps, apology, and explanation), generate a more positive affective tone. Moreover, firm responses may mitigate some of the detrimental impact of subsequent coalitions. An adaptive recovery approach may partially mitigate the coalitions' impact on online

1
2
3 conversations; we suggest firms to emphasize a speedy response that conveys accommodative
4 content in a personal and positive manner. To improve the recovery effectiveness for
5
6 complainers, firms should use taking steps when others side with the service employee and an
7
8 apology when others side with the complainer, either employed as stand-alone recovery or as
9
10 part of a multi-component approach. When complainers feel betrayed by others who side with
11
12 the firm, a factual recovery allows complainers to shift their focus away from the emotional
13
14 processing of the betrayal, while a socio-emotional recovery may rather prolong it.

19 ***Limitations and Future Research***

21
22 Based on the limitations of our work, Table 5 provides six areas for future research. We
23
24 analyzed a typical triad, yet various other compositions are conceivable and should be explored,
25
26 such as when a robot is the service agent and another service employee is a third actor (area 1).
27
28 While the present research provides a first analysis of coalitions, they are a rich phenomenon
29
30 with various unexplored facets (area 2). For example, future research may analyze how one
31
32 coalition leads to subsequent coalitions, and whether the impact differs in relation to the type of
33
34 coalitions (e.g., protective vs. predatory; Vedel, Holma, and Havila 2016). We found that
35
36 coalitions impair the positive effect of firm responses on the affective tone of the triad,
37
38 questioning whether alternative response strategies, such as humor (Béal and Grégoire 2022),
39
40 can disrupt harmful coalition dynamics (area 3). In addition, an expansion of consumption
41
42 settings is desirable (e.g., virtual realities; area 4). While our results portrayed largely negative
43
44 consequences, positive effects are also conceivable and should be researched (area 5). Finally,
45
46 the findings may inspire research in other fields, for instance, to explore the effects of multiple
47
48 touchpoints on customer experiences, an aspect inherent to coalitions in triads (area 6).
49
50
51
52

53 [Table 5 about here]

ENDNOTES

- [1] Another possible distinction between association and connectedness may be whether the third actor plays a passive or active role in the exchange. Association is about the existence of relations, and the third actor can remain passive (e.g., an observer). For connectedness, the third actor likely needs to be more active, given that one relation is required to influence another. However, caution is needed since this distinction may not hold true for every conceivable situation. Therefore, the key distinction between association and connectedness should be seen in whether one relation influences another, an aspect that is not part of association but is the defining criterion for connectedness.
- [2] Realistic group conflict theory in this context would assume that the service employee, much like the other triad members, has an underlying fear of creating minority group situations. While service employees may not always be considered in-group members, reaching an opinion congruence in a service failure setting will likely still be desirable by all triad members.
- [3] Taking steps is a broader version of credibility feedback in that it does not focus on rectifying the cause of the failure but more broadly concentrates on solving the problem (Van Vaerenbergh et al. 2019). We excluded compensation from our considerations because it can backfire in online settings (Herhausen et al. 2019).
- [4] We used a one-tailed test when comparing two HLM coefficients since we tested directional expectations.
- [5] We pre-tested the failure magnitude ($N = 60$; same items as in Study 2), varying the promoted discount rate across 10%, 20%, and 30%. The failure magnitudes were 4.59, 5.26, and 5.40, respectively. Since the 20% and 30% conditions differed from the 10% condition ($p = .032$) but not from each other ($p = .711$), we chose a rate of 20%. We also pre-tested the compensation amount ($N = 20$). An apology and partial compensation of 10% yielded an average satisfaction of 2.98, which was below the scale midpoint ($p = .009$, $d = 0.73$). This indicated that the participants expected the originally (wrongly) promoted 20% discount.
- [6] The participants indicated that the friend took the complainer's side (1.18) in the TA–CO coalition and Zara's side (6.31) in the TA–SE coalition ($F[1, 500] = 3929.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .887$). To validate the recovery manipulation, we asked the respondents if the store manager promised to verify the sales prices and apologized (one item each: 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The group means differed, as intended, across the compensation-only, taking steps, and apology conditions for the taking steps item (1.47, 6.49, and 1.47, respectively; $F(2, 500) = 1843.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .881$) and the apology item (2.98, 3.35, and 6.77, respectively; $F(2, 500) = 269.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .519$). The post-hoc tests showed no differences apart from the intended recovery. The fact that the apology ratings do not approach the lower end of the scale can be attributed to compensation as a baseline recovery. The coalition manipulation did not influence the manipulation checks for recovery, and vice versa.
- [7] Given that the satisfaction ratings did not differ in the compensation only condition, the taking steps condition when there was a TA–SE coalition (5.48) yielded higher satisfaction ratings than the compensation only condition (5.12, $p = .049$).

Table 1. Overview of Prior Service Recovery Literature Examining Triadic Contexts and Structures.

