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Abstract

In the service industry, effective service recovery is essential element to maintain customer satisfaction. Service firms can maintain good long-term relationships with customers to gain their loyalty, commitment, and product acceptance through providing effective service recovery. Because customer’s strong relationships with organizations and brands are underpinned by customer satisfaction. Regrettably, in the last two decades, the problem of poor service recovery was not handled adequately by service firms, consequently customers are not satisfied with the company’s effort toward service recovery, and complainant satisfaction is decreasing. To address this issue this paper synthesizes existing theory through a comprehensive literature review published on the topic by drawing general characteristics of the service recovery performance along with theoretical underpinning. Next, this study recognizes specific factors associated with service recovery performance. In addition, this article put light on theoretical methods that describes how/why these factors work. Finally, this article proposes four fruitful dimensions for further research. Additionally, this paper make contribution to the area of service recovery performance literature by critically analyzing and synthesizing existing research on factors associated with service recovery performance, by showing why and how these factors work.
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I. Introduction

Since the 1970s, companies have collectively spend billions of dollars to upgrade the corporate complaint-handling practices for the improvement of customer services such as, call centers, technology and staff training to provide better service to customer, however, companies are still not able to provide better customer services and complainant satisfaction is lower today than in 1976 (Grainer, Noble, Bitner, & Broetzmann, 2014). Most of the of complaining customers are not satisfied with the company’s effort toward complaint handling.
That shows that the problem of effective complaint handling is still not resolved adequately by service firms (Gruber, 2011; Munawar et al., 2013). Past studies identify that the service recovery in the services management literature considered as a strategic issue (Ashill, Baron, Carruthers, & Krisjanous, 2005). It carried out a learning experience to services organizations that will help to assure excellent service quality is provided to customers (Piaralal, Bhatti, Piaralal, & Juhari, 2016). The customer service failure by the firm might lead to 'disconfirmation state’ as identified by (De Ruyter & Wetzels, 2000; Oliver, 1980), but successfully recovered service can return a customer back to the satisfaction state from the dissatisfaction (Ashill et al., 2005).

Service recovery is mainly based on three functions, namely customer recovery, process recovery, and employee recovery (Michel, Bowen, & Johnston, 2009). Customer recovery is carry out from the customer perspective i.e. customer experience during service recovery and customer satisfaction after service recovery (Smith, Bolton, & Wagner, 1999; Tax, Brown, & Chandrashekaran, 1998). process recovery consist on the processes or system advancement to reduce problems from reoccurring (Michel et al., 2009; Yang, Lee, & Cheng, 2015), and employee recovery derived from the management point of view that how employees prepare better to respond a service failures (Bowen & Johnston, 1999; Kumar, Kumar, & Kumar, 2016). The study in hand will be focus on the employee recovery as service recovery performance (SRP) and strategies associated with SRP will discussed with the employees’ perspective that how firm increase the service recovery through their employees and what are the factors that might enhance the performance of employees during service encounter.

A. Service Recovery Performance (SRP)

SRP of an employee, refers to the degree of personal assessment of the service that employee delivering to the customers. SRP defined as the effective ability of a service employee’s behavior and actions to resolve the service failures and get back client’s satisfaction (Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Liao, 2007; Lin, 2010; Yavas, Karatepe, Avci, & Tekinkus, 2003). Previous literature is evident that successful service recovery is depends on the efforts of FLE’s performance that is known as service recovery performance (SRP) (Daskin & Yilmaz, 2015). SRP involves the actions taken by FLE to resolve customer complaints effectively and get customer back to satisfaction state (Oentoro, Popaitoon, & Kongchan, 2016). Consequently, SRP resulted as customer’s perceptual, intentional, affective, and behavioral outcomes such as customer repurchase intention and satisfaction that
may be influenced by SRP of an employee (Ahmad, Ahmad, & Zakaria, 2018; Piaralal, Mat, Piaralal, & Bhatti, 2014).

