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Low-cost airlines in Indonesia often experience long flight delays. Flight delays are a pattern of service failure that results in frustration, complaints and the creation of negative word of mouth. The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of service failure on customer frustration, customer complaint behaviour and frustration with complaint behaviour and its impact on negative word of mouth. Samples were selected by systematic sampling at Soekarno Hatta, Sultan Hasanuddin, Kualanamu and Syamsudin Noor airports. A total of 335 passengers who experienced delays of more than 2 hours were selected as respondents. Questionnaires are used for data collection and partial least squares are used to evaluate structural models of research. The results prove that service failure significantly affects customer frustration, complaint behaviour, and negative word of mouth, where frustration and complaints also affect to negative word of mouth.
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Background

Airlines in Indonesia often have long delays for domestic routes. The average on-time performance of Indonesian airlines is 78.48% (CNBC, 2019). Long flight delays make passengers dissatisfied and complaining. Nevertheless, some cases also followed by not providing compensation delay in accordance with the regulations, and unclear information
causing the delay. The assemblage of this flight service failure makes passengers feel frustrated, so that they complain and act emotionally. Passenger aggressive actions were described by several media (Anatasia, 2019; Aquina, 2019; Cahyani, 2018; Damarjati, 2018; Flo, 2018).

Anger and aggressive attitudes of passengers experiencing delays is not bounded to a form of dissatisfaction, but may proceed to aggression driven by negative emotions (Singh & Pandya, 1991). Previous consumer behaviour research in studying the complaints tends to focus on the construct of customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction; this causes other forms of negative emotions to be passed as important variables (Söderlund, 2003; Stauss, Schmidt, & Schoeler, 2005; Susskind, 2004).

Analysis of complaints must also be approached with a negative emotion approach. The negative emotion in question is frustration, whose existence and influence are frequently overlooked because many marketers and researchers tend to equate frustration with anger (Laros & Steenkamp, 2005; Richins, 1997). Thus, emotional protests of passengers experiencing delays need to be approached with a customer frustration approach.

This is an approach that is still rarely done and offers a new perspective in looking at customer behaviour. Customer frustration research is nonetheless very rare; some programs are explained such as loyalty programs (Stauss et al., 2005), online loyalty programs (Sven Tuzovic, 2010), online shopping (Román & Riquelme, 2014), online services (Chignell, Jovanovic, Chelsea, Jiang, & Leon, 2014), service failures and information support (Gelbrich, 2010), while frustration caused by flight delays is still not found. As a development, this research will spread by adding flight delays as frustrating incidents. Studies by (Stauss et al., 2005; Sven Tuzovic, 2010) will be adopted because they provide a strong foundation in measuring the construct of customer frustration.

The results of this study will strengthen the theoretical frustration of customers and how they will have impact on complaints and negative word of mouth. For managerial implications this can help plan a recovery strategy because avoiding and dealing with frustration is an essential strategy to maintain excellence (Berry et al., 2010; Kukar-Kinney & Close, 2010), as well as avoiding negative word of mouth (S Tuzovic & Mangold, 2008); (Sven Tuzovic, 2010) and (Román & Riquelme, 2014).

**Literature Review**

**Service Failure**

Service failure is a perception by customers that one or more specific aspects of service delivery have not met their expectations (Lovelock & Wright, 2005). Other researchers define
it as customer perceptions of services that are below expectations (Holloway & Beatty, 2003; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1993). (Grönroos, 1988; Parasuraman, Berry, & Zeithaml, 1991) suggested that service failures can be divided into 2 (two) parts, namely: 1) failure of results and 2) process failure.

Service failure refers to core service failures, and process failures, inconvenience or dissatisfaction experienced during service delivery. (Lovelock & Wright, 2005) state that there are four possible actions if a customer experiences service failure: 1) take no action, 2) complain, 3) take action through a third party and 4) move to another service provider and prevent people from using the service.

