



Report Information from ProQuest

May 30 2012 11:51

Table of Contents

1. Service recovery: its value and limitations as a retail strategy.....	1
2. Bibliography.....	12

Service recovery: its value and limitations as a retail strategy

Author: Brown, Stephen W; Cowles, Deborah L; Tuten, Tracy L.

Publication info: Journal of Service Management 7. 5 (1996): 32-46.

[ProQuest document link](#)

Abstract: This study examines the impact of service recovery as a relationship tool, in addition to its well-accepted role as a means to enhance customer satisfaction at the transaction-specific level. It begins by providing an overview of the evolving concept of service recovery and continues by explaining the important and unique role that recovery plays in the service sector. A comparison of the concept of service consistency and reliability with the concept of service recovery leads to a statement of hypotheses tested in an experimental setting. Specifically, results indicate that while service recovery results in encounter satisfaction, service recovery does not significantly influence expectations. Rather, consistency of service influences these constructs.

Links: [Linking Service](#),

Full Text: Stephen W. Brown: Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, USA

Deborah L. Cowles: Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, USA

Tracy L. Tuten: Randolph-Macon College, Richmond, Virginia, USA

Introduction

While customer satisfaction with the quality of tangible goods continues to improve, consumers around the world in general - and in the USA in particular (Berry, 1993; 1995a; McCartney, 1994) - remain lukewarm about the quality of service. As a result, service recovery - fixing or compensating for service failure - has evolved as a common frontline tactic to enhance customer satisfaction and customer perceptions of service quality.

Exhortations such as "our job is not done until our customers are completely satisfied" are becoming increasingly common as consumers' expectations and power in the marketplace increase.

The role of service recovery as a retail tactic is clear: In the event of service failure, firms should be committed to "doing the service very right the second time" (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991, p. 34). However, from a strategic perspective, service recovery can represent two distinct service philosophies. Figure 1 depicts a transaction-focused perspective of service recovery, aimed at ensuring customer satisfaction at "the 'moment of truth,' when the customer interacts with the service firm" (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996, p. 105). In contrast, Figure 2 presents a more relationship-focused view, whereby the goal of service recovery is not only to correct specific instances of failure, but also to improve the service delivery system such that future instances of failure are precluded, customers' overall perceptions of service quality are enhanced, and long-term relationships with loyal customers are assured. In at least one regard, Figure 1 implies that service recovery is an alternative route to customer satisfaction. In contrast, Figure 2 highlights the importance of consistency and reliability to developing long-term customer relationships. Moreover, it shows that service recovery efforts should play a role both in creating immediate customer satisfaction and in improving future service design and delivery.

The marketing literature speaks clearly to the short-term benefits of service recovery, as well as to the effectiveness of various recovery tactics (e.g. Berry and Parasuraman, 1991; Johnston, 1995a; 1996b; Kelley and Davis, 1994; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). However, empirical studies designed to measure the long-term impact of service recovery, as well as the strategic role it may play in achieving profitable business relationships, are limited. Johnston (1995b) examined customer perceptions of service failure, as well as the appropriateness of responses by a service firm and its employees. Despite distinguishing between reactive and

proactive recoveries to service failures in a subsequent study (1996), Johnston focused on the role and influence of recovery on customers' perceptions of a specific transaction. Kelley and Davis (1994, p. 52) have observed: "Although practitioners attest to the potency of service recovery efforts, a dearth of empirical research confines any theoretical discussion to anecdotal reports. The apparent significance of recovery efforts warrants more systematic investigations of the concept and related variables".

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the growing body of service recovery knowledge by examining its impact as a relationship tool, in addition to its well-accepted role as a means to enhance customer satisfaction at the transaction-specific level. The discussion begins by providing an overview of the evolving concept of service recovery and continues by explaining the important and unique role that recovery plays in the service sector. A comparison of the concept of service consistency and reliability with the concept of service recovery leads to a statement of hypotheses tested in an experimental setting. Results of the data analysis are reviewed and interpreted in the context of current knowledge and implications for future research.

