

Perceived Justice Initiatives and Customers' Post-Complaint Satisfaction in the Fastfood Industry

Ateke, Brown Walter
College of Graduate Studies, University of Port Harcourt.

Ogonu, Gibson Chituru
Universal Basic education, Rivers State

Ishmael, Elvis Chibunna
Marketing Officer, Leaders Bookshop, Port Harcourt

Abstract

The primary aim of every business organisation is to create satisfied customers. Not only because it leads to a secured customer base, but also because it leads to greater financial performance in the long term. This study investigated the connection between perceived justice initiatives and customers' post-complaint satisfaction in the fast food industry in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. One hundred and eighty-five respondents who are patrons of forty fastfood firms participated in the study. The study collected data from the respondent through the use of questionnaire, while the hypotheses were tested using the spearman's rank order correlation coefficient, relying on the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. The study found positive and significant relationship between the three dimensions of perceived justice initiatives considered in the study and customers' post-complaint satisfaction, with interactional justice showing the strongest relationship with customers' post-complaint satisfaction. The study concluded that effective and efficient service recovery programmes anchored on sound grasp of customers' expectation will enhance customers' post complaint satisfaction; and recommends that fastfood firms which seek to improve their performance through customers' post complaint satisfaction should institute perceived justice initiatives through interactional justice, distributive justice and procedural justice.

Keywords: Perceived justice initiatives, Distributive justice, Procedural justice, Interactional justice, Post-complaint satisfaction.

1. Introduction

The increasingly enlightened and demanding nature of present day customers and the competitiveness of today's marketplace have made it very challenging to satisfy today's customer. Service deliveries never seem perfect to customer, as they term every deficiency or shortcoming in the service delivery process as a failure. With a view to ensuring that customers who perceive service failures are accorded the needed attention so as to ameliorate their feeling of angst and reduce their tendency to defect, firms have devised several schemes to ensure competent and holistic service recovery initiatives.

Providing "zero-defect" service should be the desired objective of all service providers (Mannaa & Chaudry, 2013), but problems are unavoidable in the service industry mainly due to the unique characteristics of services (Bitner, 1993; Parasuraman et al., 1985). Even the most customer-oriented organization with the strongest quality programme is unlikely to be able to eliminate all service failures (del Río-Lanza, 2009). Hence, it can be argued that every organisation makes mistakes in meeting the expectations of today's customers who tend to be more demanding and less loyal than ever before (Nikbin, et al, 2010); even as Keaveney (1995) aver that service failure and poor service recovery constitute major cause of dissatisfaction and customer defection.

The underlying principle of the marketing concept is that firms must ensure customer satisfaction. Therefore, the full implementation of the marketing concept will require that firms strive to remedy customer dissatisfaction (Blodgett, 1994). Hence, the argument behind service recovery is the notion that if customers who experience service failures are not adequately assuaged, they may never return to the firm, and may become hostile (Anabila & Tweneboah-koduah, 2012). Typically, when a service failure occurs, the customer will expect to be compensated for the inconvenience in the form of any combination of refunds, credits, discounts or apologies. And where this expectation is not met, the firm stands not only to lose the customer but also referrals that may be made by that customer in the event of satisfactory service delivery and/or effective service recovery (Bendapudi & Leone, 2003).

Modernization and globalization brought western styled delicacies into the fastfood industry in Nigeria; with its attendant professionalization and sophistication and proliferation of brands, a development that has engendered a robust and competitive industry where firms compete for brand recognition through aggressive marketing programmes. The increased competition in the fastfood industry has not only led to improvement in the quality of service delivery, it has also brought about comprehensive customer complaint handling.

In order to ensure that customers always have satisfactory experience, firms have devised several initiatives to put smiles on the faces of their customers. However, no effort of the company is good enough unless it gets the customers' appreciation. Thus, it will be right to posit that the best way to gauge the efficacy of a service recovery effort is to view it from the customers' perspective. Perceived justice is thus viewed as a key concept that explains the formation of customer evaluations of organizational responses to service failure (Sparks & McCally-Kennedy 2011; del Río-Lanza, et al, 2009; Shapiro & Neiman-Gonder, 2006; Mattila & Cranage, 2005; Writz & Mattila, 2004; Mattila, 2001; Kelly, et al, 1993).