| Study | Triadic setting | Triad type | Structural effect | Unit of analysis | Third actor ^a | Third actor studied as | Independent variable(s) ^b | Industry setting | Non-scenario experimental data? ^c Which? | Field data for proposed effects? | Behavior studied? What? |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Bonifield and Cole (2008) | Triadic context (A) | — | — | CO | Present others ^N | Single unit | Presence of a downward social comparison | 2 firms (restaurant, air travel) | No | No | No |
| Chen et al. (2020) | Triadic context (A) | — | — | CO | Present others (same problem) ^{V,P} | Single unit | Presence of others' complaint | 2 firms (air travel, retail) | No | No | No |
| Chen, He, and Alden (2014) | Triadic context (A) | — | — | CO | Present others ^P | Single unit | Presence of other customers | 1 firm (bookstore) | No | No | No |
| He et al. (2017) | Triadic context (A) | — | — | CO | Present others ^P | Single unit | Presence of other customers | 1 firm (coffee shop) | No | No | No |
| Schaefers and Schamari (2016) | Triadic context (A) | — | — | CO | Present others ^V | Single unit | Presence of others | 2 firms (car brand, telephone service) | No | No | No |
| Béal and Grégoire (2022) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Affiliative (vs. aggressive) humor | 1 blog, 1 firm (internet service provider) | Yes, text-mining | Yes | Yes, likes and retweets |
| Hogreve, Bilstein, and Hoerner (2019) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Transparency of service recovery | 2 firms (food delivery, internet provider) | No | No | No |
| Hutzinger and Weitzl (2021) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Marketer (vs. customer) recovery, recovery responses | 1 firm (coffee house) | No | No | No |
| Javornik, Filieri, and Gumann (2020) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Conversational human voice (vs. corporate voice) | 2 firms (air travel, car rental) | No | No | No |
| Johnen and Schnittka (2019) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Accommodative (vs. defensive) response | 20 + 1 (various industries + apparel) | Yes, text-mining | Yes | Yes, positive comments and likes |
| Mantovani, Korelo, and Ibarra (2018) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^P | Individual | Close (vs. distant) relationship to the victim | 2 firms (telephone service, | No | No | No |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|------------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------|
| Mattila, Hanks, and Wang (2014) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^P | Individual | Good (vs. poor) service recovery | restaurant) 2 firms (restaurant, air travel) | No | No | No |
| Sharma, Jain, and Behl (2020) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure (distant) ^{V,P} | Individual | Ethical service transgressions | 1 firm (air travel) | Yes, netnography ^d | No | No |
| Van Vaerenbergh, Vermeir, and Larivière (2013) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^P | Individual | Presence of observing a service failure and recovery | 3 firms (restaurant, retail, hotel) | No | No | No |
| Wan and Wyer (2019) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^{V,P} | Individual | Incidental similarity to the service employee (vs. complainer) | 4 firms (restaurant, retail, book store, hotel) | Yes, field experiment | Yes | No |
| Weitzl and Hutzinger (2017) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Accommodative and defensive responses | 1 firm (coffee house) | No | No | No |
| Zhao, Jiang, and Su (2020) | Triadic context (B) | — | — | TA | Observer of the failure ^V | Individual | Apologetic (vs. denial) recovery approach | 3 firms (travel, retail, smartphone) | No | No | No |
| Bacile et al. (2018) | Triad | Open | Conduit | CO | Uncivil other customer ^V | Individual | Justice perceptions of the complainer towards the uncivil other | 1 firm (restaurant) | Yes, netnography ^d | No | No |
| Kim and Baker (2020) | Triad | Open | Conduit | CO, TA | Civil other customer (same problem) ^P | Individual | Other customers' co-recovery (none vs. informational vs. emotional) | 1 firm (hotel) | No | No | No |
| Pugh, Brady, and Hopkins (2018) | Triad | Open | Initiation | CO, SE | Manager ^P | Individual | Presence of a reprimand by manager | 2 firms (restaurant, theater) | No | No | No |
| Present study | Triad | Closed | Coalition | Triad, CO | Present others ^{V,P} | Multiple and single individuals | Presence of coalitions | 17 + 1 firms (food retailers + apparel) | Yes, text-mining | Yes | Yes, affective tone |

^aN, narratively present; P, physically present; V, virtually present

^bAdapted to fit the logic of the triadic context; presence refers to a presence versus absence comparison.

^cIncluding scenario-based surveys by Bacile et al. (2018) and Sharma, Jain, and Behl (2020).

^dPurpose was to introduce the phenomenon under study.

Notes: Triadic contexts classified according to Figure 1 in Types A and B; CO, complainer; SE, service employee; TA, third actor.

