

**Journal of Association of Arab Universities
for Tourism and Hospitality (JAAUTH)**journal homepage: <http://jaauth.journals.ekb.eg/>**The Effect of Perceived Justice Dimensions of Service Recovery on the Brand Image: Applied to Four- and Five-Star Hotels in Sharm El-Sheikh**Noura Hussien Galal Ahmed Emam Osman Elsayw Said Salama
Hotel management Department- Faculty of Tourism and Hotels- Suez Canal University**ARTICLE INFO****Keywords:**Service Recovery;
Perceived Justice;
distributive justice;
Procedural justice;
interactional justice;
Brand Image;
Egyptian Hotels.**(JAAUTH)**
Vol. 26 , No.1 ,
(2024),
pp.347 -361.**Abstract**

The research examines the impact of perceived justice dimensions of service recovery on customer perceptions of the Egyptian hotel brand image. A questionnaire was used to collect data from guests of four- and five-star hotels in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, which has the highest concentration of such businesses in the country. It collected 350 samples after eliminating 150 with incomplete responses, yielding an effective rate of 70%. Findings showed that customers' perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice significantly influence their hotel brand image. Interactional justice had a greater impact. It also found an effect of demographic differences in perceptions of the justice dimensions, with male customers more perceptive of distributive justice and female customers more perceptive of interactional justice. Age also impacts perceptions of the justice dimensions, with adults prioritizing fairness in service recovery rules and processes, while older customers appreciate fair treatment. Understanding customer needs helps hotel managers develop successful strategies for better service recovery outcomes and a positive hotel's image.

1. Introduction

Service recovery is a crucial management strategy in the service industry, aiming to improve customer relations and satisfaction, potentially leading to profitability through repurchase intentions (Kim et al., 2022; Ali et al., 2023). The goal of service recovery is to provide justice and fairness to dissatisfied customers (Liu et al., 2019), with justice referring to an individual's evaluation of the way they were treated as fair. Customers typically evaluate distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, each influenced by different service recovery strategies (Jareankiatbovorn, 2018) .

Implementing an effective service recovery strategy is also crucial for customer assessments of the service and its provider, as neglecting to respond can damage the brand's image (Liat et al., 2017). While customers' assessments of the fairness of recovery efforts lead to positive impressions and perceptions of service providers (Zaid et al., 2021). Brand image is a crucial strategy in hotel marketing, playing a significant role in positioning and setting a brand apart from its rivals (Çelikkol, 2020). It reduces risk perceptions and conveys quality assurance (Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018), impacting customer behavior and purchase decisions. Therefore, creating a desirable brand image is more crucial for services than

physical products, especially in an intensely competitive sector like the hospitality sector (Bakri et al., 2020). Consequently, a significant correlation between service recovery and brand image may be observed, and this correlation frequently dictates the success or failure of businesses (Mustafa et al., 2015; Zaid et al., 2021). However, brand image has been largely overlooked as a direct outcome in service recovery literature, particularly in the Egyptian hotel's context.

Furthermore, the literature review shows that the effects of justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactional) on the brand image are not all of the same relative importance (Mostafa et al., 2015). This inconsistency may be due to a variety of customer demographic characteristics (Fan et al., 2016), the most significant of which are gender and age, which are crucial factors for an effective recovery (Babin et al., 2021; Ali et al., 2023). Accordingly, evaluating perceived fairness in hotel brand image while considering these factors is an interesting research extension. It can assist specialists in developing successful recovery strategies based on customer needs and preferences that calm customer anger, restore satisfaction (Ali et al., 2023), and positively impact their perception of the hotel's image (Liat et al., 2017). In order to close this gap, we examine how the service recovery process has affected the brand's image while accounting for customer demographic variations. More particularly, this research aims to evaluate the perceived justice dimensions of service recovery on brand image while accounting for customer age and gender disparities.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

2.1 Service recovery

Service recovery is a crucial organizational technique to address issues, change customer attitudes, prevent negative word-of-mouth, and retain customers (Migacz et al., 2017). It involves providing service correctly the second time (Koc, 2017). Service failures in hospitality businesses can be costly, leading to negative emotional reactions (Ortiz et al., 2017) and damage to a hotel's image and reputation (Liat et al., 2017). Effective recovery requires suitable strategies, but ensuring justice in recovery efforts is crucial (Jin et al., 2019). Successful recovery can lower perceived risk and increase customer satisfaction; it can also lead to the service recovery paradox, where customers experience superior recovery performance and higher post-recovery satisfaction (Bakar, 2017; Kim et al., 2022).

