Global Research Review in Business and Economics [GRRBE]
ISSN (Online) 2454-3217, ISSN (Print) 2395-4671
| Open-Access | Volume 12, Issue 06,
Pages 25-28 ||2026||

Service Failure and Customer Trust: Designing Fair and Effective Complaint-Resolution Systems

[1]Dr. Stanley A. V. Paul, Snr., [2]Dr. Stanley A. V. Paul, Jr., [3]Dr. Andre Martin, [4]Dr. Justin Joseph, [5]Dr. Kobina Akim Wilson, [6]Dr. Genève Phillip-Durham
[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]Professor, University of Excellence, Management and Business (U.E.M.B.), Georgetown, GUYANA

ABSTRACT

Service failures become trust problems when customers interpret an organisation's response as evidence of indifference, incompetence or unfair treatment. Complaint resolution consequently requires more than compensation or courteous communication. This conceptual article examines recovery as a coordinated process of acknowledgement, investigation, remedy and prevention. Selected research on customer retaliation, managerial responsibility, brand relationships and apology provides the basis for a framework distinguishing outcome fairness, procedural accessibility, interpersonal treatment and organisational learning. The analysis considers differences in customer vulnerability, the authority of frontline employees and the limits of standardised remedies. It also examines recent evidence showing that apologies can have different effects depending on customers' prior awareness of a failure. The article argues that behavioural effectiveness and ethical responsibility must be assessed separately: an intervention that protects immediate satisfaction may still leave an obligation unfulfilled. Effective recovery should restore the customer's position where possible and demonstrate a credible capacity to prevent recurrence.

KEYWORDS: service recovery; customer trust; complaints; organisational fairness; apology; service failure.

1. INTRODUCTION

A delayed delivery, incorrect charge or missed service commitment creates an immediate problem. The organisation's response creates a second encounter in which the customer evaluates whether the provider can be trusted to deal with that problem fairly. Repeated transfers, contradictory explanations and unexplained delays can deepen the original failure even when compensation is eventually offered. Trust in this context concerns expectations about future conduct. A customer may question whether the organisation possesses the competence to perform, the honesty to explain what happened or the willingness to consider the customer's interests. Recovery must therefore address both the immediate loss and the meaning attached to the organisation's behaviour. This article develops a complaint-resolution framework that connects customer treatment with managerial systems. Its central claim is that fairness requires coordination across the entire process. A generous remedy does not automatically cure an inaccessible procedure, and an empathetic conversation does not replace a necessary correction. The organisation must understand which aspect of the failure its response actually addresses.

2. ANALYTICAL APPROACH

The article is a purposive conceptual review of six scholarly contributions published by Cambridge and Oxford university presses. Keeffe et al. (2008) investigate customer anger and retaliation following service failures. Kimberley and Härtel (2008) develop a conceptual account of senior management's role in service crises. Aaker et al. (2004) examine consumer-brand relationships and transgression. Jenkins et al. (2026) investigate circumstances in which apologies can produce adverse customer responses. The selected sources differ in method, setting and level of analysis. Their findings cannot establish a universal recovery formula. The framework developed below is therefore a normative and managerial synthesis, with explicit attention to the distinction between empirical effects and recommended institutional practices. No original customer data were collected. Complaint resolution is treated as one component of service recovery. Some failures affect customers who never complain, and some complaints concern misunderstandings rather than an established service breach.

A fair system must be capable of identifying both possibilities without presuming either customer infallibility or organisational innocence.

3. DIAGNOSING THE FAILURE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The first task is to establish what happened. Organisations should distinguish the service promised, the performance delivered and the consequences of any difference. This requires relevant records and a clear account from the customer. An investigation that begins only with the provider's internal categories may overlook the actual problem being reported. Consequences also vary. The same delay may be a minor inconvenience for one customer and cause a missed deadline or substantial disruption for another. A fair process should consider relevant circumstances without creating an arbitrary system in which the most forceful complainant receives the largest remedy. Staff need criteria for distinguishing material differences from unequal negotiating power. The diagnosis should separate immediate correction from consequential loss and relational damage. Correcting an invoice addresses an error. Reimbursing a charge may address an associated cost. Explaining how the error occurred and what will change addresses a different concern. Treating these responses as interchangeable can leave important aspects of the complaint unresolved. Aaker et al. (2004) show that responses to transgression depend on the character and development of the consumer-brand relationship. Their field experiment cautions against assuming that a strong prior relationship always protects a provider from adverse reactions. The implication developed here is that recovery should examine expectations created by the organisation's own promises and previous conduct.

