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). 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).

One negative service encounter or service has the potential to lower consumers’ overall satisfaction permanently (Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). 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 and positive switching barriers created and external response intentions than those with unresolved problems (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1996; Schoefer and Ennew 2005).

However uncontrollable situation related factors make failures in services unavoidable (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990). The failures in service generally happens due to vary nature of
service, due to factors not in control of service provider, due to provider himself and due to human element i.e. customers (McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003).

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).

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). Failures of services also negatively affect the loyalty of customers (Mattila 2001). So it is evident that defining and developing a good service strategies program can directly be linked to the survival of a service organization (Hoffman and Kelley 2000).

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). 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.

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). Those customers who remain dissatisfied even after service recovery terminate the relationship with buyer and cross the switching barriers (Dwyer, Schurr and Oh 1987). 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).
When a customer faces the failure of service he follows one of the two alternatives i.e. To defect or saying nothing and leave or talk to provider regarding the failure so that provider can recover the service (Colgate and Norris 2001). Weather a customer will complaint or not depends upon his perception of the fair outcome of complaining process, his own psychology and also the level of importance or involvement he attaches with the service (Blodgett, Wakefield and Barnes 1995). An effective service firm prompts the customer to complaint whereas an unsuccessful service firm remain inactive even after the customer complains (Voorhees and Brady 2005).

There are some recognized reasons behind not complaining i.e. customer perceives that the company will be inactive even after they complain, they are so furious to the person behind the failure that they don’t want to face them, they are unaware about consumers’ rights and also service providers obligations, they become sensitive about the chances to succeed after complaining and merits and demerits of complaining (Singh 1990; Bamford and Xystouri 2005). When a service firm is not successful in motivating the customer to complain they firstly fail to retain the customer and secondly they also miss a priceless opportunity to understand the true customers’ expectation with the service and thus not able to align itself accordingly (Chebat, Davidow and Codojovi 2005).

The main reason behind a customer complaint is that the customer perceives inequality in service when a failure occurs and then he seeks a measure by which he can achieve this equality i.e. through complaint (Chebat and Slusarczyk 2003). The basic principle of equity theory is that when someone faces a condition which reflects inequality then he tries to negate this by physical and emotional response (Goodwin and Ross 1990).

Numerous service organizations have gained considerable ground as of late in their quality of service rendering. Yet, recuperating from service disappointments is a region of relative
negligence and incapability for most organizations (Brown, 1997). 'Problems are an unavoidable highlight of all human processes and along these lines likewise of services' (Boshoff, 1997).

Disappointments do happen in service associations and in the retail business 'Most retail clients have experienced mix-ups and deformities throughout their encounter (Kelley, Hoffman and Davis 1993).

The significance of attempting to recuperate from service disappointments is talked about by a few researchers. Hart et al. (1990), for instance, guaranteed that 'While organizations will be unable to keep all issues, they can figure out how to recoup from them'. Berry and Parasuraman (1992) recommended that associations ought to see disappointment not so much as an issue but rather as a chance to make fulfilled clients. "Exceptional" service providers, as per Heskett, Sasser and Hart (1990), are those which have recuperation frameworks set up. These researchers accept that a powerful reaction to service problems will influence the long haul achievement of the service firm (Johnsten and Fern, 1999).

It is additionally perceived that the exceptional highlights of services, for example, relative immaterialness, and concurrent creation and utilization, make quality control particularly troublesome (Brown et al. 1994; Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry 1990, Sparks et al., 1998). Subsequently, there has been a developing enthusiasm for exploration that spotlights on recovery of services (Johnson 1995).

Coverly et al., (2002) says that experimental exploration into service recuperation has been directed in predominantly three ways: The most broadly utilized technique is the Critical Incident Technique (CIT - Flanagan 1954, illustrations of examination incorporate Bejou et al. 1996; Bejou and Palmer 1998; Chung and Hoffmann 1998; Edvardsson 1998; Edvardsson
and Strandvik 1999; Johnston 1995; Kelley et al. 1993). The second method presents purchasers with theoretical circumstances and records their reactions (Dubé and Maute 1996; Kelley and Davis 1994; Smith et al. 1998), and the last approach investigations the composed protests that a firm gets (Tax et al. 1998). Extra methodological choices like repertory frameworks (Kelly 1955) phenomenological meetings (Thompson et al. 1989) and centre gatherings have for the most part been disregarded.

Shockingly look into service recovery is up till now restricted 'In spite of the fact that specialists verify the strength of service recuperation endeavours, a shortage of observational examination limits any hypothetical talk to recounted reports' (Kelley and Davis, 1994; Johnsten and Fern, 1999). Fisk et al. (1993) additionally prophesised that the significance of Service Recovery would be immediately grasped by specialists and is deserving of further research. Consequently, failures in services and its recovery issues are points now getting noteworthy consideration in the writing (cf. Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999).

One negative experience can possibly bring down purchasers' general satisfaction with a service forever (Hocutt, Bowers and Donavan 2006). Subsequently, the capacity to take care of business the first run through is thought to offer huge advantages to the service organization regarding higher devotion, more repurchase propositions and fundamentally lower switch and outer reaction plans than those with uncertain issues (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1996; Schoefer and Ennew 2005).

Nonetheless, service disappointments are frequently unavoidable because of numerous wild situational variables (Hart, Heskett and Sasser Jr. 1990). The reasons why failures happen
incorporate issues with services itself, issues with services supplier, issues which are past suppliers' control and issues related to the clients (McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003). A failure happens when clients experience disappointment in light of the fact that the service was not conveyed as guaranteed of course expected (Ennew and Schoefer 2003). It implies that failure happens when the shoppers' view of service delivery does not coordinate his/her satisfactory service desires (Kelley, Hoffman and Davis 1993). A service disappointment accordingly speaks to an organizations’ shortage in keeping up service unwavering quality, consequently throwing a negative sway on clients' apparent service quality (La and Kandampully 2004).

On the off chance that buyers get to be disappointed on the grounds that of service disappointment and ensuing service recuperation, it may bring about negative verbal (NWOM) conduct, surrenders and ascend in customer dissentions (Richins 1983; Reichheld and Sasser 1990). Service disappointments can possibly crush association's dependability in customers’ loyalty (Mattila 2001). So the advancement and successful execution of service recovery system are specifically connected to association’s survival and development (Hoffman and Kelley 2000)

**Equity Dimensions: precursors to recovery satisfaction**

The justice theory is the principle system used by various scientists to generally inspect service recuperation systems (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, procedural justice and interactional justice (Tax & Brown, 1998).

**Distributive Justice:** It 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).

*Procedural Justice:* it 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).

Interactional Justice: This 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, pro activeness to understand the source of problem, his courtesy, 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).

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 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, Fornell and Rust 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).

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).

**Word-of-Mouth:** 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). Positive WOM said to be extraordinary information for the provider and on the other hand negative word of mouth is most disastrous happening for a business (Singh 1990).

**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 dissentions 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.

**Recovery Satisfaction, Trust and Commitment**

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).

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).