The research on examining factors that contribute to employees’ SRP starts to gain its popularity in the past two decades. Examples of studies are Boshoff and Allen (2000) who conduct an exploratory study in New Zealand to investigate the several management factors that have significant influence on service firm’s ability to recover a failure of service successfully and get back a dissatisfied customer to state of satisfaction. Similarly Yavas et al. (2003) examine the SRP of FLE’s in Turkish Banks, had replicated Boshoff and Allen (2000) framework but removing the role conflict and top management commitment in banking industry turkey. Furthermore, Ashill et al. (2005) investigated SRP model in hospital industry in New Zealand, in another study (Ashill, Carruthers, & Krisjanous, 2006) also conduct a cross sectional survey identify the impact of factors (namely, training, empowerment, rewards, management support, service technology and servant leader) to the employee’s SRP. Similarly, Karatepe (2006) extend SRP model with the addition of one factor, (namely emotional exhaustion) with SRP. Ardahan (2007) conduct an empirical base study to identify the potential impact of several management factors on boundary spanning role employees’ perception of SRP in the Turkish hospitality industry. In addition, Ashill, Rod, and Carruthers (2008) have examine the role overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict, relationship with the SRP of frontline employee on governmental staff.

In addition, Tan, Hussain, and Murali (2014) examined the impact of organization’s characteristics, employee’s characteristics, and employee’s SRP in Malaysia. Karatepe (2012); Karatepe and Vatankhah (2015) investigates perceived organizational support on SRP and job performance with the mediation role of carrier satisfaction in hospitality industry Cameron and airline industry Iran. Kim, Paek, Choi, and Lee (2012) investigate the role of work engagement and burnout as mediator in terms of emotional responses between organizational efforts toward service recovery and FLE’s performance in healthcare industry. While Kim and Oh (2012) also study the emotional responses as moderator in hospital industry Korea. Daskin and Yilmaz (2015) conducted an empirical investigation in the context of Turkey to investigate the impact of different factors likewise work self-efficacy, management commitment to service quality, work family conflict, organizational politics, and satisfaction of job on FLE’s SRP. Recently, Piaralal et al. (2016) investigate management factors, personal factors, and human resource factors in insurance industry. Oentoro et al. (2016) investigate moderating impact of personality traits namely extraversion and emotional
stability on the relationship between perceived supervisory support (PSS) and employees SRP in call centers in the context of Thailand. From the early-2000 to date, a growing number of studies have been investigated on SRP. There are number of settings devoted to the theme in past, e.g., reviews, issues, and calls for future research. However, most of the studies put focus on the topic within organizational context. (Kim & Oh, 2012; Van der Heijden, Schepers, Nijssen, & Ordanini, 2013).

Due to number of reasons it is adequate to address this research gap. First, several studies have been carried out to evaluate the effects of different management factors such as empowerment, employee rewards, organizational commitment, and employee training on employee’s SRP. The results from these studies are reported mixed and contradictory findings. For instance, in a study to investigate employee’s SRP, Ardahan (2007) and Kim and Oh (2012) revealed that empowerment, such as authority assignment, did not have sufficient influence on employee’s SRP. However, Baron et al. (2005); Piaralal et al. (2016); Yavas and Babakus (2010) and Rod, Carruthers, and Ashill (2006) found that empowerment is the most important factor that plays essential role in service recovery. Furthermore, Piaralal et al. (2014); Rod et al. (2006) and Yavas et al. (2003) did not find any relationship between employee rewards and employee’s SRP. The findings of their studies were contrary from the results of Ashill et al. (2008) and Masdek, Rozana, Abdul Aziz, and Awang (2011)’s studies. Moreover, Yavas et al. (2003) mentioned that organizational commitment does not influence employee’s SRP. On the other hand Ashill et al. (2008) and Piaralal et al. (2016) found that organizational commitment has a positive effect on employee’s SRP. In addition, Rod et al. (2006) found that customer service training did not influence the employee’s SRP. In contrary, Masdek et al. (2011) and Daskin and Yilmaz (2015) found that training have an impact on employee’s SRP. Second, past literatures revealed that there is scarce information about how FLE’s can improve their SRP and contribute more to the complaint-handling process (Van der Heijden et al., 2013). According to Kim and Oh (2012), limited studies have indicated the important role of emotional parameters such as, organizational commitment (Ashill et al., 2008; Rod & Ashill, 2010) and job satisfaction (Rod et al., 2006), which can link organizational effort with employee’s SRP. Third, most of the researchers studied selected organizational factors that can influence the SRP of employee for instance, customer service orientation, Rewards, Training, Teamwork, organizational commitment, and empowerment. But do not integrate the social factors within organizations for instance,
workplace social support (supervisor support, coworker support) and personal factors of service employee such as personality traits.