Table 2. Definition, Data Source, and Statistical Properties of Study Variables

| Level: Variable | Definition | Measurement | Mean (SD) |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Affective Tone | | | |
| 1: Affective tone ^a | Text-based valence of affective sentiment, indicating a positive (>50) or negative (<50) emotional tone. (1–100) | LIWC Dictionary | 39.81 (34.98) |
| Number and Presence of Coalitions | | | |
| 2: Number of TA–CO coalitions | Number of third actors in a complaint episode that took sides with the complainer. (number) | Manual coding | 0.66 (1.22) |
| 2: Number of TA–SE coalitions | Number of third actors in a complaint episode that took sides with the service employee. (number) | Manual coding | 1.34 (2.78) |
| 1: Presence of a TA–CO coalition | Did the comment follow or institute a TA–CO coalition (i.e., presence) or was a TA–CO coalition absent at the point in the discussion. (0 = absence, 1 = presence) | Manual coding | .41 (.49) |
| 1: Presence of a TA–SE coalition | Did the comment follow or institute a TA–SE coalition (i.e., presence) or was a TA–SE coalition absent at the point in the discussion. (0 = absence, 1 = presence) | Manual coding | .57 (.50) |
| Firm Response | | | |
| 1: Presence of a firm response | Whether the comment was made after (i.e., presence) a firm response or a response was not (yet) made. (0 = absence, 1 = presence) | Extraction | .22 (.41) |
| – ^b More personal firm response | The firm responded in a more (e.g., addressing the complainer by name) or less personal manner. (0 = less, 1 = more personal) | Manual coding | .67 (.47) |
| – ^b More authentic firm response | Text-based authenticity of the firm response, being above or below the average across all firm responses. (0 = less, 1 = more authentic). | LIWC Dictionary | .36 (.48) |
| – ^b Positive firm response | Text-based emotional tone of the firm response, being either positive (≥50) or negative (<50). (0 = negative, 1 = positive). | LIWC Dictionary | .73 (.44) |
| – ^b Taking steps | The firm has expressed that it has taken or will take specific steps to solve the problem (e.g., approached manager). (0 = no, 1 = yes) | Manual coding | .34 (.47) |
| – ^b Explanation | The firm gave an explanation for the problem. (0 = no, 1 = yes) | Manual coding | .27 (.44) |
| – ^b Deferral | The firm asked the complainer to contact them privately (e.g., direct message) or do so themselves. (0 = no, 1 = yes) | Manual coding | .46 (.50) |
| – ^b Apology | The firm expressed remorse for what has happened. (0 = no, 1 = yes) | Manual coding | .67 (.47) |
| Control Variables | | | |
| 2: Failure controllability | The firm could have taken steps to prevent the failure. (1 = not at all, and 7 = very much) | Manual coding | 5.87 (.66) |
| 2: Failure stability | The cause of the failure is likely to vary or be stable over time. (1 = not at all, and 7 = very much) | Manual coding | 3.50 (1.41) |
| 2: Outcome failure | Whether the results (outcome) or the way (process) of product or service delivery was flawed. (0 = process, 1 = outcome failure) | Manual coding | .62 (.49) |
| 2: Failure reversibility | To what extent the failure can be repaired or reversed (or is nonrepairable). (1 = not at all, and 7 = very much) | Manual coding | 3.53 (1.56) |
| 2: Failure severity | The size of loss that is entailed in a failure, rendering the failure a minor or major problem. (1 = not at all, and 7 = severe). | Manual coding | 4.92 (0.89) |
| 2: Mediators | Number of users who acknowledged the complaint and attempted at suggesting ways of fixing the problem. (number) | Manual Coding | .07 (.31) |
| 2: Branch: coffee chains ^c | Coffee chains, including Costa Coffee and Greggs. (0 = baseline, 1 = coffee chains) | Extraction | .15 (.36) |
| 2: Branch: fast-food joints ^c | Fast-food joints, including McDonalds, Burger King, Subway, and KFC. (0 = baseline, 1 = fast-food) | Extraction | .10 (.30) |
| 2: Branch: general retailers ^c | General and apparel retailers, including Marks & Spencer, Primark, Dr. Martens, Zara, and Next. (0 = baseline, 1 = general retailers) | Extraction | .09 (.29) |
| 2: Brand buzz ^d | YouGov's Brand Buzz score, measuring whether consumers heard positive (>0) or negative things (<0) about a brand. (-100–100). | YouGov | 8.69 (3.68) |
| 1: Word count | The text length of the comment. (number of words) | Dictionary | 29.01 (29.69) |
| 1: Words >six letters | Percentage of words in the comment that are longer than six letters. (0–100%) | Dictionary | 14.48 (10.55) |
| 2: Daytime | Whether the episode started during daytime or late evening hours (6:00–24:00) or nighttime (0:01–5:59). (0 = nighttime, 1 = daytime). | Extraction | .95 (.22) |

^a16 values were missing (e.g., a comment that did not contain any text) and replaced with the mean.

^bThe coding was based on the 123 episodes in which a retailer responded to the complaint. When there were multiple firm comments within an episode (e.g., conversation between firm and complainer), we combined the firm comments.

^cDummy variables for four categories (coffee chains, fast-food joints, general retailers, and grocery retailers). Grocery retailers (Asda, Tesco, Aldi, Sainsbury's, Lidl, Morrisons) were the largest category (N = 213) and used as the baseline comparator.

^dThe score is based on the United Kingdom market and data from March 2021, thus aligning with our Facebook data.

Table 3. HLM Results of the Impact of Coalitions and Firm Responses on Affective Tone.

| DV: Affective Tone | Expected direction | 1: Presence of coalitions | | | 2: Presence of a firm response | | | 3: Presence of a firm response before and after the first coalition | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------|----------|--------------------------------|-------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------|
| | | Coeff. | SE | <i>p</i> | Coeff. | SE | <i>p</i> | Coeff. | SE | <i>p</i> |
| Intercept (level 2) | | 59.00 | 13.04 | <.001 | 57.20 | 13.09 | <.001 | 55.57 | 12.89 | <.001 |
| Coalitions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presence of a TA-CO coalition | H _{1a} : - | -14.51 | 3.32 | <.001 | -14.17 | 3.26 | <.001 | -11.01 | 4.00 | .006 |
| Presence of a TA-SE coalition | H _{1b} : - | -7.16 | 3.38 | .034 | -6.51 | 3.34 | .052 | -3.57 | 4.01 | .373 |
| Presence of a TA-CO coalition × presence of a TA-SE coalition | H ₂ : + | 12.12 | 3.95 | .002 | 11.46 | 3.93 | .004 | 8.64 | 4.52 | .056 |
| Firm Response | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presence of a firm response | | — | — | — | 2.92 | 2.44 | .231 | — | — | — |
| Presence of a firm response under ... | | | | | | | | | | |
| ... (a) absence of a coalition ^a | H ₃ : | — | — | — | — | — | — | 8.46 | 4.81 | .079 |
| ... (b) presence of a coalition ^a | (a) > (b) | — | — | — | — | — | — | .32 | 2.47 | .896 |
| Control Variables^b | | | | | | | | | | |
| Failure controllability | | -.79 | 1.66 | .635 | -.54 | 1.71 | .753 | -.68 | 1.68 | .685 |
| Failure stability | | 1.23 | .72 | .087 | 1.29 | .72 | .076 | 1.31 | .72 | .068 |
| Outcome failure | | .51 | 2.20 | .815 | .52 | 2.19 | .811 | .50 | 2.18 | .819 |
| Failure reversibility | | .13 | .82 | .876 | .12 | .82 | .880 | .13 | .81 | .872 |
| Failure severity | | -1.07 | 1.55 | .490 | -1.20 | 1.54 | .437 | -1.19 | 1.55 | .442 |
| Mediators | | 3.86 | 2.39 | .107 | 3.71 | 2.40 | .124 | 4.34 | 2.46 | .078 |
| Branch: coffee chains | | -2.85 | 3.19 | .373 | -2.79 | 3.18 | .380 | -2.98 | 3.14 | .344 |
| Branch: fast-food | | .04 | 4.05 | .993 | .39 | 4.03 | .923 | -.01 | 4.04 | .998 |
| Branch: general retailers | | -.10 | 4.53 | .983 | .37 | 4.57 | .935 | .31 | 4.60 | .946 |
| Brand buzz | | -.15 | .37 | .695 | -.18 | .38 | .638 | -.20 | .38 | .596 |
| Word count | | -.03 | .02 | .160 | -.03 | .02 | .147 | -.03 | .02 | .151 |
| Words > six letters | | -.21 | .07 | .003 | -.21 | .07 | .002 | -.21 | .07 | .002 |
| Daytime | | -4.12 | 4.96 | .407 | -4.22 | 4.94 | .393 | -4.27 | 4.90 | .384 |
| Complaint comment | | -5.68 | 3.44 | .099 | -4.52 | 3.47 | .193 | -1.89 | 4.04 | .639 |
| Firm comment | | 29.10 | 3.35 | <.001 | 29.91 | 3.34 | <.001 | 31.38 | 3.48 | <.001 |
| Model Information | | | | | | | | | | |
| ΔDeviance (df) | | 167.8 (18) | | | 169.2 (19) | | | 171.7 (20) | | |
| <i>p</i> of Δdeviance | | <.001 | | | <.001 | | | <.001 | | |
| R ^{2b} | | 9.5% | | | 9.5% | | | 9.7% | | |

