1. Introduction

Continuously increasing cut throat competition and ever rising expectation of customers have given rise to the research studies related to customer satisfaction and connected constructs in services (Kandampully 1998; Chumpitaz and Paparoidamis 2004). To fight this intense competition every service organisation these days is striving to increase the efficiency, gain and enhance loyalty of customer by focussing on long lasting relationship without giving up the quality of service (Javalgi and Moberg 1997). When a service company is successful in increasing the quality of service and satisfaction of customers then cost attached with service is reduced exponentially i.e. the cost of warranty, servicing defective goods/service and maintenance costs (Anderson et al. 1997). When service quality is higher it will give rise to high retention rates of customer which is directly correlated with profitability (Reichheld and Sasser 1990; Fornell 1992). So it is clear that if the service organisation make service right first time then there are many benefits like customer loyalty becomes higher, repurchase intentions become positive, switching barriers are created and outside reaction expectations turns out to be essentially lower than those when the problems are not resolved (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1996; Schoefer and Ennew 2005). Also defining and developing a good recovery strategies program can directly be linked to the survival of a service organization (Hoffman and Kelley 2000).

One negative service experience can possibly bring down purchasers' general fulfilment with service for all time (Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). In the eyes of customers if their actual service experience or perception of service is not according to what they expected then service is said to be failed (Ennew and Schoefer 2003). This also means that service failure occurs when actual service experience does not match the adequate level of customers’ expectation (Kelley, Hoffman and Davis 1993). When service fails the provider is unable to maintain the reliability of service which results in the negative perception of service (La and Kandampully 2004). Failures of services also negatively affect the loyalty of customers (Mattila 2001).

But uncontrollable situation related factors make failures in services unavoidable (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990). Service fails due to vary nature of service, factors not in control of service provider, provider himself and human element i.e. customers (McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003). As the services cannot be seen, can’t be inventoried, cannot be standardized and production and consumption cannot be separated, zero defects in services are a myth (Gronroos 1992).

When a customer experiences disconfirmation with the expectation of service they may be passive, can take evasive action and complaint, take legal action against the service provider or leave the service altogether never to come back and spread negative things about the provider (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998; Stephens and Gwinner 1998; Lovelock, Patterson and Walker 2001). If service customer faces service failure and also bad service recoveries then customers display negative word of mouth behaviour. They also don't return to the service in future and also show complaining behaviour. (Richins 1983; Reichheld and Sasser 1990). These customers terminate the relationship with buyer and cross the switching barriers (Dwyer, Schurr and Oh 1987).

Various researches have suggested that satisfaction with service recovery efforts is shaped by how customer perceives the fairness of outcome of recovery process, how fairly the recovery procedure is being carried out and also how fairly they have been treated by the service employee who is executing the recovery and these dimensions of recovery fairness together with equity/justice theory are the principle system used by various scientists to generally inspect service recuperation systems (McColl-Kennedy & Sparks, 2003; Michel, 2001).

Also very few explorations have inspected the relationship between administration recuperation and relationship quality variables (Brown, Cowles, & Tuten, 1996; Ruyter & Wetzels, 2000). Therefore, next to no is the thought about role played of relationship quality between recovery fulfilment and attitudinal and behavioural results (Brown et al., 1996; Ruyter & Wetzels, 2000). Research also suggests that satisfaction with complaint handling is strongly associated with both trust and commitment (Kelley and Davis 1994) and can serve as an important mediator linking perceptions of fairness to post complaint behaviours and attitudes (Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran 1998).
As a result, this paper intends to study (1) the impact of justice dimensions on the recovery satisfaction of customer (2) the role of recovery satisfaction in shaping the behavioral intentions of customer and (3) the moderating effect of trust and commitment on the relationship between recovery satisfaction and behavioral intentions (RI and WoM).

2. Theoretical Foundation and Hypothesis

Service Recovery: All the efforts done and actions taken by the service firm to recover the faith of customer after the service is failed are called recovery of service or service recovery (Yunus 2009). Service recovery can also be defined as a series of events in which there is complaint from the side of customer, setting up a process of interaction following the complaint through which the decisions and outcomes can be ascertained (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). Service recovery is responsible for a service customer staying or leaving a service after service failure occurs (Colgate and Norris 2001). It is not possible for service firm to provide error free service but the method to deal with dissatisfaction caused after a service failure has a crucial impact on retaining the customers and their favourable word of mouth behaviour and they also refer the service to other potential customers (Durvasula, Lysonski and Mehta 2000).

So effective recovery is a thinking of management which primarily focuses on making the customer satisfied (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990). Service recovery can also be explained as all the actions taken by service firm after the customer feels negative disconfirmation with whatever he has expected about the firm’s service (Mattila and Patterson 2004). Recovery of service is done so that firm is able to deliver whatever it had promised to the customers and his expectations are matched with actual service which can in turn regain his confidence and trust that firm can satisfy him in future (Zemke and Bell 2000).

When service fails and recovery is done it offers moment of truth opportunity to service provider in which they can attempt to preserve and satisfy the customers (Smith and Bolton 2002). So it is evident that when a service failure takes place firm’s recovery efforts give it chance to both regain the confidence of the customer and retain him in positive way or distort the experience further and let the customer switch to competitor.

The justice theory is the principle system used by various scientists to generally inspect customers’ evaluation of service recovery (McColl-Kennedy & Sparks, 2003; Michel, 2001). The justice theory is taken from the equity theory and social trade theory and is in view of social brain research where the individual clients' fairness impression of service recovery circumstances and choices are analysed (Adams, 1965). Hoffman and Kelly (2000) connected the social exchange concept to a service recuperation methodology and recommended that clients measure their entirety of inputs (financial aspects, time, vitality, and psychic expense) against their whole of yields (money discount, conciliatory sentiment, substitution, and manner of staff) when they assess service recuperation endeavours. Perceived justice proposes that all activities amid the recuperation procedure and outcome delivery are all crucial to recovery assessment.

As needs be, perceived justice comprises of three dimensions: distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ) (Tax & Brown, 1998).