The evolution of service recovery

As both a business practice and a focus of marketing research, the concept of service recovery has evolved over time. Prior to the 1970s and early 1980s, the term "service recovery" dealt largely with restoring computer or telecommunications outages, or recovering from natural disasters.

However, beginning in the late 1970s and continuing throughout the next decade, marketers began to emphasize not only the incidence of service recovery in the reactive context of resolving specific service problems (Andreasen and Best, 1977), but also the longer-term benefits of recovery (Berry et al., 1988) such as enhanced customer loyalty and favourable word-of-mouth communication. In 1990, Hart et al. published a classic article describing "the profitable art of service recovery", and attention turned to the proactive, strategic role that service recovery can play in a competitive marketplace.

Perhaps more than any other single factor, the nature of service products themselves increases the likelihood of errors, or service failures and, therefore the need for recovery. Most of the characteristics thought to distinguish service products from tangible goods increase the likelihood of failure both from an operational perspective and from the customer's viewpoint. For example, a service is more or less intangible, an activity or a series of activities, heterogeneous and simultaneously produced/distributed and consumed. Each of these characteristics makes it difficult for marketers to understand and to meet customers' expectations. Service variability has been identified as an ongoing problem both for marketing managers and quality managers (Ballantyne et al., 1995). Moreover, the customer often is required to participate in the production of the service product (Gronroos, 1983; Lovelock, 1983; Zeithaml et al., 1985). Importantly, Johnston's study of service failure and recovery (1995a) found that many failures are created by customers themselves.

Service recovery and customer satisfaction

Recovery to service failures can take many forms. Service recovery has been defined as satisfactory problem resolution (Andreasen and Best, 1977; Berry et al., 1988), the actions a service provider takes to respond to a service failure (Gronroos, 1990a), and doing the service right the second time (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991; Brown, 1994; Zemke and Bell, 1990). Recovery tactics include refunds, compensation, apologies and excuses (Dube and Maute, 1994), as well as fixing what went wrong and redoing the service (Brown, 1994). Bitner et al. (1990) developed a typology for unfavourable service encounters, and showed quantitatively what others had suggested qualitatively: service failures can create satisfied customers when response to the service failure is appropriate. Kelley et al. (1993) identified 12 distinct recovery strategies in the context of service provided by customer contact employees of general merchandise retailers. They found that while certain recovery strategies resulted in increased satisfaction, other strategies did not.

Service recovery continues to receive attention in part due to rising consumer expectations and competitive responses in the marketplace to meet and exceed those expectations. Consumers evaluate services by comparing the service they perceive they have received (service performance) with their expectations of what

they should have received (Bateson, 1992; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). In competitive terms: A firm makes promises and strives to build expectations that will differentiate it in the marketplace, causing customers to select it over its competitors. Bitner (1995) and Gronroos (1990a; 1994; 1995) have observed that it is much easier for service marketers to make promises than to enable service employees to keep those promises. Over-promising has long been identified as a primary cause for service quality "gaps" (Zeithaml et al., 1990). The temptation is for service firms to promise too much and to raise customer expectations to a high - occasionally unrealistic - level. The convergence of rising consumer expectations and aggressive competitive activities results in the implicit need for service recovery in retail settings.

Together, the prevalence of service failure in retail service settings and the growth of the service sector in the world's economy point to the need for a better understanding of the role that service recovery should play in today's marketplace. In the USA alone, services account for nearly three-quarters of the gross domestic product and nearly 80 per cent of all employment; moreover, the service sector will account for most net job growth for the foreseeable future (Henkoff, 1994). Berry (1993) suggested that firms can measure the cost of poor service quality by:

- measuring the number of customers who defect for service-related reasons;
- calculating the profit contribution of customers who defect for service-related reasons; and
- determining profits lost by service failures.

Anderson and Fornell (1994) concluded that learning "when it is worth investing in trying to respond to dissatisfied customers is an important avenue for future research" (p. 255) and that understanding customer responsiveness to recovery efforts should be a high priority for service firms.