^aWe obtained similar results for the absence and presence of a TA–CO coalition (absence: β = 4.98, *p* = .168; presence: β = 0.64, *p* = .823) and a TA–SE coalition (absence: β = 4.98, *p* = .163; presence: β = 1.02, *p* = .717). Therefore, we did not distinguish between the two coalitions in this analysis, yielding stronger power.

^b17 episodes comprised next to the focal problem a reference to other customers. We checked via a dummy variable, coding these episodes as 1 (and otherwise as 0), if they influenced the results, which they did not (Models 1/2/3: γ = -2.21/-2.43/-2.25, *p* = .552/.503/.540).

^cCalculated as reduction in total variance of the model to the null model (Huang 2018).

Table 4. Mediated Moderation Results of Study 2 and Study 3.

| | Expected direction | Study 2: Tesco | | | | | | Study 3: Zara | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| | | (1) Satisfaction | | (2) Perceived betrayal | | (3) Satisfaction | | (1) Satisfaction | | (2) Perceived betrayal | | (3) Satisfaction | |
| | | Beta | <i>p</i> | Beta | <i>p</i> | Beta | <i>p</i> | Beta | <i>p</i> | Beta | <i>p</i> | Beta | <i>p</i> |
| Unmediated moderation effects | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coalition (TA–SE) ^a | Model 2, H _{4a} : + | .02 | .791 | .74 | <.001 | -.01 | .939 | .09 | .070 | .84 | <.001 | -.01 | .900 |
| Recovery (taking steps) ^a | | .06 | .399 | .02 | .614 | .06 | .387 | -.36 | <.001 | -.03 | .329 | -.36 | <.001 |
| Coalition × recovery | Model 1 ^b : + | .20 | .002 | .07 | .134 | .05 | .636 | .13 | .012 | -.01 | .667 | -.04 | .663 |
| Mediated moderation effects | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Perceived betrayal | | — | — | — | — | .01 | .959 | — | — | — | — | .13 | .198 |
| Perceived betrayal × recovery | Model 3, H _{4b,c} : + | — | — | — | — | .22 | .024 | — | — | — | — | .20 | .034 |
| Control Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | | -.07 | .344 | .02 | .726 | -.07 | .296 | .02 | .704 | .05 | .102 | .01 | .825 |
| Gender (male) ^c | | .02 | .778 | .02 | .630 | .04 | .525 | -.10 | .076 | .00 | .925 | -.08 | .130 |
| Gender (no disclosure) ^c | | -.03 | .687 | .06 | .166 | -.04 | .554 | -.03 | .504 | .01 | .682 | -.04 | .448 |
| Failure magnitude | | -.11 | .124 | -.12 | .014 | -.11 | .131 | -.07 | .199 | .12 | <.001 | -.09 | .092 |
| Failure attributions | | -.40 | <.001 | .12 | .012 | -.38 | <.001 | -.23 | <.001 | .09 | .004 | -.23 | <.001 |
| Attitude toward complaining | | .02 | .745 | -.01 | .892 | .05 | .499 | .11 | .037 | .01 | .759 | .12 | .032 |
| Prior experiences ^d | | .07 | .310 | -.07 | .115 | .06 | .415 | -.07 | .224 | .01 | .824 | -.07 | .201 |
| Customer contact in daily work | | -.09 | .174 | .01 | .869 | -.10 | .124 | -.07 | .186 | .02 | .521 | -.08 | .142 |
| Self-efficacy | | .02 | .755 | .00 | .987 | .03 | .659 | .01 | .891 | -.01 | .814 | .00 | .955 |
| Empathic concern | | -.03 | .695 | .04 | .415 | -.02 | .801 | .12 | .041 | -.07 | .031 | .15 | .012 |

^aCoalition: +.5 = TA–SE, –.5 = TA–CO; recovery: +.5 = taking steps, –.5 = apology.

^bNo hypothesis formulated.

^cComparing male and “do not wish to disclose” answer options with female as reference category.




^dPrior experiences with Facebook and fashion stores for Study 2 and Study 3, respectively.

Notes: Recovery, firm recovery; perceived betrayal, complainers’ perceived betrayal by the third actor; satisfaction, complainers’ satisfaction with the recovery by the firm.

