

# **CUSTOMERS' SATISFACTION TOWARDS SERVICE RECOVERY IN HOTEL INDUSTRY**

**DR. K. HARI HARA RAJU  
DR. SUBBARAO. EBICHERLA  
PROF. JALADI RAVI**

## **ABSTRACT**

*Hotels have been important element in the economies of many countries. The enormous increase in tourism of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has caused the hotel business to outgrow national boundaries and become global in character. Hotels are directly linked to and are integral part of many other economic activities. Service recovery refers to the actions a service provider takes in response to service failure. By including also customer satisfaction into the definition, service recovery is a thought-out, planned, process of returning aggrieved/dissatisfied customers to a state of satisfaction with a company/service. Service recovery differs from complaint management in its focus on service failures and the company's immediate reaction to it. The present article examines the customers' satisfaction towards service recovery in luxury hotels located in Rayalaseema region.*

**Key words:** *Hotel, Tourism, Service recovery, Business.*

## **Introduction**

One of the fastest growing sectors of the economy of our time is the hotel industry. The hotel industry alone is a multi-billion dollar and growing enterprise. It is exciting, never boring and offer unlimited opportunities. The hotel industry is diverse enough for people to work in different areas of interest and still be employed within the hotel industry. This trend is not just in India, but also globally. Modern hotels provide refined services to their guests. The customers or guests are always right. This principle necessitated application of management principles in the hotel industry and the hotel professionals realized the instrumentality of marketing principles in managing the hotel industry.

A hotel is an institution or a building which provides lodging, meals and other services for the travelling public. It is a business enterprise having a building for public accommodation that furnishes lodging and usually provides meals,

beverages and personal services. It often offers, depending on its category, entertainment, and rooms for meetings, banquets, balls, parlours, and shops of various kinds, lounges, lobbies, cafes, bars and restaurants. Hotel is the home away from home. It is the place where the tourist stops and become the guest. To a greater or lesser extent the facilities of the hotel may also serve the local population but the primary function of a hotel is to accommodate those away from home and supply them with their basic needs and try to meet their expectations.

Service recovery refers to the actions a service provider takes in response to service failure. By including also customer satisfaction into the definition, service recovery is a thought-out, planned, process of returning aggrieved/dissatisfied customers to a state of satisfaction with a company/service. Service recovery differs from complaint management in its focus on service failures and the company's immediate reaction to it. Complaint management is based on customer complaints, which, in turn, may be triggered by service failures. However, since most dissatisfied customers are reluctant to complain, service recovery attempts to solve problems at the service encounter before customers complain or before they leave the service encounter dissatisfied. Both complaint management and service recovery are considered as customer retention strategies.

When service failure occurs the negative effects on profitability and customer loyalty create drastic challenges for service organizations to overcome. Although at first a service failure can be a devastating embarrassment for the organization, if handled properly a service provider can counter act those negative effects and challenges by responding to a customer's complaint in an effective manner. This task can be accomplished by the service organization's approach to a quality service recovery process. A service organization can create the ideal strategic plan for handling customer complaints; however, a plan which is never implemented only looks pleasing on paper. Thus, one of the most important keys to providing excellent service recovery is convincing the customer to bring the failure to the provider's attention and allow the organization to implement the service recovery process. Service recovery related literature attributes the social exchange theory and the equity theory for providing the theoretical framework for studies exploring customer's evaluation of service recovery efforts.

According to Adams (1965), the two theories demonstrate that the exchange relationship should be balanced between the service organization and the

customer. Oliver (1997) explained the significance of social exchange when he stated that the customer's satisfaction is based on their perception of equal partners during the service recovery exchange. For example, the professionalism demonstrated between employees, managers and employees, and between the service organization and the customer. He continued to explain that the equity theory; which is also a vital component, is the customer's perception of fair or unfair interpersonal relations or the amount of compensation involved in correcting the problem. From this research, a distinction between distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional or interpersonal justice was developed, emphasizing differential effects of procedural elements on customer satisfaction outcomes.

In 1988, Gronroos suggested that a service recovery was an organization's response to poor quality service. Service organization must take some form of action and the action must be effectively carried out to reduce the damage in the relationship and to transfer the customer from dissatisfied to a satisfied state. In 2000, McCollough, Berry and Yadav recognized that a successful recovery was an action that returned a customer to a satisfied state with the service provider and the quality of the action could either destroy or enhance the customer's loyalty and future behavioral intention.

