

Customer Complaint Handling and Post-Complaint Behaviour in the Fast Food Industry

Ogonu, Gibson Chituru
Department of Marketing
Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria
gibsonogonu@gmail.com

Obabuike I. Nkpurukwe
Department of Business Administration
Federal University, Wukari

Abstract

The study examined the relationship between customer complaint handling practices on post complaint behaviour in the fast food industry. The study is essential because we live in the world of choice and any lost customer is very difficult to regain. The study reviewed relevant literature. Data were drawn through questionnaire from 200 employees of 66 fast food firms in Rivers State. The data collection instruments were validated using Cronbach test, whereupon all variables surpassed the benchmark 0.7. Analyzing the data using descriptive and inferential statistics (Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient the study found that complaint handling practice (CHP) studied were strong and significant at $P < 0.05$ (one-tailed) in determining customer post complaint behaviour. Specifically. The study therefore concludes that effective and efficient service delivery anchored on sound grasp of customers' needs, matched with appropriate complaint handling initiatives will enhance good post complaint behaviour. Based on our conclusions, we recommend that fast food business should adopt policies such as robust customer collaborative, market intelligence, distributive and interactional justice as a means of reassuring customers of super value proposition in their service delivery.

Keywords: *Complaint handling practices, Post complaint behaviour.*

1. Introduction

The advantages of customer satisfaction and the prices of customer dissatisfaction on firms have been extensively researched by scholars. The yearning of every firm therefore, is to secure the long-term preference of customers and to maximize the benefits that accrue there from. This is not just an ideal; it is an expected norm for all players in an industry. However, it is common to see or hear of fast food firms that are struggling to cope; spending so many resources, but achieving less than desired. Though several factors could be culprits for this phenomenon, managers are apt to look for solutions in the most unlikely programmes or activities, thus, often plummeting into further uncertainties or record short-lived successes.

The fast food industry is a service dominant one. It is thus not immune to instances of service failure that characterize service deliveries. Hence, customer complaints will also be an integral facet of the industry. However, much is not known about the complaint handling practices of firms in the industry, and how such practices assuage customers when they experience service glitches. It may not be out of place to suspect that fast food firms do not have enshrined complaint handling practices that deliver post-complaint satisfaction to customers; which may have resulted to the low level of customer loyalty experienced by firms in the industry. The

fast-food industry in Nigeria is associated with heavy advertising expenditure. This testifies to the fact that firms in the industry are always scouting for customers. It also attests to the fact that fast food customers do not exhibit loyalty in the industry.

A number of studies have thus been carried on complaint handling and post-complaint behaviour (Ateke & Harcourt, 2017; Ateke & Kalu, 2016; Ogonu, 2014; Valenzuela et al., 2006; Stauss, 2002; Maxham, 2001; Tax et al., 1998 etc.). However, most of these studies offer little help to fast food firms in Nigeria because most were conducted in other sectors of the economy or were alien to Nigeria. Other factors ranging from differences in economic conditions, level of enlightenment of consumers and disparities in regulatory frameworks makes it impracticable to implement the findings of these studies in the Nigerian context. Also, most of the studies conducted on complaint handling practices and post-complaint behaviour did not use organizational culture as a moderating variable or take their bearing from the equity theory, attribution theory and the prospect theory.

Thus, with a view to complementing the body of knowledge on complaint handling practices and post-complaint behaviour, the current study seeks to investigate the link between the variables; using distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice as dimensions of complaint handling; while repeat purchase, word-of-mouth and commitment are used as measures of post-complaint behaviour. It is the considered view of this researcher that a study of this nature is sorely needed especially in view of the current harsh economic conditions and the dwindling fortunes of firms in Nigeria; which underscored the need for firms to maintain their customer base.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework (Organizational Justice Theory)

