JRSSEM
JOURNAL RESEARCH OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, ECONOMICS, AND MANAGEMENT

IMPACT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LISTENING SKILLS ON THE QUALITY LEVEL OF CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS HANDLING ABILITY (CASE STUDY IN BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS COURSE STUDENTS YOGYAKARTA)

Lucia Nurbani Kartika*
Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana
e-mail: ciakartika@staff.ukdw.ac.id
*Correspondence: ciakartika@staff.ukdw.ac.id

Abstract. Product or service provided by a customer feedback on a product or service. Of the quality of the product or service used by the customer. More and more complaints given by customers require extra attention for every company that receives complaints to improve in the manufacture of products or services. For this reason, every company must be able to provide satisfaction to its customers by one way of responding and handling customer complaints appropriately and correctly. The methodology used to conduct this research is a quantitative approach to establish a causal relationship between the impact of listening skills on the customer's ability to handle complaints. In this case, it is a student case study. Based on the above Based on the research results, communication is certainly the most important key in building good relationships between individuals. Through oral or written communication, it is hoped that the public can fully understand what is conveyed by the sender of the message. Inevitably, communication is the most important thing in determining customer satisfaction of a company. Customer complaints about the use of a product or service provide feedback on the quality of the product or service used by customers. Therefore, the authors initiated "The Effect of Listening Skills Training on the Quality Level of Customer Complaint Management" and achieved significant results.

Keywords: impact; customer complaint; ability

INTRODUCTION

There are 3 skills that are needed to improve the quality of customer complaint handling capabilities, namely: Complaint Handling Management, Listening Skills, Empathic Listening which will be summarized in a series of workshops by the author and tested on Duta Wacana Christian University students**.** Complaint according to (Forte & Brazdil, 2016); (Xu & Li, 2016) is an expression of dissatisfaction from the client. Complaints are generally defined as mistakes, problems, stress, frustration, conflicts, demands, and the like. Complaint Handling or referred to as complaint handling is In simple terms (Jeanpert, Jacquemier-Paquin, & Claye-Puaux, 2021); (Brennan, Sourdin, Williams, Burstyner, & Gill, 2017), complaints can be interpreted as expressions of dissatisfaction or disappointment. The dissatisfaction felt by consumers when buying and using goods, whether in the form of physical products or services. Customer complaints cannot be ignored, because ignoring them will make customers feel unappreciated and not cared for at all (Weber & Chatzopoulos, 2019); (Fernández et al., 2015). Therefore, the company must have a specific procedure for handling complaints.

Hearing is a physiological process while listening involves receiving stimuli (Valenti et al., 2012); (Litovsky, 2015). The understanding of receiving here emphasizes that someone in listening activity means absorbing the received stimulus and then processing it in a certain way. At least for some time, the received signal is held and processed.

METHODS

The methodology that will be used to conduct this research is a quantitative approach to prove the causal relationship of the effect of listening skills on the ability to handle customer complaints, in this case a student case study. This methodology is used to examine and prove causal relationships in an effort to develop listening skills of business communication students in developing customer complaint handling skills through the formation of listening skills. The data collection method uses a questionnaire or questionnaire, which is a data collection technique by giving a group of questions or statements to respondents to be answered.

In a research variable becomes one of the elements that must exist and even becomes an important element because this is what will then be observed or investigated by a researcher.

Variables according to Hatch and Farhady as quoted by Sugiyono are theoretically an attribute of a person or object that has variations from one person to another or one object to another. In more detail, the research variables are as follows:

a. Independent

Variables the independent variables of this study are:

Formation of Listening Skills : X

Content Listening : X_1

Critical Listening : X_2

Empathic Listening : X_3

b. Dependent

Variables The dependent variables of this study are ability complaint Handling Management: Y

The normality test

The normality test is used to determine whether the data population is normally distributed or not. The data is declared normal if the significance is greater than 0.05 (Kwak & Park, 2019); (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012).

Homogeneity Test Homogeneity

A test is used to determine whether some variants of the data population are the same or not. If the significant value is greater than 0.005, it can be said that the variance of two or more groups is the same (Kim, 2014); (Kang & Yusof, 2012).

Hypothesis formulation
Ho: Homogeneous data
Ha: Inhomogeneous data

Test (t-test)

One sample t-test in principle wants to test whether a certain value (given as a comparison) is significantly different or not with the average of a sample. The particular value here is generally a parameter value to measure a population (Bellon-Maurel, Fernandez-Ahumada, Palagos, Roger, & McBratney, 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. **The normality test**
   Criteria : Hypothesis formulation
   Ho: The sample comes from a normally distributed population
   Ha: The sample does not come from a normally distributed population.

   If the value of Sig. > 0.05, Ho is accepted or the sample comes from a normally distributed population.
   If the value of Sig. < 0.05, Ho is rejected or the sample does not come from a normally distributed population.

Table 1. Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
Pretest	.228	5	.200[*]	.932	5	.607
Posttest	.269	5	.200[*]	.894	5	.376
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction						

Table 2. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pretest	Posttest
N		5	5
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	19.40	49.2000
	Std. Deviation	Most	2.191 2.58844
Extreme Differences	Absolute	.228	.269
	Positive	.192	.179
	Negative	-.228	-.269
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.509	.602
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.958	.862

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the results of the normality test, it is known that the value of Sig > 0.05. So Ho is accepted. Or it can be concluded that the sample comes from a normal distribution.

