

# *A Comparative Study of the Perception of Clients and Service Providers in the Areas of Service Recovery in Human Capital Market*

**Key words:** *Recruitment, Relationship Quality, Service Quality, Relationship Marketing, Service Recovery.*

**Amitabha Gupta\* and Arup Kumar Baksi\*\***

## **ABSTRACT**

With the best service organizations, failures can happen – may be due to the fact that service not available as expected, it may be delivered too late or too fast or employees may be not courteous. These service failures develop negative experiences. If not fixed they can lead to customers leaving, bad mouthing about the services or even going to consumer courts. It has been seen that resolving the problems effectively has a very positive impact on the customer satisfaction and loyalty. Customers who experience service failures but the same has been fixed by the service providers as soon as possible then the loyalty level of the customers got increased. It has been identified that customers who are dissatisfied, but experience excellent service recovery, usually be more satisfied and more prone to repeat purchase than are those who are satisfied at the first place. It has been found that a customer give more importance on their recent service quality experiences in their decision for repeat purchase. Service Recovery plays a very important role in maintaining and improving

customer satisfaction and human capital market is not an exception. HR Service Industry in India is there for around more than three decades. Service Sectors were not great contributors to Indian GDP in pre-linearization era. But post 1991 Service Industry started gaining higher pie in the Indian GDP. IT/ITES Industry was the major contributor in such growth. However, HR Service Industry were not playing a big role in such growth mainly because of the Brick and Mortar Style traditional service delivery system as compared to the highly matured other service sectors playing globally like IT and ITES Industry. The primary focus of this study is identifying the probable impact of Relationship Quality on various service quality parameters and thereby on perceived service quality of the customers in the context of HR services and in the process develops measurement constructs both for service quality parameters and perceived service quality with specific fit to HR service operations in the recruitment domain. In this paper the authors have tried identify the factors that affect the Service Recovery Process in the HR Service Industry specifically in the Recruitment Industry.

*\*Research Scholar, Department of Management & Business Administration, Aliah University, Kolkata, West Bengal  
E-mail: hr.amitabha@gmail.com*

*\*\*Associate Professor, Department of Management & Business Administration, Aliah University, Kolkata, West Bengal  
E-mail: baksi.arup@gmail.com*

## INTRODUCTION

Service transactions are typified with uncertainty and risk. This triggers a risk-aversion attitude in both buyer and seller which makes the dyad extremely complex to interpret. The quantum of non-monitory cost involved in accessing services makes it a lesser switch-prone industry and hence the relationship inertia sets in. But, unlike product market, the relationship in service market is multilayered. Research, thus far, has only focused on a static layer of relationship with an assumption that service transactions are successful at every instance. But given the high probability of failure due to unpredictable and non-standardized human interactions, the relationships are expected to be dynamic with recovery initiatives apprehended to inflict a major buffering or a magnifying impact on the quality of relationship. Existing models of relationship quality, namely, RELQUAL, fails to explain such dynamicity and it is inadequate to explain service recovery paradox too.