Organizational justice theory examines individuals' perceptions of fairness in their employment relationship (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Organizational justice has become one of the most popular and most researched areas in the fields of organization and management. In management and organization research, the terms "justice" and "fairness" are often used interchangeably, such as when referring to "organizational justice" and "organizational fairness" perceptions. Researchers have debated about the number of different types of justice that are important in fairness perceptions. Some researchers have focused on one type (an overall perception of fairness), two types (distributive justice and procedural justice), three types (adding interactional justice), and four types (separating interactional justice into both interpersonal justice and informational justice). The first type of fairness that was examined in the social sciences was distributive justice, which looks at people's perceptions of the fairness of outcomes that they received. One of the early theories of justice (equity theory) posited that the fairest allocations are those that reward people in proportion to their contributions (Adams, 1963, 1965). Additional allocation rules that were shown to be fair were based on equality and need. The second type of justice is called procedural justice, and it refers to people's perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcomes that they receive (Greenberg, 2009). Work by Thibaut and Walker (1975, 1978) found that individuals were more accepting of unfavorable outcomes as long as the process used to allocate those outcomes was fair. For example, when people have a say or a voice in a process, they tend to believe that it was fair even if they did not receive the fairest outcome as a result of that process (Shapiro, 1993). According to the "fair process effect" (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), under fair process conditions (for example, consistent, representative, unbiased procedures), even unfavorable outcomes can be perceived by individuals as being fair. The third type of justice that was examined by researchers was interactional justice. Work by Bies

and others found that individuals appraise the fairness of the interpersonal treatment they receive during decision-making procedures and outcome distributions (for example, Bies, 2005; Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987). Fairness perceptions were found to be higher when people believed that they were treated with dignity and respect, and when information was shared and adequate explanations were given regarding allocation of important resources (Bies, 1987). Initially, there was some debate about whether interactional justice was distinct from procedural justice. Most researchers today believe that interactional justice and procedural justice are distinct concepts (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005). Colquitt (2001) subdivided interactional justice into two separate components: informational justice and interpersonal justice. Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) presented empirical support for the validity of this subdivision. Informational justice refers to fairness perceptions that the decision maker is truthful and provides adequate justifications for decisions. People believe that they are an important part of the organization when officials take the time to thoroughly explain the reasons behind justice decisions. Interpersonal justice refers to treating people with dignity and respect. People believe that they deserve to be treated well and feel that things are unfair when they are not treated well. Organizational justice is an important part of interpersonal relations among people in the workplace. Employees monitor the fairness of processes, outcomes, and interpersonal treatment in their organizations. When employees see that their organization is being fair, then four important individual needs are met for them: the need for belonging, the need for meaning, the need for positive self-regard, and the need for control (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001). Organizational justice helps (1) fulfill people's desire for important attachments to others in their organizations, (2) bring employees closer together and have a strong sense of pride in their organization, (3) fulfill employees' need for things to be "done right" and with a sense of morality, and (4) enable employees to have a more positive view of themselves and who they are in their organization. Organizational justice research examines what individuals assess when they make fairness judgments. Two different approaches have been used by organizational justice researchers to identify the objects of employees' fairness assessments: (1) the event paradigm and (2) the social entity paradigm (Choi, 2008). Research in the event paradigm contends that employees evaluate the fairness of a specific event, such as a pay raise, a performance appraisal, or a smoking ban (for example, fairness theory, Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Under this approach, people assess the fairness of each isolated event on the basis of what should, would, or could have happened to them. Research in the social entity paradigm contends that employees assess the fairness of the organization as a whole (for example, the fairness of supervisors or of the organization) (for example, fairness heuristic theory, Lind, 2001). Under the social entity approach, people develop ideas about the level of fairness that they expect to receive from a boss or from an organization as a whole, and these ideas guide future behavior and attitudes. This view holds that people establish a baseline level of fairness expected from a person or an entity and that this baseline can be revised upward or downward as events unfold. For the most part, organizational justice has examined these two paradigms separately, without attempts at integration. Some researchers have suggested weaknesses in examining each of the three or four types of organizational justice separately (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Instead, they argue for the use of one general justice construct. Their view is that an employee's overall justice perception may be more important in influencing subsequent attitudes and performances than would any one of the three or four types of justice alone.