Consumers' evaluation of their service encounters is usually influenced by their perception of justice, or whether they have been treated fairly (Teo & Lim, 2001). Fairness in recovery procedures through effective interpersonal communications and restitution often lead to post complaint satisfaction. Perceived justice is believed to be a strong factor in assuaging dissatisfied customer (Blodgett et al, 1995; 1997) and securing their continued patronage, even as proper post-complaint handling can influence perceived quality, improve service provision as well as impact on customer retention (Stauss & Schoeler, 2004).

Scholars suggest that the theory of justice is based on a three-dimensional view of the concept of fairness and has evolved over time to include distributive justice (Deutsch, 1985; Homans, 1961), Procedural justice (Lind & Tyler 1988; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) and interactional justice (Bies & Moab, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; 1988). Even though these dimensions are correlated, they are accepted as distinct dimensions of the justice construct (Erdogan, 2002). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the actual outcome or consequence of a decision. Procedural justice refers to whether or not the procedures or criteria used in making the decision are perceived as being fair. Interactional justice deals with interpersonal behaviour in the enactment of procedure and delivery of outcomes.

In view of the above, the current study intend to examine the connection between perceived justice initiatives and customers' post complaint satisfaction; and to provide direction for the study, the following hypotheses are formulated:

- H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and customers' post-complaint satisfaction.
- H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and customers' post-complaint satisfaction.
- H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and customers' post-complaint satisfaction.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Perceived Justice

Perceived justice is customers' evaluation of the fairness of the service provider in handling or remedying complaints and objections arising from service encounters that fall short of customers' expectation or companies' promised standard. Extant literature in marketing identify perceived justice as a key concept in explaining the formation of customer evaluations of organizations' responses to a service failure (del-Roi-Lanza et al, 2009; Shapiro & Neiman-Gonder, 2006; Matilla & Cranage, 2005; Wirtz & Matilla, 2004; Matilla, 2001; Sparks & McColl-Kennedy, 2001; Hoffman & Kelly, 2000), while Smith et al (1999) suggests that the fairness of the recovery procedures, the interpersonal communications and activities and the outcome are the primary antecedents of customer evaluations.

Customers are central to the study and practice of marketing. However, much of how seller-customer relationship is formed and nurtured remains vague. Though relationship marketing literature has addressed the formation of relationships and the development of loyalty programmes (Mansfield & Warwick, 2000), very little is known about how these relationships are sustained and maintained. Trust building, complaint handling and conflict resolution are organisational initiatives aimed at maintaining seller-buyer relationships. When consumers experience satisfactory problem resolution, they tend to be more loyal than if they never experienced a problem; and this leads to greater profitability (Mansfield & Warwick, 2000).

In as much as it is the aim of every firm to deliver services that are devoid of defects, service failures have become almost inevitable in all service contexts even for firms who offer world-class service systems (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003); mostly due to differences in customers' service expectations and the variable nature of services. The concept of perceived justice, originated from the social exchange theory (Adams, 1965; Blau, 1964), and has been used to explain individuals' reactions to multiple conflict situations (Gilliland, 1993; Lind & Tyler, 1988).

The justice theory states that in every exchange that takes place, people weigh the inputs against the outcomes and compare them with those of others in similar situations (Adams, 1965). In the event that there is equality between them, the exchange is considered as fair, but if the outcomes do not meet with the person's expectations, then this results in inequity (Nikbin, et al, 2010). Research on service recovery presents ample evidence of the suitability of the concept of justice as a basis for understanding the process of service recovery

and its outcomes (Smith et al, 1999; Tax et al, 1998; Blodgett et al, 1997; Goodwin & Ross, 1992).