Although many definitions have been recognized in related literature, one of the most widely accepted definitions of service recovery is by Zemke and Bell (1990) when they defined service recovery as: "a thought-out process for returning aggravated customers to a state of satisfaction with the firm after a service or product has failed to live up to the customer's expectations". Mattila and Patterson's (2004) research led them to define service recovery as a process which involved actions taken by a service provider to respond to a situation where a failure occurred in the organization's core or supplementary offerings. Boshoff's (1999) research acknowledged Zemke and Bell's (1990) definition but contributed that an effective service recovery process was one that was proactive in nature opposed to reactive. Wildes (2005) suggested that in order to achieve optimum levels of customer satisfaction employees must be well trained and empowered to deal with all service situations. Therefore, suggesting that a formal, documented approach to service recovery would aid in the training of employees and in the consistent delivery of service quality.

## **Objective of the study**

The main objective of the study is to examine the customers' satisfaction towards service recovery in selected luxury hotels in Rayalaseema region.

## **Hypotheses of the study**

Ho1: There is no significant difference between respondents' satisfaction towards service recovery and age of the respondent.

Ho2: There is no significant difference between respondents' satisfaction towards service recovery and income of the respondent.

## **Methodology**

The present study is based on both primary and secondary data. The Primary data for the study are collected by using a questionnaire for customers. The aspects on which the data are sought to be collected from the sample respondents include socio economic profile, and satisfaction on service recovery. The process of gathering reliable and meaningful information is the cardinal aspect of the enquiry and forms a central link in the operational plan for the entire research design. Commercial tax offices of Ananthapur, Chittoor, Kadapa, Kurnool are a great source to obtain a list of hotels in Rayalaseema region. The principal sources of information of the present study are various published books, journals, bulletins and internet.

## **Sampling**

Sample selection procedure is done by the following procedure. Initially the total number of luxury hotels in each district were identified. Later a proportion on the total units is calculated by dividing the number of hotels in the district by total number of hotels of four districts. For example total number of hotels in Ananthapur are 19 divided by the total number of hotels i.e.,  $19/79=0.24$ . And from each hotel 20 respondents were selected by using proportionate stratified random sampling technique to collect data from the respondents of districts.

In the second stage the researcher has selected the respondents by using random sampling technique. 20 customers are selected from each one of 5 hotels from Ananthapur, 15 hotels from Chittoor, 2 hotels from Kadapa and 3 hotels from

Kurnool. Thus the total sample of 500 respondents is comprised of 100 respondents from Anathapur, 300 respondents from Chittoor, 40 from respondents from Kadapa and 60 respondents from Kurnool.

## Statistical Tools Used

The primary data have been interpreted with the help of simple statistical tools such as Simple percentages and ANOVA test is used to average significance difference in the opinion of the respondents. SPSS for Windows Version 18.0 is used for the purpose of extensive analysis.

## Analysis and Interpretation

**Table- 1 Respondents' socio-economic profile**

Variables	Particulars	No. of Respondents	Per cent
Age (in Years)	Up to 20	64	12.8
	21-30	149	29.8
	31-40	92	18.4
	41-50	74	14.8
	Above 50	121	24.2
	Total	500	100.0
Gender	Male	260	52.0
	Female	240	48.0
	Total	500	100.0
Educational Qualification	Up to SSC	91	18.2
	HSC	149	29.8
	Graduation	85	17.0
	Post-Graduation	55	11.0
	Others	120	24.0
	Total	500	100.0
Occupation	Salaried	132	26.4
	Self-Employed	127	25.4
	Professional	92	18.4
	Business	80	16.0
	Others	69	13.8
	Total	500	100.0
Marital Status	Unmarried	164	32.8
	Married	284	56.8
	Others	52	10.4
	Total	500	100.0
Income (Per month)	Below 10,000	150	30.0

	10,001–20,000	175	35.0
	20,001–30,000	85	17.0
	Above 30,000	90	18.0
	Total	500	100.0

Nearly 30 per cent of the customers (i.e., 29.8%) of respondents are in the age group of 21-30 years, and 24.2 per cent of respondents are in above 50 years age group. Majority of the respondents are males with 52.0 per cent higher than female respondents. Most of the respondents are having education in HSC (29.8%) and other qualifications (24%) like diploma, ITI etc., 26.4 per cent of the respondents are salaried, 25.4 per cent are self-employed, 18.4 per cent are professional, 16.0 per cent are doing business and the remaining 13.8 per cent of the respondents are expressed that other occupation. Married respondents accounted for the highest proportion of 56.8 per cent, 32.8 per cent are unmarried and the remaining 10.4 per cent of the respondents are others (i.e., widow, divorced and widower) and most the respondent's (i.e., 65%) monthly income is below Rs.10,000 to 20,000.