Customer Satisfaction: Satisfaction of customer after any exchange is his comparative evaluation of benefits received as an outcome of exchange and the cost and efforts applied by him to secure the service (Ostrom and Iacobucci 1995). The perception of recovery satisfaction is influenced by the dissatisfaction caused by service failure, what expectations customer has from recovery the difference between recovery expectation and recovery perception i.e. recovery disconfirmation (Andreassen 2000). There is only one factor which is responsible for the growth and existence of a service firm and that is customer satisfaction which is only possible by matching customers’ expectation of service (Cronin and Taylor 1992). Customer satisfaction has a direct and strong influence on loyalty of customer (Fornell 1992). Wow experience and frustration with service (Oliver 1999), intentions to behave in future (Smith and Bolton 1998), and WoM intentions (Richins 1983) have been predicted on the basis of many predictors in order to model loyalty intentions of customers and also to predict profitability of service firm (Rust and Zahorik 1993). When a customer can point out and categorically see the quality of service it becomes a significant predictor of satisfaction of customer (Fornell 1992). When customers encounter a good service they do not forget to tell about this satisfying experience (Richins 1983). Services that cater high satisfaction prevent customers to cross switching barriers of the company (Fornell 1992).

2. Theoretical Foundation and Hypothesis

Service Recovery: All the efforts done and actions taken by the service firm to recover the faith of customer after the service is failed are called recovery of service or service recovery (Yunus 2009). Service recovery can also be defined as a series of events in which there is complaint from the side of customer, setting up a process of interaction following the complaint through which the decisions and outcomes can be ascertained (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). Service recovery is responsible for a service customer staying or leaving a service after service failure occurs (Colgate and Norris 2001). It is not possible for service firm to provide error free service but the method to deal with dissatisfaction caused after a service failure has a crucial impact on retaining the customers and their favourable word of mouth behaviour and they also refer the service to other potential customers (Durvasula, Lysonski and Mehta 2000).

So effective recovery is a thinking of management which primarily focuses on making the customer satisfied (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990). Service recovery can also be explained as all the actions taken by service firm after the customer feels negative disconfirmation with whatever he has expected about the firm’s service (Mattila and Patterson 2004). Recovery of service is done so that firm is able to deliver whatever it had promised to the customers and his expectations are matched with actual service which can in turn regain his confidence and trust that firm can satisfy him in future (Zemke and Bell 2000).

When service fails and recovery is done it offers moment of truth opportunity to service provider in which they can attempt to preserve and satisfy the customers (Smith and Bolton 2002). So it is evident that when a service failure takes place firm’s recovery efforts give it chance to both regain the confidence of the customer and retain him in positive way or distort the experience further and let the customer switch to competitor.

The justice theory is the principle system used by various scientists to generally inspect customers’ evaluation of service recovery (McColl-Kennedy & Sparks, 2003; Michel, 2001). The justice theory is taken from the equity theory and social trade theory and is in view of social brain research where the individual clients' fairness impression of service recovery circumstances and choices are analysed (Adams, 1965). Hoffman and Kelly (2000) connected the social exchange concept to a service recuperation methodology and recommended that clients measure their entirety of inputs (financial aspects, time, vitality, and psychic expense) against their whole of yields (money discount, conciliatory sentiment, substitution, and manner of staff) when they assess service recuperation endeavours. Perceived justice proposes that all activities amid the recuperation procedure and outcome delivery are all crucial to recovery assessment.

As needs be, perceived justice comprises of three dimensions: distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and interactional justice (IJ) (Tax & Brown, 1998).

Customer Satisfaction: Satisfaction of customer after any exchange is his comparative evaluation of benefits received as an outcome of exchange and the cost and efforts applied by him to secure the service (Ostrom and Iacobucci 1995). The perception of recovery satisfaction is influenced by the dissatisfaction caused by service failure, what expectations customer has from recovery the difference between recovery expectation and recovery perception i.e. recovery disconfirmation (Andreassen 2000). There is only one factor which is responsible for the growth and existence of a service firm and that is customer satisfaction which is only possible by matching customers’ expectation of service (Cronin and Taylor 1992). Customer satisfaction has a direct and strong influence on loyalty of customer (Fornell 1992). Wow experience and frustration with service (Oliver 1999), intentions to behave in future (Smith and Bolton 1998), and WoM intentions (Richins 1983) have been predicted on the basis of many predictors in order to model loyalty intentions of customers and also to predict profitability of service firm (Rust and Zahorik 1993). When a customer can point out and categorically see the quality of service it becomes a significant predictor of satisfaction of customer (Fornell 1992). When customers encounter a good service they do not forget to tell about this satisfying experience (Richins 1983). Services that cater high satisfaction prevent customers to cross switching barriers of the company (Fornell 1992).
Client Fulfillment with service recovery is explained as clients' full of feeling mental reaction in light of subjective assessments of the general service execution after organizational recovery endeavours (Hess Jr., Ganesan and Klein 2003).

**Word-of-Mouth:** Despite the fact that the meanings of behavioural goals appear to change contingent upon research context, social scientists view behavioural intentions as a client's readiness to give positive or negative word of mouth and his or her intention to repurchase (Oliver, 1997; Spreng et al., 1995; Yi, 1990). It is the probability that a service customer will spread positive vibes about the service provider after he encounters service failure and recovery (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002). It can also be defined as the interpersonal communication among service customer regarding service offering where origin is quoted irrespective of the commercial effect (Litvin, Goldsmith and Pan 2008). If a firm is able to generate positive word of mouth it can take advantage of existing customer to convert a potential customer to a regular one (Gremler, Gwinner and Brown 2001). If we talk about the post purchase behaviour then WOM is the communication pointed towards other consumers to discuss firms offering and providers of a service (Westbrook 1987). It also enables the firm to know that whether a customer will be coming for future purchase or not (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1993). It is i.e. positive WOM said to be extraordinary information for the provider and on te other hand negative word of mouth is most disastrous happening for a business (Singh 1990). Word of mouth conduct has been recognized as a critical post buys intention. Mangold et al. (1999) underlined that interpersonal correspondence has a noteworthy effect on customer buying conduct. Since potential clients see verbal correspondence as solid, it may have a generous effect (Yi, 1990). Besides, its significance as a wellspring of data is huge in service consumption in view of the impalpable way of service.