The above-mentioned studies reveal that the research on consumer SRP is a comparatively new phenomenon. The existing research on SRP is mainly underpinned by some specific theories such as, Social exchange theory (Ardahan, 2007; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Rod et al., 2006; Yavas et al., 2003) and equity theory (Masdek et al., 2011; Piaralal et al., 2014; Piaralal et al., 2016), which comprises on deductive method of investigation and mainly with quantitative methods such as, experimental and survey methods? Second, author identifies several factors that are associated with SRP and synthesize them as factors of SRP namely customer service orientation, Rewards, Training, Teamwork, organizational commitment, and empowerment. Second, building on above preceding analysis, author propose four other areas for future research that are important for knowledge advancement on the topic: Process perspective, theoretical underpinnings SRP, a non-positivist paradigm to studying SRP, and the extension of factors that lead toward SRP.

2. Definitions of key variables

A. SRP

If of an employee, refers to the degree of personal assessment of the service that employee delivering to the customers. SRP defined as the effective ability of a service employee’s behavior and actions to resolve the service failures and get back client’s satisfaction (Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Liao, 2007; Lin, 2010; Yavas et al., 2003).

B. Customer service orientation

It is defined as a culture in the organization stanching with the policies and procedures to support behaviors of employees toward excellent service delivery (Ashill et al., 2005; Lytle, Hom, & Mokwa, 1998; Rod & Ashill, 2010).

C. Rewards

These are received as an exchange of services between employee and employer such as compensation, appreciation, position, and social identity (Piaralal et al., 2016; Yavas & Babakus, 2010; Yavas et al., 2003).

D. Employee training

It is defined by researchers simply as a systematic technique of learning, for the effectiveness of team and organization, individual development in terms of improving the knowledge of employee, bringing about behavioral and attitude changes, and skills
development to perform efficiently and effectively (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009; Barcus, 2008; Ongori & Nzonzo, 2011; Yavas et al., 2003).

E. Teams

These are defined in previous literature as “a distinguishable set of two or more people who interact, dynamically, interdependently, and adaptively toward a common and valued goal, objective, or mission” (Salas, Dickinson, Converse, & Tannenbaum, 1992) (Baker, Day, & Salas, 2006; Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001; Morgan Jr, Glickman, Woodard, Blaiwes, & Salas, 1986; Salas, Shuffler, Thayer, Bedwell, & Lazzara, 2015).

F. Employee empowerment

This involves the liberty and willingness to take decisions and make commitments (Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Forrester, 2000). Employee empowerment, empower the employees toward fulfillment of tasks, use creative gut feelings to take fast and fair actions toward the complaints (Namasivayam, Guchait, & Lei, 2014; Yavas & Babakus, 2010) (Rod & Ashill, 2010).

3. Methodology

This study will follow the systematic literature review principles, along with procedure of literature review (Fink, 2005; Greenland, 1987; Jesson, Matheson, & Lacey, 2011) by collecting and critically analyzing the literature on the topic. For the comprehensive and critical analysis, author develop a critical review form to analyze several key points of the previous studies namely emphasis of the paper, bibliographic details, underpinned theory, research philosophy (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2013), key findings, methodology, definition of SRP, SRP domain, type of service recovery, research context, geographical location of the study, practical or theoretical contribution, and future recommendations of the study. These points enable the author to comprehensive and systematic review of the literature.

The author starts searching literature on the topic from December 2017 to May 2018. For the purpose of identification of most relevant papers, after that, done a cross search to comprehend literature within the downloaded papers. In this study number of sources are used to search the literature on the topic, (1) marketing and management journals mostly listed in the clarivate analytics (The Master Journal List 2017 and JCR report 2016), (2) comprehensive research databases such as, Ebsco and Scopus, and most relevant disciplines that are listed as social sciences disciplines, (3) wide inter-disciplinary bibliography on SRP published in the several journals, and (4) Google Scholar as well.
Additionally, to search the literature on SRP, Author developed number of keywords, extending from specific to general terms, such as additional broad words within the context of study were employed to search related information with some studies, while, particular keywords more frequently utilized for the informational indexes as a part of information source. Author searched the keyword ‘service recovery’ to identify most related studies from management and marketing journals. Author mainly focused on the article’s keywords, subject, abstract, and title. The main keywords that are used to search the literature from Google scholar are ‘service recovery performance and marketing’, ‘service recovery and marketing’, ‘service recovery and management factors’, ‘factors of service recovery’, ‘service performance’, ‘service restoration’, ‘frontline employee service recovery’, ‘employee recovery’ and ‘service encounters’.