**Table 2 Respondents opinion on Service Recovery**

Variables	HD	D	N	S	HS	Total
The employees I dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint	80 (16.0)	177 (35.4)	54 (10.8)	140 (28.0)	49 (9.8)	500 (100.0)
When I complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation.	61 (12.2)	180 (36.0)	64 (12.8)	150 (30.0)	45 (9.0)	500 (100.0)
The hotel employees I dealt with was very understanding.	75 (15.0)	175 (35.0)	65 (13.0)	120 (24.0)	65 (13.0)	500 (100.0)
The employee I complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem.	110 (22.0)	156 (31.2)	68 (13.6)	118 (23.6)	48 (9.6)	500 (100.0)
My complaint was not passed from one employee to the next.	104 (20.8)	165 (33.0)	80 (16.0)	100 (20.0)	51 (10.2)	500 (100.0)
The hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve	96 (19.2)	170 (34.0)	78 (15.6)	98 (19.6)	58 (11.6)	500 (100.0)

my problem.						
The hotel sent me a written apology.	99 (19.8)	153 (30.6)	69 (13.8)	133 (26.6)	46 (9.2)	500 (100.0)
The hotel ensured that I was not out of pocket.	88 (17.6)	154 (30.8)	78 (15.6)	124 (24.8)	56 (11.2)	500 (100.0)
The hotel employees I complained to be very polite.	82 (16.4)	148 (29.6)	68 (13.6)	142 (28.4)	60 (12.0)	500 (100.0)
The hotel provided me with explanation of why the problem had occurred.	78 (15.6)	138 (27.6)	68 (13.6)	160 (32.0)	56 (11.2)	500 (100.0)
The hotel employees I dealt with provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred.	102 (20.4)	138 (27.6)	60 (12.0)	132 (26.4)	68 (13.6)	500 (100.0)
The hotel employees I dealt with were well dressed	76 (15.2)	144 (28.8)	54 (10.8)	168 (33.6)	58 (11.6)	500 (100.0)
The hotel employees I dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment.	84 (16.8)	132 (26.4)	48 (9.6)	194 (38.8)	42 (8.4)	500 (100.0)
In my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem.	80 (16.0)	134 (26.8)	58 (11.6)	156 (31.2)	72 (14.4)	500 (100.0)
I was satisfied with the way the hotel handled the problem.	67 (13.4)	148 (29.6)	66 (13.2)	167 (33.4)	52 (10.4)	500 (100.0)
I was satisfied with my experience.	64 (12.8)	154 (30.8)	70 (14.0)	150 (30.0)	62 (12.4)	500 (100.0)
I am satisfied with my overall experience with the hotel.	102 (20.4)	132 (26.4)	89 (17.8)	117 (23.4)	60 (12.0)	500 (100.0)
As a whole I am happy with the hotel.	98 (19.6)	146 (29.2)	61 (12.2)	158 (31.6)	37 (7.4)	500 (100.0)
Overall, I am pleased with the service experiences	96 (19.2)	157 (31.4)	78 (15.6)	118 (23.6)	51 (10.2)	500 (100.0)
This hotel's employees can be trusted at all times	81 (16.2)	182 (36.4)	64 (12.8)	123 (24.6)	50 (10.0)	500 (100.0)
This hotel's employees made every effort to	87 (17.4)	157 (31.4)	75 (15.0)	132 (26.4)	49 (9.8)	500 (100.0)

fulfill the promises made to its customers						
Overall, this hotel is reliable.	76 (15.2)	173 (34.6)	63 (12.6)	148 (29.6)	40 (8.0)	500 (100.0)
I would recommend this hotel to other people.	82 (16.4)	148 (29.6)	73 (14.6)	146 (29.2)	51 (10.2)	500 (100.0)
I would tell other people positive things about this hotel.	87 (17.4)	143 (28.6)	92 (18.4)	135 (27.0)	43 (8.6)	500 (100.0)
I consider this hotel as my first choice compared to other hotels	72 (14.4)	152 (30.4)	65 (13.0)	174 (34.8)	37 (7.4)	500 (100.0)
I have a strong intention to visit this hotel again.	100 (20.0)	142 (28.4)	81 (16.2)	113 (22.6)	64 (12.8)	500 (100.0)