**Repurchase Intentions:** Repurchase plans will be the individual's judgments about purchasing an assigned item or administration from the same organization again while considering his current circumstances (Hellier et al. 2003). It shows clients' self-reported probability of taking part in future repurchase conduct (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002; Seiders et al. 2005). They are considered as a positive result of consumer loyalty (Cronin and Taylor 1992; Andreassen and Lervik 1999). It can be defined as an extent to which clients plan to buy firms' items in times to come (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002). A consumer, choice to repurchase from his/her current provider is regularly mind boggling and may include execution, cost and aggressive contemplations (Kumar 2002). After some time, issues with clients are certain to happen. In the following thousand years, nonetheless, organizations ought to foresee significantly more dissensions than any other time in recent memory. Different elements will add to this: the development in client decisiveness: the expanded openness of offers and client administration delegates by means of email, pagers, cells, and pitched 800 numbers: and the expanded utilization of the Internet by clients. Kept buying by current clients is an imperative concern in light of the fact that the expense of acquiring another client for the most part enormously surpasses the expense of holding a client (Spreng et al., 1995). Researchers have found that consumer loyalty or disappointment is a discriminating variable influencing re buys intentions (E. W. Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Oliver, 1981).

**Trust and Commitment:** Dwyer et al., 1987; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Moorman, Deshpande, and Zaltman (1993) characterized trust as the "ability to depend on a trade partner in whom one has faith" (p. 315). In the same line, Morgan and Hunt (1994) conceptualized trust as "faith in a trade partner's dependability and uprightness" (p. 23). The definitions underline the significance of trust in exchange partners. Commitment is likewise a key segment for building a long haul relationship (Gundlach et al., 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande (1992) characterized commitment as "a persevering yearning to keep up an esteemed relationship" (p. 316). Also, Morgan and Hunt (1994) characterized commitment as "an exchange partner accepting that a continuous association with another is so imperative as to warrant greatest endeavours at looking after it" (p. 23).

Past researches have also pointed towards these two determinant relationship construct i.e. trust and commitment, in the evolution of long term bonding between service provider and customer (Dwyer et al., 1987; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Tax et al., 1998). Morgan and Hunt (1994) speculated that fruitful relationship marketing requires trust and commitment as its crucial components. Trust has every now and again been examined as a predecessor of the procedure of relationship evolution (Bejou & Palmer, 1998; Crosby et al., 1990; Dwyer et al., 1987; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Moorman, Deshpande, and Zaltman (1993) characterized trust as the "ability to depend on a trade partner in whom one has faith" (p. 315). In the same line, Morgan and Hunt (1994)
conceptualized trust as "faith in a trade partner's dependability and uprightness" (p. 23). The definitions underline the significance of trust in exchange partners. Commitment is likewise a key segment for building a long haul relationship (Gundlach et al., 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande (1992) characterized commitment as "a persevering yearning to keep up an esteemed relationship" (p. 316). Also, Morgan and Hunt (1994) characterized commitment as "an exchange partner accepting that a continuous association with another is so imperative as to warrant greatest endeavours at looking after it" (p. 23).

The effect of Justice/Recovery efforts on Recovery Satisfaction

Examination bolsters the thought that equity is the beginning stage to gauge the nature of the connections between a service organizations and people which impacts clients' reactions to service failures and recoveries (Philippe and Siadou-Martin 2007). Equity matters in light of the fact that it serves four mental needs of individuals which are: control over nature; requirement for belongingness; feeling of self-personality and self-regard (Corpanzano et al. 2001). Equity concerns the result circulations, as well as how the dispersion is touched base at and the way in which it is actualized (Austin 1979). Equity hypothesis recommends that clients will be fulfilled by the service recovery exertion on the off chance that they get reasonable result, reasonable system, reasonable direct and were dealt with in an aware way (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998; Hoffman and Kelley 2000; Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002; Nguyen and McColl-Kennedy 2005). The interconnection of different mental needs of individuals proposes that equity can have both immediate and backhanded impacts (Corpanzano et al. 2001).

Consumer satisfaction relates to a people, subjectively inferred ideal result or experience connected with utilization of an item or service (Maxham III 2001). Fulfilment or disappointment judgment will be accepted to be shaped as a rundown of value/disparity of ones' own result in respect to other party's result, given data (Andreassen 2000). Consumer satisfaction alludes to the feeling of satisfaction or disappointment a client feels after they think about the apparent impacts of a certain item with the impacts they expect (Juan and Yan 2009). It is a reaction of satisfaction and judgment that an item or service highlights, or the item or service itself is giving a pleasurable level of utilization related satisfaction (Oliver 1997). It can be seen as an additive function of the desire level and the coming about disconfirmation (Oliver 1980).

Thus, to know clients' fulfilment or disappointment with the recovery strategy one must know their view of equity which incorporates distributive, procedural and interactional equity. Figure 1 shows the proposed model and portrays the relationship between perceived equity, recovery satisfaction, relationship constructs and behavioural intentions and also mentioned moderating impacts.