Employees want to be treated fairly by their managers and by their organizations; if they are not treated fairly, then their attitudes and performance may be negatively affected. For example, employees will assess the fairness of the procedures used to allocate important resources. You can improve employees' fairness perceptions of these processes by giving them

a voice in the decision-making process, consistently following and applying rules, accurately using information in the decision-making process, correcting any errors that might occur during the decision-making process, and trying to prevent and guard against any biases or prejudices that might exist. Employee fairness perceptions will most likely be higher when managers act fairly in their resource allocations. However, this may not be the case if employees do not believe that a manager is fair, even if he or she really is fair. As a manager, you should not only be fair but also look fair to employees (Greenberg, 1988). You need to go out of your way to demonstrate how fair you are when allocating important resources, such as by showing employees the information that was included and the process that was followed that made the outcome decision fair. If employees perceive procedures to be unfair, then they may reject the entire system in the organization and believe it to be unfair. Employees care about how they are treated during resource allocation decision-making processes. You can improve employees' fairness perceptions by treating employees with dignity and respect; showing when, how, and what information was used during decision-making processes; and providing full and adequate explanations about how and why important resource allocations were made. Employees tend to feel more valued when someone in their organization thoroughly explains the rationale behind resource allocations, and this can result in more productive employee attitudes and behaviors.

2.2 Customer Complaint Handling Practices

Complaints should be looked at in a constructive, positive and professional manner (Zaira, 2003). Mainly, because of the complaint handling process can make use of information for quality improvements and have a great impact on customer retention (Straus & Schoeler, 2004). Complaints and the processes for handling them are important issues for service providers because they have the potential of eliciting an adverse effect on customer satisfaction and loyalty (Anderson, 1994). Research on customer post complaint behaviour has focused mainly on the customer's attitude towards complaining (Gruber, Szmigin & Voss, 2009), attribution of blame and the likelihood of a successful solution (Gruberfirst, 2014). Kerr, (2004) recommends effective generic guidelines in the successful resolution of complaints. They include acting expediently to resolve the issue; acknowledging mistakes without being defensive; not arguing with customers; openness in solving the problem; considering the possibility of compensation by trying to regain the goodwill of customers (Kau & Loh, 2006). Despite the fact that organizations appreciate the importance of managing complaints, overall customer satisfaction after a failure have not improved (Michel, Bowen & Johnston, 2009). Organizations should encourage dissatisfied customers to complain so that they can solve the problem and retain the customer. Unfortunately, organizations that do not rise to the challenge of handling complaint are turning down the important opportunity of reclaiming and improving a relationship with aggrieved customers, owing to the apparent importance of effective complaints handling, there is a research gap on how companies should treat all complaining customers to achieve customer satisfaction. Companies strive in the direction of improve service quality, but overall customer satisfaction remains a problem in organizations.

Service recovery has an outcome dimension according to Duffy, Miller & Bexley 2006) which is "what?" the customer receives as part of the organization's efforts to recover, whereas the process dimension of service recovery is concerned with "how?" recovery is achieved.

Service providers see complaints and the processes for handling them as very important because they possess the prospect to have a negative effect on customer satisfaction and loyalty (Anderson, 1994). According to Bolting (1989) two key areas of research concentrates on the motivation or antecedents for complaining behavior; Tronvoil, (2007) considers customer factors as demographic characteristics; Singh (1990) looks at attitude or antecedent in respect

to complaining behavior. Studies on customer complaint behavior has mainly concentrated on customer's attitude towards complaining (Richins, 1983) attribution of blame and the tendency of a prosperous solution (Singh, 1990). Potent across-the-board guidelines in the successful determination of complaints were recommended by Lovelock, Petterson & Walker, (2001). They include acting tactically to determine the issue; acknowledging mistakes without being self-protective, not contending with customers; unobstructing in handling the problem; taking into consideration the potentiality of compensation attempting to regain the goodwill of customers (McCole, 2004).

Michael, Bowen and Johnston (2009) comment that despite the fact that organizations treasure the importance of managing complaints, inclusive customer satisfaction after a failure has not ameliorated. From the meta-analyses perspective, complaint handling is determined by post-complaint customer behavior such as repurchase intentions and WOM activity (Gruber, 2011). Service recovery according to Duffy, Miller and Bexley (2006) possess an outcome dimension which is "what?" the customer take as part of the organizations effort to recover, whereas the process dimension of service recovery borders on "how" recovery is attained. It was suggested by Duffy et al., (2006) that the outcome dimension is more significant when the initial service is delivered, but the significance of the process dimension is emphasized in service recovery. Kau & Loh (2006) argues that service recovery dealings between a service provider and a customer; failure in the provision of the initial service, a response to failure, and a hunger after effect to convert a dissatisfied customer into a satisfied one.