However, perceived justice as suggested by scholars is a multidimensional view of the concept of fairness and has evolved over time to include distributive justice (Deutsch, 1985; Homans, 1961), Procedural justice (Lind & Tyler 1988; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) and interactional justice (Bies & Shapiro, 1987; 1988).

Distributive justice according del Río-Lanza (2009) refers to the assignment of tangible resources by the firm to rectify and compensate for a service failure. It is measured by justice, fairness, need, value and rewards of outcomes (Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005; Wirtz & Mattila, 2004; Smith et al., 1999). In a service recovery context, it refers to the perceived fairness of the service recovery outcome (Nikbin et al, 2010; Holloway et al., 2009). Studies have provided ample evidence that perceived fairness of tangible outcomes have a positive effect on recovery evaluation (Hoffman & Kelly 2000; Smith et al., 1999; Boshoff, 1997; Goodwin & Ross, 1992).

Nikbin et al (2010), citing del Río-Lanza (2009) state that procedural justice includes the methods a firm use to handle problems arising from service delivery in aspects such as accessibility, timing/speed, process control, delay and flexibility to adapt to the consumer's recovery needs. Davidow (2003) on the other hand suggest that procedural justice also involves policies, procedures, and tools that companies use to support communication with customers and specifically, the time taken to process complaints and to arrive at a decision. In service recovery context, procedural justice means the customer's perception of justice for the several stages of procedures and processes needed to recover the failed service (Mattila, 2001). Procedural justice focuses on the way that the outcome is reached (Nikbin, et al 2010); and is further sub-dimensionalized into flexibility, accessibility, process control, decision control, response speed and acceptance of responsibility (del Río-Lanza et al., 2009; Tax et al., 1998; Blodgett et al., 1997; Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

Interactional justice focuses on interpersonal interactions during the process of service recovery (Nikbin, et al 2010). It means the evaluation of the degree to which the customers have experienced justice in human interactions from the employees of service organization during the recovery process (Sparks & McColl-Kennedy, 2001). Sub-dimensions of interactional justice as revealed by previous studies are courtesy, honesty, offering explanations, empathy, endeavor, and offering apologies (Clemmer, 1988; Tax et al., 1998, McColl-Kennedy & Sparks 2003; del Río-Lanza et al., 2009).

2.2 Post-Complaint Satisfaction

In marketing, customer satisfaction is a term used to measure the extent to which the value offerings of firms meet or exceed the expectation of their customers. Post-complaint satisfaction may thus be conceived as a measure of the extent to which the service recovery efforts of the firm meet or exceed the customers' expectation and assuage their angst following service failure. In the view of Mansfield and Warwick (2000), post-complaint satisfaction is satisfaction after a problem with the service has occurred and the consumer has sought redress with the marketer (i.e. satisfaction after a problem-resolution experience).

Service failures may upset or annoy customers. What actually causes customer dissatisfaction and complaint behaviour however, is failure to immediately and effectively address service failures (Chang, et al, 2008). Customer dissatisfaction is especially heightened when there is a failure in the core service (Hoffman & Kelly, 2000). Core service failure is the main cause of customer defection and hostile behaviour. Thus, the objective of service recovery is to move a customer from a state of dissatisfaction to a state of satisfaction (Nikbin, et al, 2010). Ensuring that customers get fair treatment in the event of service failure does not only bring about post complaint satisfaction, it also induces loyalty behaviours. The effect of perceived justice in service recovery on customer satisfaction has been established by previous studies. For instance, Wirtz and Mattila (2004) indicate that recovery outcomes, procedures and interactional treatment have a joint effect on post-recovery satisfaction.

Complaints handling must be constructive, positive and professional (Zairi, 2000), mainly because it can generate information for quality improvements and have a great impact on customer retention (Strause & Schoeler, 2004). Also, the benefits of regaining the confidence of service customers through effective complaint handling may outweigh the cost of doing so (Strause & Schoeler, 1999); since service recovery provides a major opportunity for organizations to generate satisfied customers. Mistakes and failures seem to be an inevitable part of a service delivery. Consequently, every opportunity an organization gets to create satisfied customers must be welcome (Johnston, 2001).