Author established literature selection criteria based on following characteristics, paper omitted that not dealing with SRP, and not are empirical or conceptual within the context of SRP, such as books, conference summaries, keywords and abstracts, editorials, literature reviews and newspaper/magazine articles). In total, after duplication author identified almost 600 articles. To set up each paper's significance, author evaluated its abstract, title, and, complete contents, and identified 41 studies that are fully relevant to SRP.

4. Findings

This section will present the findings that are concluding after the comprehensive literature review. The findings of this article These are systematized about three themes, namely general theoretical characteristics involved in the research of the SRP, coupled with the research philosophy of research and the research methodology, particular factors that may lead to SRP, and theoretical mechanism that explains that why or how improve employee’s SRP.

Table 1: Breakdown of SRP studies in various publication outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal publication outlet</th>
<th>Number of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of service management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously- International Journal of Service Industry Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Academy of marketing Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Bank Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Service Industries Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. General characteristics

SRP is emerging research area. This topic gained its popularity in the start of 2000’s e.g. (Ashill et al., 2005; Babakus, Yavas, Karatepe, & Avci, 2003; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Yavas et al., 2003). The author of this article, recognized the outlets and journals where utmost related studies have been published. The list of journal outlets (mentioned above) shows the most relevant research papers on the area of SRP that have been been published in high rank business, marketing, and management journals namely Journal of Service Management, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Services Marketing, and other highly rated business management journals. Table.1 also showcase that literature on the SRP have been published not only in the marketing related journals, but also published over many other disciplines interlinked with the SRP.

Before further discussion on the findings of this literature review, a number of clarifications in needed. First, some of the studies that are included in this literature review are not full-scale SRP studies. However, these studies indirectly relevant to the SRP. Second,
some of the studies do not discriminate in terms of conceptual differences among frontline employees and service employees and use both terms in exchange.

Researchers have been studied SRP to address the issue of increasing customer dissatisfaction because of poor quality of service recovery. Furthermore, SRP was investigated to carry out the question that how service employees deliver excellent service quality during recovery in various service setting such as the health care sector (Ashill et al., 2005; Ashill et al., 2006; Rod & Ashill, 2010), banking sector (Babakus et al., 2003; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Karatepe, 2006; Yavas et al., 2003), public sector service organization (Ashill et al., 2008; Rod, Ashill, & Carruthers, 2008; Rod et al., 2006; Slåtten, 2008), Hospitality sector (Ardahan, 2007; Karatepe, 2012; Kim, Tavitiyaman, & Kim, 2009), call centers (Ashill, Mukherjee, Rod, Thirkell, & Carruthers, 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2009), educational institutes (Yavas, Karatepe, & Babakus, 2010), insurance industry (Piaralal et al., 2014; Piaralal et al., 2016), and airline industry (Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2015). All of above mentioned studies similar with the objective to investigate the SRP of employees that what factors that could influence the employee’s SRP.

**B. Research Philosophy and Methodology**

On the philosophical grounds, most of the reviewed studies investigated SRP with positivistic or post positivistic approach. For instance, (Ardahan, 2007; Ashill et al., 2005; Ashill et al., 2009; Ashill et al., 2008; Karatepe, 2006; Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2015; Karatepe, Yorganci, & Haktanir, 2009; Kau & Wan, 2006; Kim et al., 2009; Masdek et al., 2011; Oentoro et al., 2016; Piaralal et al., 2014; Rod & Ashill, 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2010; Rod et al., 2008; Rod et al., 2006; Tan et al., 2014; Yavas et al., 2003). For instance, on the basis of ontological reasoning, these studies construe the SRP objective coupled with the scientific method and a ‘hypothetico-deductive reasoning’ (Ashill et al., 2005; Ashill et al., 2009; Karatepe et al., 2015; Karatepe et al., 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2009; Rod et al., 2006), ‘theory-testing’ (Ashill et al., 2005; Ashill et al., 2009; Ashill et al., 2008; Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2015; Karatepe et al., 2009; Kau & Wan, 2006; Kim et al., 2009; Piaralal et al., 2014; Rod & Ashill, 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2010; Rod et al., 2006), experimental (Kau & Wan, 2006), and survey (Ardahan, 2007; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Karatepe, 2006; Masdek et al., 2011; Oentoro et al., 2016; Piaralal et al., 2016; Rod et al., 2008; Rod et al., 2006; Tan et al., 2014; Yavas et al., 2003).