Distributive Justice (DJ) and Recovery Satisfaction

DJ is based on the concept that in any service transaction or encounter customers compares the input and output of that exchange to get an idea of the fairness of that exchange. The concept is called social exchange theory (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2003). It can also be described as the recovery perception of the customer that whether the output of recovery was fair as compared to their needs (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). It can also be explained as the measure of equitable distribution of rewards after service recovery (Niehoff and Moorman 1993). So it can be said that after a service recovery customers compares and mentally calculate their input and output to the process and also compares their own ratios to other customer to assess equity (Loi, Hang-Yui and Foley 2006). So it can be said that distributive justice judges the perception of fairness of the outcomes to the inputs of service failure and customer calculates this fairness by calculating how much his discontent was offset by the tangible outputs of recovery (Hoffman and Kelley 2000; Weun, Beatty and Jones 2004). It can also be defined as the benefits received by the customers after recovery as compared to the invisible inputs like his time cost, money cost and emotional cost (McCollough, Berry and Yadav 2000). Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran (1998) said that this fairness perception is further moderated by prior experience of the customer with firm, their perception and knowledge about the resolution of problems of other customers and also by the perception about the magnitude of their own loss as a result of service failure. The magnitude of reward is directly proportional to the failure severity (Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). The perceived outputs of recovery process while evaluating distributive justice can be money back, monetary rewards, free service offering for future and request to forgive from the side of provider (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998; Hoffman and Kelley 2000).
Distributive equity is measured in light of the equity theory, fairness and need. It is fundamentally concerned with the particular results of the recovery effort (Kau and Loh 2006). Customers who experience a recovery process and know how kindred clients have been dealt with in comparative circumstances will expect the same treatment (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). Distributive equity will be an imperative forerunner of consumer satisfaction with service recuperation (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998; Smith and Bolton 1998; Smith, Bolton and Wagner 1999; Kau and Loh 2006). Earlier research has exhibited a solid relationship between distributive equity and consumer satisfaction with recovery. Expense, Brown and Chandrashekaran (1998) discovered an immediate constructive outcome of distributive equity on consumer loyalty with administration recuperation. Smith, Bolton and Wagner (1999) found to have positive connection between distributive equity and consumer recovery satisfaction experiences in lodgings and eateries. Karatepe (2006) in their investigation of lodging settings found that giving reasonable result emphatically impacts complainants' fulfilment. Maxham III and Netemeyer (2002) in their study of bank clients discovered support for the positive connection between distributive equity and client recovery satisfaction. Along these lines, we propose that

\[ H1: \text{Distributive Justice will positively affect customers’ satisfaction with service recovery} \]

Procedural Justice (PJ) and Recovery Satisfaction

PJ is the perception of fairness of the process by which the recovery has been achieved (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). It is related to procedures, ways and techniques by which recovery has been implemented in the firm (Folger and Cropanzano 1998). It analyses the effect of decision making process while recovering service on the quality of exchange between customer and provider (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998; Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). Voice influences the perception of just procedure (Goodwin and Ross 1992) together with neutrality (Sparks and McColl-Kennedy 2001). The meaning of voice is that whether customer is given the chance to raise his voice or not in failure and recovery scenario (Yavas et al. 2003). Goodwin and Ross (1992) outlined that when customer has a fair chance to express his dissatisfaction through voice then the perception of just procedure rises and also it gives customers a feeling of catharsis where they feel a psychological satisfaction after being openly expressive. The perception of equity also increases when customers are given chance to express (Sparks and McColl-Kennedy 2001).

The service consumer being a human poses a challenge in front of provider that even if he is satisfied with the outcome of recovery he may still be dissatisfied with the procedure by which it has been achieved and this fact makes procedural justice a crucial concept (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002; Kau and Loh 2006). Procedural justice can also be defined a tool to measure that how much customers have a freedom to say, how much adaptive service recovery procedure is, how much fast and accurate it is and how easy is it to access for customers (Seiders
and Berry 1998; Schoefer and Ennew 2005). Procedural justice allows service customer to resolve the problem in such a manner that long lasting relationship is preserved and maintained (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). Service providers can upgrade consumer satisfaction with recovery by giving them reasonable procedure and opportune recovery (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002). In service experiences, contact workers ought to give products and purpose clashes in a right and useful way (Martinez-Tur et al. 2006).

Former observational exploration gives confirmation to bolster the reason that clients who see that the service supplier has taken after reasonable process and give them opportune recuperation are fulfilled by the suppliers' service recovery. While utilizing recreations and tape situations as a part of lodging settings, Sparks and McColl Kennedy (2001) reported that both voice and impartiality impact the clients' view of saw decency of procedure. Donavan (2006) uncovered that clients who get brief and on-the-spot reaction to service failures are fulfilled by the service provider. Mattila (2001) in her observational study for hairdressers, cleaners and eateries found that the timeframe taken and adaptability to tackle the issues impact consumer recovery satisfaction. In an eatery setting, Hocutt and Bowers (2006) also showed same results and therefore, we propose that

**H2: Procedural Justice will positively affect customers’ satisfaction with service recovery.**

**Interactional Justice (IJ) and Recovery Satisfaction**

PJ can be explained as perception of justice while personally interacting with the service provider’s employees after a customer faces service failure and during recovery process (Maxham III and Netemeyer 2002). It is the justness of treatment a customer receives while interacting during recovery process (Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran 1998). It can also be defined as the justness of employee’s behaviour while the personal interaction is going on in recovery (Davidow 2003). It is the way in which service employee behave while interacting with customers while recovery process is on. This includes his willingness to solve the problem, proactiveness to understand the source of problem, how polite he is, willingness to apologise and provide resolution (Collie, Sparks and Bradley 2000; McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003; Schoefer and Ennew 2005). It is true that how service employee behave while recovering service represents a crucial point in the service encounter and can make service memorable or worth forgetting in the eyes of customers (Bitner, Booms and Mohr 1990). Apology is said to be a major component in recovery process and can help customer remain within switching barriers (Goodwin, Ross 1992).