Table 5. A Research Agenda.

| Areas | Research Gap and Research Questions |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Triad members and consequences | <p><i>Research gap:</i> The analyzed composition of the triad (an individual complainer, a service employee, and one or multiple others) and the focus on the consequences for the complainer formed a starting point for the analysis of coalitions.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> How do coalition dynamics unfold when there are deliberate power differences among the triad members (e.g., the third actor is another service employee, the complainer is represented by a group of customers experiencing the same failure)? How do coalition dynamics change when actors take non-human forms, such as service robots, brands, and even nature as an entity? Finally, what consequences do coalitions have for the other actors involved, besides the complainer; the service employee being of particular relevance, for instance?</p> |
| 2. Nature of coalitions | <p><i>Research gap:</i> Coalitions are a rich phenomenon. Thus, questions remain in the context of service failures.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> How do more complex and multiple coalitions occur? Could there be a ripple effect with one coalition triggering another? Are there further ways in which the relations are connected and coalition effects impact the triad members? Given that coalitions differ in type (e.g., being protective or predatory in nature), is it possible to identify different coalition types with idiosyncratic effects? While having found effects on an affective level, do coalitions also operate on a cognitive level? Finally, which other mechanisms besides complainers' perceived betrayal by the third actor can explain coalition effects (e.g., the emotional support, rather than betrayal, by the third actor)?</p> |
| 3. Coalitions and firm responses | <p><i>Research gap:</i> Once a coalition is formed, firm responses became ineffective in restoring the affective tone of the triad. Thus, different questions remain on how to tackle coalition dynamics.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> Which recovery strategies and response styles are effective in making a positive change in the triad after a coalition? When considering coalitions as a detrimental dynamic, how can firms prevent coalitions in the first place and, once formed, curtail the formation of further coalitions? Could alternative response strategies, such as humor (Béal and Grégoire 2022), disrupt coalition dynamics?</p> |
| 4. Coalitions across consumption settings | <p><i>Research gap:</i> The present research covered field data across different failure instances and retailers. Yet, consumption settings vary beyond what we analyzed, offering room for future research.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> Are effects similar for offline contexts, for example, where consumption is marked by multiple actors (e.g., hospitality, travel, and medical consultations), hybrid and other virtual settings (e.g., chatting with friends while shopping, virtual reality), and contexts that contain hedonic versus utilitarian elements (e.g., Johnen and Schnittka 2019)? Given that culture shapes social interactions, how does culture interfere with coalitions?</p> |
| 5. Positive sides of coalitions | <p><i>Research gap:</i> While coalitions are discussed as a pervasive phenomenon (Komorita and Chertkoff 1973), there may also be positive sides to them. Thus, questions related to coalition consequences and motives are worth exploring.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> Could coalitions exert positive effects, similar to the less intuitive, buffering effect seen in the TA–SE coalition? Furthermore, is the formation of coalitions possibly driven by motives that are not negative, such as when complainers fear being unsuccessful with their complaint?</p> |
| 6. Broader considerations | <p><i>Research gap:</i> Examining coalitions in triadic structures yielded novel and rich insights for the service failure and recovery literature. It appears fruitful to expand the concepts of coalitions and triads to other fields of inquiry.</p> <p><i>Research questions:</i> Do coalitions cause similar effects for other transgression types (e.g., customer incivility) and negative events (e.g., brand transgressions and product-harm crises)? Given that triads and coalitions focus on multiple touchpoints, how can we advance our understanding of the effects of multiple touchpoints from a customer experience perspective (Lemon and Verhoef 2016)? Finally, which insights can we gain from an expansion to four or more actors?</p> |


FIGURE 1
TRIADIC CONTEXTS, TRIADS, AND PRIOR RESEARCH

| <p>Triadic Contexts: Existence of relations, in that the TA (a) influences or (b) is influenced by the dyad.</p> | <p>Triads (or Triadic Structures): Connectedness of relations; various ways in which at least two relations influence each other and so form a network structure.</p> | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Open Triads: Actors are indirectly linked to each other through one of the actors.</p> | <p>Closed Triads: All actors are directly linked to each other.</p> |
|  <p>Different research (Table 1) showing that the presence of others (TA) may amplify the effects of poor and good recoveries but can also buffer against negative effects (Type A). Customers in the role of the TA may use the failure and recovery to form affect, attitudes, judgment, and intentions (Type B). Various context variables may influence the effects for Type A and B contexts.</p> |  <p>Bacile et al. (2018) and Kim and Baker (2020) found that the complainer carries the positive and negative valence of the interaction with the TA forward to the service employee. Thus, the complainer acts as a conduit of positive or negative influence. <i>This research examines the effect of one relation on another.</i></p> <p>Pugh, Brady, and Hopkins (2018) showed that a private and civil reprimand by a manager (TA) may increase satisfaction with the service encounter of both the complainer and frontline employee. Thus, the TA acts as an initiator of the damaged relation. <i>This research examines the effect of two relations on a third.</i></p> |  <p>A yet unexplored way in which the TA can act is by taking sides, or forming a coalition, which is examined in this research. <i>The study of coalitions examines the effect of one relation on two others.</i> For this, different effects are possible, with one specific being analyzed as indicated: how a TA–SE (vs. TA–CO) coalition leads to the complainer feeling betrayed by the TA, shifting the complainer’s recovery preferences.</p> |


Notes: SE, service employee; CO, complainer; TA, third actor. The unit of analysis is marked in gray, with semicircles indicating that one of the two actors is analyzed, depending on the type of the triadic context (a: CO, b: TA). Representative sources for the conceptualization are Ritter (2000) and Vedel, Holma, and Havila (2016).

FIGURE 2
OVERVIEW OF STUDIES AND HYPOTHESES

A: Conceptual Framework of Study 1




B: Conceptual Framework of Studies 2 and 3




^aThe expected sign of the interaction term, indicating that higher values of complainers' perceived betrayal by the third actor favors the effect of taking steps on complainers' satisfaction with the recovery by the firm and disfavors that of an apology.