2.2. Perceived Justice of service recovery

The justice theory, developed by Rawls in 1971, is a widely accepted concept in service recovery studies and is a strong predictor of post-recovery satisfaction (Etemad-Sajadi and Bohrer, 2019; Olson and Ro, 2020). It suggests that customers perceive injustice when services fail, but this perception decreases when recovery techniques are effectively used. The justice of the recovery process is crucial in determining consumer assessment for recovery techniques and is used to assess the success of recovery efforts (Ampong et al., 2021). Perceived justice refers to customers' sense of fairness towards the efforts taken by businesses to address their errors, which have been evaluated from three perspectives: distributive (fairness of outcome), procedural (fairness of processes), and interactional (fairness of interactions) (Jareankieatbovorn, 2018). Each service recovery strategy has a positive impact on perceived justice, with compensation having a positive impact on distributive justice (Chen and Kim, 2019), response having a positive impact on procedural justice (Olson and Ro, 2020), and the service provider's effort and apology having a positive impact on interactional justice (Liao et al., 2022). Fairness in recovery efforts boosts customer satisfaction, loyalty (Bakar, 2017), and behavioral intentions, making them more likely to return and recommend a business (Cai and Qu, 2018). as well as its impact on the

image of service providers (Liat et al., 2017; Zaid et al., 2021). However, the significance of justice dimensions in recovery results remains unclear, leading to a gap in the literature on what customers judge as a fair recovery, reflecting their diverse attitudes towards failure and recovery processes (Ayerterey and Okafor, 2024).

2.3 Brand Image

Brand image is a consumer's overall perception, beliefs, and ideas of a particular brand, as influenced by their rational or emotional perceptions (Mirzai et al., 2016). In other words, brand image reflects the way customers think about a brand and the thoughts that come to mind when they think about it (Ansary and Nik Hashim, 2018). Brand image is crucial for tourists' valuations of hospitality establishments due to its impact on their perceptions of quality, price, and satisfaction (Lee et al., 2017). Brand image can help differentiate hotels in the same star category (Sürücü et al., 2017) and significantly influence customer recommendations and purchase intentions in hotels (Çelikkol, 2020). It also benefits businesses by improving marketing campaigns (Ansary and Nik Hashim, 2018), market share, competitive edge (Mabkhot et al., 2017), and profitability (Dada, 2021). A brand's image is mostly shaped by the customer experience with the brand and the quality of service provided (Arshad, 2021; Dam and Dam, 2021). Thus, hotel businesses must manage service interactions and service quality to establish a strong image and ensure client satisfaction. To enhance their brand image, hotels aim to provide high-quality services or recovery procedures, as service recovery is crucial in customer assessments of the brand and its offerings (Liat et al., 2017)

2.4 Hypotheses Development

Brand image is a customer's mental representation of a brand, and effective management in service companies involves providing good service quality or recovery (Cheng, 2018; Liat et al., 2017). Studies show a positive correlation between the two concepts, with fair service recovery improving a brand's image (Mostafa et al., 2015; Liat et al., 2017; Zaid et al., 2021). Thus, perceived justice is crucial in building brand image, but the effects of justice dimensions vary. Nikbin et al. (2010) found distributive and interactional justice components to affect a business's image, while Mostafa et al. (2015) suggested interactional justice only impacts a business's image. Further, Zaid et al. (2021) found the brand's image is impacted by the three dimensions of justice, suggesting a perceived discrepancy in a brand's image through justice. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: The perceived justice dimensions have a positive impact on brand image

Hypothesis 1a: Distributive justice positively impacts brand image.

Hypothesis 1b: Procedural justice positively impacts brand image.

Hypothesis 1c: Interactional justice positively impacts brand image.

Customer responses to poor service encounters are influenced by both external and internal factors, including service failure mode and personal traits. Customer assessments of the recovery process may vary based on demographic characteristics (Fan et al., 2016). Recovery strategies and failure-related factors are important (Jeong and Lee, 2017; Shams et al., 2020), but differences among customers are less understood. Over 80% of customers remain dissatisfied with recovery attempts, suggesting that recovery success is conditional (Ma and Zhong, 2021). Gender plays a significant role in consumer behavior, particularly in service recovery research (Roschk et al., 2013). Men are less emotionally affected and more goal-oriented, while female customers prioritize interpersonal connections, leading to a

different focus on service delivery procedures (Ding et al., 2016). Thus, gender disparities affect assessments of the recovery process's justice.

Hypothesis 2: Gender differences influence customer perceptions of justice dimensions.

Hypothesis 2a: There is a significant difference in the estimation of distributive justice by gender.

Hypothesis 2b: There is a significant difference in the estimation of procedural justice by gender.

Hypothesis 2c: There is a significant difference in the estimation of interactional justice by gender.

Age is another significant impactor for customer assessments of the recovery process (Roschk et al., 2013), with younger age groups being easier to please than older ones. Older customers report stronger senses of justice (Varela-Neira et al., 2010), while younger customers are more affected by their cognitive conceptions of justice (Babin et al., 2021). Middle-aged people have a peak in distributive justice due to financial obligations, while early adulthood is critical for procedural justice issues (Roschk et al., 2013). As previously reported in the literature of service recovery, the following hypotheses are presented:

Hypothesis 3: Age differences influence customer perceptions of justice dimensions.