*Note: (HD=Highly Dissatisfied, D=Dissatisfied, N=Neutral, S=Satisfied, HS=Highly Satisfied)*

Respondents' opinion on service recovery is presented in table 2. The above table reveals that out of the total 500 sample respondents 51.4 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the employees dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint. For complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation nearly 50 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied. Half of the per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the hotel employees dealt were with was very understanding. Regarding the employee complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem, it is interesting to note that majority (i.e., 53.2 per cent) of the respondents are dissatisfied. For my complaint was not passed from one employee to the next 53.8 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied. Out of total 500 respondents 53.2 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve my problem. Regarding the hotel sent me a written apology, it is interesting to note that majority (i.e., 50.4 per cent) of the respondents are dissatisfied. Majority (i.e., 48.4 per cent) of the respondents are dissatisfied with the hotel ensured that respondent was not out of pocket. 46 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the hotel employees are very polite when they take the complaint. An equal per cent of 43.2 per cent of the respondents are satisfied and dissatisfied with the hotel provided with explanation of why the problem had occurred to the respondent. 48 per cent

of the respondents are dissatisfied with the hotel employees provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred to the respondents. 45.2 per cent of the respondents are satisfied with the hotel employees dressing. They all are well dressed when they are approaching to the customer. Majority of 47.2 per cent of the respondents are satisfied with the hotel employees dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment. 45.6 per cent of the respondents are satisfied with the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem to the respondents. 43.8 per cent of the respondents are satisfied with way the hotel handled the problem. 43.6 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with satisfaction with the experience in the hotel. 46.8 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the overall experience with the hotel. Nearly 49 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with whole happiness with the hotel. Majority of 50.6 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the service experiences in the hotel. 42.8 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with hotel's employees can be trusted at all times. Nearly 49 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with Hotel employees made every effort to fulfill the promises made to its customers. Nearly 50 per cent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the reliability of the selected hotels in the rayalaseema region. 46 Per cent of the respondents are not recommending these hotels to the other people in the future. Majority of 46 per cent of the respondents are not telling the positive things of about the hotel. 44.4 per cent of the respondents are not considering this as my first choice compared to other hotels in rayalaseema region. Nearly 49 per cent of the respondents are do not have a strong intention to visit the same hotel again.

**Table-3The performance difference among age of the respondent towards Respondent's opinion on service recovery**

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	f-value	p-value
The employees I dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint	500	2.80	1.277	0.057	3.367*	0.010
When I complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation	500	2.88	1.223	0.055	1.315	0.263
The hotel employees I dealt were with was very	500	2.85	1.300	0.058	2.716*	0.029

understanding						
The employee I complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem	500	2.68	1.308	0.058	0.433	0.785
My complaint was not passed from one employee to the next	500	2.66	1.287	0.058	2.533*	0.040
The hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve my problem	500	2.70	1.298	0.058	2.340	0.054
The hotel sent me a written apology	500	2.75	1.293	0.058	0.464	0.762
The hotel ensured that I was not out of pocket	500	2.81	1.295	0.058	0.658	0.621
The hotel employees I complained to be very polite	500	2.90	1.307	0.058	0.670	0.613
The hotel provided me with explanation of why the problem had occurred	500	2.96	1.292	0.058	1.340	0.254
The hotel employees I dealt with provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred	500	2.85	1.372	0.061	0.553	0.697
The hotel employees I dealt with were well dressed	500	2.98	1.303	0.058	0.368	0.832
The hotel employees I dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment	500	2.96	1.289	0.058	0.626	0.644
In my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem	500	3.01	1.341	0.060	0.340	0.851
I was satisfied with the way the hotel handled the problem	500	2.98	1.259	0.056	0.389	0.817
I was satisfied with my experience	500	2.98	1.272	0.057	1.686	0.152
I am satisfied with my overall experience with the hotel	500	2.80	1.326	0.059	0.132	0.971
As a whole I am happy with the hotel	500	2.78	1.282	0.057	0.412	0.800
Overall, I am pleased with the service experiences	500	2.74	1.289	0.058	0.200	0.939
This hotel's employees can be trusted at all times	500	2.76	1.266	0.057	1.859	0.116
This hotel's employees made every effort to fulfill the promises made to its	500	2.80	1.276	0.057	0.819	0.513

customers						
Overall, this hotel is reliable	500	2.81	1.239	0.055	1.071	0.370
I would recommend this hotel to other people	500	2.87	1.280	0.057	0.399	0.809
I would tell other people positive things about this hotel	500	2.81	1.250	0.056	0.261	0.903
I consider this hotel as my first choice compared to other hotels	500	2.90	1.232	0.055	0.528	0.715
I have a strong intention to visit this hotel again	500	2.80	1.336	0.060	0.999	0.408