The relatively recent emergence of the relationship-marketing paradigm in modern marketing consolidates the increasing importance given by marketing academics to managing, developing and evaluating relationships (Berry, 1995; Payne et al., 1995; Sheth and Parvatiyar, 1992, 1995). Within this paradigm, the topic of relationship quality has stimulated a profuse production of scientific publications. Although previous literature has measured relationship quality between service firms and their customers (Roberts et al., 2003), between manufacturers/suppliers and distributors/resellers (Dorsch et al., 1998; Kumar et al., 1992, 1995) and between salespeople and customers (Bejouet al., 1996), there is no tested scale for its dynamicity in service aspects, particularly, considering the failure prone nature of service transactions triggered by extreme heterogeneity, non-standardization and intensive human interaction. There is a recent study which shows no support to recovery paradox. It shows the overall satisfaction was consistently lower for those customers who had experienced a service failure than for those who had experienced no failure, no matter what the recovery effort is. The explanation for why no recovery paradox is suggested by the magnitude of the service failure in this study it is-a three hour airplane flight delay. This type of failure may be too much to be overcome by any recovery effort. Considering mixed opinions on if recovery paradox exists it is safe to say "doing it right the first time" is the best and safest strategy. When a failure does occur then every effort at superior recovery should be made. In cases where the failure can be fully overcome the failure is less critical, or the recovery effort is clearly superlative, it may be possible to observe evidence of the recovery paradox.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Many researchers in services marketing have suggested that the quality of a customer-organization relationship affects customers' responses to service failures (Berry 1995; Goodman et al., 1995; Kelley and Davis 1994). Some propose that customer relationships provide an important buffer to service firms when service failures occur, resulting in less customer dissatisfaction. Berry (1995) suggested that customers may exhibit greater tolerance for failures when service personalization and customization lead to social relationships with the service provider (e.g., regular communications, continuity with the same employee, name recognition, and service augmentation). Ronald et al (2011) focused on customers' expectation of relationship continuity and observed that service recovery (following a perceived service failure) either acts as a buffer or magnify the impact of recovery on relationship quality, something which is closely related to service recovery paradox. This relationship quality is also expected to be affected with customers' service recovery expectations. Customers' service recovery expectations are customers' beliefs about the level of reparation that is appropriate after a service failure (Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman 1993). Ronald et al (2011) found that customers' service recovery expectations are significantly affected by (a) severity of the failure, (b) customers' causal attributions regarding the failure, and (c) customers' expectations of relationship continuity. The dynamic nature of service transactions can be attributed to high probability of service failures and subsequent recovery initiatives. According to previous studies, build-up and decay impacts are modelled by impulse-response function (IRF) in dynamic models. Build-up means the increasing impact before IRF reaches its peak impact point, while decay refers to the decreasing impact over time from the peak impact point to zero (Bronnenberg et al. 2008; Pauwels and Hanssens 2007). Other studies have proposed 'persistence' or 'dynamic' erosion effects (Bronnenberg et al., 2009; Bronnenberg et al., 2000) and an adjusting period (Pauwels et al, 2002) or dust-settling period (Nijs et al. 2011) are likely to influence the recovery process. The causal attributions, such as, stability attribution and controllability (Ronald, 2011) A summary of service recovery variables and its dynamic effects are tabulated in Table-1.

**Table 1 - Service Recovery Variables and Expected Dynamic Effects**

Variables		Probable dynamic effects on relationship quality	
Quality of Past Service Performance	Smith and Bolton (2002), Wirtz and Mattila (2004), Harris et al.(2006), Grewal et al. (2008)	Long Decay	Build-up Magnitude
Customers' Expectations of Relationship Continuity	Bronnenberg et. al., 2000, Pauwels, Hanssens, and Siddarth 2002, Ronald, 2011		
Attributions of Stability	Bronnenberg et. al., 2000, Pauwels et al (2002), Ronald, 2011		
Attributions of Controllability	Fang et al (2012), Ronald, (2011)		
Compensation	Fang et al (2012), Ronald, (2011)		
Communication	Fang et al (2012), Ronald, (2011)		

**RATIONALE OF THE STUDY**

Service transactions are typified with uncertainty and risk. This triggers a risk-aversion attitude in both buyer and seller which makes the dyad extremely complex to interpret. The quantum of non-monitory cost involved in accessing services makes it a lesser switch-prone industry and hence the relationship inertia sets in. But, unlike product market, the relationship in service market is multilayered. Research, thus far, has only focused on a static layer of relationship with an assumption that service transactions are successful at every instance. But given the high probability of failure due to unpredictable and non-standardized human interactions, the relationships are expected to be dynamic with recovery initiatives apprehended to inflict a major buffering or a magnifying impact on the quality of relationship. Existing models of relationship quality, namely, RELQUAL, fails to explain such dynamicity and it is inadequate to explain service recovery paradox too. So it is of high importance to understand if there is any differences exists among the perceptions regarding the

Service Recovery Variables between the Clients and the Service Providers in the HR Service Industry (Recruitment Domain).