Hypothesis 3a: There is a significant difference in the estimation of distributive justice by age.

Hypothesis 3b: There is a significant difference in the estimation of procedural justice by age.

Hypothesis 3c: There is a significant difference in the estimation of interactional justice by age.

The research model is derived from the previous one, and the research variables and hypotheses are also explained.

3. Methodology

Data were gathered from guests staying at four- and five-star hotels in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, using a questionnaire. These hotels, which have the largest concentration in this area, were the focus of the study due to their reputation for providing excellent customer service, high-quality products, and a positive public image. Using a random sampling technique, 350 samples were collected after eliminating 150 incomplete responses, resulting in an effective rate of 70%. Factor analysis was used to examine reliability and validity (Cronbach's Alpha), as well as multiple regressions to find relationships between variables. A 5-point Likert's scale is employed to measure variables. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: demographics, perceived justice, and brand image. Perceived justice was assessed using the distributive justice (4 items), interactional justice (4 items), and procedural justice (4 items) scales that were adapted from Cheng (2018) and Mostafa et al. (2015). Whereas brand image (six questions) is adapted from Suhartanto (2011). Academic experts reviewed the questionnaire to ensure its clarity and usability, and a practice test was conducted to assess people's understanding and identify any issues. Changes were made to improve reliability and accuracy based on pretest suggestions.

4. Findings

4.1 Profile details of respondents

Table 1: Profile of respondents (N=350)

Profile of the Participants	Classification	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	151	43.1 %
	Female	199	56.9 %
Age	> 25	32	9.1 %
	25 >35	83	23.7 %
	35 > 45	88	25.1 %
	45 > 55	71	20.3 %
	< 55	76	21.7 %
Education	High School	96	27.4 %
	Bachelor	171	48.9 %
	Diploma	8	2.3 %
	Master	36	10.3 %
	PhD	39	11.1 %
Occupation	Self-employed	81	23.1 %
	Business Owner	53	15.1 %
	Government Officer	44	12.6 %
	Retired	38	10.9 %
	Student	20	5.7 %
	Housewife	61	17.4 %
	Others	53	15.1 %
Nationality	Egyptian	119	34.0 %
	Arabian	91	26.0 %
	Foreigner	140	40.0 %

As shown in Table 1, the majority of respondents were women (56.9%), with families being the primary visitors, which explains why the questionnaire received higher responses from women. The age range of respondents was 36–45 (25.1%), indicating that most were adult travelers. Most (48.9%) had bachelor's degrees. Self-employed individuals made up the largest percentages (23.1%). The majority (40%) were foreigners.

4.2 Reliability analysis

Table 2: The statement's reliability analysis

Study Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Validity coefficient	Items numbers
Brand Image	0.996	0.997	6
Distributive justice	0.978	0.988	4
Procedural justice	0.983	0.991	4
Interactional justice	0.996	0.997	4

Table 2 shows that the reliability coefficient for the scale is greater than 0.978, and the validity coefficient for the scale is higher than 0.991, which are acceptable values. It indicates the scale's validity and reliability and the possibility of relying on it in analyzing and evaluating data.

4.3 Descriptive Analysis of the Measurement Model

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of distributive, procedural, and interactional dimension and brand image

Research Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Independent variables (perceived justice)		
Distributive Justice		
The hotel manager offered appropriate compensation for the service failure	4.26	.868
The amount of compensation was adequate	4.23	.893
The compensation offered by the hotel met my expectations	4.26	.895
The compensation was offered in a sincere manner	4.36	.871
Total	4.2779	.85444
Procedural Justice		
I was allowed to express my problem	4.24	.905
The hotel had a proper procedure for recovering service failure	4.21	.930
The hotel staff provided me a proper explanation for service failure and recovery	4.20	.916
The hotel staff responded promptly to my problem	4.22	.952
Total	4.2179	.90260
Interactional Justice		
The hotel staff demonstrated appropriate concern about my problem	4.31	.975
The hotel staff are well-trained in handling service recovery	4.30	.968
The hotel provided proper efforts towards service recovery	4.32	.978
I am satisfied with the staff's overall treatment during service recover	4.31	.979
Total	4.3093	.96846
Dependent variable (Brand Image)		
This hotel has a good reputation	4.42	.995
This hotel is comfortable	4.43	.995
This hotel is luxurious for its category	4.37	.997
I feel special when staying at this hotel	4.39	.997
I feel this hotel suits my needs	4.41	.994
Compared to other hotels, this hotel has a unique image	4.36	.999
Total	4.395	.986

Table 3 shows that the responses to the distributive, procedural, and interactional justice items were in the direction of agreement. It shows that the mean of distributive justice ranges between ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.893$) and ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.871$), indicating that most hotel customers who experienced service failure received fair compensation. The mean of procedural justice ranges between ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.916$) and ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.905$), indicating that hotels follow fair procedures and policies in handling service failure and recovery cases. The mean of interactional justice ranges between ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.968$) and ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.978$), indicating customer satisfaction with hotel staff's treatment and

efforts to recover service. Overall, the study suggests that hotels make fair efforts in handling service failure and recovery cases.