Service recovery and quality improvement

In addition to its impact on customer satisfaction, service recovery has a potential role to play in service firms' quality improvement initiatives (e.g. total quality management (TQM) and continuous quality improvement (CQI)). While such initiatives have taken different forms and met with varying degrees of success (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996), each has tended to focus on internal and external customer needs and expectations, as well as empowering frontline employees to meet and exceed those expectations. In TQM and CQI terms, service recovery is rework. The goal of quality management should be to increase product value by eliminating waste, rework and errors and by improving work processes. Although service recovery can increase costs, it also can provide the information needed to redesign systems free of deficiencies if used in a relationship context.

Johnston (1995a; 1995b) noted that the primary causes of customer dissatisfaction were mistakes made during routine processes and that dealing with the root causes of dissatisfaction generally requires a systematic improvement of the service process itself. Thus, incidents of service failure have the potential for providing firms with valuable information which can be used to fix the root causes of failures and help them improve service processes.

Both the service marketing literature (Berry, 1981; Bitner et al., 1994; Crosby et al., 1990) and the quality literature (Walton, 1986) identify frontline employees as key to customer satisfaction and central to the creation of quality. Ballantyne et al. (1995), examining the relationship between services marketing and quality management, emphasized the importance of internal marketing (i.e. marketing to employees) to improving service quality and customer retention. The service provider is expected to create a service experience that meets or exceeds customer expectations and to provide service recovery in the case of failure.

At the same time, service employees should be both inspired and obliged to provide information accurately and consistently about the service failure/recovery, which management then can use to redesign the system.

Unfortunately, most service employees are poorly paid, poorly trained and poorly valued (Henkoff, 1994).

According to Zeithaml and Bitner (1996), critical inhibitors to the delivery of quality service include employees who do not understand the role they are supposed to play or who feel "squeezed" between customers and company management, as well as service firms who: hire the wrong employees; provide inappropriate training;

compensation, and recognition; and fail to empower their employees and to create an environment in which teamwork prevails.

Poorly designed service delivery systems and inadequate service leadership (Berry, 1993; 1995a; Berry and Parasuraman, 1992) can encourage service employees to use service recovery as a defensive mechanism - to do whatever the customer wants just to keep the customer quiet, so as to stay out of trouble with management. Bateson (1992) has conceptualized the relationship between management, service provider and service customer as a three-cornered "fight" (p. 126). Such situations are unfortunate, given the general consensus among scholars and practitioners that reliability - the consistency of service quality over time - is the most critical dimension of service success. According to Berry (1995a), service customers view reliability as the single outcome dimension of service transactions, whereas the other four service quality dimensions (empathy, assurance, responsiveness and tangibles) generally are viewed as process dimensions.

Service recovery versus service reliability

Performing a service dependably and accurately is central to services marketing excellence (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991). Over the past decade, studies examining how customers make service quality evaluations have concluded that service reliability is the most critical dimension (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991; Berry et al., 1988; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). Consistent, reliable service quality offers an important benefit to consumers inasmuch as it limits their expectations by reducing the need for and occurrence of service recovery. Service problems are transitory service intensifiers which elevate customers' expectations during the service recovery. Subsequent to service failures, awareness increases and a customer's "zone of tolerance" decreases (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991; Johnston, 1994; Zeithaml, et al., 1993).

In one sense, service recovery can be viewed as the antithesis of service reliability. When service is not provided reliably in a way that meets or exceeds customer expectations, service recovery - both as a strategy and a tactic - is in order. At the same time, service recovery affords service firms a "second chance" to meet customer expectations (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991). Thus, the literature suggests a positive relationship between customer satisfaction at the time of service failure and the incidence of service recovery. The first hypothesis addresses the relationship between service recovery and customer satisfaction with a specific service encounter:

H1: In a situation of service failure, retail customers who experience service recovery at the time of the failure will be more satisfied with the outcome of the encounter, compared to retail customers who do not experience service recovery, regardless of their perceptions of the firm's service consistency.