**METHODOLOGY**

- The Customers of HR Services (In this paper only Recruitment Services) i.e. HR professionals involved into hiring process are the best source of getting the exact data to explore the research problem.
- The authors have surveyed total 47 HR Professionals (Clients) of Kolkata from various industries like IT, ITES, BPO, Startups etc.
- The authors have also surveyed 20 HR Consultants (Service Providers from Kolkata).
- Sample Size-1 (Client): 47
- Sample Size-2 (Service Provider): 20
- The authors have taken a 5 Point Likert Scale to construct the questionnaire with 1=Strongly Disagree and 5= Strongly Agree

**Variables for Measuring Service Recovery**

Variable	Items
Quality of Past Service Performance	Past Service Performance Service Recovery Performance Rewards
Customers' Expectations of Relationship Continuity	Employee training Employee empowerment Teams
Attributions of Stability	Dependability Consistency Continuity
Attribution of Controllability	Perceived Controllability Behavioral Intentions Technological Control

Variable	Items
Compensation	Strategic Compensation Appropriate Compensations Service Continuity
Communication	Candid Communication Involving Clients Recovery Process Communication

- 47 HR professionals and 20 HR Service Providers have been surveyed to explore relationship between Service Recovery and Perception of Service Quality of the Recruitment Service Providers. 18 Questions were asked.
- Null Hypothesis : There is no significant difference between Client and Service Provider’s perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market.
- Alternative Hypothesis: There is significant difference between Client and Service Provider’s perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market.

1. To identify the differences in the opinion between the Service Providers and the Clients regarding the impact of the identified variables of Service Recovery in the Service Recovery Process.
2. Identification of the most Significant Variables to be taken care off by the Service Providers to ensure efficient Service Recovery in case of any Service Failure in the HR Service Industry (Recruitment Vertical).

Our Null Hypothesis is there is no significant difference between Client and Service Provider’s perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Objectives: Our Major Objectives are:

Here in this study the authors have used Mean Square Comparison Method in SPSS to identify the P-Value to test the significance level.

**Table 2 - Mean Square Comparison**

Mean	GROUP				
	CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	Total	P Value	Significance
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Satisfactory Past Service Experience help to recover any Service Failure	4.11	3.85	4.03	0.154	Not Significant
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Efforts of the Service Providers to Recover Service Failure is a positive factor to manage future Service Failure	4.11	4.05	4.09	0.744	Not Significant
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Rewards for past Service Failure have a positive effect on the future Service Failure	3.80	3.65	3.76	0.429	Not Significant
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Quality Employee Training Service Recovery Initiatives have a positive effect on future Service Failure Recovery.	4.11	4.35	4.18	0.293	Not Significant
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Employee Empowerment in handling Service Failure have a positive impact on the Recovery of Future Service Failure.	3.94	3.25	3.73	0.008	Significant

Mean	GROUP				
	CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	Total	P Value	Significance
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): A Well Defined and Trained Service Recovery Team always plays an important role in handling future Service Failure.	4.26	3.80	4.12	0.136	Not Significant
(Attribution of Stability): Consistent Efforts from the Service Providers to handle Service Failure create a Sense of Stability in the mind of the Clients.	4.04	4.05	4.04	0.954	Not Significant
(Attribution of Stability): Service Continuity even in Case of Service Failure give the Clients a sense of Stability	3.93	3.25	3.73	0.009	Significant
(Attribution of Control-ability): If Clients have a perceived Control over the situation during a Service Failure then it has a positive impact on the future service failure recovery.	3.57	3.25	3.48	0.277	Not Significant
(Attribution of Control-ability): Positive Behavioral Intentions of the Service Providers During Service Failure Recovery Initiative plays an important role future service failure recovery	4.04	3.40	3.85	0.016	Significant
(Attribution of Control-ability): If the Clients have direct control through Technological Platforms during Service Failure Recovery Process that will have positive impact future similar instances	4.13	3.35	3.90	0.014	Significant
(Compensation): Strategic Compensation to the clients during an Service Failure have a positive impact in maintaining Loyalty of the Clients.	4.09	3.75	3.99	0.358	Not Significant
(Compensation): Appropriate Compensation can ensure Service Continuity during any Service Failure	4.11	4.20	4.13	0.392	Not Significant
(Compensation): Compensation has a positive impact on any Service Recovery Initiatives	3.94	3.90	3.93	0.696	Not Significant
(Communication): Proper Candid Communication during any service failure can maintain trust among the Clients	4.19	2.70	3.75	0.000	Significant
(Communication): Involving Clients in the Recovery Process can have a positive effects during Future Service Failure Situations.	3.89	4.67	4.11	0.007	Significant
(Communication): Recovery Process Communication in every stages can help to maintain client's loyalty during any Service Failure	4.21	3.30	3.94	0.000	Significant

The lower the P-Value The More the value is significant means in those cases the Null Hypothesis is not accepted and alternative Hypothesis is accepted.