The results indicate that the response to the brand image variable items also was in the direction of agreement. The results indicate that the item that states “This hotel is comfortable” is the highest in terms of approval ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.995$). The mean of responses ranges between ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.994$) and ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.999$), indicating that hotel guests have a positive image of them based on their comfortable stay.

4.4 Correlation Analysis

Table 4: Correlation analysis

		distributive	Procedural	Interactional
Brand image	Pearson Correlation	.736**	.763**	.844**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
distributive	Pearson Correlation	1	.584**	.621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
Procedural	Pearson Correlation		1	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.000

Following an analysis of the relationships between the study's variables, the study found a positive correlation between distributive justice ($r = 0.763^{**}$, $p = 0.000$), procedural justice ($r = 0.763^{**}$, $p = 0.000$), and interactional justice ($r = 0.844^{**}$, $p = 0.000$) in enhancing brand image. Therefore, hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c are confirmed (Table 4).

4.5 Regression Analysis

Table 5: Regression analysis

Dependent variable	Independent variables	R²	F	F Sig	beta β	t	sig
Brand Image	Distributive justice	0.806	478.576	0.000	0.346	9.649	.000
	Procedural justice				0.241	6.064	.000
	Interactional justice				0.503	13.117	.000

Regression analysis is the mathematical representation of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables, and can be categorized into simple regression analysis (single independent variable) and multiple regression analysis (multiple independent variables) (Sürücü *et al.*, 2019). Multiple regression analysis was used to assess for a significant relationship between perceived justice and brand image. This study was conducted to evaluate whether perceived justice substantially predicts brand image. Table 5 displays the effectiveness of the regression model that was used to represent the research findings. Explanatory factors for brand image variables included distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice variables. The model was shown to be significant, with the predictor accounting for 80.6% of the variance in brand image. The remaining 19.4% is explained by other predictor factors.

The specific influence of each variable on the dependent variable is ascertained by conducting a thorough regression analysis of coefficients (Table 5). The research found that distributive justice ($\beta = 0.346$, $p = 0.000$), procedural justice ($\beta = 0.241$, $p = 0.000$), and interactional justice ($\beta = 0.503$, $p = 0.000$) had a significant and positive effect on brand image. Hypothesis 1 is accepted in accordance with the findings. The findings align with Zaid's study (2021) that the brand image is directly positively influenced by all justice dimensions in service recovery. However, the findings contradict Mostafa *et al.*'s (2015)

research, which showed that distributive and procedural justice have an influence on a business's image through satisfaction as a mediator rather than having a substantial direct impact. The findings suggest that interactional justice has the greatest effect on the brand's image, consistent with Mostafa et al.'s (2015) study. Interestingly, this association is stronger than distributive justice. The researcher suggests that high-income guests of five- or four-star hotels may not require financial compensation for service failure, but rather value equitable treatment that leads to a rise in self-esteem, which can be achieved through interactional justice. Further, the majority of respondents were women, who have a distinct emotional nature compared to men, demonstrating a greater interest in fair treatment and positive attitudes towards organizations (Ali et al., 2023).

Table 6: Regression analysis after split data according to gender

	Dependent variable	Independent variables	R ²	F	F Sig	beta β	t	sig
Male	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.602	74.038	0.000	0.503	8.721	.000
		Procedural justice				0.168	2.741	.007
		Interactional justice				0.289	4.311	.000
Female	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.887	512.291	0.000	0.210	4.918	.000
		Procedural justice				0.259	5.252	.000
		Interactional justice				0.610	13.128	.000

Regression analysis was performed on the perceived justice dimensions and brand image in the hotel business, with gender-specific data division. The model was discovered to be important. Based on the data, men described 60.2% of the variation in these dimensions and brand image; their coefficient of determination (R²) was 0.602, whereas women explained 88.7% of the variation, with an R² value of 0.887. It suggests that the main predictors are women (Table 6).

