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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to influence the Service Recovery Justice Perceived Satisfaction and Impact on Relationship Quality, and Purchase Intention at PT Indotruck Utama As One Volvo Trucks Dealer Indonesia. The study design was a survey with causality analysis of quantitative methods. The population in this study is that consumers Volvo truck Indonesia. The sample selection using sampling nonprobability with 100 respondents. This study uses primary data derived from questionnaires. Mechanical questionnaires using Likert scale measurement. Data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) with the help of program LISREL 8.8. The results showed that procedural justice is proven positive effect on service recovery satisfaction, distributive justice is not a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction, interaction justice proven positive effect on service recovery satisfaction, service recovery satisfaction proven to have a positive influence on relationship quality, and service recovery satisfaction proved have a positive influence on purchase intention in PT. Top Indotruck as one of the Volvo Trucks dealer Indonesia. Complaint handling service recovery after a failure of the service used as one way to establish an ongoing relationship and be useful for the PT. Top Indotruck. The management should aim at customer satisfaction as much as possible so as to provide a sense of comfort and content for consumers, a grievance effective given the management of dealer Volvo Trucks Indonesia through service restoration can strengthen the quality of positive relationships that attract consumers to make purchasing decisions on product Volvo.
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INTRODUCTION

Today's business competition situation is increasingly increasing, both from the domestic and global market. This causes all companies compete in providing the best quality service to their customers and maintain that customer remains loyal (Ramli & Sjahruddin, 2015). So that companies are required to provide tangible evidence of the benefits and advantages of the products or services offered can provide customer satisfaction (Ramli, 2016), especially those that can create an emotional customer. Especially in conditions of failure to provide services to consumers that cause consumers to complain or not satisfied with the service of the company.

According to Singh in Ghoniyah (2012), there are four possible responses of consumers in facing service failure, namely consumers do nothing, but move directly to competitors, consumers stop using services and move to competitors and also do negative word-of-mouth, immediately complain to the company to get compensation; consumers report it to the media. Hunt in Ghoniyah (2012) states that retaliation is the fifth possibility in complaint behavior. Dissatisfied consumers will damage the service company’s facilities.

Referring to Singh’s opinion above, it is clear that one of the possibilities that consumers will make if they are not satisfied with the service will turn to competitors (Ramli, 2010; Ramli, 2012). Therefore, companies need to do their best with the concept of service recovery satisfaction for service failures, especially for products or companies that are experiencing tight competition and have many competitors, such as the Volvo brand truck products, which are very tight competition. , because several other players like Scania, Mercedez, and others also offer almost the same types of products. Although for the European brand truck segment in Indonesia, Volvo leads the number 1 market, with a 30 percent market share or around 25,000 units per year in 2014. It will damage the facilities of service companies.

Volvo Trucks Indonesia with its related division takes a multiple approach in the transportation business. There are technological approaches from own trucks and leading industry innovations, such as Volvo Dynamic Steering. There are also services, customer with care, which are reflected in the services provided to meet customer needs, such as maintenance, productivity, fuel efficiency and safety (http://www.beritasatu.com/mobil).
Service recovery refers to actions taken by the company when experiencing service failure or service failure (Zethaml, Bitner & Gremler, 2006). Even so, there are still many companies that do not do this. Even though service recovery strategies have a huge impact ranging from the customer's immediate response to forming customer loyalty. Service recovery procedures are very important for the company to achieve customer satisfaction and loyalty (Lovelock, 2001). Customer satisfaction with service recovery after the occurrence of service failure can affect consumers to re-consume and spread negative word-of-mouth (Wirtz & Matilla, 2004). Both of these behaviors can be seen as indications of future customer satisfaction and loyalty. According to Huang et al. (2015), one of the factors that influence service recovery satisfaction is perceived justice, which consists of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, where perceived justice will have an impact on purchase intention. Meanwhile, Wang et al. (2014) stated that besides being influenced by service recovery satisfaction, purchase intention was also influenced by relationship quality.

Based on the background of the above thoughts, researchers are interested in examining the "Effects of Perceived Justice on Service Recovery Satisfaction and its impact on Relationship Quality and Purchase Intention at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of Indonesia's Volvo Trucks dealers ".