FIGURE 3
Results of Studies 1, 2, and 3


A: Presence of a TA-CO coalition × Presence of a TA-SE coalition Interaction in Study 1



B: Satisfaction Means Across Experimental Conditions in Studies 2 and 3



C: Recovery × Perceived Betrayal Interaction with Johnson-Neyman Points in Studies 2 and 3



REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Abney, Alexandra K., Mark J. Pelletier, Toni-Rochelle S. Ford, and Alisha B. Horky (2017), “#
7 IHateYourBrand: Adaptive Service Recovery Strategies on Twitter,” *Journal of Services*
8 *Marketing*, 31 (3), 281–94.
9
10
11
12 Albrecht, Arne K., Tobias Schaefer, Gianfranco Walsh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2019), “The
13 Effect of Compensation Size on Recovery Satisfaction After Group Service Failures: The
14 Role of Group Versus Individual Service Recovery,” *Journal of Service Research*, 22 (1),
15 60–70.
16
17
18
19
20 Arend, Matthias G. and Thomas Schäfer (2019), “Statistical Power in Two-Level Models: A
21 Tutorial Based on Monte Carlo Simulation,” *Psychological Methods*, 24 (1), 1–19.
22
23
24 Arceneaux, Kevin, Martin Johnson, and Chad Murphy (2012), “Polarized Political
25 Communication, Oppositional Media Hostility, and Selective Exposure,” *The Journal of*
26 *Politics*, 74 (1), 174–86.
27
28
29
30
31 Bacile, Todd J., Jeremy S. Wolter, Alexis M. Allen, and Pei Xu (2018), “The Effects of Online
32 Incivility and Consumer-to-Consumer Interactional Justice on Complainants, Observers, and
33 Service Providers During Social Media Service Recovery,” *Journal of Interactive Marketing*,
34 44 (November), 60–81.
35
36
37
38
39 Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny (1986), “The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction
40 in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations,”
41 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6), 1173–82.
42
43
44
45 Benard, Stephen (2012), “Cohesion From Conflict: Does Intergroup Conflict Motivate
46 Intragroup Norm Enforcement and Support for Centralized Leadership?” *Social Psychology*
47 *Quarterly*, 75 (2), 107–30.
48
49
50
51 Benard, Stephen and Long Doan (2011), “The Conflict–Cohesion Hypothesis: Past, Present, and
52 Possible Futures,” in *Advances in Group Processes*, Vol. 28, Shane R. Thye and Edward J.
53 Lawler, Eds. Bingley, Emerald: 189–225.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Berger, Jonah, Ashlee Humphreys, Stephan Ludwig, Wendy W. Moe, Oded Netzer, and David
4
5 A. Schweidel (2020), “Uniting the Tribes: Using Text for Marketing Insight,” *Journal of*
6
7 *Marketing*, 84 (1), 1–25.
- 8
9 Bonifield, Carolyn and Catherine A. Cole (2008), “Better Him Than Me: Social Comparison
10
11 Theory and Service Recovery,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 565–77.
- 12
13 Boyd, Ryan L., Ashwini Ashokkumar, Sarah Seraj, and James W. Pennebaker (2022), *The*
14
15 *Development and Psychometric Properties of LIWC-22*. The University of Texas at Austin.
- 16
17 Brief, Arthur P., Elizabeth E. Umphress, Joerg Dietz, John W. Burrows, Rebecca M. Butz, and
18
19 Lotte Scholten (2005), “Community Matters: Realistic Group Conflict Theory and the Impact
20
21 of Diversity,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (5), 830–44.
- 22
23 Béal, Mathieu and Yani Grégoire (2021), “How Do Observers React to Companies’ Humorous
24
25 Responses to Online Public Complaints?” *Journal of Service Research*, 25 (2), 242–59.
- 26
27 Chen, Ke, Jianxun Chen, Wu Zhanc, and Piyush Sharma (2020), “When in Rome! Complaint
28
29 Contagion Effect in Multi-Actor Service Ecosystems,” *Journal of Business Research*, 121,
30
31 628–41.
- 32
33 Chen, Qimei, Yi He, and Dana L. Alden (2014), “Social Presence in Service Failure: Why It
34
35 Might Not Be a Bad Thing,” *Customer Needs and Solutions*, 1 (4), 288–97.
- 36
37 Cohen, Jacob, Patricia Cohen, Stephen G. West, and Leona S. Aiken (2003), *Applied Multiple*
38
39 *Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- 40
41 Customer Rage Study (2020), “The 2020 Customer Rage Study,” (accessed March 7, 2021),
42
43 [https://research.wpcarey.asu.edu/services-leadership/research/research-initiatives/customer-](https://research.wpcarey.asu.edu/services-leadership/research/research-initiatives/customer-rage/)
44
45 [rage/](https://research.wpcarey.asu.edu/services-leadership/research/research-initiatives/customer-rage/).
- 46
47 Duhachek, Adam (2005), “Coping: A Multidimensional, Hierarchical Framework of Responses
48
49 to Stressful Consumption Episodes,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 41–53.
- 50
51 Fischer, Peter, Joachim I. Krueger, Tobias Greitemeyer, Claudia Vogrincic, Andreas
52
53 Kastenmüller, Dieter Frey, Moritz Heene, Magdalena Wicher, Martina Kainbacher (2011),
54
55 “The Bystander-Effect: A Meta-Analytic Review on Bystander Intervention in Dangerous
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 and Non-Dangerous Emergencies,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 137 (4), 517–37.

3
4 Fu, Shaoxiong, Hongxiu Li, Yong Liu, Henri Pirkkalainen, and Markus Salo (2020), “Social
5
6 Media Overload, Exhaustion, and Use Discontinuance: Examining the Effects of Information
7
8 Overload, System Feature Overload, and Social Overload,” *Information Processing &
9
10 Management*, 57 (6), 102307.

11
12 Gamson, William A. (1961), “A Theory of Coalition Formation,” *American Sociological Review*,
13
14 26 (3), 373–82.