The research discovered a positive correlation between gender, perceived justice dimensions, and brand image (Table 6). The results confirmed hypothesis 2a, indicating gender-related differences in the estimation of distributive justice, with males being more concerned ($\beta = 0.503$, $p < .000$). The results confirmed Hypothesis 2b, indicating gender-related differences in the estimation of procedural justice, with females being more concerned ($\beta = 0.259$, $p < .000$). The results confirmed Hypothesis 2c, indicating gender-related differences in the estimation of interactional justice, with females being more concerned ($\beta = 0.610$, $p < .000$). These findings align with previous research indicating that women are more sensitive to interactional and procedural justice, while men are more sensitive to distributive justice (Ding, 2016). This results in different focus on service delivery procedures, with female consumers prioritizing interpersonal connections and male customers prioritizing efficiency and quality. Compensation alone is not sufficient for women to recover from service failures (Ali et al., 2023).

Table 7: Regression analysis after split data according to age

	Dependent variable	Independent variables	R ²	F	F Sig	beta β	t	sig
> 25	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.551	11.456	0.000	.267	3.219	.003
		Procedural justice				.133	1.857	.074
		Interactional justice				.047	.587	.562
25>35	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.895	224.885	0.000	.302	5.296	.000
		Procedural justice				.234	2.972	.004
		Interactional justice				.558	8.402	.000
35>45	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.881	206.713	0.000	.085	1.169	.246
		Procedural justice				.547	7.641	.000
		Interactional justice				.455	6.183	.000
45>55	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.762	71.698	0.000	.575	7.192	.000
		Procedural justice				.097	1.155	.252
		Interactional justice				.370	4.517	.000
< 55	Brand Image	Distributive justice	.744	69.789	0.000	.365	4.556	.000
		Procedural justice				.072	.787	.434
		Interactional justice				.646	6.920	.000

Regression analysis was performed on the perceived justice dimensions and brand image in the hotel business, with age-specific data division (Table 7). The model was discovered to be important. Customer under 25 described 55.1% of the variation in these dimensions and brand image; their coefficient of determination (R²) was 0.551, whereas customers aged 25-35 explained 89.5% of the variation, with an R² value of 0.895. customers aged 35-45 explained 88.1% of the variation, with an R² value of .881. customers aged 45-55 explained 76.2% of the variation, with an R² value of .762. customers over 55 explained 74.4% of the variation, with an R² value of .744.

The research found a significant positive relationship between most age groups, perceived justice dimensions (distributive, procedural, and interactive), and brand image (Table 7). Age groups under 25 ($\beta = 0.267$, $p < .003$), 25-35 ($\beta = 0.302$, $p < .000$), 45-55 ($\beta = 0.575$, $p < .000$), and over 55 ($\beta = 0.365$, $p < .000$) showed a positive relationship with distributive justice. However, there was no significant relationship between age groups 35-45 ($\beta = 0.085$, $p < .246$) and distributive justice. Adult age groups 45-55 ($\beta = 0.575$, $p < .000$) and above 55 ($\beta = 0.365$, $p < .000$) showed higher explanatory power for distributive justice, indicating age-related differences in the estimation of distributive justice, with age groups over 45 being more concerned about it. Therefore, hypothesis 3a is confirmed.

The finding also reveals a significant positive relationship between age groups under 25 ($\beta = 0.133$, $p < .074$), 25-35 ($\beta = 0.234$, $p < .004$), and 35-45 ($\beta = 0.547$, $p < .000$) and procedural justice. However, there is no significant relationship between age groups 45-55 ($\beta = 0.097$, $p < .252$) and over 55 ($\beta = 0.072$, $p < .434$) and procedural justice (table 12). It had a stronger explanatory power when applied to the age range of 35-45 ($\beta = 0.547$, $p < .000$), indicating age-related differences in the estimation of procedural justice, with the adult group 35-45 being more concerned about it (Table 7). Therefore, hypothesis 3b is confirmed.

When it came to interactional justice, there was a strong positive link between age groups 25-35 ($\beta = 0.558$, $p < .000$), 35-45 ($\beta = 0.455$, $p < .000$), 45-55 ($\beta = 0.370$, $p < .000$), and over 55 ($\beta = 0.646$, $p < .000$). However, there was no significant link between interactional justice and brand image and age groups under 25 ($\beta = 0.047$, $p < .562$). However, when applying interactional justice to the age range of 25-35 ($\beta = 0.558$, $p < .000$) and over 55 ($\beta = 0.646$, $p < .000$).

<.000), its explanatory power was higher, indicating age-related differences in the estimation of interactional justice, with older groups being more concerned about it (Table 7). Therefore, hypothesis 3c is confirmed.

The finding supports Roschk et al.'s (2013) research that the effects of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice differ across different age groups of customers. However, it contradicts Tektaş's (2016) findings that age does not affect justice perceptions. The findings imply that hotel management should handle customers differently during service recovery due to differences in age demands. The results suggest that given that age expectations vary, hotel management should treat customers differently during service recovery. Strategies specific to each category can ensure guest satisfaction and enhance their impression of the hotel.