From both the customer's and the service provider's perspective, the evaluation of a specific service transaction - the "moment of truth" (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996; Gronroos, 1990a; 1990b) - is based on a single, well-defined encounter between the customer and the service firm. Encounter satisfaction has been defined as customer perceptions of service performance compared to service expectations focused at this frontline level of service delivery (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994). Bitner et al. (1990) are among those who have emphasized the value of service recovery in creating encounter satisfaction when there has been a service failure. However, the literature provides no definitive evidence about the impact of either service consistency or service recovery on more general outcome measures, such as overall satisfaction and perceptions of overall quality (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994), as well as other related measures (e.g. future expectations, customer image of the service firm).

The construct of overall satisfaction is thought to occur at multiple levels of the organization. In addition to multiple service encounter experiences over time, it includes a satisfaction evaluation of the contact person, the core service, and the institution as a whole (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994). Because the customer's overall dis/satisfaction with the organization is based on all encounters and experiences with that particular organization, service consistency over time might be expected to play a more influential role in shaping this construct, compared either to a specific service performance or to service recovery following a specific service

failure. Although the literature is not in agreement about the value of the construct perceived service quality, it has been defined as the customer's overall impression of the relative superiority/inferiority of the organization and its services (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994). It is thought to be influenced by factors beyond encounter - and overall satisfaction. Similarly, a customer's evaluation of a service firm's image, as well as expectations about the quality of future service encounters, would likely be shaped by a broader range of influences and over a longer period, compared to customer satisfaction at the transaction level. As in the case of overall satisfaction, service consistency may have a greater impact than service recovery on customer perceptions of overall quality and image, and expectations of future interactions. H2 and H3 focus on the relationship between service consistency/service recovery and these longer-term outcome measures (i.e. overall satisfaction, perceived overall quality and image and future expectations) vis-a-vis encounter satisfaction:

H2: In a situation of service failure, service recovery tactics will have a greater (positive) impact than prior service consistency on outcome measures of satisfaction which relate to the specific transaction which created the need for the recovery (i.e. encounter satisfaction).

H3: In a situation of service failure, consistency of quality service during previous encounters will have a greater (positive) impact than service recovery on measures of satisfaction which relate to factors beyond the specific transaction during which the failure occurred (i.e. overall satisfaction, overall quality, perceived image of the service firm and expectations of future interactions).

Research methodology

A two-by-two between groups experiment was conducted to test hypotheses set forth in the previous section.

The experimental design included two treatments:

- (1) the condition of consistency of good service (Consistency) during previous store visits (versus inconsistency); and
- (2) the condition of service recovery (Recovery) following poor quality service (versus the absence of service recovery).

The experiment used scenarios and a projective technique, which permitted subjects to focus on and respond to the same stimuli. The scenario placed subjects in a large department store where they were in a "bit of a hurry" and shopping for a gift needed at that time. Their previous experience with service provided by the store is presented as either consistently good or inconsistent (both good and bad). In the scenario, no assistance by sales personnel is offered. Once ready to check out, the customer must search for a salesperson. In the recovery treatment, the sales clerk who eventually provides service apologizes for the lack of attention and slow service and offers to gift wrap the purchase free of charge. Such vignettes have been shown to be helpful in measuring complex variables, and can provide "good approximations to realistic psychological and social situations" (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 476).

In the service failure scenario, consistency of quality service (Consistency) was manipulated using the following language: "The department store is one that you have shopped in several times before. The service you have received in past visits has typically been good and you like the selection this store offers". The treatment was reinforced in the summary with the following statement: "You have been to this store before and have been consistently pleased". The contrasting treatment of inconsistent quality service (No consistency) was as follows: "The department store is one that you have shopped in several times before. The service you have received in past visits has never been consistent (you have received both excellent and poor service), but you like the selection the store offers". This treatment was reinforced in the summary in the following way: "You have been to the store before and have not been consistently pleased".