A meta-analysis of satisfaction with complaint handling has issued forth antecedents such as expectation, performance and disconfirmation of expectations (Szymanski & Henard, 2001) while the study of Varela-Neira, Vazquez-Casielles and Iglesiaas (2010) examined the effective responses to complaint handling experienced by the customer. Gee, Coates and Nicholson (2008) advances that further research is required in order to bring about a clear line between and organization's response to a complaint and the impact of the response on customer behaviors.

Many companies do not pay adequate attention to handling complaints effectively (Stauss & Scheler, 2004; Homburg & First, 2007). This is surprising as customer complaints are useful source of important market intelligence (eg. Priluck & Lala, 2009) which firms should adopt to rectify the root cause of the problem and to improve the service or product (McCollough et al., 2000).

Nevertheless, few Companies recognize the importance of customer complaints through the estimate that fewer than 50 percent of complaints receive a reply from the company and those that do often view the organization's response as unsatisfactory (Naylorm 2003). It seems that the issue of service failure is not adequately addressed by service providers especially when the seriousness of the failure is not evident, or when customers do not display a high level of dissatisfaction with the failure. Negative Word of Mouth (Lerman, 2006) and switching behaviour (Homberf & First, 2005), inevitably lead to the high costs of acquiring new customers (Hart et al., 1990) if alternatives are available switching barriers may not exist, and if customers do not have loyal feeling towards the company (Colgate & Norris, 2001). On the other hand, a positive approach to dealing with customer complaints should help to maintain customers and generate positive communication about the company (Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Stauss, 2002). Importantly repeat purchase by established customers usually require up to 90% less marketing expenditure than do purchases by first time buyers (Dhar & Glazar, 2003).

In general customers make their complains in person to contact employees (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2007; Brown, 2000) and therefore these employees are considered to have a critical role in the recovery of failures (Maxham & Netenyer 2003), they should also play an important role for creating complaint satisfaction in face – to – face complaint handling encounters. It is largely the employee's response, in such face-to-face situations which influences the perception of the complaint handling encounter and the overall evaluation of the company's complaint resolution process. It is the behaviours and attitudes of customers contact employees which primarily determine the customers' perceptions off service quality (Hardline & Ferrwell, 1996) and their role is vital for the recovery from creating complaint satisfaction (Bell & Luddington, 2006). Interpersonal service situations offer an opportunity to manage quality (Bearden, et al., 1998) and establish what king of service delivery is satisfactory (Chebat & Kollias, 2000). The managerial implications are that once a company has recognized and understood of complaining customers' expectations, they can ensure that contact employees are trained to manage their behaviors appropriately to match their customer's underlying expectations. Such behavior should have a positive impact on customer satisfaction (Bostschen et al., 1999).

In essence with Tax & Brown (2000) enhanced complaint handling system contributes to greater customer loyalty. In this sense, based on justice theory, it is revealed that customer satisfaction with service provider's complaints handling efforts is conditioned by three dimensions of fairness as follows: outcome justice, interactions justice and procedural justice. In particular, during complaint handling process, customers assess the ultimate result which is received, interpersonal relations with employees throughout complaint incidence and the process employed to fix the problem (Tax, Brown & Chandrashekara, 1998). Moreover, Tax et al. (1998) study has found out that previous positive experience with service provider diminishes impact of poor service recovery, additionally, it is demonstrated that dissatisfaction with complaint handling decrease level of commitment, whereas satisfaction with recovery procedure has an immediate positive impact on customer loyalty and trust and this is in parallel with the findings of Andreasse (1999).

Furthermore, in their study Stauss & Schoeler (2004) provided strong empirical evidence to support the positive relationship between effective complaint handling and customer retention. The authors shed the light over strategic importance of complaint management in terms of customer relationship management and provide manager with practical instrument to measure returns on complaint handling efforts. It is widely considered that customer and complaint management departments are cost producing units that contribute to a greater pressure over complaint manager proving substantiality of their activities (Stauss & Schoeler, 2004). In an attempt to solve the dilemma, the scholars have visualized that returns on complaint management stimulated about 312.8 percent. After reducing repurchases benefit by complaint management cost, it is calculated that profit of complaint management against infusions into complaint management constitutes 312.8%; this number shows considerable effect or effective complaint handling on customer retention and loyalty, this argument is further reinforced by the findings of Oh (2006).