15
16 Gelbrich, Katja and Holger Roschk (2011), “A Meta-Analysis of Organizational Complaint
17
18 Handling and Customer Responses,” *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (1), 24–43.

19
20 Grégoire, Yany and Robert J. Fisher (2008), “Customer Betrayal and Retaliation: When Your
21
22 Best Customers Become Your Worst Enemies,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing
23
24 Science*, 36 (2), 247–61.

25
26 Grégoire, Yany and Anna S. Mattila (2021), “Service Failure and Recovery at the Crossroads:
27
28 Recommendations to Revitalize the Field and its Influence,” *Journal of Service Research*, 24
29
30 (3), 323–28.

31
32 He, Yi, Miao Hu, Qimei Chen, Dana L. Alden, and Wei He (2017), “No Man Is an Island: The
33
34 Effect of Social Presence on Negative Word of Mouth Intention in Service Failures,”
35
36 *Customer Needs and Solutions*, 4 (4), 56–67.

37
38 Henkel, Alexander P., Johannes Boegershausen, Anat Rafaeli, Jos Lemmink (2017), “The Social
39
40 Dimension of Service Interactions: Observer Reactions to Customer Incivility,” *Journal of
41
42 Service Research*, 20 (2), 120–34.

43
44 Hess, Ronald L. Jr., Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), “Service Failure and
45
46 Recovery: The Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction,” *Journal of the
47
48 Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (2), 127–45.

49
50 Herhausen, Dennis, Stephan Ludwig, Dhruv Grewal, Jochen Wulf, and Marcus Schoegel (2019),
51
52 “Detecting, Preventing, and Mitigating Online Firestorms in Brand Communities,” *Journal
53
54 of Marketing*, 83 (3), 1–21.

- 1
2
3 Hogreve, Jens, Nicola Bilstein, and Kathrin Hoerner (2019), "Service Recovery on Stage: Effects
4 of Social Media Recovery on Virtually Present Others," *Journal of Service Research*, 22 (4),
5 421–39.
6
7
8
9 Huang, Francis L. (2018), "Multilevel Modeling Myths," *School Psychology Quarterly*, 33 (3),
10 492–99.
11
12
13 Hutzinger, Clemens and Wolfgang J. Weitzl (2021), "Co-Creation of Online Service Recoveries
14 and its Effects on Complaint Bystanders," *Journal of Business Research*, 130, 525–38.
15
16
17 Jackson, Jay W. (1993), "Realistic Group Conflict Theory: A Review and Evaluation of the
18 Theoretical and Empirical Literature," *The Psychological Record*, 43 (3), 395–413.
19
20
21 Javornik, Ana, Raffaele Filieri, and Ralph Gumann (2020), "'Don't Forget That Others Are
22 Watching, Too!' The Effect of Conversational Human Voice and Reply Length on
23 Observers' Perceptions of Complaint Handling in Social Media," *Journal of Interactive
24 Marketing*, 50, 100–19.
25
26
27
28
29 Jeong, Myeongki, Hangjung Zo, Chul Ho Lee, and Yasin Ceran (2019), "Feeling Displeasure
30 from Online Social Media Postings: A Study Using Cognitive Dissonance Theory,"
31 *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 231–40.
32
33
34
35
36 Johnen, Marius and Oliver Schnittka (2019), "When Pushing Back Is Good: The Effectiveness of
37 Brand Responses to Social Media Complaints," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing
38 Science*, 47 (5), 858–78.
39
40
41
42 Khamitov, Mansur, Yany Grégoire, and Anshu Suri (2020), "A Systematic Review of Brand
43 Transgression, Service Failure Recovery and Product-Harm Crisis: Integration and Guiding
44 Insights," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48 (May), 519–42.
45
46
47
48 Kim, Kawon and Melissa Baker (2020), "Paying It Forward: The Influence of Other Customer
49 Service Recovery on Future Co-Creation," *Journal of Business Research*, 121, 604–15.
50
51
52 Komorita, Samuel S. and Jerome M. Chertkoff (1973), "A Bargaining Theory of Coalition
53 Formation," *Psychological Review*, 80 (3), 149–62.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Kowsari, Kamran, Kiana J. Meimandi, Mojtaba Heidarysafa, Sanjana Mendu, Laura Barnes, and