2. Homogeneity Test Homogeneity

Criteria

If the value of Sig. > 0.05, Ho is accepted or the data is homogeneous, if the value of Sig. <0.05, Ho is rejected or the data is not homogeneous.

Test results using SPSS

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable:

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.061	1	8	.812

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Test

Based on the results of the homogeneity test, it is known that the value of Sig > 0.05. So Ho is accepted. Or it can be concluded that the data variance is homogeneous.

3. Test (t-test)

Formulation of Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant difference in

value after the workshop
Ha: There is a significant difference in value after the workshop

Criteria

If the value of Sig. > 0.05, Ho or there is no significant difference in value after the workshop.

If the value of Sig. <0.05, Ho or there is a significant difference in value after the workshop.

Table 4. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	19.40	5	.980	2.191
	Posttest	49.20	5	2.588	1.158

Interpretation: based on the test results in the paired samples statistics the average value of participants at the beginning before the workshop (pretest) is 19.40 with a standard deviation of 2.191 while the average the value after the workshop (posttest) was 49.20 with a standard deviation of 2.588. This means that descriptively there are differences in scores before and after attending the workshop.

Table 5. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest - 29.800	-34.950	-24.650	-16.067	4,000	Interpretation	1.855	4.147	:

The paired samples test table, the mean difference (pretest – posttest) = -29, 800 The negative sign indicates that after participating in the workshop the participants' test scores were higher than before the workshop.

The significant value is 0.00. sig value. < 0.05. Thus Ho is rejected or it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in value after attending the workshop.

Conclusion:

There is a difference in value/ability after attending the workshop.

CONCLUSIONS

Communication is indeed the most important key in building a good relationship between each individual. Through oral or written communication, it is hoped that people can understand what the sender of the message is saying well. Inevitably in the company, communication is the most crucial thing in determining customer satisfaction. Complaints given by customers in the use of products or services are feedback on the quality of products or services used by customers. Because of this, the author initiated the "Impact of Listening Skills Formation on the Quality Level of Customer Complaint Handling Ability (Case Study on Business Communication Course Students UKDW Yogyakarta)" and got quite significant results. This can be seen based on the test results in the table paired samples statistics the average value of participants at the beginning before the workshop (pretest) is 19.40 with a standard deviation of 2.191 while the average value

after the workshop (posttest) is 49.20 with a standard deviation 2,588. This means that descriptively there are differences in scores before and after attending the workshop. Based on the calculation of processing by SPSS, the Workshop on Formation of Listening Skills on the Quality Level of Customer Complaints Handling Ability is declared valid / successful.

For future research, it is hoped that a wider population sample will be used, so that research will continue to develop, not limited to Duta Wacana Christian University students.

REFERENCES

Bellon-Maurel, Véronique, Fernandez-Ahumada, Elvira, Palagos, Bernard, Roger, Jean Michel, & McBratney, Alex. (2010). Critical review of chemometric indicators commonly used for assessing the quality of the prediction of soil attributes by NIR spectroscopy. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, *2*(9), 1073–1081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2010.05.006

Brennan, Carol, Sourdin, Tania, Williams, Jane, Burstyner, Naomi, & Gill, Chris. (2017). Consumer vulnerability and complaint handling: Challenges, opportunities and dispute system design. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *4*(6), 638–646. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12377

Fernández, R., Bragagnini, P., Álvarez, N., Delgado, R., Garcia, J. P., Escartín, R., & Gracia, J. (2015). Handlebar injury in children: Are we ignoring the signs? *Journal of Pediatric Surgery Case Reports*, *3*(5), 215–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsc.2015.03.

005

Forte, Ana Catarina, & Brazdil, Pavel B. (2016). Determining the level of clients' dissatisfaction from their commentaries. *International Conference on Computational Processing of the Portuguese Language*, 74–85. Springer.

Ghasemi, Asghar, & Zahediasl, Saleh. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, *10*(2), 486.

Jeanpert, Sophie, Jacquemier-Paquin, Laure, & Claye-Puaux, Sophie. (2021). The role of human interaction in complaint handling. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *6*(2), 102–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102670

Kang, Ho Ming, & Yusof, Fadhilah. (2012). Homogeneity tests on daily rainfall series. *Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences*, *7*(1), 9–22.

Kim, Hae Young. (2014). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) comparing means of more than two groups. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, *3*(9), 74–77. https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2014.39.1.74

Kwak, Sang Gyu, & Park, Sung Hoon. (2019). Normality test in clinical research. *Journal of Rheumatic Diseases*, *2*(6), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.4078/jrd.2019.26.1.5

Litovsky, Ruth. (2015). Development of the auditory system. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, *2*(9), 55–72.

https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-62630-1.00003-2

Valenti, Vitor E., Guida, Heraldo L., Frizzo, Ana C. F., Cardoso, Ana C. V, Vanderlei, Luiz Carlos M., & Abreu, Luiz Carlos de. (2012). Auditory stimulation and cardiac autonomic regulation. *Clinics*, *6*(7), 955–958. https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2012(08)16

Weber, Marcel, & Chatzopoulos, Christos G. (2019). Digital customer experience: the risk of ignoring the non-digital experience. *Int. J. Ind. Eng. Manag*, *10*(3), 201–210.

Xu, Xun, & Li, Yibai. (2016). The antecedents of customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction toward various types of hotels: A text mining approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *5*(5), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.03.003