The Recovery treatment was manipulated by the sales associate offering to gift wrap a purchase at no charge following a situation of service failure, and reinforced in the summary: "The sales associate also tries to make your experience better by offering to gift wrap your item at no charge". In the No recovery condition, no reference to such an offer was made in the scenario. Subjects evaluated the scenarios as "believable" and

"realistic," with mean scores of 1.59 and 1.44, respectively (1 = very believable/realistic and 5 = not believable not realistic). No differences between analysis groups existed concerning these evaluations.

The experimental manipulations were hypothesized to impact subjects' responses concerning five dependent variables: encounter satisfaction (ENSAT), overall satisfaction (OVSAT), overall quality (OQUAL), future expectations (FUEXP), and image (IMAGE), as discussed in the previous section. Items used to measure each of these constructs are found in Table I. Measures adapted from Bitner and Hubbert (1994), i.e. ENSAT, OVSAT and OQUAL, were found to be highly reliable, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.80, 0.84, and 0.80, respectively. The three items used to measure IMAGE were marginally reliable; however, separate analyses with individual items serving as dependent variables produced results similar to those using the multi-item measure, discussed below and shown in Tables II and III. A single item (FUEXP) measured participants' expectations concerning future interactions with the treatment store ("I will expect better service the next time I go to this store"), a statement considered appropriate given the research context of a situation of service failure.

Undergraduate and graduate business students (n = 424) of a major university in the southeast USA were recruited to participate voluntarily in the experiment. More than one-half (60.5 per cent) of the participants were under 25 years of age, 26.9 per cent were ages 26-35, with the remaining participants more than 36 years of age. Nearly one-half (48.1 per cent) of the participants were working part-time while pursuing a programme of higher education; 32.7 per cent were employed on a full-time basis. The following student classifications were represented: 7.7 per cent sophomore, 22.7 per cent junior, 41.4 per cent senior, and 17.8 per cent graduate level. The majority of participants (66.8 per cent) had worked in a retail setting at some time in their adult lives. Slightly more than half of the subjects were males and 46 per cent were females, with the remainder in the no-response category. Following exposure to the scenario, subjects responded to items contained in a questionnaire.

Data analysis and results

A t-test for independent samples was used to test the first hypothesis (Table II). Study participants who were in the Recovery treatment group were significantly more satisfied ($p = 0.000$) with the outcome of the service encounter (ENSAT mean score, 3.62) compared to those who did not experience service recovery (ENSAT mean score, 4.03).

Table III shows the results of an analysis of variance, as well as cell means, comparing the relative impact of Recovery and Consistency on the same dependent variable. As anticipated in H2, although an examination of cell means suggests that previously reliable service (Consistency) appears to impact customers' immediate satisfaction favourably, the influence is not statistically significant. On the other hand, the presence of service recovery (Recovery) was found to have a significant and favorable impact on participants' satisfaction with the specific retail encounter (ENSAT), reported in Tables II and III are consistent with previous studies which underscore the role that service recovery plays in enhancing satisfaction at the "moment of truth" following a service failure.

Findings

Analysis of variance was also used to test H3, with separate analyses conducted for each of four separate, dependent variables: overall satisfaction (OVSAT), perceived overall quality (OQUAL), overall image (IMAGE), and future expectations (FUEXP). It is important to note that owing to the relationship between service recovery and encounter satisfaction, the latter was used as a covariate in each of the four analyses. In other words, from an empirical perspective, it is important to control for the impact of encounter satisfaction on the four longer-term dependent variables, as depicted in Figure 2. Results of these analyses, depicted in Table IV, support H3. In the case of overall satisfaction and perceived overall quality, both the consistency of prior service and satisfaction with the immediate service encounter had a significant and positive influence on participants' evaluations. However, in the case of both perceived overall image and future expectations, consistency of

quality service alone had a significant influence on participants' evaluations. An examination of cell means in Table IV shows that the influence was favourable in all cases. Such empirical findings underscore the primacy of service reliability, as well as the potentially limited value of service recovery, in the creation of long-term customer relationships.