In a service recovery circumstance, interactional equity concentrates on the apparent decency of the way in which the client is dealt with exhaustive out the service recovery exertion (Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). Exploration proposes that regardless of the fact that clients see the technique and result as reasonable, they may in any case see themselves as treated unjustifiably, in the event that they see shamefulness amid personal interaction with service provider (Bies and Shapiro 1987; Maxham III and Netemeyer 2003). Tax, Brown and Chandrashekaran (1998) demonstrated that giving a clarification, concern and genuineness influences consumer satisfaction with the recuperation process. McCollough, Berry and Yadav (2000) in an investigation for carrier voyages found that if clients see the service provider as contrite, sympathetic and responsive, it brings about Fulfilment. Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan (2006) in the lodging settings reported that clients' apparent compassion and civility of service provider decidedly impact their Fulfilment. Maxham III nad Netemeyer (2002) demonstrated a solid effect of interactional equity on clients' post recovery satisfaction. As the assessment of service recovery procedure is vigorously impacted by the interaction between clients and service specialists, we propose that

**H3: Interactional Justice will positively affect customers’ satisfaction with service recovery.**

**The effect of Recovery Satisfaction and Relationship Quality on Behavioural Intentions and associated hypothesis**

Examination has demonstrated positive relationship between satisfaction and behavioural plans of clients (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1996). Nature of service or item prompts larger amounts of client retention (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990) which thus prompts profitability (Fornell 1992; Reichheld and Sasser 1990).
Intentions are said to be an element of Fulfilment (Oliver and Swan 1989). Service recovery advantages a firm on the grounds that it decidedly impacts clients' expected utilities of a buy, their observation of item quality and WOM (Blodgett and Anderson 2000). Successful recovery essentially enhances all aspects of behavioural intentions (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1996)

Satisfaction with Service Recovery and Word-of-Mouth (WOM)

WOM is characterized as the casual interchanges between private gatherings concerning the assessments of merchandise and services (Anderson 1998). Satisfaction with the service recovery has demonstrated to have a constructive outcome on clients' post recovery WOM. An informal message that is effectively looked for will have more effect on the explanatory variable than a message which is inactively achieved (Bansal and Voyer 2000). Research has indicated that WOM will be a more viable apparatus than promoting, individual offering and radio publicizing in changing over clients' negative or unbiased attitudes into positive one (Harrison-Walker 2001). Blodgett, Wakefield and Barnes (1995) in their study being led at a retail location found that clients who get reasonable treatment and see that equity has been done to them are more prone to re-patronize the vendor and may take part in positive WOM, therefore spreading goodwill for the dealer. In a banking division, Maxham III and Netemeyer (2002) reported that clients who are fulfilled by recovery efforts feel pleased and consequently need to enlighten others concerning their experience. Kau and Loh (2006) likewise upheld the certainty that consumer satisfaction with recuperation decidedly influences their WOM intentions. Consequently, we propose that

H4: Satisfaction with service recovery will have a positive effect on customers’ post recovery word-of-mouth.

Satisfaction with Service Recovery and Repurchase Intentions

Cronin and Taylor (1992) observed when they observed service quality in financial, cleaning, fast food and pest control commercial enterprises that a positive connection exists between satisfaction and repurchase propositions of the clients. In the investigation of cell phone industry, Bolton (1998) has discovered positive connection between fulfilment or satisfaction and clients intentions to repurchase. Maxham III and Netemeyer (2002) reported that clients who are fulfilled by recovery are more inclined to repurchase from the firm. Hellier et al. (2003) reported that general satisfaction with the service emphatically connected with the behavioural plans to repurchase from the same provider of service. Zboja and Voorhees (2006) found in two sectors i.e. PCs and gadgets that satisfaction with firm has an immediate positive impact on clients' repurchase prepositions. A decent recovery of service will absolutely impact repurchase intentions while terrible recovery will have negative impact on repurchase plans. In light of the above writing, we propose that

H5: Satisfaction with service recovery will have a positive effect on customers’ post recovery repurchase intentions.

Role of Trust and Commitment in the relationship between Customers’ Recovery Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions

To add to a trade partner's trust in a business relationship, a service supplier should reliably meet the desires of able execution (Sirdeshmukh, Singh, & Sabol, 2002). Service failure emerges when service delivery execution does not meet a client's desires (Kelley & Davis, 1994; Kelley et al., 1993). A service disappointment may bring about a breakdown in reliability quality (Berry & Parasuraman, 1991). Gwinner et al. (1998) demonstrated that among the three relational advantages, confidence advantages are the most vital from a client's point of view. In this way, it is critical to perceive how compelling recovery endeavours impact a client's view of the reliability, dependability, and trustworthiness of the organization. Ruyter and Wetzels (2000) contend that the feeling of disparity taking after a service failure could be facilitated in effective recuperation and could restore client trust in the service supplier.
Dependability and uprightness in exchange relationships are sufficiently critical to warrant most extreme endeavours at looking after them (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). In spite of the fact that a service delivery might at first neglect to meet a client's desires, a positive service recuperation that effectively meets the client's service recovery desire may enhance the client's commitment. Kelley and Davis (1994) proposed that a client's perceived service recuperation may work as a channel for overhauling the client's organizational commitment. Charge et al. (1998) affirmed that fulfilment with protestation handling is strongly connected with client commitment.

As Morgan and Hunt (1994) contended, "authentic certainty that a partner can depend on another in reality will suggest the behavioural intention to depend" (p. 23). They said that trust is an element of one's behavioural intention. Bowen and Shoemaker (1998) expressed that commitment to a relationship prompts larger amounts of general fulfilment and behavioural intentions. Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, and Gremler (2002) discovered a critical direct relationship in the middle of commitment and informal word of mouth. In the setting of service disappointment and recovery, an exhibition of dependability and reliability through dependable service recuperation endeavours will build a positive assessment of a service supplier. Researchers recommend that a client's trust and commitment intervene between service recuperation and general fulfilment and behavioural intentions.

Chihyung, Back and Shanklin, (2005) have also proved the mediating effects of trust and commitment in their study. Research also suggests that satisfaction with complaint handling is strongly associated with both trust and commitment (Kelley and Davis 1994) and can serve as an important mediator linking perceptions of fairness to post complaint behaviours and attitudes (Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran 1998). Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran (1998) have demonstrated that effective service recovery can have a positive impact on consumer trust and commitment. But none of the studies were found to have the moderating effect of trust and commitment on the linkage between recovery satisfaction and behavioural intentions of repurchase intentions and word of mouth and that is the research gap we could find out.

Customer’s Trust and Commitment as a Moderator for the relationship between Recovery Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions.

One of the main intents of this study is to investigate moderating impact of trust and commitment because as described in previous section, past literature about the roles of trust and commitment in the relationship between recovery satisfaction and behavioural intentions suggests that these two relationship constructs can even moderate the aforesaid relationship and it should be investigated that whether their moderating impact is significant or not.