**Customer Frustration**

Frustration is a universal concept because it is linked to a person's psychological state. In the context of consumer behaviour, frustration can arise if the intention of purchasing a service is not achieved (service failure). For example, someone is frustrated because a flight is delayed. According to (Svari, Slåtten, Svensson, & Edvardsson, 2011), customer frustration is defined as an emotional response due to obstruction of achieving a goal or action that is potentially beneficial or satisfying, or an emotional response to an obstacle. Frustration is caused by not reaching a goal due to certain obstacles (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Shorkey & Crocker, 1981; Stauss et al., 2005).

Frustration is a condition of emotional distress associated with the issue of anger (Bougie, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2003; Roseman, 1991; Tronvoll, 2011). Disappointing conditions occur because satisfaction goals are not achieved or hindered by internal and extraneous factors or called frustration incidents (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Berkowitz, 1978, 1989; Bessiere, Ceaparu, Lazar, Robinson, & Shneiderman, 2004; Britt & Janus, 1940; Petzer, De Meyer, Svari, & Svensson, 2012). Customers who face incidents of frustration with the service will encourage the emergence of negative emotions as frustration sensations, which will produce responses in the form of frustrated behaviour. This operation is known as general frustration model, which explains three main elements of frustration, namely 1) frustration incidents, 2) frustration sensations and 3) frustration behaviour (Stauss et al., 2005; Sven Tuzovic, 2010).

A frustration incident is a barrier event that reaches a customer's unattainable goal, for example, flight delays and late compensation. These customer frustration sensations include 1) unpleasant negative emotions with high heat, and 2) high attention, as one's special attention to events that cause frustration. Frustration behaviour can be seen in customer actions in the shape of 1) aggressive protest, 2) intensification of effort and 3) avoidance (Stauss et al., 2005).
Frustration sensation is a psychological term that is triggered by an incident of frustration, which is a form of negative emotion and is described as an unpleasant feeling (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Stauss et al., 2005). (Stauss et al., 2005) suggests this form of customer frustration includes: 1) unpleasant negative emotions with high passion, and 2) high attention, as one's special attention to events that cause frustration. The sense of frustration then gives rise to a variety of customer frustration behaviours.

Customer frustration behaviour involves actions that fall out of the sensation of frustration, which is the customer's attempt to reduce or eliminate obstacles to achieving goals (Berkowitz, 1989; Stauss et al., 2005).

**Complaint Behaviour**

Customer complaints continue to be an important topic for marketers. Complaint behaviour is a concept that covers all different customer actions if they are dissatisfied with a purchase or service (Mowen & Minor, 2008). Complaints are also understood as negative feedback to service providers (Bell & Luddington, 2006) and responses to service failures (Huang, Huang, & Wu, 1996).

Customer complaint behaviour is classified into voice responses, personal responses, and third-party responses. Lerman (2006) in (Bodey & Grace, 2006) identifies three types of complaint behaviour, including 1) votes, 2) personal actions, and 3) third party actions. Most of the votes refer to the complaint behaviour directed at the guilty party. Lam and Tang (2003) group complaints behaviour into 1) personal and urgent, 2) badmouthing, 3) complaints to management and publications.

Publishing complaints through third parties may be a case of logical behaviour when consumers are dissatisfied with the company's response to service failures. According to Rangkuti (2009), customer complaint actions are divided into (2) two kinds, namely 1) complaint actions submitted verbally, by telephone or direct communication, and 2) complaint actions taken in writing by filling out complaint forms. In general, customers submit complaints with the aim to: obtain compensation, express anger, provide feedback solutions and pursue the quests of the customer himself (Lovelock & Wright, 2005).