Conclusions, limitations and directions for future research

A recent focus of competitive service firms has been to empower employees to provide service recovery in the face of service failure from the perspective of the customer. While the critical role of service recovery cannot be challenged, research presented here suggests that management should focus at least equally on the design of service delivery systems which preclude the need for service recovery. Moreover, management should focus on enabling service employees to improve service delivery systems continuously by:

providing them both the resources and the authority to recovery; and

inspiring them to participate in the process of continual improvement.

The implications of service recovery as a means to create and retain satisfied customers, as well as its potential role in the continual improvement of a service delivery system will be discussed in turn.

With growing interest in relationship marketing (e.g., Berry, 1995a; Bitner, 1995; Gronroos, 1995), many service firms are placing greater emphasis on targeting profitable customers (Berry, 1995). As a result, Berry has suggested that some firms may need to develop different relationship strategies and tactics for loyalty-prone versus deal-prone customers. In a similar study, Johnston (1996) suggests the need for tailoring recovery tactics depending on whether a customer feels "annoyed" or "victimized" by a specific service failure. Such research suggests that firms may be wise either to vary service recovery offers based on the potential profitability of individual customers, or to develop general recovery policies with the long-term profitability of various customer segments in mind. Similarly, Johnston (1996) suggests that time and effort spent on improving factors of low importance to customers may be wasted.

Both the extant marketing literature and the results of this study suggest that service recovery can indeed have a positive impact on customer satisfaction and other indicators of service quality. At the same time, the apparent "diminishing returns" of the impact of service recovery, vis-a-vis the delivery of quality service in a consistent manner over time, give greater merit to questions raised by Anderson and Fornell (1994) pertaining to the investment worthiness of any specific act of service recovery. Do all service failures warrant recovery actions? When does it make more sense for a firm to allocate limited resources to improving service processes, as opposed to repairing service failures? As firms try to improve marketing productivity, they must develop ways to assess the bottom-line impact of service recovery.

Findings reported here should be interpreted in the context of a number of limitations. First, the appropriateness of projective, role-playing research methods as the basis of generalizable findings can be challenged. However, such methods can also be defended inasmuch as they provide a means to measure complex variables, as well as an ethical alternative to manipulating potentially harmful variables (e.g. Kerlinger, 1986). Controlled experimental manipulations also enable inferences concerning causal relationships among a set of observed variables. Also, because researchers sometimes question the legitimacy of using student samples in experimental studies, the limitations to generalizability which can occur in such situations were considered prior to the implementation of this study. The benefits of a controlled experiment were felt to outweigh any limitations for two reasons:

- (1) students are frequently in the position of a retail customer; and
- (2) the demographic characteristics of the sample (e.g. age, income and employment) supported its viability in the research context.

Finally, the use of a retail department store may pose a potential limitation. That is, retail environments comprise vastly different settings, products, services, and customer characteristics. Given the complexity of the retail environment, responses to a department store scenario may not fully reflect all retail settings.

The marketing literature supports the idea that service recovery can result in customer satisfaction despite an incidence of service failure. However, findings of this study suggest that recovery alone may not be a sufficient strategy. Consistency of quality service should be the preferred strategy and overriding goal, and firms should use service recovery strategically as a means to achieve service reliability. Consistency of quality service may have a greater bearing on long-term measures of customer satisfaction, compared to service recovery. However, as suggested by Ballantyne et al. (1995), service failures and subsequent recovery can contribute to the goal of reliability if knowledge gained from recovery efforts is used to improve the service delivery system and to preclude future failures of that system. Learning more about the relationship between service recovery and service process improvement, as depicted in Figure 2, should provide the basis for future research in this area.

Finally, given the broad range of service recovery tactics available to retailers, it is important to note that the recovery offered in the scenarios which were used as the basis for this study's experimental research - an apology and free gift wrapping - in no way inconvenienced the customer. Indeed, because the customer in the scenario was described as shopping for a gift, the free offer of gift wrapping could be viewed as value added to the transaction. This approach to service recovery stands in stark contrast to tactics used by service firms which are said to "hassle" the customer (Berry, 1993) either because circumstances of the service failure leave no alternative approach or because the service firm's recovery offer is not really genuine. Future research is needed to help firms understand the relative impact of different service recovery tactics for various customer segments.