4. FOUR DIMENSIONS OF FAIR RESOLUTION

Outcome fairness concerns the remedy. A response should bear a defensible relationship to the established failure and the customer's position. Appropriate remedies may differ across circumstances, but the reasons should be intelligible. A standard voucher may have little value to a customer who reasonably no longer wishes to use the service. Procedural fairness concerns access, timeliness, evidence and review. Customers should know how to raise a problem, what information is needed and when a response can be expected. Requiring repeated explanations to different departments imposes additional costs. An accessible initial channel is insufficient if later stages become confusing or unresponsive. Interpersonal fairness concerns respect, candour and the quality of communication. Staff should acknowledge the concern without making promises they lack authority to fulfil. They should avoid blaming the customer before the relevant facts are examined. Respectful treatment remains necessary when the organisation concludes that the requested remedy is not justified. Organisational learning concerns whether information from the complaint changes the conditions that produced the failure. A provider that repeatedly compensates for the same preventable error may be managing reactions while leaving the service defect intact. Learning therefore requires a connection between individual case resolution and operational responsibility. These dimensions can conflict. A detailed investigation may delay a remedy, while immediate compensation may be offered before all facts are known. The framework does not eliminate such trade-offs. It requires the organisation to recognise them and design proportionate responses, including interim measures where uncertainty remains.

5. FRONTLINE AUTHORITY AND MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Frontline employees often encounter the customer's frustration while lacking control over the systems that caused it. If they must seek approval for every minor correction, the process can become unnecessarily slow. If they possess unlimited discretion, outcomes may become inconsistent and employees may face pressures they are not equipped to manage. Authority should therefore be bounded and explicit. Staff can be authorised to correct specified errors, provide defined interim assistance and escalate cases with particular characteristics. The boundaries should reflect potential consequences and staff competence. They should also be reviewed when recurring complaints reveal that existing authority is inadequate. Keeffe et al. (2008) report that more substantial recovery strategies reduced retaliation, directly and through customer anger, in their quasi-experimental study. The findings support attention to the content of the response rather than assuming that a symbolic gesture is sufficient. They do not establish that every expensive remedy is effective or that compensation should be determined by the intensity of a customer's anger. Kimberley and Härtel (2008) argue that senior management behaviour and attributes can influence customer evaluation during a service crisis. Their conceptual contribution directs attention beyond the immediate employee-customer encounter. Managers determine staffing, policies, incentives and escalation routes. They should therefore accept responsibility for the conditions under which frontline recovery occurs. Employee protection also matters. A fair complaint process can recognise customer frustration without permitting threats or abuse. Clear escalation and support arrangements allow staff to continue addressing the substantive issue while maintaining appropriate boundaries. Protecting employees and resolving legitimate complaints are compatible responsibilities.

6. APOLOGY, EXPLANATION AND DISCLOSURE

An apology can acknowledge a failure and communicate concern, but its effect depends on context. Jenkins et al. (2026) report across five experiments that apologies can reduce favourable customer responses when they increase awareness of a previously unnoticed failure. Their findings also identify more favourable conditions when customers already know that a failure occurred. The managerial interpretation requires care. Evidence that disclosure can reduce immediate satisfaction does not establish that concealment is ethically acceptable or legally permissible. An organisation may have obligations to inform customers regardless of the predicted marketing effect. Behavioural outcomes and normative responsibilities must therefore be examined separately. An effective explanation should identify what is known, what remains uncertain and what the organisation will do next. Speculation presented as certainty can create a further breach of trust when later information contradicts it. At the same time, a formulaic statement that an investigation is ongoing may be inadequate if no timetable or responsible person is identified. Apology should also be distinguished from excuse. Explaining that an external disruption contributed to a failure may be relevant, but it does not necessarily resolve the provider's responsibility to the customer. The organisation should explain how the circumstances affect the remedy rather than use them to terminate discussion prematurely. Where responsibility is disputed, staff can acknowledge inconvenience and commit to examination without falsely admitting facts that have not been established. Candour requires accuracy in both directions: neither automatic denial nor unsupported concession serves a fair process. The language of a response can influence its reception without resolving the underlying failure. Fuoli et al. (2021) combined analysis of corporate Twitter responses with experimental evaluation and found more favourable responses to an affective communication style, irrespective of formality. This evidence concerns expressed concern and engagement in a particular communication setting. It supports training staff to recognise the customer's experience clearly, while leaving the adequacy of investigation, remedy and follow-through to be assessed separately. Warm wording should accompany an accountable resolution process.