On the theoretical conception, few of these studies underpinned by Bagoozi’s 1992 reformulation of attitude theory (Ashill et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2010),
equity theory (Piarelal et al., 2014). And other studies follow the mixed theoretical conceptions likewise, conservation of resources (COR) (Karatepe et al., 2009; Rod & Ashill, 2009), role stress theory (Ashill et al., 2009), theory of causality (Ashill et al., 2005; Rod et al., 2006), justice theory (Kau & Wan, 2006), social information processing (SIP) theory (Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2015) research methodologies are dominant.

C. Factors associated with Employee’s SRP

This section will synthesize and further discuss about the indicators that have an evident in past literature to predict SRP. Fig.1 shows an integrative framework that includes the factors of SRP strategies. This section further shows the specific SRP factors and links each specific SRP factor with the topic. In the remaining part of this section, author will discuss in detail on factors of SRP.

Figure 1: Factors associated with SRP

- Customer service orientation
- Employee Reward
- Employee Training
- Teamwork
- Empowerment
- Service Recovery Performance

Customer service orientation

Service orientation has been studied by researchers from the organizational level and individual level perspectives (Gazzoli, Hancer, & Kim, 2013; Gil Saura, Berenguer Contrí, Cervera Taullet, & Moliner Velázquez, 2005; Homburg, Hoyer, & Fassnacht, 2002). At an organizational level, service orientation is an essential element of a market orientation focusing on firm strategies, practices and systems aimed to appreciate and promote service oriented behaviors that will generate and providing excellence service quality to the customer (Chung & Schneider, 2002; Deshpandé, Farley, & Webster Jr, 1993; Lytle et al., 1998; Yoon, Choi, & Park, 2007). Authors emphasized that the progress from selling products to providing services and a more service-oriented culture will prompt better than expected execution (Gebauer, Edvardsson, & Bjurko, 2010). An organizational culture with a strong and effective customer service orientation lets the employees know that what are the priorities of the
organization associated to the frontline employee’s priorities (Ashill et al., 2005; Lytle et al., 1998; Rod & Ashill, 2010). Furthermore, customer orientation is also related to desirable employee outcomes and business success (Hennig-Thurau, 2004; Jaworski & Kohli, 1993). In addition, service orientations linked to revenue, expansion, client satisfaction, staff satisfaction and faithfulness (Doyle & Wong, 1998; Harris, Mowen, & Brown, 2005; Johnson, 1996; Sasser, Schlesinger, & Heskett, 1997).

Past literature identified that the customer service orientation is one of the essential factor related to the SRP by FLE’s in the services sector, for instance studies conducted in public healthcare and service organization in New Zealand, banking segment in Turkey, and life insurance industry in Malaysia indicate that customer service orientation linked to SRP of an employee suchs, (Ashill et al., 2008; Cengiz & Kirkbir, 2007; Piaralal et al., 2016; Rod & Ashill, 2010). Other studies also shows customer orientation positively related toward customer satisfaction and service quality (Brady & Cronin, 2001; Hennig-Thurau, 2004). In addition, Piaralal et al. (2016) and Ardahan (2007) found strong influence of customer service orientation toward employee’s SRP.