Although service recovery is thought to be a valuable retail strategy, many challenges are associated with its use as a competitive business strategy. What is the return-on-investment for service recovery in general, or different kinds of service recovery in particular? Does the impact of service recovery vary according to retail setting (e.g. length of purchase cycle, relative risk of product category, service product versus customer service, type of service customer)? How overpowering is the so-called "hassle factor" (Berry, 1993; Brown, 1994) vis-a-vis the eventual outcome of a service encounter following service recovery? Can businesses quantify the value of information gained from service recovery incidents? How can firms motivate service employees at all levels to provide service recovery feedback for service design improvements? What infrastructure is needed for firms to be able to integrate such information into quality improvement efforts? Future research should be designed to help answer these and other interesting service recovery questions.

References

1. Anderson, E.W. and Fornell, C. (1994, "A customer satisfaction research prospectus", in Rust, R and Oliver, R. (Eds), *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 241-68.
2. Andreasen, A. and Best, A. (1977, "Consumers complain - does business respond?", *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, Vol. 77, pp. 93-101.
3. Ballantyne, D., Christopher, M. and Payne, A. (1995, "Improving the quality of service marketing: service (re)design is the critical link", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 11, pp. 7-24.
4. Bateson, J.E.G. (1992, "Perceived control and the service encounter", in Bateson, J.E.G. (Ed.), *Managing Services Marketing*, Dryden Press, Forth Worth, TX, pp. 123-32.
5. Berry, L. (1981, "The employee as customer", *Journal of Retail Banking*, Vol. III No. 1, pp. 33-40.
6. Berry, L. (1993, "Improving America's service", *Marketing Management*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 28-38.
7. Berry, L. (1995a, "Relationship marketing of services - growing interest, emerging perspectives", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 236-45.
8. Berry, L. (1995b, *On Great Service: A Framework for Action*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
9. Berry, L. and Parasuraman, A. (1991, *Marketing Services: Competing through Quality*, Free Press, New York, NY.
10. Berry, L. and Parasuraman, A. (1992, "Prescriptions for a service quality revolution in America",

Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 5-15.

11. Berry, L., Zeithaml, V. and Parasuraman, A. (1988, "The service-quality puzzle", *Business Horizons*, September-October, pp. 35-43.
12. Bitner, M.J. (1995, "Building service relationships: it's all about promises", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 246-51.
13. Bitner, M.J. and Hubbert, A.R. (1994, "Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality: the customer's voice", in Rust, R. and Oliver, R. (Eds), *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 72-94.
14. Bitner, M.J., Booms, B. and Mohr, L. (1994, "Critical service encounters: the employee's viewpoint", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 105-10.
15. Bitner, M.J., Booms, B. and Tetreault, M.S. (1990, "The service encounter: diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, pp. 71-84.
16. Brown, S.W. (1994, "Service recovery: new strategies for what to do when things go wrong", presentation at the *Frontiers in Services Marketing Conference*, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, October.
17. Crosby, L.A., Evans, K.E. and Cowles, D. (1990, "Relationship quality in services selling: an interpersonal influence perspective", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, July, pp. 68-81.
18. Dube, L. and Maute, M.F. (1994, "The effect of defensive marketing strategies on customer responses to service failure", working paper presented at the *Frontiers in Services Marketing Conference*, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, October.
19. Gronroos, C. (1983, "Innovative marketing strategies and organization structures for service firms", in Berry, L., Shostack, L. and Upah, E. (Eds), *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, pp. 9-21.
20. Gronroos, C. (1990a, *Services Management and Marketing: Managing the Moments of Truth in Service Competition*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
21. Gronroos, C. (1990b, "Relationship approach to marketing in service contexts: the marketing and organizational behavior interface", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 3-11.
22. Gronroos, C. (1994, "From scientific management to service management: a management perspective for the age of service competition", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 5-20.
23. Gronroos, C. (1995, "Relationship marketing: the strategy continuum", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 252-4.
24. Hart, C., Heskett, J.L. and Sasser, W.E. (1990, "The profitable art of service recovery", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 148-56.
25. Henkoff, R. (1994, "Finding, training, and keeping the best service workers", *Fortune*, 3 October 1994, pp. 110-22.
26. Johnston, R. (1994, "The zone of tolerance: exploring the relationship between service transactions and satisfaction with the overall service", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 46-61.
27. Johnston, R. (1995a, "Service failure and recovery: impact, attributes and process", *Advances in Service Marketing and Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-28.
28. Johnston, R. (1995b, "The determinants of service quality: satisfiers and dissatisfiers", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 6 No. 5, pp. 53-71.
29. Johnston, R. (1996, "Achieving focus in service organizations", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 10-20.
30. Johnston, R. and Fern, A. (1996, "Service recovery: annoyed versus victimised customers", working paper, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Coventry.
31. Kelley, S.W. and Davis, M.A. (1994, "Antecedents to customer expectations for service recovery", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 52-61.