5. Discussion, implication and future research

5.1 Discussion

The research explores the impact of perceived justice dimensions on hotel brand image, focusing on distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. The findings conclude that every dimension of justice, including fair treatment during recovery (interactional justice), fair standards in decision-making (procedural justice), and equitable compensation (distributive justice), increases customers' positive perceptions of hotels, with interactional justice having a stronger impact on brand image. Hence, the findings lend support to the idea that different justice aspects have different effects on recovery outcomes (Ding et al., 2016). Thus, prioritizing fair treatment of front-line staff is crucial, as it significantly impacts customer perceptions of interactional justice, recovery processes, and hotel image. The researcher suggests some reasons for the dominance of interactional justice in predicting brand image, including the possibility that the findings are unique to the hotel sector, which is known for its high volume of interpersonal interactions and the ingrained perceptions of interactional justice (Nikbin et al., 2010).

The results could also be explained by the characteristics of the respondents; the majority were women, and because of their emotional nature, they are more likely to value equitable treatment (Ali et al., 2023). Interactional justice's considerable impact on hotel image is also highlighting the value of human skills in service contexts. By stressing apology, explanation, and courtesy as effective service recovery tactics for creating a positive hotel's image (Mostafa et al., 2015). It was also found that customers' responses to justice dimensions vary based on their demographic traits. Male customers perceive distributive justice more, while female customers prefer interactional justice. Thus, compensation alone is not sufficient for women to recover from service failures, but it is more effective for male customers as stated by Ali et al. (2023). Older people express a stronger appreciation for equitable treatment, followed by monetary compensation in service recovery. Adults focus more on the fairness of rules and processes of service recovery, followed by fair treatment. To ensure the recovery process's effectiveness, these variances must be considered when designing service recovery strategies to meet the specific demands of each customer.

5.2 Research Implications

The research offers theoretical advances in service recovery, revealing that all aspects of justice influence brand image perceptions, which supports the three-dimensional framework earlier studies (Cai and Qu, 2018; Cheng et al., 2018) proposed. In addition, it provides evidence for the variation in the relative significance of justice aspects on the outcomes of recovery. The results also highlight the impact of demographic traits on perceived justice and brand image, with the recovery performance of justice dimensions varying across customer

demographic characteristics. The findings of this research support the notion that the success of service recovery is linked to external factors such as customer traits (Fan et al., 2016).

Additionally, the research has practical implications, stating that maintaining a pleasant customer experience and positive perceptions towards service providers in the hotel industry require efficient handling of complaints and service recovery tactics. Hotel management should adopt a new perspective and consider service failure as a serious risk management concern. To achieve fairness, hotels should establish equitable norms and practices in distributive, procedural, and interactional aspects of justice. Offering flexibility in compensation choices, expediting processes, and promptly responding to service failures can improve customer perceptions of fairness. Interactional fairness has the most significant impact on customer perceptions, so management should emphasize treating customers fairly during the recovery process. Additionally, hotel management should consider customer age and gender differences when handling customers who have experienced failure. Psychological compensation, such as care and empathy, can improve women's recovery experiences. Male customers are more goal-oriented and less emotional, making monetary compensation more effective. Older people prioritize interactional justice, while adults prioritize problem-solving speed and flexibility. Distributive justice is more appreciated by young people under 25, highlighting the need for monetary compensation. Hotel management must consider the unique demands of each guest for a fair recovery and a positive image, and empowering staff with behavior-based rewards for quick recovery and customized compensation.

5.3 Limitations and Future research

The research faced challenges such as poor responses from hotel guests, insufficient cooperation from hotel managers, potential survey record mistakes, and replay biases. The research's specific methodology and service context may limit its generalizability to other industries. Further research should consider alternative approaches from complementary viewpoints. There are several suggestions for further research. Reliable findings require a time interval between failure incidents and evaluations, and captured answers during failure can enhance accuracy, as emotions and severity of failure affect perceptions of the fairness of service recovery. Cultural factors may also influence perceived fairness dimensions and hotel brand image, since it has been stated that recovery efforts depend on cultural factors (Chebat et al., 2020; Ampong et al., 2021). Additionally, first-time and recurring consumers have different expectations for service recovery depending on the quality of their previous relationships with service providers (Chen and Kim, 2019), which may act as a moderator between perceived justice dimensions and hotel brand image.

References

- Ali, M. A., Ting, D. H., Isha, A. S. N., Ahmad-Ur-Rehman, M., & Ali, S. (2023). Does service recovery matter? Relationships among perceived recovery justice, recovery satisfaction and customer affection and repurchase intentions: the moderating role of gender. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 17(2), 308-326.
- Ampong, G.O.A., Abubakari, A., Mohammed, M., Appaw-Agbola, E.T., Addae, J.A. and Ofori, K.S. (2021), "Exploring customer loyalty following service recovery: a replication study in the Ghanaian hotel industry", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. 639-657.
- Ansary, A., & Hashim, N. M. H. N. (2018). Brand image and equity: the mediating role of brand equity drivers and moderating effects of product type and word of mouth. *Review of Managerial Science*, 12(4), 969–1002.