\* Significant at 5% level

The distribution of mean performance among age of the respondent on satisfaction on service recovery in the hotel is depicted in table 3. From the above table shows that there is a significant difference between in respondent's satisfaction towards the employees dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint, the hotel employees dealt were with was very understanding and my complaint was not passed from one employee to the next with different age groups of the respondent, it is significant at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. And, the null hypotheses remaining variables such as when respondents are complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation, the employee complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem, my complaint was not passed from one employee to the next, the hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve my problem, the hotel sent me a written apology, the hotel ensured that was not out of pocket, the hotel employees complained to be very polite, the hotel provided me with explanation of why the problem had occurred, the hotel employees I dealt with provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred, the hotel employees I dealt with were well dressed, the hotel employees dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment, in my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem, I was satisfied with the way the hotel handled the problem, I was satisfied with my experience, I am satisfied with my overall experience with the hotel, as a whole I am happy with the hotel, overall, respondents are pleased with the service experiences, this hotel's employees can be trusted at all times, this hotel's employees made every effort to fulfill the promises made to its customers, overall, this hotel is reliable, I would recommend this hotel to other people, I

would tell other people positive things about this hotel, I consider this hotel as my first choice compared to other hotels and I have a strong intention to visit this hotel again are not having any significant difference between the above variables and respondent's age group. Hence, the null hypotheses have been accepted.

**Table-4The performance difference among income of the respondent towards Respondents' opinion on service recovery**

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	f-value	p-value
The employees I dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint	500	2.80	1.277	0.057	0.071	0.975
When I complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation	500	2.88	1.223	0.055	2.206	0.087
The hotel employees I dealt with were very understanding	500	2.85	1.300	0.058	6.180**	0.000
The employee I complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem	500	2.68	1.308	0.058	2.681*	0.046
My complaint was not passed from one employee to the next	500	2.66	1.287	0.058	1.526	0.207
The hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve my problem	500	2.70	1.298	0.058	0.789	0.501
The hotel sent me a written apology	500	2.75	1.293	0.058	1.796	0.147
The hotel ensured that I was not out of pocket	500	2.81	1.295	0.058	0.981	0.401
The hotel employees I complained to be very polite	500	2.90	1.307	0.058	1.727	0.161
The hotel provided me with explanation of why the problem had occurred	500	2.96	1.292	0.058	1.167	0.322
The hotel employees I dealt with provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred	500	2.85	1.372	0.061	0.093	0.964
The hotel employees I dealt with were well dressed	500	2.98	1.303	0.058	0.094	0.964
The hotel employees I dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment	500	2.96	1.289	0.058	0.650	0.583
In my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem	500	3.01	1.341	0.060	0.324	0.808
I was satisfied with the way the hotel handled the problem	500	2.98	1.259	0.056	0.566	0.637
I was satisfied with my experience	500	2.98	1.272	0.057	0.472	0.702

I am satisfied with my overall experience with the hotel	500	2.80	1.326	0.059	0.020	0.996
As a whole I am happy with the hotel	500	2.78	1.282	0.057	1.438	0.231
Overall, I am pleased with the service experiences	500	2.74	1.289	0.058	1.697	0.167
This hotel's employees can be trusted at all times	500	2.76	1.266	0.057	0.897	0.443
This hotel's employees made every effort to fulfill the promises made to its customers	500	2.80	1.276	0.057	0.628	0.597
Overall, this hotel is reliable	500	2.81	1.239	0.055	0.783	0.504
I would recommend this hotel to other people	500	2.87	1.280	0.057	1.478	0.220
I would tell other people positive things about this hotel	500	2.81	1.250	0.056	0.197	0.898
I consider this hotel as my first choice compared to other hotels	500	2.90	1.232	0.055	0.278	0.841
I have a strong intention to visit this hotel again	500	2.80	1.336	0.060	0.948	0.417