- 1
2 Donald Brown (2019), "Text Classification Algorithms: A Survey," *Information*, 10 (4), 150.
3
4 Lemon, Katherine N. and Peter C. Verhoef (2016), "Understanding Customer Experience
5 Throughout the Customer Journey," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (6), 69–96.
6
7 Levine, John M., Richard L. Moreland, and Carey S. Ryan (1998), "Group Socialization and
8 Intergroup Relations," In *Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior*, Constantine
9 Sedikides et al., Eds. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum: 283–308.
10
11 Maas, Cora J.M. and Joop J. Hox (2005), "Sufficient Sample Sizes for Multilevel Modeling,"
12 *Methodology*, 1 (3), 86–92.
13
14 Mattila, Anna, Lydia Hanks, and Chenya Wang (2014), "Others Service Experiences: Emotions,
15 Perceived Justice, and Behavior," *European Journal of Marketing*, 48 (3/4), 552–71.
16
17 Mantovani, Danielle, José C. Korelo, and Jenny Ibarra (2018), "Effects of Brand Transgressions
18 on Third-Party Consumers," *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 36 (3), 306–17.
19
20 Muller, Dominique, Charles M. Judd, and Vincent Y. Yzerbyt (2005), "When Moderation is
21 Mediated and Mediation Is Moderated," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89
22 (6), 852–63.
23
24 Nazifi, Amin, Katja Gelbrich, Yany Grégoire, Sebastian Koch, Dahlia El-Manstrly, and Jochen
25 Wirtz (2021), "Proactive Handling of Flight Overbooking: How to Reduce Negative eWOM
26 and the Costs of Bumping Customers," *Journal of Service Research*, 24 (2), 206–25.
27
28 Neubaum, German and Nicole C. Krämer (2017), "Opinion Climates in Social Media: Blending
29 Mass and Interpersonal Communication," *Human Communication Research*, 43 (4), 464–76.
30
31 Porath, Christine, Deborah MacInnis, and Valerie S. Folkes (2011), "It's Unfair: Why Customers
32 Who Merely Observe an Uncivil Employee Abandon the Company," *Journal of Service
33 Research*, 14 (3), 302–17.
34
35 Preotiuc-Pietro, Daniel, Mihaela Gaman, and Nikolaos Aletras (2019), "Automatically
36 Identifying Complaints in Social Media," *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the
37 Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5008–19.
38
39 Pugh, Harrison B., Michael K. Brady, and Lucas M. Hopkins (2018), "A Customer Scorned:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Effects of Employee Reprimands in Frontline Service Encounters,” *Journal of Service*
4
5 *Research*, 21 (2), 219–34.
- 6
7 Ritter, Thomas (2000), “A Framework for Analyzing Interconnectedness of
8
9 Relationships,” *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29 (4), 317–26.
- 10
11 Roschk, Holger and Katja Gelbrich (2014), “Identifying Appropriate Compensation Types for
12
13 Service Failures: A Meta-Analytic and Experimental Analysis,” *Journal of Service Research*,
14
15 17 (2), 195–210.
- 16
17 Rozin, Paul and Edward B. Royzman (2001), “Negativity Bias, Negativity Dominance, and
18
19 Contagion,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5 (4), 296–320.
- 20
21 Schaefers, Tobias and Julia Schamari (2016), “Service Recovery via Social Media: The Social
22
23 Influence Effects of Virtual Presence,” *Journal of Service Research*, 19 (2), 192–208.
- 24
25 Sharma, Isha, Kokil Jain, and Abhishek Behl (2020), “Effect of Service Transgressions on
26
27 Distant Third-Party Customers: The Role of Moral Identity and Moral Judgment,” *Journal of*
28
29 *Business Research*, 121, 696–712
- 30
31 Sherif, Muzafar, O. J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William. R Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif (1951),
32
33 *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*, Middletown. CT:
34
35 Wesleyan University Press.
- 36
37 Siltaloppi, Jaakko and Stephen L. Vargo (2017), “Triads: A Review and Analytical Framework,”
38
39 *Marketing Theory*, 17 (4), 395–414.
- 40
41
42 Social Media Today (2020), “Who’s Complaining, and What Are the Most Common Reasons for
43
44 Calling Out Businesses on Social?” (accessed January 9, 2022),
45
46 [https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/whos-complaining-and-what-are-the-most-](https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/whos-complaining-and-what-are-the-most-common-reasons-for-calling-out-bus/570076/)
47
48 [common-reasons-for-calling-out-bus/570076/](https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/whos-complaining-and-what-are-the-most-common-reasons-for-calling-out-bus/570076/).
- 49
50 Thibaut, John W. and Harold H. Kelley (1959), *The Social Psychology of Groups*, New York,
51
52 NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- 53
54 Valentini, Sara, Chiara Orsingher, and Alexandra Polyakova (2020), “Customers’ Emotions in
55
56 Service Failure and Recovery: A Meta-Analysis,” *Marketing Letters*, 31, 199–216.
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Van Vaerenbergh, Yves, Iris Vermeir, and Bart Larivière (2013), "Service Recovery's Impact on
4 Customers Next-In-Line," *Managing Service Quality*, 23 (6), 495–512.
5
6
7 Van Vaerenbergh, Yves, Dorottya Varga, Arne De Keyser, and Chiara Orsingher (2019), "The
8 Service Recovery Journey: Conceptualization, Integration, and Directions for Future
9 Research," *Journal of Service Research*, 22 (2), 103–19.
10
11
12 Vargas-Salfate, Salvador, Dario Paez, James H. Liu, Felicia Pratto, and Homero Gil de Zúñiga
13 (2018), "A Comparison of Social Dominance Theory and System Justification: The Role of
14 Social Status in 19 Nations," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44 (7), 1060–76.
15
16
17 Vedel, Mette, Anne-Maria Holma, and Virpi Havila (2016), "Conceptualizing Inter-
18 Organizational Triads," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 57, 139–47.
19
20
21
22
23 Walther, Joseph B. (2018), "The Emergence, Convergence, and Resurgence of Intergroup
24 Communication Theory in Computer-Mediated Communication," *Atlantic Journal of
25 Communication*, 26 (2), 86–97.
26
27
28
29 Wan, Lisa and Robert S. Wyer Jr. (2019), "The Influence of Incidental Similarity on Observers'
30 Causal Attributions and Reactions to a Service Failure," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45
31 (6), 1350–68.
32
33
34
35
36 Weitzl, Wolfgang J. and Clemens Hutzinger (2017), "The Effects of Marketer-and Advocate-
37 Initiated Online Service Recovery Responses on Silent Bystanders," *Journal of Business
38 Research*, 80, 164–75.
39
40
41
42 Yang, Huadong, Evert van de Vliert, and Karen Jehn (2018), "A Psychological Approach to
43 Third-Party Side-Taking in Interpersonal Conflicts," *Organizational Psychology Review*, 8
44 (2–3), 174–91.
45
46
47
48 Zaccaro, Stephen J., Andrea L. Rittman, and Michelle A. Marks (2001), "Team leadership," *The
49 Leadership Quarterly*, 12 (4), 451–83.
50
51
52 Zhao, Haichuan, Lan Jiang, and Chenting Su (2020), "To Defend or Not to Defend? How
53 Responses to Negative Customer Review Affect Prospective Customers' Distrust and
54 Purchase Intention," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 50, 45–64.
55
56
57
58
59
60