- Arshad, M. (2021). The key determinants of service quality strategies that improve the brand image of hotels in the UK (Doctoral dissertation, University of the West of Scotland).
- Ayertey, S., Okafor, S. (2024). Customer-Brand Interactions and Service Failure Recovery. In: Ozuem, W., Ranfagni, S., Willis, M. (eds) Digital Transformation for Fashion and Luxury Brands. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Babin, B. J., Zhuang, W., & Borges, A. (2021). Managing service recovery experience: effects of the forgiveness for older consumers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 58, 102222.
- Bakar, S. Z. (2017). Service Recovery in E-Services: Service Recovery Process, Perceived Justice and Satisfaction (Order No. 10266611). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1945973079).
- Bakri, M., Krisjanous, J., & Richard, J. E. (2020). Decoding service brand image through user-generated images. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 34(4), 429–442.
- Cai, R., & Qu, H. (2018). Customers' perceived justice, emotions, direct and indirect reactions to service recovery: Moderating effects of recovery efforts. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 27(3), 323–345.
- Çelikkol, Ş. (2020). Brand Image and Brand Trust's Effect on Brand Loyalty: A Study in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 8(4), 2478-2490.
- Chakraborty, U., & Bhat, S. (2018). Credibility of online reviews and its impact on brand image. *Management Research Review*, 41(1), 148–164.
- Chebat, E., Roth, Y., & Chebat, J. C. (2020). How culture moderates the effects of justice in service recovery. *Review of Marketing Science*, 18(1), 21-41.
- Chen, P., & Kim, Y. G. (2019). Role of the perceived justice of service recovery: A comparison of first-time and repeat visitors. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(1), 98-111.
- Cheng, B. L., Gan, C. C., Imrie, B. C., & Mansori, S. (2018). Service recovery, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty: evidence from Malaysia's hotel industry. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 11(2), 187–203.
- Çelikkol, Ş. (2020). Brand Image and Brand Trust's Effect on Brand Loyalty: A Study in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 8(4), 2478-2490.
- Dada, M. H. (2021). Impact of brand association, brand image & brand loyalty on brand equity. *Journal of Marketing Strategies*, 3(1), 29-43.
- Dam, S. M., & Dam, T. C. (2021). Relationships between Service Quality, Brand Image, Customer Satisfaction, and Customer Loyalty. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(3), 585–593.
- Ding, M. C., Ho, C. W., & Lii, Y. S. (2016). What men and women really want: differences in gender-based evaluations of service recovery efforts. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 17(1), 59-80.
- Etemad-Sajadi, R., & Bohrer, L. (2019). The impact of service recovery output/process on customer satisfaction and loyalty: The case of the airline industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(2), 259–266.

- Fan, A., Wu, L., & Mattila, A. S. (2018). Gender differences in the intentions to voice complaints across different service failure modes. *Journal of foodservice business research*, 21(1), 22-32.
- Jareankieatbovorn, N. (2018). Customer perceptions of service failure, service recovery and loyalty recovery: An investigation into the airline industry (Doctoral dissertation, Brunel University London).
- Jeong, M. & Lee, S.A. (2017), "Do customers care about types of hotel service recovery efforts? An example of consumer-generated review sites", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 5-18.
- Jin, D., Nicely, A., Fan, A., & Adler, H. (2019). Joint effect of service recovery types and times on customer satisfaction in lodging. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 149–158.
- Kim, J. H., Du, W., & Youn, H. (2022). Revisiting the service recovery paradox in the restaurant industry. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 34(3), 437-453.
- Koc, E. (2017). Service failures and recovery in tourism and hospitality: a practical manual. In CABI eBooks.
- Lee, S., Oh, H., & Hsu, C. H. (2017). Country-of-operation and brand images: evidence from the Chinese hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(7), 1814–1833.
- Liao, Y. K., Wu, C. Y., Truong, G. N. T., & Do, Y. T. (2022). The Roles of Service Recovery and Perceived Justice on Post-Recovery Satisfaction in M-Commerce. *Sustainability*, 14(22), 14838.
- Liat, C. B., Mansori, S., Chuan, G. C., & Imrie, B. C. (2017). Hotel Service Recovery and Service Quality: Influences of Corporate Image and Generational Differences in the Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 30(1), 42–51.
- Liu, H., Jayawardhena, C., Dibb, S., & Ranaweera, C. (2019). Examining the trade-off between compensation and promptness in eWOM-triggered service recovery: A restorative justice perspective. *Tourism Management*, 75, 381-392.
- Ma, K. and Zhong, X. (2021), "Moral judgment and perceived justice in service recovery", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 574-588.
- Mabkhot, H. A., Shaari, H., & Salleh, S. M. (2017). The influence of brand image and brand personality on brand loyalty, mediating by brand trust: an empirical study. *Jurnal Pengurusan UKM Journal of Management*, 50.
- Migacz, S., Zou, S., & Petrick, J. F. (2017). The “Terminal” Effects of Service Failure on Airlines: Examining Service Recovery with Justice Theory. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(1), 83–98.
- Mirzai, A., Fard, Y. S., & Slambolchi, A. (2016). The branding: a study of brand image, brand associations and reputation. *Advanced Social Humanities and Management*, 3(1), 52-64.
- Mostafa, R. B., Lages, C. R., Shabbir, H. A., & Thwaites, D. (2015). Corporate image: A service recovery perspective. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(4), 468-483.