\* *Significant at 5% level*

\*\* *Significant at 1% level*

The distribution of mean performance among income of the respondent on satisfaction on service recovery in the hotel is presented in table 4. From the above table conclude that there is a significant difference between in respondent's satisfaction towards the hotel employees dealt with much understood with place of the residence of the respondent. It is significant at 1% level of significance and the employee complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem is significant at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. And the null hypotheses for remaining variables such as in my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem, with income of the respondent, the employees dealt with communicated clearly when providing feedback about my complaint, in my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem, my complaint was not passed from one employee to the next when respondents are complained about poor service, the hotel employees asked questions to help clarify the situation, the employee complained to do not find someone else to solve my problem, my complaint was not passed from one employee to the next, the hotel informed me in writing about the progress made to solve my problem, the hotel sent me a written apology, the hotel ensured that was not out of pocket, the hotel employees complained to be very polite, the hotel

provided me with explanation of why the problem had occurred, the hotel employees dealt with provided a satisfactory explanation of why the problem had occurred, the hotel employees dealt with were well dressed, the hotel employees dealt with worked in a tidy, professional environment, in my opinion, the hotel provided a satisfactory solution to the problem, I was satisfied with the way the hotel handled the problem, I was satisfied with my experience, respondent satisfied with my overall experience with the hotel, as a whole respondent happy with the hotel, overall, respondents are pleased with the service experiences, this hotel's employees can be trusted at all times, this hotel's employees made every effort to fulfill the promises made to its customers, overall, this hotel is reliable, respondent would recommend this hotel to other people, I would tell other people positive things about this hotel, respondent consider this hotel as my first choice compared to other hotels and respondent have a strong intention to visit this hotel again are not having any significant difference between the above variables and respondent's income. Hence, the null hypotheses have been accepted.

## References:

1. Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange, in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Academic Press. 267-297
2. Andreassen, Alain R., & Arthur Best. (1977) Customers Complain-Does Business Respond. *Harvard Business Review* 55, July–August: 93-101
3. Boshoff, C. (1999). RECOVSAT – An instrument to measure satisfaction with transaction-specific service recovery. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 1(3), 236-249.
4. Encyclopedia America. (1972). International Edition, Americana Corporation, New York, vol.14, p.447.
5. Gronroos, C. (1988). Service quality: The six criteria of good perceived service quality. *Review of Business*, 9(1), 10-13.
6. Grönroos, Christian. (1988). Service Quality: The Six Criteria of Good Perceived Service Quality. *Review of Business*, 9: 10-13
7. Halstead, Diane, Edward A Morash, & John Ozment. (1996). Comparing Objective Service Failures and Subjective Complaints: An Investigation of Domino and Halo Effects. *Journal of Business Research* 36(2): 107-15

8. Lewis, Barbara R. (1996) *Service Promises, Problems and Retrieval. Working Paper*. Paper presented at the QUIS, Karlstad,
9. Mattila, A. S., & Patterson, P. G. (2004). Service recovery and fairness perceptions in collectivists and individual contexts. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(4), 336-346.
10. McCollough, M. A., Berry, L. L., & Yadav, M. S. (2000). An empirical investigation of customer satisfaction after service failure and recovery. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(2), 121-137.
11. Medlik S. (1980). *The Business of Hotels*, Heinemann, London, Chapter. I, p.3
12. Oliver, R. L. (1997). Varieties of value in the consumption satisfaction response. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 23(7), 247-254.
13. Stauss, Bernd, & Wolfgang Seidel. (2005) *Complaint Management, The Heart of CRM*. Mason, OH: Thomson,
14. Wildes, V. J. (2005). Attracting and retaining food servers: How internal service quality moderated occupational stigma. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*.
15. William Benton. (1974). Knowledge in depth. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. London, vol. 8, pp.1117.
16. Zemke, R., & Bell, C. (1990). *Service recovery training*, 27(6), 42-48.

## About the Authors

DR. K. HARI HARA RAJU, Post-Doctoral Fellow (UGC), Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

E-mail: dr.khhr@gmail.com.

DR. SUBBARAO. EBICHERLA, Post-Doctoral Fellow (UGC), Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

E-mail: dresubbarao@gmail.com.

PROF. JALADI RAVI, Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India. E-mail: dr.ravijaladi@gmail.com