**Negative Word of Mouth (NWOM)**

According to (Schiffman, Kanuk, & Wisenblit, 2007), word of mouth is the process by which one person (the opinion leader) informally influences the actions or attitudes of others, who may be opinion seekers or opinion recipients. (Kotler & Armstrong, 2012) suggested that some customers will feel satisfied with the product and then they will deliver positive word of mouth. But there are some customers who are not satisfied and then do negative word of mouth.
Harrison Walker (2001) in (Harris & Ogbonna, 2012) defines negative word of mouth as informal person-to-person communication between non-commercial communicators and recipients based on brands, products, organisations, or services that are negatively charged. Negative word of mouth aims to lower the esteem for the object in the communication (Richins, 1983).

Customers use products differently, behave differently, and talk differently. The company cannot control customers' words to others, and the disadvantage is when customers speak word of mouth negatively on the product (negative word of mouth). Even though the company perceives that it has given the best, customers can still talk about product deficiencies (Kandampully, 1998).

**Hypothesis and Research Model**

**Relationship Service Failure and Customer Frustration**

The customer frustration theory describes a person will have negative emotions when the expected goal is blocked or prevented (Lazar, Jones, Hackley, & Shneiderman, 2005; Svari et al., 2011; Wetzer, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2007), or because the service response is not satisfying (Laros & Steenkamp, 2005; Nguyen & McColl-Kennedy, 2003; Ruth, Brunel, & Otnes, 2002) and customer satisfaction will decrease (Lazar et al., 2005).

Service failure causing customer frustration has been examined by several previous studies. Customer frustration is triggered by service failure or perceived negative service so that the customer's goals or expectations are not met or hindered (Chignell et al., 2014; Day, 1984; Folkes, Koletsky, & Graham, 1987; Nyer, 2000). Other research shows that service quality is correlated with emotional satisfaction (Guchait & Namasivayam, 2012; Söderlund, 2003; Wong, 2004) and proves frustration is negatively correlated with service satisfaction. Based on this, a hypothesis is formulated: Service failure will increase customer frustration.

**Relationship Service Failure and Complaint Behaviour**

Service failure is a substantial predictor of customer complaint behaviour (Blodgett, Wakefield, & Barnes, 1995; Chelminski & Coulter, 2011; Wirtz & Mattila, 2004). Complaints need a service recovery strategy to regain a positive customer response, if it cannot reduce loyalty and increase negative word of mouth (Komunda & Osarenkhoe, 2012; Lewis & McCann, 2004; Swanson & Kelley, 2001). The pattern of relations between these two variables is positive, signifying that the higher the service failure will increase, the higher the complaint behaviour.
Further findings, (Augusto de Matos, Vargas Rossi, Teixeira Veiga, & Afonso Vieira, 2009) prove that attitudes toward complaints (management of customer complaints) moderate the relationship between service failure and customer satisfaction. (Park, Lehto, & Park, 2008) found incidents related to service failures at airlines and accommodation where full refund and additional costs are the desired compensation when service failures occur. Based on this, the hypothesis formulated is that: service failure will increase complaints to the airline.

**Relationship Customer Frustration and Complaint Behaviour**

Explaining how frustration leads to complaint behaviour can be examined in the frustration-aggression theory, which states that the frustration incident leads directly to aggressive behaviour. The frustration-aggression hypothesis explains that frustration incidents lead directly to aggressive behaviour. According to this perspective, complaints to service providers is a form of aggressive behaviour (Stauss et al., 2005), where frustrated customers try to "come back" at service providers (Blodgett et al., 1995; Bougie et al., 2003; Oliver, 1997). Frustration is a condition of emotional distress associated with the issue of anger (Bougie et al., 2003; Roseman, 1991; Tronvoll, 2011).

The customer frustration theory explains that an individual whose goal is blocked will experience frustration and will then try to achieve it by making a complaint. Customer complaints become an important variable for the emergence of customer frustration. Frustration is the best predictor of complaint behaviour (Bennett, 1997; Tronvoll, 2011), besides that (Susskind, 2004; Svari & Erling Olsen, 2012) prove customer frustration increases customer complaints. Based on this the hypothesis is formulated: higher frustration of passengers will increase customer complaints to the airline.