7. DESIGNING THE RESOLUTION PROCESS

A practical process begins with a single case record that preserves the customer's account, relevant evidence and previous commitments. Responsibility should remain identifiable even when specialist departments contribute. The customer should not have to reconstruct the organisation's internal structure to obtain a coherent response. Triage should consider severity, urgency and vulnerability. A minor billing correction differs from a failure affecting an essential service or an imminent deadline. Faster treatment for a materially urgent case can be fair when the criteria are explicit. Priority based only on public visibility or the customer's commercial status is more difficult to justify. The investigation should focus on the disputed issue. Requests for information should be proportionate and explain why the material is needed. Repeatedly demanding documents already supplied can signal that the organisation is using procedure to discourage persistence. Managers should monitor such patterns rather than evaluate staff solely on the number of cases closed. The decision should state the finding, remedy, reasons and review route. If the request is rejected, the response should address the customer's principal argument. If a partial remedy is offered, the organisation should explain what it covers and what remains disputed. Clear closure is more credible than an ambiguous assurance that the matter has been handled. Follow-up should verify delivery of the remedy. A promised refund that is never processed becomes another failure. Where appropriate, the organisation can ask whether the practical problem has been resolved, while avoiding pressure on customers to declare satisfaction as a condition of receiving what they are owed.

8. LEARNING WITHOUT DISTORTING INCENTIVES

Complaint data can reveal recurring defects, but they do not represent all customer experiences. Some customers lack time, confidence or access to complain. Others leave without explaining why. Managers should therefore combine complaints with other service evidence and avoid interpreting low complaint volume as conclusive proof of quality. Classification should preserve the underlying cause rather than merely the channel or emotional tone. Categories such as angry customer explain little about what failed. More useful categories identify inaccurate information, missed commitments, inaccessible procedures or repeated transfers. The aim is to connect patterns with an accountable process owner. Performance targets can also distort behaviour. A narrow target for rapid closure may encourage premature rejection or administrative reclassification. A target for high satisfaction may encourage inconsistent concessions. Balanced review should examine resolution quality, timeliness, recurrence and the implementation of corrective action. Learning should be proportionate to the evidence. A single unusual complaint may identify an important risk, but it may also reflect circumstances that do not justify redesigning the entire service. Managers should examine frequency, severity and the plausibility of recurrence. The process should allow important exceptions to inform judgement without letting anecdote dominate every decision. Complaint records are also shaped by willingness to object. Jung et al. (2017) analysed US complaint databases alongside a survey and found relationships between political ideology and complaining or disputing behaviour. Their findings concern particular data and explanatory mechanisms, rather than a basis

for classifying individual customers. For service governance, the relevant implication is selection: recorded complaints do not constitute a neutral census of service failures. Organisations should combine them with transaction checks and accessible invitations to provide feedback, including from customers who have not formally complained.

Research Implications and Limitations:

The proposed framework has not been empirically validated as a complete system. Its applicability may differ across essential services, discretionary purchases and professional relationships. The selected research also spans different periods and contexts. These limitations make local evaluation necessary before attributing customer retention or financial outcomes to a particular recovery design. Future research should distinguish restoration of the customer's position from restoration of trust. A remedy may achieve the first without achieving the second. Longitudinal studies could examine whether reasoned decisions, reliable follow-through and reduced recurrence matter more for future behaviour than immediate satisfaction ratings. Research should also consider customers who do not use formal complaint channels.

9. CONCLUSION

Complaint resolution becomes credible when an organisation identifies the failure accurately, provides a proportionate remedy, treats the customer respectfully and addresses the conditions that allowed the problem to occur. Apology and compensation can contribute, but their effects depend on context and do not replace substantive responsibility. A fair recovery system connects frontline authority with managerial accountability and evaluates success through both the customer's resolved problem and the organisation's demonstrated capacity to improve.

REFERENCES

1. Aaker, J., Fournier, S., & Brasel, S. A. (2004). When good brands do bad. *Journal of Consumer Research, 31*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1086/383419
2. Fuoli, M., Clarke, I., Wiegand, V., Ziezold, H., & Mahlberg, M. (2021). Responding effectively to customer feedback on Twitter: A mixed methods study of webcare styles. *Applied Linguistics, 42*(3), 569-595. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa046
3. Jenkins, M. R., Fombelle, P. W., & Steffel, M. (2026). Are apologies always the best policy? Apologies for service failures backfire when consumers are not aware of the failure. *Journal of Consumer Research, 53*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaf064
4. Jung, K., Garbarino, E., Briley, D. A., & Wynhausen, J. (2017). Blue and red voices: Effects of political ideology on consumers' complaining and disputing behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research, 44*(3), 477-499. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx037
5. Keeffe, D. A., Russell-Bennett, R., & Tombs, A. (2008). Customer retaliation at the employee–customer interface. *Journal of Management & Organization, 14*(4), 438-450. https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.837.14.4.438
6. Kimberley, N., & Härtel, C. E. J. (2008). Employee/customer interface in a service crisis: Impact of senior management attributes and practices on customer evaluation. *Journal of Management & Organization, 14*(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.837.14.2.207