Good service recovery initiative engenders customer post-complaint satisfaction, which influences long term customer loyalty. When customers get committed to a service provider, they are more likely to forgive a poor service experience (Priluck, 2003) and remain loyal to the service provider. Research shows that customers exhibit higher levels of trust and commitment when they are assuaged through adequate service recovery initiatives in the event of service failure, especially, if they have a relationship with the service provider (Priluck, 2003). Such customer-service provider relationship can be represented by following a sequence that includes trust, which influences relational commitment, which in turn influences customer loyalty (Zamora, et al, 2004;

Vasques & Alonso, 2000).

Every firm must continually explore better ways of serving their customers in order not to lose them to competitors. Since competitors are always keen on attracting customers, the firm that does not look after its own customer will lose them to some other company which can attract them with cheaper and better offerings. Thus Verma and Kaur (2001) suggest that an understanding of the consumer complaining behaviour requires a continuous rationalization of the negative feedback, and criticism offered by the consumer, not only by carrying out sophisticated computerized analysis, but by contacting the dissatisfied consumer directly and asking him the reason for his grouse against of the company.

3. Methodology

The aim of this study is to find out the extent of relationship between perceived justice initiatives and customers' post-complaint satisfaction in the fast food industry in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive research design, and employs the use of questionnaire as the means of data collection. The research setting is a non-contrived one and the researchers have no control over the research elements. A total of one hundred and eighty-five customers of forty fastfood firms in Port Harcourt participated in the study.

The Respondents were approached in the various fastfood restaurants and were intimated of the aim the research, after appropriate introduction. All the respondents that participated in the study admitted that they have had service failure and recovery episodes with the fastfood firm in which they were approached. In responding to the questionnaire, they were required to indicate the extent to which items on the questionnaire describe possible scenarios they may have encountered, by ticking from 1-5 on a likert scale, where 1= negligible; 2= little; 3= moderate; 4= great; 5= very great. Data analysis was done using tables, frequencies, percentages and mean scores, while the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance in a two-tailed test.

4. Results

Table 1: Correlation analysis of the relationship between distributive justice and post-complaint satisfaction

			Correlations	
			Distributive Justice	Post-complaint Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Distributive Justice	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.874**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	185	185
	Post-complaint Satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.874**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	185	185

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Output of Data Analysis on the Relationship between Perceived Justice Initiatives and Customer Post-complaint Satisfaction (2015)

The table above presents the result of the test of H_{01} . Based on the spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (rho) of 0.874 generated by the test, this study infer that a very strong and positive relationship exist between distributive justice and post-complaint satisfaction. Hence, the study rejects the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis, meaning that there is a significant relationship between the variables.

Table 2: Correlation analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and post-complaint satisfaction

			Procedural Justice	Post-complaint Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Procedural Justice	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.769**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	185	185
	Post-complaint Satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.769**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	185	185

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Output of Data Analysis on the Relationship between Perceived Justice Initiatives and Customer Post-complaint Satisfaction (2015)

The spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (rho) of the relationship between procedural Justice and post-complaint satisfaction is estimated at 0.769. This value indicate that a strong relationship exist between the variables. The result is positive, which means that the relationship between procedural Justice and post-complaint satisfaction is a positive one.

Table 3: Correlation analysis of the relationship between interactional justice and post-complaint satisfaction

			Interactional Justice	Post-complaint Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Interactional Justice	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.925**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	185	185
	Post-complaint Satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.925**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	185	185

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Output of Data Analysis on the Relationship between Perceived Justice Initiatives and Customer Post-complaint (2015)

The spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (rho) produced by the test of relationship between interactional justice and post-complaint satisfaction is estimated at 0.925. This value is very high and means that a very strong relationship exist the variables. The positive sign of this correlation coefficient result indicate that successful interactional justice from the firm will result to increased post-complaint satisfaction. Based on the foregoing, the study reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis.