**Relationship Service Failure and Negative Word of Mouth**

Service failures also encourage customers to say negative things about the service or negative WOM. (Lovelock & Wright, 2005); (Chelminski & Coulter, 2011); (Swanson & Hsu, 2011); (Swanson & Kelley, 2001) prove that negative perceptions of service have a positive effect on negative WOM. This is also supported by findings (Singh, 1988), which prove one of the customer responses due to service failure is to do negative word of mouth. (Svari & Erling Olsen, 2012) found that negative service incidents, where customers associate responsibility in whole or in part because of themselves, customers will be more likely to complain anonymously via social media or the internet, and therefore become a source of negative word of mouth for the company.
Customer Frustration and Negative Word of Mouth

Customer frustration increases the customer's negative word of mouth to the company's products or services as demonstrated by (S Tuzovic & Mangold, 2008); (Sven Tuzovic, 2010); (Román & Riquelme, 2014) both in online forums, social media and in person.

Figure 1. Research Model

Complaint Behaviour and Negative Word of Mouth

Customers who complain to service providers or products tend to be involved in negative word of mouth. Customers who engage in negative word mouth behaviour are found to have no difference between those who complain and those who don't complain in the average number of people, and with whom they are involved in negative word of mouth (Nyer & Gopinath, 2005). Complaint behaviour is an action carried out by an individual which involves communicating something negative about the product or service to the manufacturing company or to some third-party organisational entity (Mowen & Minor, 2008).

Method

The sample of this study is low-cost carrier Indonesian domestic airline passengers, who experienced flight delays of more than 2 hours that occurred in the period 2018 and 2019. Data collection was held at four airports, including: 1) 151 respondents at the Soekarno Hatta Airport, Jakarta conducted on 12-20 February 2019; 2) 84 respondents at the Sultan Hasanuddin Airport, Makassar conducted on 3-8 March 2019; 3) 66 respondents at Kualanamu
Airport, Medan conducted on 14-19 March 2019; and 4) 34 respondents at Syamsudin Nor Airport Banjarmasin conducted on 22-25 March 2019. Data collection points were at the arrival and passing areas and airport lounges, where every 5th passenger who passed the data collection point was approached and asked to be a respondent. The initial inquiry is asked to find out the fulfillment of population criteria, if it is fulfilled, then be asked to become a respondent. On average five out of six passengers who met the criteria refused to become respondents. A total of 335 passengers who met the criteria were willing to become respondents and filled in the research questionnaire.

The questionnaire was developed with a Likert scale with five alternative answers from 1 strongly disagree, to 5 strongly agree. Service failure (SF) is assessed by three items adapted from (Grönroos, 1988; Parasuraman et al., 1991), customer frustration (CF) is measured by four items adapted from (Stauss et al., 2005), complaint behaviour (CB) measured by three items adapted from (Rangkuti, 2009), and negative word of mouth (NWOM) adapted four items from (Lupiyoadi, 2014). The demographic profile of the respondents was processed with SPSS 21, while the evaluation of measurement models and structural models used smartPLS 3.2.8.

**Results and Discussion**

*Demographic Profile*

**Table 1: Demographic Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Delay experience with LCC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 years</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5 times</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59 years</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6 times</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 59 years</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7 times</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The most frequent airlines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Air Asia</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Batik Air</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>Citilink</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Garuda Indonesia</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Lion Air</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sriwijaya Air</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wings Air</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measurement Outer Model**

The research model is constructed with reflective indicators, where validity testing uses convergent validity, discriminant validity and the average variance extracted (AVE) while reliability testing uses composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha (Garson, 2016). Evaluation results obtained by all constructs and indicators meet the minimum standard value. Recommended values: outer loadings > 0.6, AVE > 0.5, Cronbach's alpha > 0.6, composite reliability > 0.7, and variance inflation factor < 5 (Garson, 2016). One NWOM item got a greater VIF value, but it was decided to ignore it, because the data was not formative models and had very good alpha values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and indicators</th>
<th>Convergent validity</th>
<th>Internal Consistency Reliability</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outer loadings</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of thumb</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sf1: Experiencing flight delays</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sf2: Compensation did not conform to regulations</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sf3: Officers who were less cooperative</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf1: Frustrated, flight was delayed</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf2: Emotional, compensation did not conform to regulations</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf3: Emotional, asking to be dispatched</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf4: Within a certain period, avoided airline delays</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cb1: If delay, complain &quot;face to face&quot;</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cb2: If long delay, you strongly protest</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Word of Mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measurement Inner Model**