Many studies were found that were talking about the direct relationship of Trust and Commitment with recovery Satisfaction, WOM and Repurchase Intensions of customers but none of the studies were found to be investigating the moderating role of trust and commitment on relationships of above mentioned constructs. So we have tried to address this research gap by forming below mentioned hypothesis.

**H6:** Customer’s Trust on the mobile service provider significantly moderates the relationship between Recovery Satisfaction and Word of Mouth (WOM) Intentions of the customer.

**H7:** Customer’s Trust on the mobile service provider significantly moderates the relationship between Recovery Satisfaction and Repurchase Intensions of the customer.

**H8:** Customer’s Commitment with the mobile service provider significantly moderates the relationship between Recovery Satisfaction and Word of Mouth (WOM) Intentions of the customer.

**H9:** Customer’s Commitment with the mobile service provider significantly moderates the relationship between Recovery Satisfaction and Repurchase Intensions of the customer.

3. Research Design

A research design is a system that indicates the subtle elements of the methods important for getting the data expected to structure or take care of the examination issue (Malhotra 2007). It gives the structure to be utilized as
an aide as a part of gathering and investigating information (Nargundkar 2003). It will be a set of development choices that make up the expert arrangement determining the techniques and methods for gathering and dissecting the required data (Smolders and Bramble 2007).

Sample

The population consisted of individuals owning and using mobile phone connections. The sample consisted of student subjects from various colleges and universities. The survey was carried out in major cities of Madhya Pradesh (Gwalior, Indore, Jabalpur and Bhopal). The significant purpose behind considering understudies was that they are the most dynamic fragment utilizing mobiles. They utilize their cellular telephones for making calls as well as for playing games, downloading ring tones, surf the web, listening to music and testing reactions to SMS challenges. The utilization of student sample is viewed as fitting on the grounds that it for the most part contains an a fine tuned blend of individuals from diverse social and financial foundations and consequently speaks to the general purchasing consumers (Smith, Bolton and Wagner 1999; Bodey and Elegance 2006; Schoefer and Ennew 2005; Hocutt, Groves and Donavan 2006; Bonifield and Cole 007). The study utilized both judgment and convenience sampling to gather the information. In judgment testing populace components are purposively chosen taking into account the judgment of the researcher. In the first place, the judgment examining was utilized where we chose to gather the information from the graduate and post graduate understudies in schools and colleges. Examination bolsters the utilization of judgment examining (Oliver 1993; Poon, Hui and Au 2003; Karatepe and Ekiz 2004). At that point we utilized comfort sampling because of time and monetary requirements. Marketing of services research additionally underpins the utilization of convenience method of sample (Davidow 2000; Spake et al 2003; Walsh and Mitchell 2005; Hocutt, Groves and Donavan 2006).

Measurement

Multi-item scales that were validated in previous studies were identified and modified to fit the study setting. All exogenous and endogenous variables were measured on 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). Distributive Justice having four questions was taken from Blodgett et al., 1997; Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b and was evaluated as the perceived outcome (compensation) fairness (Cronbach's alpha=.550; average variance extracted [AVE] =.526; composite reliability [CR] =.727).

Procedural Justice again had four questions and was adopted from Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b and was measured as the perceived fairness of procedures and timely responsiveness (Cronbach's alpha=.532; average variance extracted [AVE] =.562; composite reliability [CR] =.751). Interactional Justice also had four questions and was taken from Blodgett, Hill, & Tax, 1997; Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b and was appraised as apology, explanation, and concern toward customers (Cronbach's alpha=.679; average variance extracted [AVE] =.506; composite reliability [CR] =.803). Recovery satisfaction again having indicators was taken from Brown, Cowles, & Tuten, 1996; Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b and was measured after a service failure scenario and a service recovery scenario were presented (Cronbach's alpha=.533; average variance extracted [AVE] =.518; composite reliability [CR] =.762). Trust construct having four questions and was adopted from Morgan & Hunt’s (1994) scale and was appraised as confidence in the reliability and the integrity of the service provider (Cronbach's alpha=.678; average variance extracted [AVE] =.508; composite reliability [CR] =.805). Commitment construct having four questions and was adopted from Morgan & Hunt’s (1994) and was evaluated as the willingness to maintain the relationship. Repurchase intendons questionnaire had three questions and Blodgett et al., 1997; Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b and were measured by assessing the respondents’ willingness to revisit and recommend the restaurants to others (Cronbach's alpha=.581; average variance extracted [AVE] =.551; composite reliability [CR] =.782). Word of Mouth intentions scale again had three questions and was adopted from Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002b (Cronbach's alpha=.695; average variance extracted [AVE] =.622; composite reliability [CR] =.831).

Data Collection

To refine the scale according to localized data first a pilot sample of 300 respondents was taken and adopted questionnaire containing 32 questions was administered to those students. No item was removed after first step of refining so our questionnaire still consisted of 32 statements, therefore, following the rule of thumb of 5 subjects
per item; our sample size of 1690 respondents is adequate. It was ascertained beforehand that every respondent had complained regarding service failure. SEM requires use of larger sample size to maintain the accuracy of estimates and to ensure representativeness (Schumacker and Lomax 1996). But since the SEM is conducted through PLS Technique the requirement of large sample size is not important (Hair and Hult, 2006). But still the data was collected from 2000 mobile phone users who complained and 1690 usable questionnaires were returned, thus giving us a response rate of 84.5 percent for this study.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

The total sample consists of 794 (46.9%) males and 896 (56.1%) females and 1212 (71.7%) respondents in the age group below 25 and 329 (19.4%) of 25-40 years. It also included 111 (6.5%) respondents of 40-45 age group and 38 (2.2%) respondents of age above 55 and 1091 (64.6%) respondents were students undergraduate, 226 (13.4%) were salaried employees, 169 (10.0%) were doing business wherein 73 (4.39%) respondents were housewives and 131 (7.7%) respondents were professionals. The sample includes 1367 (80.8%) singles and 323 (19.2%) married respondents with most users in no income 1000 (59.1%) group and lowest number of respondents were from above 45000 income group (1.5%) with

PLS Path Model Analysis

Model Estimation and Evaluation

To test our hypotheses, we apply PLS path modeling (Lohmöller, 1989; Wold, 1975) to estimate our theoretical model using the software application SmartPLS (Ringle, Wende, and Will, 2005). We incorporate the interaction effect between trust and recovery satisfaction and also between commitment and recovery satisfaction to see their effect on repurchase intentions and word of mouth intentions two-stage approach (Chin, Marcolin, & Newsted, 2003; Henseler&Fassott, 2010).