5. Discussion

5.1 Distributive Justice and Post-complaint Satisfaction

The test result of the relationship between distributive justice and customers' post-complaint satisfaction produced a rho coefficient of 0.874** which is indicative of a positive and very strong relationship between the variables. This observation is in agreement with that of Nikbin et al (2010), Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) and Smith et al (1999) who found similar relationship in their various studies. This implies that distributive justice in its basic form involve devising new ways of improving the efficiency and productivity of the firm. Thus, the significant role of distributive justice in affecting customer post-complaint satisfaction would be supported by fair distributive treatment such as refunds, discounts etc. (Nikbin et al, 2010) that are important in putting smiles on the faces of customers.

This observation is also consistent with that of Kim et al (2009) whose earlier findings show that distributive justice is one of the fastest instruments that can give an organization an edge in creating customer trust and commitment through post-complaint satisfaction.

5.2 Procedural Justice and Post-complaint Satisfaction

The result of the test of relationship between procedural justice and post-complaint satisfaction indicates that the variables are positively correlated, and the correlation is also significant. This observation is made based on the rho coefficient of 0.769** produced by the test. This observation is coherent with the argument Sparks and McColl-Kennedy (2001) who posits that procedural justice influence customers commitment through post-complaint satisfaction. This study believe that it is only satisfied customers that gets committed to a service provider, thus, in building trusting and committed service provider-customer relationships, the firm must ensure customer satisfaction through effective and efficient service recovery and complaint handling initiatives.

The observation of this study indicates that successes achieved in terms of procedural justice can translate to higher repatronage rates and higher performance. This observation agrees with the findings of Chang et al (2008) del Rio-Lanza et al (2009), which supported the idea that procedural justice results to higher customer repatronage, which in turn influences marketing performance in terms of profitability.

5.3 Interactional Justice and Post-complaint Satisfaction

Based on the test result of the relationship between interactional justice and customers' post-complaint satisfaction which produced a coefficient of 0.925**, the study inferred that a very strong and positive relationship exist between the variables. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Blodgett (1994), Blodgett et al (1995) and Blodgett et al (1997) whose earlier findings agreed that interactional justice influences post-complaint satisfaction and induces customers' commitment and trust.

Thus, a high level of interactional justice may hold the solution to most customer complaints, and can generate information that will lead to improved service delivery in the fast food industry. Through interactions, the firm's service personnel can convince customers of their readiness to deliver needed services that suits the expectations of customers. This position is supported by Mattila and Cranage (2005) whose findings challenged firms to always place emphasis on interactive justice as a means of achieving post-complaint satisfaction and commitment of customers.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

In view of the result of test of hypotheses and the discussion presented above, this study aver that a significant and positive relationship exists between perceived justice initiatives and customers' post-complaint satisfaction in the fastfood industry. It is thus concluded that effective and efficient service recovery efforts anchored on sound grasp of customers' needs, matched with appropriate perceived justice initiatives will enhance customers' post complaint satisfaction. This conclusion is reached in view of the observation that all the dimensions of perceived justice initiatives considered in the study have significant relationship with customers' post-complaint satisfaction.

Perceived justice, thus, has the potential to improve firms' productivity efforts and increase organizational performance not only by having a satisfied, committed and loyal customer base, but also by gaining information from those customers that can be used to improve the value creation and delivery processes of the firm.

The implication of this observation is that perceived justice initiatives when effectively implemented through interactional, distributive and procedural justice will benefit fastfood firms, and better their performance. The study therefore recommends that fastfood firms which seek to improve their performance through customers' post complaint satisfaction should institute perceived justice initiatives through interactional justice, distributive justice and procedural justice, by adopting policies that encourage robust customer collaboration, customer satisfaction survey, and speedy responses to customer complaints as a means of reassuring customers of super value offering/service recovery.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In Berkovitz, L. (Ed), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press.
- Anabila, P., Narteh, B., & Tweneboah-Koduah, A. (2012). Relational marketing practices and customer loyalty: Evidence from the banking industry in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(13), 51-61.
- Bendapudi, T., N. & Leone, R. P. (2003). Psychological implications of customer participation in co-production. *Journal of marketing*, 3(1), 23-31.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1, 43-55.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 199-218.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments.

- Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3), 676-685.
- Bitner, M. J. (1993). Managing the evidence of service. In Scheuing, E. E., Christopher, W. F. (Eds). *The service quality handbook*, American Management Association (AMACOM), New York.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blodgett, J., Wakefield, K., & Barness, J. (1995). The Effects of customer service on consumer complaining behavior. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 9(4), 31-42
- Blodgett, J. G. (1994). The effects of perceived justice on complaints' repatronage intention and negative word-of-mouth. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behaviour*, 2, 1-14.
- Blodgett J. G., Hill, D. J., & Tax, S. S. (1997). The effects of distributive, procedural and interactional justice on post complaint behaviour. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(2), 185-210.
- Boshoff, C. (1997). An experimental study of service recovery options. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 8(2), 110-130.
- Chang, H., Lee, J., & Tseng, C. (2008, March). The influence of service recovery on perceived justice under different involvement level: An evidence of retail industry. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4 (2), 57-82
- Chebat, J. C. & Slusarczyk, W. (2005). How emotion mediate the effects of perceived justice on loyalty in service recovery situations: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(5), 664-673.
- del Rio-Lanza, A. B., Vazquez-Casielles, R., & Diaz-Martin A. M. (2009). Satisfaction with service recovery: Perceived justice and emotional responses. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(8), 775-781.
- Davidow, M., 2003. Organisational responses to customer complaints: What works and what doesn't. *Journal of Service Research*, 5(3), 225-250.
- Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive Justice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 555-578.
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 694-734.
- Goodwin, C., & Ross, I. (1992). Consumer responses to service failures: Influence of procedural and international fairness perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 25(2), 149-163.
- Hoffman, K. D., & Kelley, S. W. (2000). Perceived justice needs and recovery evaluation: A contingency approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(3/4), 418-432.
- Holloway, C. J., Humphreys, C., & Davidson, R. (2009). *The business of tourism*. 8th Edition. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Homans, G. (1961). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace
- Johnston, R. (2001) Linking complaint management to profit, *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 12(1) 60-69.
- Keaveney, S. M. (1995). Customer switching behaviour in service industries: An exploratory study. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(2), 71-82.
- Kelly, S. W., Hoffman, K. D. & Davis, M. A. (1993). A typology of retail failures and recovery. *Journal of Retailing*, 59, 71-82.
- Kim, T., Kim, W. G., & Kim, H. (2009). The effects of perceived justice on recovery satisfaction, trust, word-of-mouth, and revisit intention in upscale hotels, *Tourism Management*, 30, 51-62.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Mannaa, M., & Chaudhry, B. (2013, October). Role of justice in the complaint handling setting: Scenario-based experiment study. *Academy of Contemporary Research Journal*, 2 (4), 131-151.
- Mansfield, P. M., & Warwick, J. (2000). The impact of post-complaint satisfaction with the salesperson, retailer, and manufacturer on relationship commitment. *AMA Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings*, 11, 204.
- Mattila, A. S. (2001). The effectiveness of service recovery in a multi-industry setting. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15(7), 583-596.
- Mattila, A. S. & Wirtz, J. (2004). Consumer complaining to firms: The determinants of channel choice. *Journal of service marketing*, 18(2). 147-155.
- Mattila, A. S., & Cranage, D. (2005). The impact of choice on fairness in the context of service recovery. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(5), 271-279.
- Maxham, J. III, & Netemeyer, R. (2002). A longitudinal study of complaining customers' evaluations of multiple service failures and recovery efforts. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(4), 57-71.
- McCull-Kennedy, J. R., Daus, C. S., & Sparks, B. A. (2003). The role of gender in reactions to service failure and recovery, *Journal of Service Research*, 6(1), 66-82.
- Nikbin, D., Ismail, I., Marimuthu, M., & Jalalkamali, M. (2010, November). Perceived justice in service recovery and recovery satisfaction: The moderating role of corporate image. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2(2), 47-56.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985, Fall). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50.
- Priluck, R. (2003). Relationship marketing can mitigate product and service failures. *Journal of Services Marketing* 17(1) 37-52.
- Shapiro, T., & Nieman-Gonder, J. (2006). Effect of communication mode in justice-based service recovery. *Managing Service Quality*, 16(2), 124-144.
- Smith, A., Bolton, R. & Wagner, J. (1999, August). A Model of Customer satisfaction with service encounters involving failure and recovery. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36, 356-372.
- Sparks, B. A., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2001). Justice strategy options for increased customer satisfaction in a services recovery setting. *Journal of Business Research*, 54,209-218.
- Stauss, B., & Schoeler, A. (2004). Complaint management profitability: What do complaint managers know?. *Managing service quality*, 14(2/3), 147-156.
- Tax, S. S., Brown, S. W., & Chandrashekar, M. (1998). Customer evaluations of service complaint experiences. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513-530.
- Teo, T. S. H. & Lim, V. K. G. (2001). The effects of perceived justice on satisfaction and behavioural intention: The case of computer purchase. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 29(2), 109-124.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale: Ne Erlbaum.
- Vasquez-Parraga, A. Z., & Alonso, S. (2000). Antecedents of customer loyalty for strategic intent. In John P. Workman, J. P., & William D. Perrault, W. D. (Eds). *Marketing Theory and Applications*. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 82-83.
- Verma, D. P. S., Kaur, G. (2001 July-December). Post-complaint satisfaction: A neglected area. *Delhi Business Review*, 2(2), 131-136.
- Wirtz, J., & Mattila, A. S. (2004). Consumer responses to compensation, speed of recovery and apology after a service failure. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(2), 150-166.
- Zamora, J., A. Z., Vasquez-Parraga, F. M., & Cisternas, C. (2004). Formation process of guest loyalty: Theory and empirical test. *Studies and Perspectives in Tourism*, 13(3-4), 197-221.
- Zariri, M. (2000). Managing customer dissatisfaction through effective complaints management systems. *The Total Quality Management Magazine*, 12(5), 331-335.
- Zeithaml, V. A., & Bitner, M. J. (2003). *Services Marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm*. 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix

Table 1: Items and scores on distributive justice scale

S/N	Items	Response options and scale					Total
		5	4	3	2	1	
pj1	To what extent does this firm compensate customers for service failures	35 (19%)	65 (32.4%)	30 (16.2%)	40 (21.6%)	20 (10.8%)	185 (100%)
		175	240	90	80	20	605
pj2	To what extent does this firm give fair treatment to a customer who is a victim of service failure	40 (21.6%)	50 (27%)	50 (27%)	35 (19%)	10 (5.4%)	185 (100%)
		200	200	150	70	10	630
pj3	To what extent will you refer to this firm as “just” in rectifying service failure	70 (37.8%)	70 (37.8%)	30 (16.2%)	10 (5.4%)	5 (2.7%)	185 (100%)
		350	280	90	20	5	745
pj4	To what extent are you sure to be refunded by this firm in the event of service recovery?	75 (40.5%)	65 (35.1%)	30 (16.2%)	10 (5.4%)	5 (2.7%)	185 (100%)
		375	260	90	20	5	750
pj5	By your own assessment, to what extent does this firm empower its staff to handle customer complaints in the event of service failure?	45 (24.3%)	70 (37.8%)	40 (21.6%)	20 (10.8%)	5 (5.4%)	185 (100%)
		225	280	120	40	5	675
pj6	Based on your personal experience with this firm, to what extent will you rate them as fair in remedying failed services?	45 (24.3%)	60 (32.4%)	40 (21.6%)	30 (16.2%)	10 (5.4%)	185 (100%)
		375	240	120	60	10	655