- Nikbin, D., Ismail, I., Marimuthu, M., & Jalalkamali, M. (2010). Perceived justice in service recovery and recovery satisfaction: the moderating role of corporate image. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2(2).
- Olson, E. D., & Ro, H. (2020). Company Response to Negative Online Reviews: The Effects of Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, and Social Presence. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 61(3), 312-331.
- Ortiz, J., Chiu, T., Chih, W., & Hsu, C. (2017). Perceived justice, emotions, and behavioral intentions in the Taiwanese food and beverage industry. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 28(4), 437–463.
- Roschk, H. , Müller, J. and Gelbrich, K. (2013), “Age matters: How developmental stages of adulthood affect customer reaction to complaint handling efforts”, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* , Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 154-164.
- Shams, G., Rehman, M. A., Samad, S., & Rather, R. A. (2020). The impact of the magnitude of service failure and complaint handling on satisfaction and brand credibility in the banking industry. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 25(1), 25–34.
- Suhartanto, D. (2011). An examination of brand loyalty in the Indonesian hotel industry (Doctoral dissertation, Lincoln University).
- Sürücü, Ö., Öztürk, Y., Okumus, F., & Bilgihan, A. (2019). Brand awareness, image, physical quality and employee behavior as building blocks of customer-based brand equity: Consequences in the hotel context. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 40, 114-124.
- Varela-Neira, C., Vázquez-Casielles, R., & Iglesias, V. (2010). The effects of customer age and recovery strategies in a service failure setting. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 15, 32-48.
- Zaid, S., Palilati, A., Madjid, R., & Bua, H. (2021). Impact of service recovery, customer satisfaction, and corporate image on customer loyalty. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 961–970.



تأثير أبعاد العدالة المدركة لمعالجة أخطاء الخدمة في الصورة الذهنية للعلامة التجارية: بالتطبيق على فنادق الأربع والخمس نجوم في شرم الشيخ

نورا حسين جلال أحمد امام عثمان الصاوى سعيد سلامة
قسم إدارة الفنادق - كلية السياحة والفنادق - جامعة قناة السويس

المخلص

تتناول الدراسة تأثير أبعاد العدالة المدركة لمعالجة اخطاء الخدمة في تصورات العملاء لصورة العلامة التجارية للفنادق المصرية. تم استخدام استبانة لجمع البيانات من نزلاء الفنادق ذات الأربع والخمس نجوم في مدينة شرم الشيخ، مصر، التي تستحوذ على أعلى تركيزاً من تلك الفنادق. تم جمع ٣٥٠ عينة بعد استبعاد ١٥٠ ذات إجابات غير مكتملة، مما أسفر عن معدل استجابة فعال بنسبة ٧٠٪. أظهرت النتائج أن تصورات العملاء حول العدالة التوزيعية والإجرائية والتفاعلية تؤثر بشكل كبير على صورة العلامة التجارية للفنادق. وكان للعدالة التفاعلية التأثير الأكبر. لقد وجد ايضا تأثيراً للاختلافات الديموغرافية للعملاء في تقييماتهم لابعاد العدالة، حيث أن العملاء الذكور أكثر إدراكاً للعدالة التوزيعية والعملاء الإناث أكثر إدراكاً للعدالة التفاعلية. ويؤثر العمر أيضاً على تصورات عدالة جهود التعافي، حيث يعطي البالغون الأولوية للعدالة في قواعد وعمليات استرداد الخدمة، بينما يقدر العملاء الأكبر سناً المعاملة العادلة. .يساعد فهم احتياجات العملاء مديري الفنادق على تطوير استراتيجيات ناجحة لتحقيق نتائج أفضل لاستعادة الخدمة، مما يؤدي إلى صورة ذهنية إيجابية للفنادق.

معلومات المقالة

الكلمات المفتاحية

استرداد الخدمة؛
العدالة التوزيعية؛
العدالة الإجرائية؛
العدالة التفاعلية؛
صورة العلامة
التجارية؛
الفنادق المصرية.

(JAAUTH)

المجلد ٢٦، العدد ١،
(٢٠٢٤)،
ص ٣٤٧-٣٦١.