**Employee Rewards**

Rewards are important in the organizations to shape and enhance the performance of employee toward the task fulfillment, and linked directly toward with the motivation process Babakus et al. (2003); (Danish & Usman, 2010). rewards are critical element in service quality for the staff encouragement to provide excellent services, and to motivate the employees in customer complaint handling (Lewis & Gabrielsen, 1998; Yavas & Babakus, 2010; Yavas et al., 2003). Rewards and SRP has a significant relationship shown in past literature, for instance, (Ashill et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2009; Masdek et al., 2011; Parasuraman, 1987; Piaralal et al., 2014; Yavas & Babakus, 2010). Prior studies, that are conducted in New Zealand banking industry, and in private bank of Turkey found that employee rewards have a positive relationship with SRP (Ashill et al., 2005; Babakus et al., 2003; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Kirkbir & Cengiz, 2007). Furthermore, monetary rewards significantly influence employee performance in Malaysian life insurance industry (Forrester, 2000). Although the number of studies shows that rewards do not have impact on employee’s SRP such as (Ardahan, 2007; Ashill et al., 2005; Rod et al., 2006; Yavas et al., 2003), but giving rewards to employee’s are necessary for service organizations to deliver an excellent quality services and to improve the service performance of employee (Frimpong & Wilson, 2013; Parasuraman, Berry, & Zeithaml, 1991; Piaralal et al., 2016).
Employee Training

Employee training is the foremost strategic resource of the organization it acts as the backbone of the services industry (Ahmad & Din, 2009). Khan, Abbasi, Waseem, Ayaz, and Ijaz (2016) emphasized that employee training and development programs for the employees are essential to improve and develop the skills of staff. For the efficient and effective employee performance (Piaralal et al., 2014). Several past studies carried out by different authors for instance, (Yavas & Babakus, 2010) in banking sector in New Zealand, (Crawford & Riscinto-Kozub, 2011) in the luxury resort setting, (Ardahan, 2007) among FLE’s in Turkey, (Babakus et al., 2003; Kirkbir & Cengiz, 2007; Yavas et al., 2003) in Turkish retail banks, and (Piaralal et al., 2016) life insurance industry in Malaysia, and (Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2015) in airline industry identified that employee training have a relationship with SRP. In the services marketing literature, it is widely described that service employees who don’t have the necessary job and interactive skills, cannot deal effectively with customer complaints to deliver quality service (Liao & Chuang, 2004; Lytle & Timmerman, 2006). However, the results of some studies show that there is no significant relationship between employee training and SRP, such as (Ashill et al., 2005; Ashill et al., 2006; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Rod et al., 2006; Yavas et al., 2003).

Teamwork

It is widely acknowledged that in previous literature, teamwork is an important factor of successful service recovery and play a significant role to deliver quality service (Shemwell, Yavas, & Bilgin, 1998; Yavas et al., 2003). As team, people enables to collaborate, improve individual skills, greater participation, feelings of accomplishment, offer constructive feedback, knowledge, and abilities between individuals (Conti & Kleiner, 1997; Fröbel & Marchington, 2005; Jones, Richard, Paul, Sloane, & Peter, 2007). Past studies evident that teamwork is linked with employee’s SRP and that is conceptualized as a key factor to enhance the performance of employee toward service recovery rather than an individual in organizational setting, for instance, (Ardahan, 2007; Ashill et al., 2005; Babakus et al., 2003; Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Crawford & Riscinto-Kozub, 2011; Karatepe, 2006; Kirkbir & Cengiz, 2007; Kumar, Isa, Hin, & Abdullah, 2012; Piaralal et al., 2014; Piaralal et al., 2016; Rod & Ashill, 2010; Yavas et al., 2003). Even though, few studies found that teamwork has no significant relationship with SRP (Boshoff & Allen, 2000; Yavas et al., 2003), but when refer to the past service marketing literature, it shows that teamwork can enhance SRP (Ashill et al., 2005; Kirkbir & Cengiz, 2007).
Employee Empowerment

Studies that have done in services marketing literature, shows that employee empowerment have a relationship with SRP, such studies conducted in the different industries for example hospital, banking, life insurance industry and hotel industry (Ashill et al., 2005; Babakus et al., 2003; Kirkbir & Cengiz, 2007; Kumar et al., 2012; Lytle & Timmerman, 2006; Masoud & Hmeidan, 2013; Piaralal et al., 2014; Piaralal et al., 2016). According to Babakus et al. (2003); Kirkbir and Cengiz (2007) Ashill et al. (2005) there is significant relationship between employee empowerment of FLE’s and their SRP. The researchers argued that autonomy to customer help and the authority to make decisions will improve employee’s SRP and allows managers to consider other policy related matters (Kumar et al., 2012). in the context of hospitality, and Kumar et al. (2012) in insurance industry reveals that empowerment of FLE’s has been linked with SRP. The firm decentralized management and flatted structure more empower the customer service staffs (Yavas et al., 2003). Furthermore, the applications of authority for front line staffs in lodging services have increase client happiness (Ardahan, 2007). Moreover, employee empowerment has been linked to different variables according to past literature such as organizational commitment (Karim & Rehman, 2012; Rod & Ashill, 2010; Thomas & Tymon, 1994), work fulfillment (Flohr Nielsen & Høst, 2000; Thomas & Tymon, 1994), performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Mohrman, Lawler III, & Mohrman Jr, 1992; Nielsen & Pedersen, 2003), and intention to leave the organization (Ashill et al., 2008; Piaralal et al., 2016).