From evaluation of structural models by looking at path coefficients that illustrate the strength of relationships between constructs, significant influence is defined on the value of t-test or CR (critical ratio) obtained from the bootstrapping process (resampling method).

The direct effect of service failure on customer frustration is relatively strong, on complaint behaviour classified as moderate, whereas with negative word of mouth in the weak category. Customer frustration has a moderate effect on complaints behaviour, and weak on negative word of mouth. Finally, complaint behaviour has a moderate effect on negative word of mouth. All path coefficients are positive, which can be interpreted if service failure increases, it will increase customer frustration, complaints and negative word of mouth, and also customer frustration which will increase complaints and negative word of mouth, and complaints will increase negative words from the mouth

**Figure 2: Path coefficient model**
The next structural model evaluation is to assess R-Square, which evaluates how far the model's ability to explain variations in endogenous variables (Garson, 2016). These outcomes represent the amount of variance of the construct that can be explained by the model. According to (Chin, 1998) criteria R-Square consists of three classifications: 0.67, 0.33 and 0.19 as substantial, moderate and weak. Based on this, customer frustration is classified as having a moderate effect (0.476) while complaint behaviour (0.818) and negative word of mouth (0.750) are substantial.

**Figure 3. T-statistics**

Table 3: Result of path Coefficients and t-value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 Service Failure -&gt; Customer Frustration</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>21.702</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Service Failure -&gt; Complaint Behaviour</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>14.621</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 Customer Frustration -&gt; Complaint Behaviour</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>14.375</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 Service Failure -&gt; NWOM</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>4.328</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 Customer Frustration -&gt; NWOM</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>4.828</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 Complaint Behaviour -&gt; NWOM</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>7.704</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of the strength of the relationship between variables must include the significance of the substance or effect size because statistical significance does not provide important information related to the magnitude of the difference or correlation (Olejnik & Algina, 2000; Sullivan & Feinn, 2012). Cohen in (Sullivan & Feinn, 2012) and (Sawilowsky, 2009) categorised the effect size: 0.2 small, 0.5 medium, 0.8 large, and 1.3 very large.

Table 4 shows that service failure has a substantial influence on the occurrence of customer frustration and has a medium effect on complaints. Likewise, frustration gives a medium effect on the behaviour of complaints. This illustrates that the emotional actions of passengers as a form of frustration are strongly influenced by service failures, which in this study include 1) flight delays, 2) delay in giving compensation, 3) unsatisfactory service. Service failure and frustration both surely become powerful drivers of passenger complaint behaviour. Service failure, customer frustration and complaint behaviour – all three have no substantial effect on negative word of mouth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exogenous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last evaluation of the goodness of the model was done by calculating the value of Goodness of Fit (GoF), used to validate the structural model as a whole. GoF is a measure that combines effect size with convergent validity, suggested by (Tenenhaus, Vinzi, Chatelin, & Lauro, 2005). Nevertheless, the use of GoF is considered to have some statistical weaknesses. Weaknesses include unsuitability for model validation (Henseler & Sarstedt, 2013) and do not handle models that are determined correctly (F. Hair Jr, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & G. Kuppelwieser, 2014).

GoF is a geometric mean, a comparison of the average communality of the outer model and the average R-Square $(R^2)$ of the inner model. Goodness-of-fit is equal to the square root of the product of the average communality multiplication with R-Square. (Henseler & Sarstedt, 2013) suggested that GoF was still useful in assessing PLS-SEM data sets and provided a model explanation that was better than others, with higher reflecting better explanation. The
value of goodness of fit produced $0.63 > 0.36$; this illustrates that the GoF research model is included in the large category (strong) in predicting the structural model formed.