2.3 Post-Complaint Behaviour

Complaint handling is judged not by satisfaction with the organization's response, but by post-complaint purchaser behaviour such as repurchase intentions and word-of- mouth intentions (Davidow, 2003). Post-purchase intentions are usually seem as a signal for forecasting future behaviours of the customers (Kau et al., 2006). Customers' post complaint behaviour refers to the responses triggered by perceived dissatisfaction that is neither sensitively accepted nor quickly forgotten in the consumption of a product or service (Homburg & Fürst, 2005).

Research by Duffy, Miller and Bexley (2006) recommend that customers' complaint behaviour is a complex phenomenon which is reflected in the number of alternative definitions proposed to explain this kind of behaviour. Traditionally, the common determinant of complaining behaviour was described as dissatisfaction due to inadequacies of integrity, reliability, responsiveness, availability and functionality (Tronvoll, 2012). Hence, consumer dissatisfaction is a result of the discrepancy between expected and realized performance (Gruber, 2011). Dissatisfaction is based on disconfirmation of expectation (Michel & Meuter, 2008) and it is a customer experience that is less than the perceived expectation. Tronvoll (2007) described customers' complaint behaviour as a function of dissatisfaction. Homburg & Furst (2005) assert that dissatisfaction is a significant factor that attributes to complaints.

Post-purchase satisfaction has been considered a central mediator that links prior beliefs to post-purchase cognitive structures, communication and repurchase behavior (Orisingher, Valentini & Angelis 2010). Similarly, satisfaction with the handling of a complaint can be considered a central element mediating the relationship between assessments made regarding these management and post-complaint attitudes and behavior. According to the literature on social justice, satisfaction is linked to assessments of fairness in various conflict situations (Tronvoll, 2012). Extending this logic to complaint handling, it is widely recognized that consumer satisfaction with the complaint episode results from the assessment of aspects regarding the final outcome (distributive justice), the process that led to the outcome (procedural justice) and the manner in which the consumer was treated and informed during the episode (interactional justice), that is, how fair these aspects were (Gruber, 2011).

Marketing literature has focused on identifying various determinants of customer post complaint behaviour; including perceived costs; attitude towards complaining; environmental and demographic variables and the likelihood of a successful complaint (Dean, 2004). Further, the existing models of customers' complaint behaviour focused on the separation of private action from public action (Gruber, 2011). This categorization has become increasingly irrelevant (and maybe even misleading) because of recent advances in Information Communication Technological (ICT) systems. In the past, when a customer experienced an unfavourable service experience, he or she talked to relatively few people; in contrast, the advent of the internet has dramatically increased the number of people available for negative communication (Tax & Brown, 1998). In these circumstances, it becomes difficult to maintain a separation of the concepts of private action and public action. In response to these developments, the proposed model suggests new categories of complaining behaviour in terms of communication complaint responses and action complaint responses. This schema facilitates a categorization of a wide range of complaint responses over time.

Complaint handling has been recognized as a critical task for service managers in mobile telephone services. There is a need to enhance the trustworthiness of mobile phone operators by keeping customers' best interest at heart, providing customized services and exemplary behaviour of contact personnel to make the interaction a memorable experience. Based on post complaint behaviour, customers who are satisfied with complaint handling engage in positive word-of-mouth and are more loyal than customers who are dissatisfied with complaint handling of service quality of mobile telephone service providers.

Customer complaint behavior is significant for service scholars and manager and knowledge regarding complaint behavior provides the service providers with useful insight into several areas that concerns routine service problems (Harari, 1992; Johoston & Mehra, 2002). Customer complaint behavior manifests as a behavioral expression of an unfavorable attitude