5. Agenda for future research

The next part of this paper of this paper recognizes four further research dimensions that can guide researchers for future research on the topic, thus, it will be an attempt to make significant contribution to literature to advance the knowledge SRP.

A. Process perspective

Employee impact on customer satisfaction is not constrained just to their conduct amid the other-client disappointment episode. How they deal with the affected customers may likewise significantly effect on satisfaction (Huang, 2010). Learning from failures might be more imperative than just recuperating individual clients, Because when improved processes influence customer satisfaction, it creates the most important means of making frontline impacts via service recovery (Michel et al., 2009). process management is one of the major aspect of SRP, because frontline service employee adopts process management tools and typical recovery routines, which render the recovery efforts more effective by reducing their
repetitive and ineffective processes (Yang et al., 2015). Above discussed studies could explain much about how SRP of employee contribute more to recover service failure. Process of SRP is further useful to study the improvement behavior of employee in SRP and exploring how improvement behavior shapes the efficiency and willingness of frontline employee (Yang et al., 2015).

B. Positivist/post-positivist approaches to SRP

Surprisingly, studies that have been conducted in the past are supported by a positivist or post-positivist research approach (Blaikie, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Scotland, 2012). However, that philosophy of research is general, important and valuable too (Blaikie, 2007; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013), but drawback of this approach is that it limits what can be found (Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Locke, 2011; Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014) about SRP. Therefore, there are still great possibility to explore new dimensions of employee’s SRP if researchers put focus on the interpretivism approach, critical theory method. Above discussed philosophies of research can change the assumptions regarding current theories underlined in the past literature regarding SRP and provide insights from a different dimension (Bozic, 2017).

C. Other factors of SRP

Researchers have been explored several factors associated with employee’s SRP; however, there is still need to investigate further this topic. Although customer service orientation, employee Reward, training, teamwork, and empowerment are received the enough attention in previous research, but limited studies explore emotional factor that might influence the SRP such as, role stressors (e.g. role ambiguity, role conflict, and emotional exhaustion), organizational factors such as workplace social support (e.g. organizational, supervisor, coworker support), and internal marketing factors. Therefore, future investigation can be done on the additional SRP determinants if there are any. This is highly recommended in the past literature, researchers should focus more on internal exogenous factors of SRP. For example, internal marketing factors (e.g. internal communication, training and development, empowerment, and internal market research) that received little attention to predict the SRP within organizational settings in the marketing context. In the area of SRP, future investigation could examine factors at different levels such as individual and organizational level and particularly when service firms facing diverse service failures.

D. Theoretical mechanism of SRP
This study of SRP literature explores that researchers use several theoretical mechanisms for theorizing SRP. However, this work is a long way from finish. More research is required to set up additional theoretical mechanisms integral to SRP. Researchers should develop or borrow the theoretical mechanism from additional theoretical viewpoints that are not implemented in past to address SRP. particularly the inductive and abductive methods might be valuable here. Those additional theoretical methods might help to dig out potential additional procedures linked with SRP. Additionally, researchers can investigate the emotional aspect of the frontline employees in SRP process (e.g. (Bagozzi, 1992) that how emotional responses lead employees toward effective SRP.

6. Conclusion

This literature review study combines theory and research central to SRP. SRP is relatively emerging research field and existing research offer significant initial insights into methods and processes that are linked to SRP. However, findings of this study led the author to suggest that there is a need for more investigation because of the scares existing knowledge on the topic, and secondly, a large portion of the investigations shares similar philosophical and methodological assumptions, prompting on a very basic level comparative discovery. To further enhance the knowledge on the SRP researchers could choose any of four areas regarding SRP identified in this study, for further research. This study might be an effort to attract marketing, business, and management scholars to contribute in emerging research topic and offers a solid foundation to conduct further research on SRP.
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