Table 2: Items and scores of on procedural justice scale

Response options and scale							
S/N	Items	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Pj7	To what extent do you think this firm adopts a defined method in handling service failure issues?	25 (19%) 125	30 (16.2%) 120	40 (21.6%) 120	45 (24.3%) 90	45 (24.3%) 45	185 (100) 500
pj8	By your assessment, to what extent does this firm's service recovery methods adequately recompense customers?	15 (8.1%) 75	20 (10.8%) 80	40 (21.6%) 120	60 (32.4%) 120	50 (27%) 50	185 (100%) 445
pj9	To what extent do you appreciate the time this firm takes to process complaints and arrive at a decision?	70 (37.8%) 350	40 (21.6%) 160	45 (24.3%) 135	20 (10.8%) 40	10 (5.4%) 10	185 (100%) 695
pj10	To what extent do you agree that this firm keeps their customers comfortable while processing their complaints?	60 (32.4%) 300	70 (37.8%) 300	30 (16.2%) 90	20 (10.8%) 40	5 (5.4%) 5	185 (100%) 715
pj11	From your experience as a customer, to what extent is the time this firm takes to remedy failed service justifiable?	30 (16.2%) 150	35 (19%) 140	20 (10.8%) 60	50 (27%) 100	50 (27%) 50	185 (100%) 500

Table 3: Items and scores on interactional justice scale

Response options and scale							
S/N	Items	5	4	3	2	1	Total
pj12	As a customer, to what extent do you agree that staffs of this firm are courteous when taking complaints from customers?	35 (19%) 175	45 (24.3%) 180	70 (37.8%) 210	25 (13.5%) 50	10 (5.4%) 10	185 (100%) 625
pj13	Based on your encounters with this firm, to what extent do you agree that the firm exhibit politeness in resolving customer problems?	40 (21.6%) 200	45 (24.3%) 180	70 (37.8%) 210	20 (10.8%) 40	10 (5.4%) 10	185 (100%) 640
pj14	To what extent do you believe that this firm treats you justly when you complain them about their services?	30 (16.2%) 150	40 (21.6%) 160	60 (32.4%) 180	45 (24.3%) 90	10 (5.4%) 10	185 (100%) 590
pj15	To what extent do you feel that this firm interacts freely with customers in the process of handling complaints?	50 (27%) 250	40 (21.6%) 160	40 (21.6%) 120	30 (16.2%) 60	25 (13.5%) 25	185 (100%) 615
Pj16	To what extent do you agree that this firm owns up and apologizes for service failures?	70 (37.8%) 350	70 (37.8%) 280	30 (16.2%) 90	10 (5.4%) 20	5 (2.7%) 5	185 (100%) 745

Table 4: Items and scores on post-complaint satisfaction scale

Response options and scale							
S/N	Items	5	4	3	2	1	Total
pcs1	To what extent does the service recovery effort of this service provider meet your service expectation?	60 (32.4%) 300	45 (24.3%) 180	40 (21.6%) 120	30 (16.2%) 60	10 (5.4%) 10	185 (100%) 670
pcs2	To what extent do the service recovery initiatives of this service provider remedy your dissatisfaction following service failure?	55 (29.7%) 275	60 (32.4%) 240	30 (16.2%) 90	20 (10.8%) 40	20 (10.8%) 20	185 (100%) 665
pcs3	What is the extent of your happiness after this service provider handled your complaint?	40 (21.6%) 200	50 (27%) 200	40 (21.6%) 120	35 (19%) 70	20 (10.8%) 20	185 (100%) 610
pcs4	To what extent do you feel the recovered service measures up with the money and time you spent with this service provider?	50 (27%) 250	40 (21.6%) 160	40 (21.6%) 120	35 (19%) 70	20 (10.8%) 20	185 (100%) 620
pcs5	To what extent are you likely to recommend this service provider to other customers?	45 (24.3%) 225	40 (21.6%) 160	40 (21.6%) 120	30 (16.2%) 60	30 (16.2%) 30	185 (100%) 595

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