32. Kelley, S.W., Hoffman, K.D. and Davis, M.A. (1993, "A typology of retail failures and recoveries", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 69 No. 4, pp. 429-52.
 33. Kerlinger, F. (1986, *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd ed., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Forth Worth, TX.
 34. Lovelock, C.H. (1983, "Classifying services to gain strategic marketing insights", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47, Summer, pp. 9-20.
 35. McCartney, S. (1994, "If PC service is so strong, survey shows, middling quality may become a plus", *Wall Street Journal*, 16 May 1994, p. B6,5.
 36. Rust, R. and Oliver, R. (1994 (Eds) *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
 37. Walton, M. (1986, *The Deming Management Method*, Perigree Books, New York, NY.
 38. Zeithaml, V. and Bitner, M.J. (1996, *Services Marketing*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
 39. Zeithaml, V., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L. (1985, "Problems and strategies in services marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 33-46.
 40. Zeithaml, V., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L. (1990, *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perception and Expectations*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
 41. Zeithaml, V., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L. (1993, "The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 21, pp. 1-12.
 42. Zemke, R. and Bell, C. (1990, "Service recovery: doing it right the second time", *Training*, June, pp. 42-8.
- Illustration

Caption: Figure 1; Transaction-focused service recovery; Figure 2; Relationship-focused service recovery; Table I; Measures of customer satisfaction (dependent variables); Table II; Recovery versus no recovery on encounter satisfaction; Table III; Service recovery versus service consistency on encounter satisfaction; Table IV; Significance levels comparing the effect of service recovery versus service consistency

Subject: Studies; Customer satisfaction; Customer services; Retailing; Relationship marketing;

Location: United States, US

Classification: 9190: United States, 9130: Experimental/theoretical, 7000: Marketing, 8390: Retailing industry

Publication title: *Journal of Service Management*

Volume: 7

Issue: 5

Pages: 32-46

Number of pages: 0

Publication year: 1996

Publication date: 1996

Year: 1996

Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing, Limited

Place of publication: Bingley

Country of publication: United Kingdom

Journal subject: Business And Economics--Production of Goods And Services

ISSN: 09564233

Source type: Scholarly Journals

Language of publication: English

Document type: Feature

ProQuest document ID: 233666321

Document URL:

<http://jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/233666321?accountid=10639>

Copyright: Copyright MCB UP Limited (MCB) 1996

Last updated: 2010-06-11

Database: ABI/INFORM Complete

Bibliography

Citation style: APA 6th - American Psychological Association, 6th Edition

Brown, S. W., Cowles, D. L., & Tuten, T. L. (1996). Service recovery: Its value and limitations as a retail strategy. *Journal of Service Management*, 7(5), 32-46. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/233666321?accountid=10639>

Contact ProQuest

Copyright © 2012 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved. - **Terms and Conditions**