The PLS pathmodel estimation provides R² values of .281 for recovery satisfaction, .221 for repurchase intentions and .232 for word of mouth intentions, which suggests good explanatory power of the model. We check the latent constructs in the path model for multicollinearity. As shown in Table – 1 all variance inflation factors (VIF) have a value of less than 2 (see Table 3)—which is clearly below the critical value of 10 so we perceive no severe multicollinearity problems (Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 1980; Kleinbaum, Kupper, & Muller, 1988). Convergent validity has also been established as AVEs for all latent constructs is more than 0.5 and all the indicators had factor loadings are of values ranging from 0.6 to 0.9 which is in line with Bagozzi and Yi (1988). We also tested the discriminant validity of the latent variables in the PLS path model using heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT). Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt, (2015) show by method for a reenactment examine that the traditional methodologies (i.e., the Fornell-Larcker standard and cross-loadings) don't dependably identify an absence of discriminant legitimacy in common examination circumstances. These researchers in this manner propose an optional methodology, taking into account the multitrait-multimethod lattice, to evaluate discriminant legitimacy: the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of standardized co variances (HTMT). Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt (2015) likewise exhibit this current approach's prevalent execution by method for a Monte Carlo reproduction study, in which they contrast the new approach with the Fornell-Larcker foundation and the evaluation of (partial) cross-loadings. At long last, they have likewise given rules on the most proficient method to handle discriminant legitimacy issues in prediction based SEM i.e. PLS SEM. If the HTMT correlation value between two constructs is below 0.90, discriminant validity has been established between them (See Appendix A). Figure 2 below shows the model with factor loadings, path coefficients and R² values.
Estimating the Proposed Model by testing the Direct and Moderating Effect

As shown in Table – 1 below we provide the parameter estimates all constructs. We also provide the standard errors, t-values, and significant levels obtained by applying a nonparametric bootstrapping routine (which is the standard method to test the significance of PLS path modeling results; Henseler et al., 2009). No model fit was assessed as we have already stated that we are using PLS based SEM in place of covariance based method. The PLS based method is said to be more suitable for marketing studies as we have discussed before. All the direct and moderating effects were calculated with the help of SmartPLS software. Table - 1 also shows the descriptive statistics, VIF statistics, and hypothesis testing results for latent variable as well as interaction terms. Hypothesis testing has been done by a non-parametric method called bootstrapping (which is the standard method to test the significance of PLS path modeling results; Henseler et al., 2009). The table below reports both the direct and the interaction effects. Refer to Figure 6 above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table – 1: Results of PLS Path Model Estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrete</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Satisfaction X Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Satisfaction X commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: b = path coefficient, sd = standard deviation, se = standard error, ns = not significant, ns = not applicable, ** p < 0.05 (two-sided test; sample size: 1690).

a The values represent the maximum variance inflation factor (VIF) of the latent constructs in the PLS path model.

b We apply a nonparametric bootstrapping routine to test the significance of the PLS path modeling results.
As shown above in Table – 1 H1 states that distributive justice positively affects customer satisfaction with service recovery. The results prove the relationship in the predicted direction with $\beta = .377 \ (p < .05)$. Thus, H1 is not rejected. H2 proposes that procedural justice will have direct and positive effect on customer satisfaction with service recovery. The results suggested that procedural justice positively and significantly affects customer satisfaction with service recovery with $\beta = .081 \ (p < .05)$. Thus, H2 is not rejected. H3 states that interactional justice will positively affect customer satisfaction with service recovery. The results proves the hypothesis significant and in predicted direction with $\beta = .188 \ (p < .05)$ thus, not rejecting H3. H4 suggests that satisfaction with service recovery will positively and significantly influence customers’ post recovery word-of-mouth. The results proved that satisfaction with service recovery has positive influence on customers’ post recovery word-of-mouth with $\beta = .135 \ (p < .05)$. Thus, H4 is not rejected. H5 states that satisfaction with service recovery will positively and significantly influence customers’ repurchase intentions after service recovery. The results proved that satisfaction with service recovery has positive influence on customers’ post recovery repurchase intentions with $\beta = .086 \ (p < .05)$. Thus, H5 is not rejected. H6 states that customers’ trust on mobile service provider will moderate the relationship between recovery satisfaction and his word of mouth intentions. To prove this hypothesis the interaction between trust and recovery satisfaction was computed and the hypothesis was tested. The result show $\beta = -.065 \ (p < .05)$, thus not rejecting H6. H7 states that customers’ trust on mobile service provider will moderate the relationship between recovery satisfaction and his repurchase intentions. To prove this hypothesis the interaction between trust and recovery satisfaction was computed and the hypothesis was tested. The result show $\beta = -.030 \ (p > .05)$, thus rejecting H7. H8 states that customers’ commitment with mobile service provider will moderate the relationship between recovery satisfaction and his word of mouth intentions. To prove this hypothesis the interaction between commitment and recovery satisfaction was computed and the hypothesis was tested. The result show $\beta = .069 \ (p < .05)$, thus not rejecting H8. H9 states that customers’ commitment with mobile service provider will moderate the relationship between recovery satisfaction and his repurchase intentions. To prove this hypothesis the interaction between commitment and recovery satisfaction was computed and the hypothesis was tested. The result show $\beta = .103 \ (p < .05)$, thus not rejecting H9.