directed to an object, person, or situation (Johnston & Michel, 2008). Homburg and Furst (2005) refers to customer complaint as the reaction initiated by perceived dissatisfaction that is neither psychologically approved or promptly not bearing in mind the consumption of a product or service. Singh (1988) defines customer complaint behavior as a set of multiple (behavioral and non-behavioral) reactions, some or all of which are aroused by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase situation. Early definition by Jacoby and Jaccard (1981) conceptualized customer complaint behavior as action a person embark upon that concerns negative communication about a product or service. For Ndubuisi and Ling (2006) Customer dissatisfaction emanates from the dissimilarity between expected and realized performance, Oliver (1970) posits that dissatisfaction is founded on disconfirmation of expectation, and manifests as a customer experience less than the perceived expectation. Dissatisfaction is one autonomous factor that is needed to usher in consumer complaints (Heung & Lam, 2003). Nevertheless, some customers who are dissatisfied may not institute complaint actions, and those who institute complaint actions expects to be given justice (Gruber, Szmigin & Voss 2009). It is customer who feels that justice was not given that may probably feel angry and may involve in negative word of mouth or may leave the business. (Brodgett & Anderson, 2000). It is very clear to state that all companies experience customer dissatisfaction to a given extent (Ndubuisi & Ling, 2005). It becomes necessary to investigate post dissatisfaction behavior of customers. Empirical evidence deposited by Casado, Nicolau & Mas (2011) portrays that customer complaint behavior is a complex phenomenon. The sophistication in customer complaint behavior is seemed in the number of available “classifications, plan and definitions proposed to explain this kind of behavior” (Kemunda 2013). This therefore, informs management to establish processes that will enable service providers to respond timely in terms of service recovery activities to tackle” problems of lost customer lifetime value and behavioral intentions” (Tronvoil, 2007). In customer service terminology, complaint behavior is not properly tackled (Heung & Lam, 2003; Kim & Shin, 2003; Ndubuisi & Ling, 2006). To minimize negative consequences, feedback mechanism and action is imperative. Information and feedback that emanates from customers are normally recognized as critical factors in obtaining a favorable marketing outcome (Maxham & Netemeyer, 2003). Regrettably, a handful of customers do not register complaint after service failure dissatisfaction, but quit (Tax, et al., 1998). It is therefore necessary for organizations to take in for questioning the reaction of customer to service failure and how service providers make efforts towards service recovery manipulate the research element

2.4 Empirical Studies (please add few empirical reviews here)

3. Methodology

This study focused on complaint handling practices and customers post complaint behaviour in fast food industry. *The study reviewed relevant literature. Data were drawn through questionnaire from 200 employees of 66 fast food firms in Rivers State. The data collection instruments.* The research adopted both is descriptive and quantitative statistical tools. Questionnaire was used as the instrument for primary data collection. To ensure the validity of the instrument, it was subjected to expert jury opinion. The jury consisted of members of the academia and practitioners with adequate knowledge in the subject area. The internal consistency of the measurement items was determined by subjecting them to the Cronbach’s Alpha test.

4. Results and Discussions

Tables 1 and 2 have been used to present the data and their analysis in line with the objectives of the study.

Table 1: Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between the elements of complaint handling practices and post complaint behaviour

Variables 1	Statistics	Correlations	Complaint Handling Practices	Customer Complaint Behaviour
Elements of complaint handling practices	Pearson's correlation sig (2-tailed)		1.000	.629 ^{xx}
	N		200	100
Customer post complaint behaviour	Parson's correlation sig (2-tailed)		.629 ^{xx} .000 200	1.000 200

^{xx}correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 shows the Pearson's correlation analysis using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 22.0. The Pearson's r is estimated as 0.629^{xx}. This value shows that a strong relationship exists between the elements of complaint handling practices and customer post-complaint behaviour. The positive sign of this correlation coefficient shows that the elements of complaint handling and customer post complaint behaviour are directly related i.e. increase in the elements of complaint handling practices is accompanied with increase in addressing customer post-complaint behaviour.

Table 2: Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between the elements of complaint handling practices and post complaint behaviour

Variables 1	Statistics	Correlations	Complaint Handling Practices	Customer Complaint Behaviour
Elements of complaint handling practices	Pearson's correlation sig (2-tailed)		1.000	.629 ^{xx}
	N		200	100
Customer post complaint behaviour	Parson's correlation sig (2-tailed)		.629 ^{xx} .000 200	1.000 200

^{xx}correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows the Pearson's correlation analysis using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 22.0. The Pearson's r is estimated as 0.629^{xx}. This value shows that a strong relationship exists between the elements of complaint handling practices and customer post-complaint behaviour. The positive sign of this correlation coefficient shows that the elements of complaint handling and customer post complaint behaviour are directly related i.e. increase in the elements of complaint handling practices accompanied with increase in addressing customer post-complaint behaviour.

The study attempted to assess the extent to which responses from the respondents on complaint handling practices explain customer post complaint behaviour. The results of the quantitative analysis demonstrate that this is sufficient evidence to show that customer complaint practices packages adopted by fast food firms positively affects post complaint behaviour through effective handling of complaints.