In the above Mean Square Comparison in Table-2, there are 7 instances where the P-Value is significant.

It indicates that in the identified instances, There is significant difference between Client and Service Provider’s perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market.

In the following Variables there are considerable differences in opinion between the Clients and the Service Providers:

- Candid Communication
- Involving Clients
- Recovery Process Communication
- Behavioral Intentions
- Technological Control
- Continuity

**Teams**

Crosstab or Cross Tabulation is used to aggregate and jointly display the distribution of two or more variables by tabulating their results one against the other in 2-dimensional grids. In this Study the Authors have used Crosstab in SPSS to display the Client Perception and Service Provider Perception on different Service Recovery Variables in a Single Comparative Tab.

In order to further analyze the differences between the Service Provider and the Clients Regarding their opinions about the different Service Recovery Variables, the Authors have further conducted Chi-Square Test Using SPSS. The Results of the same have been described below:

(Quality of Past Service Experience): Satisfactory Past Service Experience help to recover any Service Failure

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Satisfactory Past Service Experience help to recover any Service Failure	Disagree	1 2.2%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Neutral	12 26.1%	4 20.0%	16 24.2%
	Agree	14 30.4%	15 75.0%	29 43.9%
	Strongly Agree	19 41.3%	1 5.0%	20 30.3%
	Total	46 100.0%	20 100.0%	66 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	13.011	0.005

(Quality of Past Service Experience): Efforts of the Service Providers to Recover Service Failure is a positive factor to manage future Service Failure

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Efforts of the Service Providers to Recover Service Failure is a positive factor to manage future Service Failure	Disagree	2 4.3%	3 15.0%	5 7.6%
	Neutral	7 15.2%	4 20.0%	11 16.7%
	Agree	21 45.7%	2 10.0%	23 34.8%
	Strongly Agree	16 34.8%	11 55.0%	27 40.9%
	Total	46 100.0%	20 100.0%	66 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	8.756	0.033

(Quality of Past Service Experience): Rewards for past Service Failure have a positive effect on the future Service Failure

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Quality of Past Service Experience): Rewards for past Service Failure have a positive effect on the future Service Failure	Strongly Disagree	1 2.2%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Disagree	5 10.9%	0 0.0%	5 7.6%
	Neutral	12 26.1%	12 60.0%	24 36.4%
	Agree	12 26.1%	3 15.0%	15 22.7%
	Strongly Agree	16 34.8%	5 25.0%	21 31.8%
	Total	46 100.0%	20 100.0%	66 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	8.191	0.085

(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Quality Employee Training Service Recovery Initiatives have a positive effect on future Service Failure Recovery.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Quality Employee Training Service Recovery Initiatives have a positive effect on future Service Failure Recovery.	Disagree	2 4.3%	0 0.0%	2 3.0%
	Neutral	12 26.1%	6 30.0%	18 27.3%
	Agree	11 23.9%	1 5.0%	12 18.2%
	Strongly Agree	21 45.7%	13 65.0%	34 51.5%
	Total	46 100.0%	20 100.0%	66 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	4.703	0.195

(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Employee Empowerment in handling Service Failure have a positive impact on the Recovery of Future Service Failure.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Employee Empowerment in handling Service Failure have a positive impact on the Recovery of Future Service Failure.	Strongly Disagree	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Disagree	2 4.3%	4 20.0%	6 9.0%
	Neutral	13 27.7%	8 40.0%	21 31.3%
	Agree	14 29.8%	7 35.0%	21 31.3%
	Strongly Agree	17 36.2%	1 5.0%	18 26.9%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	10.186	0.037

(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): Employee Empowerment in handling Service Failure have a positive impact on the Recovery of Future Service Failure.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Customers Expectations of Relationship Continuity): A Well Defined and Trained Service Recovery Team always plays an important role in handling future Service Failure.	Disagree	3 6.4%	3 15.0%	6 9.0%
	Neutral	6 12.8%	6 30.0%	12 17.9%
	Agree	14 29.8%	3 15.0%	17 25.4%
	Strongly Agree	24 51.1%	8 40.0%	32 47.8%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	5.059	0.168

(Attribution of Stability): Consistent Efforts from the Service Providers to handle Service Failure create a Sense of Stability in the mind of the Clients.