5. Discussion

In the study it was found out that perceived fairness of recovery i.e. service customers’ perception of Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice had a significant impact on the satisfaction derived from recovery which is in line with the past researches of Bitner, Booms and Mohr (1990), Liao (2007), Goodwin and Ross (1992), Mohr and Bitner (1995), Hoffman and Kelley (2000) and Hoffman and Kelley (2000). Current findings also depicted that distributive justice has a greater effect on customer recovery satisfaction than interactional and procedural justice which is again in line with the studies of Martinez-Tur et al. (2006), Mattila (2001), Martinez-Tur et al. (2006), Maxham III and Netemeyer (2002), Kau and Loh (2006), Orsingher, Valentini and Angelis (2010). Winsted (2000) suggested that behaviours important to consumers in evaluating service encounter are same across different types of service encounters which reinforce the idea in current study to take data in mobile services and also it has been supported that the relationship of perceived fairness does not vary across culture (Mattila and Patterson 2004).

Supporting current results Bonifield and Cole (2007) presented a conceptual model of customers’ responses to service failures while showing direct relationship between consumers’ appraisal about a service failure and their post purchase behaviours.

Current study has also shown that significant relationship exists between recovery satisfaction and post recovery behavioural intentions of service customer which is supported by Smith and Bolton (1998), Maxham III and Netemeyer (2002), Kau and Loh (2006) and Kau and Loh (2006). It was also found that satisfaction with recovery has strong impact on WOM intent which aligns with the results of current study. Research suggests that satisfaction with complaint handling is strongly associated with both trust and commitment (Kelley and Davis 1994) and can serve as an important mediator linking perceptions of fairness to post complaint behaviours and attitudes (Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran 1998) which is again in line with the current study.

Current study has also found out the significant moderating effects of trust and commitment on the relationships of recovery satisfaction and behavioural outcomes like word of mouth (WOM) and repurchase intentions of customers’ but no past study and literature had been found out showing studies of moderating impacts of these two constructs. Several studies in the service failure and recovery literature indicate the crucial direct and mediating
role played by trust and commitment in shaping consumers behavioural outcomes so we were prompted to investigate their aforesaid moderation role in the mentioned relationship of recovery satisfaction and behavioural outcomes.

6. Theoretical and Managerial Implications

This study makes both academic and practical contributions. By providing a theoretical framework, the study adds to our understanding of how justice perceptions, customer trust on the mobile service provider and her/his commitment with mobile service provider affects customer satisfaction and their behavioral intentions after recovery. This study will not only assess how efficiently service recovery is carried out from customers’ point of view rather it will also help in understanding the organizational paradigm of satisfactory service recovery.

The results of the study indicate that justice framework is an important determinant to restore customer satisfaction with the firm after they have encountered service failure. Managers should therefore understand the importance of distributive, procedural and interactional justice and design their service recovery system which confirms to the justice framework. The results also indicate that customers give more importance to distributive justice as compared to other justice dimensions. The second most important component is interactional justice. This implies that managers should be focussed towards giving fair outcome as a result of service recovery procedure. If two customers face the same problem service managers should make it sure that customers perceive the outcome of service recovery as same. This indicates that a standardized recovery outcome mechanism should be set in place by the company.

The findings showed that influence of recovery satisfaction of customer on his word of mouth intentions is more as compared to the effect on his repurchase intentions which is an important finding for service managers as they should be more sensitive to good service recovery efforts because good recovery will increase the positive word of mouth and positive word of mouth is much more powerful as compared to customers’ repurchase intension.

The interaction between trust and recovery satisfaction has on customers’ word of mouth and repurchase intensions is somewhat misleading and does not support theory i.e. the moderating effect on the relationship of recovery satisfaction and word of mouth intention is negative and significant which implies that for customer having high trust on provider the strength of relationship between recovery satisfaction and word of mouth will be weak as compared to the customer who are having less trust on the provider. But this also mean that customers who are have more trust on the provider their word of mouth is less sensitive of recovery efforts made by the provider as compared to the customers how are low in trust. This implies that service managers should be absolutely focussed towards maintaining high trust with the customers so that when service fails they are not badly disturbed by it. The moderating effects of trust on the relationship of recovery satisfaction and repurchase intentions was not proved though.

The moderating effect of customers’ commitment with mobile service provider on relationship of recovery satisfaction with customers’ word of mouth and repurchase intensions was proven and it was positive implying that customers who are highly committed with mobile service provider their word of mouth intensions and repurchase intensions are more sensitive of the recovery efforts made by service providers so service managers should be very careful for the customers which are highly committed with the mobile services and should try to provide best service recovery efforts to them so that they spread more positive word of mouth and their intentions to repurchase keep on increasing.

7. Limitations of the Study

The present study is a cross-sectional study to know the behavioural intentions of complainants after service recovery. A Longitudinal study is a better approach required to examine the customer’s behavioural intentions. The study has considered transaction specific customer satisfaction, while cumulative satisfaction of the customers can also be assessed as well. This research has taken the behavioural intentions of complainants after service recovery while the effect of satisfaction with service recovery on customers’ post-recovery trust, commitment and loyalty is missing. This study has not checked the interaction between three justice dimensions i.e. distributive
justice, procedural justice and interactional justice to know its effect on customer satisfaction with service recovery.

8. Future Research Directions

The present study has been conducted for the telecommunication industry in India. In future, a similar study can be carried out in various other service industries to know the behavioural intentions of the complainants so that the results can be generalized. A cross-cultural study can also be done within same or multiple service industry to know the moderating effects of gender, age and income on recovery satisfaction and post recovery behavioural intentions. The moderating role of brand loyalty can also be investigated in place of trust and commitment. The role severity of service failure can also be studied in future researches. What role is played by previous experience of the customer with the service provider can also be investigated in shaping customers’ recovery and overall satisfaction with mobile service provider. Customers’ previous recovery satisfaction’s effect on new recovery satisfaction can also be examined in forming the trust and commitment. A study can also be carried out to check both the direct effects of justice dimensions and the interactional effects of justice dimensions on customer satisfaction with service recovery.

APPENDIX – A: HTMT Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>DJ</th>
<th>IJ</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>Recovery Satisfaction</th>
<th>Repurchase Intention</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase Intention</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>