It makes sense to contend that the attributes of complaints handling initiatives have the potential to improve upon positively affect the metrics of customer post complaint behaviour. Although, all the attributes for complaint handling practices affect customer post complaint behaviour metrics. (please ...Corroborate other scholars works with yours in the discussions)

5. Conclusion

The following conclusions can be drawn from the discussion of our findings and from the hypotheses. It was assumed that such information would facilitate the formulation of appropriate complaint handling policies and marketing strategies by fast food firms. It is evident from the findings that there is implicit relationship between attributes of complaint handling practices and customer post complaint behaviour. Thus, given knowledge of the importance that firms attached to the various attributes of complaint handling practices, it will be fairly possible for firms to predict the outlet where consumers would prefer to do their business.

6 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, we proffer the following recommendations:

- i. Management of fast food firms should position strategically, the two dimensions of complaint handling practices (distributive justice and interactional justice) to customer post complaint behaviour, since the study unveiled a statistically significant relationship between them.
- ii. Management should be skilled in packaging distributive justice and interactional justice to relate genuinely with customer post complaint behaviour. This implication is necessary because the study revealed that distributive justice and interactional justice were the most significant dimensions of complaint handling practices that predicts customer post complaint behaviour.
- iii. Besides, the study recommends that management should adopt the customer complaint handling practices and post complaint behaviour conceptual framework which has been developed and translated into practical guidance for managers. This conceptual framework provides specific boosters for creating the success of complaint handling in predicting positively, customer post complaint behaviour, and would allow management to focus and prioritize resources.

Finally, in order to enhance repeat purchase, word-of-mouth and commitment, management should design service recovery programs that are capable of enhancing positive customer post complaint behaviour that is favorable for the focal company.

References

- Adams, S.J. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange: Advances in social Psychology*. New York: Academia, 67-299.
- Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall Justice Judgment in organizational Justice Research: A test of Mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 491-500.
- Andreasen, T. W. (1999). What drives customer loyalty with complaint resolution. *Journal of service Research* 1(4), 324-32.
- Andreassen, T.W. (2000). Antecedents to satisfaction with service recovery. *European Journal of Customer Marketing*, 34, 1/2, 156-175.

- Ateke, B. W., & Kalu, S. E. (2016). Complaint handling and post complaint satisfaction of customers of entries in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Business studies and management* 3(12) 16-26.
- Ateke, B.W., & Harcourt, H (2017). Perceived satisfaction with organizational response to complaint and repeat purchase intention, *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 3(6), 11-24
- Bearden, W. O., Malhotra, M. K., & Uscategui, K. H. (1998). *Customer contact and the evaluation of service experiences: propositions and implications for the design of services*, *Journal of Psychology and Marketing*, 15(8), 793-809.
- Bell, S. J., & Luddington, J. A. (2006). Coping with customer complaints. *Journal of Service Research*, 8(3), 192-204.
- Biers, R.J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication criteria of fairness – *Research on Negotiation in organizations*, 1, 43-55.
- Blodgett, J. G., Hill, D. J., & Tax., S.S. (1997). The effects of distributive, procedural & interactional justice on post complaint behavior, *Journal of Retailing*, 73(2), 185-210.
- Blodgett, J.G., & Anderson, R.D. (2000). A Bayesian network model of the consumer complaint process. *Journal of Service Research*. 2(4), 321-38.
- Boshoff, C. & Allen, J. (2000). The influence of selected antecedents on frontline staff's perceptions of service recovery performance. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. 11(1), 63-90.
- Botschen, G. Thelen, E. M & Pieters, R. (1999). Using Means end structures for benefit segmentation. *European Journal of Marketing*. 33(1/2), 38-58.
- Brown, S. W. (2000). Practicing best-in-class service recovery *Marketing Management* 9,8-9.
- Casado, A., Nicolau, J. H., & Mas, F.L. (2011). The harmful consequences of failed recoveries in the banking industry. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 29(1), 32-49.
- Chebet, J. C. & Kollias, P. (2000). The impact of empowerment on customer contact employees' roles in service organizations. *Journal of service Research*, 3(1),66-81
- Choi, T. Y. & Chu, R. (2001). Determination of hotel guests satisfaction and repeat patronage in the Hong Kong hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 20, 277-297.
- Colgate, M. & Norris, M. (2001). Developing a comprehensive picture of service failure. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. 12 (3), 215-233.
- Brown, S. W. (2000). Practicing best-in-class service recovery *Marketing Management* 9,8-9.
- Casado, A., Nicolau, J. H., & Mas, F.L. (2011). The harmful consequences of failed recoveries in the banking industry. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 29(1), 32-49.
- Choi, T. Y. & Chu, R. (2001). Determination of hotel guests satisfaction and repeat patronage in the Hong Kong hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 20, 277-297.
- Colquitt, J. A. Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J. Porter, C.O.L.H. & Ng, K.Y (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta – analytic review of 25 years of organizational Justice research., *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Davidow, M. (2003). Organizational responses to customer complaint: What works and what doesn't. *Journal of service Research*, 5(3), 225-250.
- Dhar, R & Glazer, R. (2003). Hedging customers. *Harvard Business Review*. 81, 86-92.
- Duffy, J.M., Miller, J.M., & Bexley, J.B. (2006). Banking customers varied reactions to service recovery strategies. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 24(2), 112-132.
- Folger, R., Knovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 3,129-177.

- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (Eds.).(2005). Handbook of organizational justice. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gruber, I., Szmigin, I., & Voss, R. (2009). *Handling customer complaints effectively*. A comparison of the value maps of female and male counterparts. *Managing Service Quality*,19(6), 636-656.
- Gruber, T. (2011). I want to believe they really care: How complaining customers want to be treated by frontline employees. *Journal of Service Management*, 22 (9), 85-110.
- Gruberfirst, T. (2014). The complaint management process, published online at The Privacy Marketing Review: Retrieved from www.reppel.co.uk/irnages/pdf/the-complaint-management-process. [Accessed on 24th March 2017].
- Hart, C., W. L., Heskett, J. L., & Earl Saser, Jr. W. (1990). *The profitable art of service recovery*. Harvard Business Review. 68, 148-156.
- Heung, V. C. S., & Lam, T. (2003). Customer Complaint behaviour towards hotel restaurant service, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospital Management*. 15(5), 283-289.
- Homburg, C., & Furst, A. (2005). How organizational complaint handling drives customer loyalty: an analysis of the mechanistic and the organic approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 69, 95-114.
- Johnston, R., & Michel, S. (2008). Three outcomes of service recovery: Customer recovery, process recovery and employee recovery. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 28(1), 79-99.
- Kau, A.K., & Loh, E. (2006). The effects of service recovery on consumer satisfaction: a comparison between complainants and non-complainants, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(20) 101-111.
- Komunda, A, (2013). Customer complaint service recovery and behavioral intentions: Literature Review. *International Journal of Business and Behavioural Sciences*, 3(7), 1-26
- Maxham, M., & Netemeyer, R.G. (2003). Firms reap what they show: The effect of shared values and perceived organizational justice on customer's evaluations of complaint handling. *Journal of Marketing*, 67, 47-62.
- McCullough, 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
- Michael, B., & Menter, M. L. (2008). The service recovery paradox: true but overrated? *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 19(4), 441-457.
- Micheal, S., Bowen, S., & Johnson, R. (2009). Why service fails? Tensions among customer, employee and process perspective. *Journal of Service Management*, 20(3), 253-273.
- Ndibusi, N. O. & Ling T, Y. (2006). *Complaint behaviour of Malasiyan consumers Management Research News*. 29(1).65-76.
- Nibkin, D., Ishmail, I., Mairimuthu, M., & Jalakarnali, M. (2010). Perceived Justice in Service Recovery and Recovery Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Corporate Image, *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2(2), 47-56.
- Orsingher, C., Valentini, S., & De Angelis, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of satisfaction with complaint handling in services. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38(2), 169-186.
- Stauss, B. & Schoeler, A. (2004). Complaint management profitability: What do complaint manager know? *Managing Service Quality*. 14 (2/3), 147-156.
- Tax, S. S. & Brown, S.W. (2000). Service recovery: Research insights and practices of Swartz. T.A. and Lacobucci, D. (eds) in *Handbook of services Marketing and management* 271-6/85 Thousand Oaks, California. Sage production.

- Tronvoll, B. (2007). Complainer characteristics when exit is closed. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 18, 25-51.
- Tronvoll, B. (2012). A dynamic model of customer complaint behaviour from the perspective of service dominant logic. *European Journal of Marketing*. 46(2), 284-305.