**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Attribution of Stability): Consistent Efforts from the Service Providers to handle Service Failure create a Sense of Stability in the mind of the Clients.	Disagree	4 8.5%	1 5.0%	5 7.5%
	Neutral	8 17.0%	6 30.0%	14 20.9%
	Agree	17 36.2%	4 20.0%	21 31.3%
	Strongly Agree	18 38.3%	9 45.0%	27 40.3%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	2.690	0.442

(Attribution of Stability): Service Continuity even in Case of Service Failure give the Clients a sense of Stability

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Attribution of Stability): Service Continuity even in Case of Service Failure give the Clients a sense of Stability	Disagree	3 6.5%	4 20.0%	7 10.6%
	Neutral	12 26.1%	11 55.0%	23 34.8%
	Agree	16 34.8%	1 5.0%	17 25.8%
	Strongly Agree	15 32.6%	4 20.0%	19 28.8%
	Total	46 100.0%	20 100.0%	66 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	2.690	0.442

(Attribution of Control-ability): If Clients have a perceived Control over the situation during a Service Failure then it has a positive impact on the future service failure recovery.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Attribution of Control-ability): If Clients have a perceived Control over the situation during a Service Failure then it has a positive impact on the future service failure recovery.	Strongly Disagree	2 4.3%	0 0.0%	2 3.0%
	Disagree	7 14.9%	8 40.0%	15 22.4%
	Neutral	12 25.5%	3 15.0%	15 22.4%
	Agree	14 29.8%	5 25.0%	19 28.4%
	Strongly Agree	12 25.5%	4 20.0%	16 23.9%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	5.789	0.215

(Attribution of Control-ability): Positive Behavioral Intentions of the Service Providers During Service Failure Recovery Initiative plays an important role future service failure recovery

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Attribution of Control-ability): Positive Behavioral Intentions of the Service Providers During Service Failure Recovery Initiative plays an important role future service failure recovery	Strongly Disagree	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Disagree	2 4.3%	5 25.0%	7 10.4%
	Neutral	10 21.3%	4 20.0%	14 20.9%
	Agree	15 31.9%	9 45.0%	24 35.8%
	Strongly Agree	19 40.4%	2 10.0%	21 31.3%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	11.030	0.026

(Attribution of Control-ability): If the Clients have direct control through Technological Platforms during Service Failure Recovery Process that will have positive impact future similar instances

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Attribution of Control-ability): If the Clients have direct control through Technological Platforms during Service Failure Recovery Process that will have positive impact future similar instances	Strongly Disagree	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Disagree	1 2.1%	8 40.0%	9 13.4%
	Neutral	9 19.1%	1 5.0%	10 14.9%
	Agree	16 34.0%	7 35.0%	23 34.3%
	Strongly Agree	20 42.6%	4 20.0%	24 35.8%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	19.284	0.001

(Compensation): Strategic Compensation to the clients during an Service Failure have a positive impact in maintaining Loyalty of the Clients.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Compensation): Strategic Compensation to the clients during an Service Failure have a positive impact in maintaining Loyalty of the Clients.	Strongly Disagree	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%
	Disagree	2 4.3%	5 25.0%	7 10.4%
	Neutral	9 19.1%	3 15.0%	12 17.9%
	Agree	15 31.9%	4 20.0%	19 28.4%
	Strongly Agree	20 42.6%	8 40.0%	28 41.8%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	7.063	0.133

(Compensation): Appropriate Compensation can ensure Service Continuity during any Service Failure

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Compensation): Appropriate Compensation can ensure Service Continuity during any Service Failure	Disagree	3 6.4%	4 20.0%	7 10.4%
	Neutral	11 23.4%	2 10.0%	13 19.4%
	Agree	11 23.4%	0 0.0%	11 16.4%
	Strongly Agree	22 46.8%	14 70.0%	36 53.7%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	9.874	0.020

(Compensation): Compensation has a positive impact on any Service Recovery Initiatives