**Conclusion and Implications**

The study found flight delays were frustrating incidents, which led to passenger frustration. Passengers showed an emotional attitude forced by a long flight delay, delay compensation that did not conform to regulations, the attitude of the officers who were less cooperative and took a stand to avoid airline delays within a certain time period (temporary). Form of frustration behaviour could be seen in emotional attitudes requiring them to be immediately dispatched to the destination and emotional protest to the airline. Passengers who are frustrated and complained then create negative word of mouth to the airline delay.

Theoretical implications: these results have extended the theoretical subject and object of customer frustration and reinforced the general frustration model by (Stauss et al., 2005; Sven Tuzovic, 2010). Managerial implications, because flight delays are a frustrating incident, service recovery is required when long flight delays occur. Airlines can use the "double-edged knife" as a strategy, namely by using late compensation as a strategic tool. This is done by a) providing compensation conforming to applicable regulations; b) providing information on the cause of delay clearly, better conveyed by the station manager; 3) providing options to move to another airline; 4) training officers to be patient and cooperative and listen to complaints.

Service failure had a significant effect on customer frustration, complaint behaviour, and negative word of mouth, and customer frustration had a significant effect on customer complaint behaviour. Service failure had a substantive effect on customer frustration and had a moderate effect on complaints. Frustration had a moderate effect on complaints. Service failure, frustration and complaint had a small effect on negative word of mouth.

Theoretical implications: the results of this study reinforce the findings that service failures are contributors to frustration (Guchait & Namasivayam, 2012; Söderlund, 2003; Wong, 2004), service failures determine behavioural complaints (Blodgett et al., 1995; Chelminski & Coulter, 2011; Wirtz & Mattila, 2004), and complaint behaviour is largely determined by frustration (Bennett, 1997; Susskind, 2004; Svari & Erling Olsen, 2012; Tronvoll, 2011). Negative word of mouth is affected by service failures, frustrations and complaints ((Singh, 1988); (Svari & Erling Olsen, 2012); (Sven Tuzovic, 2010); (S Tuzovic & Mangold, 2008); (Román & Riquelme, 2014); (Nyer & Gopinath, 2005); (Mowen & Minor, 2008).
Limitations and Future Research

Restrictions of the theoretical perspective of customer frustration must be considered. This study supports the limitations of research on customer frustration delivered by (Stauss et al., 2005), that it is rational to broaden thinking in explaining the behaviour of customers who experience other frustrated situations, for example, when customers complain that they don't get a loyalty program reward or when a customer fails get rewarded for breaking the provisions. Discourses about the difference between frustration and dissatisfaction and anger need more space to be investigated.

Researchers can further explore the relationship between constituents of the frustration model and the influence of frustration on complaints and loyalty and negative word of mouth (Chignell et al., 2014). Future research can also be directed at placing dissatisfaction variables between frustration and customer complaints and loyalty as suggested (Chignell et al., 2014).

This work relies on emotional feelings that are fully self-reported by respondents. This contains limitations, especially the possibility of emotional measurement bias. In addition, focussing on critical, negative incidents and experiences of service failure can tilt findings because it can encourage respondents to over-emphasise negative events and opinions. The use of structured questionnaires might have caused difficulties for respondents who were asked to define subjective emotional variables in certain classes, although steps were adopted to minimise the effects of this restriction by asking respondents to recall actual negative critical events.

Restrictions in the object of research are only single companies in the aviation industry sector, which certainly limits the generalisation of results. Adding and combining different types of companies are recommended for future inquiry. Sharpen or re-test the formation of customer frustration constructs, how the intensity of frustration sensations or other forms of frustration behaviour can be measured at another locus, such as employee frustration in dealing with workloads and so on.
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