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Compensation): Compensation has a positive impact on any Service Recovery Initiatives	Disagree	4 8.5%	0 0.0%	4 6.0%
	Neutral	11 23.4%	6 30.0%	17 25.4%
	Agree	16 34.0%	10 50.0%	26 38.8%
	Strongly Agree	16 34.0%	4 20.0%	20 29.9%
	Total	47 100.0%	20 100.0%	67 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	3.790	0.285

(Communication): Proper Candid Communication during any service failure can maintain trust among the Clients

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Communication): Proper Candid Communication during any service failure can maintain trust among the Clients	Disagree	1 2.1%	6 30.0%	7 10.4%
	Neutral	11 23.4%	14 70.0%	25 37.3%
	Agree	13 27.7%	0 0.0%	13 19.4%

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
	Strongly Agree	22	0	22
		46.8%	0.0%	32.8%
Total		47	20	67
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	33.489	0.000

(Communication): Involving Clients in the Recovery Process can have a positive effects during Future Service Failure Situations.

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Communication): Involving Clients in the Recovery Process can have a positive effects during Future Service Failure Situations.	Disagree	4	0	4
		8.5%	0.0%	6.2%
	Neutral	16	0	16
		34.0%	0.0%	24.6%
	Agree	8	6	14
		17.0%	33.3%	21.5%
	Strongly Agree	19	12	31
		40.4%	66.7%	47.7%
Total		47	18	65
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	11.147	0.011

(Communication): Recovery Process Communication in every stages can help to maintain client's loyalty during any Service Failure

**Crosstab**

		GROUP		Total
		CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
(Communication): Recovery Process Communication in every stages can help to maintain client's loyalty during any Service Failure	Strongly Disagree	2	0	2
		4.3%	0.0%	3.0%
	Disagree	0	3	3
		0.0%	15.0%	4.5%
	Neutral	6	9	15
		12.8%	45.0%	22.4%
	Agree	17	7	24
		36.2%	35.0%	35.8%
	Strongly Agree	22	1	23

	GROUP		Total
	CLIENT	SERVICE PROVIDER	
Total	46.8% 47 100.0%	5.0% 20 100.0%	34.3% 67 100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	P Value
Pearson Chi-Square	21.562	0.000

- From the Mean Square Comparison and Chi-Square Test it has been identified that in 9 instances there are significant difference in opinion of the Clients and the Service Providers regarding the impact of Service Recovery on the Human Capital Market.
- So in this case our Null Hypothesis i.e. There is no significant difference between Client and Service Provider's perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market is void which means There is significant difference between Client and Service Provider's perception about the impact of Service Recovery Variables in Human Capital Market.

### CONCLUSION

Service Recovery plays a vital role in any service industry and Human Capital Market is not an exception. From this study authors have identified that in case of Service Recovery Variables, in many instances there are significant differences in amongst the Clients and the Service Providers. So in case of Service Recovery Variables, the Service Providers need to reconsider their Service Recovery models by incorporating the factors that are highly weighted by the Clients. When the company fails to stand for its promises made to the customer on the basis they build expectation, it's to be said that there is service failure. When the service failure occurs, there can be again severe ramification. Customer is considered to be the bread and butter, hence retaining them is the biggest challenge, and however service failure acts as an obstacle to it.

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. C. & Narus, J. A. (1990). A Model of Distributor Firm and Manufacturer Firm Working Partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 44-53.
- Bejou, D., Ennew, C. & Palmer, A. (1998). Trust, Ethics and Relationship Satisfaction, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 16 (4), 170-75.
- Bejou, D., Wray, B. & Ingram, T. (1996). Determinants of Relationship Quality: An Artificial Neural Network Analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 36, 137-43.
- Berry, L. L. (1995). Relationship Marketing of Services-Growing Interest, Emerging Perspectives. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (4), 236-245.
- Boles, J. S., Barksdale, H. C. & Johnson, J. (1997). Business Relationships: An Examination of the Effects of Buyer-Salesperson Relationships on Customer Retention and Willingness to Refer and Recommend. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 12(3/4), 253-65.
- Bronnenberg, B. J., Dhar, S. K., & Dube, J. P. (2009). Brand History, Geography, and the Persistence of Brand Shares. *Journal of Political Economy*, 117 (1), 87-115.
- Bronnenberg, B. , DubO, ~J., Mela, J. P., Albuquerque, C., Erdem, F. P., T., Gordon, B., Hanssens, D., Hitsch, G., Hong, H., & Sun, B. (2008). Measuring Long-run Marketing Effects and their Implications for Long-run Marketing Decisions. *Marketing Letters*, 19 (3), 367-382.
- Bronnenberg, B. J, Mahajan, V. & Vanhonacker, W. R. (2000). The Emergence of Market Structure in New Repeat-purchase Categories: The Interplay of Market Share and Retailer Distribution. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37 (1), 16-31.

- Cannon, J.P. & Homburg, C. (2001). Buyer-supplier Relationships and Customer Firm Costs. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(Jan):29-43.
- Crosby, L., Evans, K. and Cowles, D. (1990). Relationship Quality in Services Selling: An Interpersonal Influence Perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (July), 68-81.
- Day, G. S. (2003). Creating a Superior Customer-Relating Capability. *Sloan Management Review*, 44 (3), 77-82.
- Dorsch M.J, Swanson, S.R, Kelley, S.W. (1998). The Role of Relationship Quality in the Stratification of Vendors as Perceived by Customers. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 26(2),128- 42.
- Dwyer, P., Schurr, H. and Oh, S. (1987). Developing Buyer-Seller Relationships, *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (April), 11-27.
- Geyskens, I., J., Steenkamp, E. M., & Kumar, N. (1998). Generalizations about Trust in Marketing Channel Relationships using Meta-analysis. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 15(3), 223-248.
- Goodwin, C. and Ross, I. (1992). Consumer Responses to Service Failures: Influence of Procedural and Interactional Fairness Perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 25 (2), 149-163.
- Holbrook, M. B. (1994), The Nature of Customer Value: An Axiology of Services in the Consumption Experience, *Service Quality: New directions in Theory and Practice* 21.
- Holloway, B. B., & Beatty, S. E. (2003). Service Failure in Online Retailing A Recovery Opportunity, *Journal of Service Research* 6 (1), 92-105.
- Holloway, B. B., Wang, S., & Parish, J. T. (2005). The Role of Cumulative Online Purchasing Experience in Service Recovery Management
- Kähkönen, A. K., Lintukangas, K., & Virolainen, V. M. (2013). The Effects of e-Business on Supply Management. *Operations and Supply Chain Management* 6 (2), 75-84
- Kaizer, H.F. (1974). An Index of Factorial Simplicity, *Psychometrika* 39 (1), 31- 36.
- Kuo, Y. F., & Wu, C. M. (2012). Satisfaction and Post-purchase Intentions with Service Recovery of Online Shopping Websites: Perspectives on Perceived Justice and Emotions, *International Journal of Information Management* 32 (2), 127-138
- Lai, F., Griffin, M., & Babin, B. J. (2009). How Quality, Value, Image, and Satisfaction Create Loyalty at a Chinese Telecom, *Journal of Business Research* 62 (10), 980-986.
- Miller, J. L., Craighead, C. W., & Karwan, K. R. (2000). Service Recovery: A Framework and Empirical Investigation, *Journal of Operations Management* 18 (4), 387-400.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1967). *Psychometric Theory*, 1st ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Malhotra, A. (2005). ESQUAL a Multiple-item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality, *Journal of Service Research* 7 (3), 213-233.
- Patterson, P. G., Cowley, E., & Prasongsukarn, K. (2006). Service Failure Recovery: The Moderating Impact of Individual-level Cultural Value Orientation on Perceptions of Justice, *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 23 (3), 263-277.
- Wang, Y. S., Wu, S. C., Lin, H. H., & Wang, Y. Y. (2011). The Relationship of Service Failure Severity, Service Recovery Justice and Perceived Switching Costs with Customer Loyalty in the context of E-tailing, *International Journal of Information Management* 31 (4), 350-359
- Zakaria, H., Zailani, S., & Fernando, Y. (2010). Moderating Role of Logistics Information Technology on the Logistics Relationships and Logistics Service Quality, *Operations and Supply Chain Management* 3 (3), 134-147.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Gremler, D. D., Bitner, M. J., & Pandit, A. (2010). *Services Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus across the Firm*, 4th ed., TMH, New Delhi.