**Research Formulation**

Based on the disclosure of the research background, the problem formulation is obtained as follows:

1. Are there procedural justice positive effects on service recovery satisfaction?
2. Are there positive effects of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction?
3. Is there a positive influence of interactional justice on service recovery satisfaction?
4. Is there a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality?
5. Is there a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention?
Research Purposes
The goal to be achieved from this research activity is to.

1. Analyzing the positive influence of procedural justice on service recovery satisfaction.
2. Analyzing the positive influence of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction.
3. Analyzing the positive influence of interactional justice on service recovery satisfaction.
4. Analyzing the positive influence of service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality.
5. Analyzing the positive influence of service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention.

Benefits Of Research
The benefits of this research are as input for company management in the automotive industry, especially truck products in providing maximum satisfaction to customers by increasing service for failures that have been done.

Limitation Of Research
Based on the existing problems, the authors limit the writing due to the limitations of time, mind, and means available, the authors only limit and discuss the influence of Perceived Justice on Service Recovery Satisfaction and its impact on Relationship Quality and Purchase Intention. The sample used is only for consumers of PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Procedural Justice
Kau and Loh, (2006) stated that, procedural justice focuses on perceived justice from policies, procedures, and criteria used by decision makers from the outcome of disputes or negotiations. Interactional justice is the treatment or attitude of employees in treating customers both in how to interact and communicate during the recovery process (Sparks and Mc Coll in Nikbin et al., 2010).
Distributive Justice

Smith and Bolton (2002) state that, distributive justice relates to apologies as a description of remorse from the service provider, the improvements given to customers due to service failures, and change offers based on what customers want or need in exchange for disappointment experienced by Blodgettet and Homburg (in Neira et al., 2009) say that, distributive justice refers to customer perceptions of resource allocation equity and tangible results of service meetings.

Tax et al. (1998) define distributive justice as consumers’ feelings because they have been treated fairly in getting the results of service recovery or complaint behavior. The results of the behavior of complaints or recovery of these services can be in the form of discounts, refunds, and other forms of compensation. Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) state that distributive justice affects satisfaction because of service recovery and overall satisfaction. Smith et al. (1999) found that distributive justice influences satisfaction with recovery in hotels and restaurants. Goodwin and Ross (1992) and Tax et al. (1998) found that distributive justice affects satisfaction with handling complaints. Distributive justice has a greater effect (compared to procedural justice and interactional justice) on customer satisfaction after service recovery, repurchase desire and loyalty (Blodgett and Granbois, 1992; Boshoff, 1997; Conlon and Murray, 1996; Smith et al., 1999; Tax et al., 1996 in Oliver et al., 2010).

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is related to interpersonal behavior in the form of procedures and delivery of results, which include explanation, honesty, politeness, effort and empathy provided by service providers (Kau and Loh, 2006).

Service Recovery Satisfaction

There are several different definitions of researchers regarding Service Recovery according to Zeithaml and Bitner (2000: 166) "Service Recovery refers to the actions taken by an organization in response to a service failure". Service improvement is the action taken by the company in responding to service failure. The action in this case is the company’s response to the complaints pointed out by the customer, customers who complain can turn into loyal customers if the company responds to the complaint well.
Therefore, customers who submit complaints due to errors in service delivery provide an opportunity for service companies to restore services. Service recovery is defined as the process by which companies try to correct service delivery failures (Kelley and Davis, 1994 in Maxham, 2001). Meanwhile, some researchers suggest that corporate recovery efforts can strengthen relationships with customers (Hoffman et al. 1995; Smith et al. 1998). Others show that more than one-half of service recovery efforts really add to the problem (Kelley et al. 1993 in Maxham, 2001). As such, it seems possible that poor service recovery can cause consumers to assess corporate failures more severely after failure recovery efforts. Contrast with poor recovery, proper recovery can restore satisfaction and promote direction for future purchases (Goodwin and Ross, 1992 in Maxham, 2001). In addition, superior service recovery efforts can lead to paradoxical scenarios, where consumers will rate firms failing higher after recovery than services received before failure (Hart et al. 1990; Kelley et al. 1993 in Maxham, 2001).

Service recovery is defined as the response of service providers to service failures (Kelley and Davis, 1994 in Valenzuela et al. 2006), organizational actions may be needed to correct failures or second opportunities that the company must really exploit after failing in the first attempt to do so correctly (Andreassen, 2001; Bowen and Johnston, 1999 in Valenzuela et al. 2006). Andreassen (2001) in Valenzuela et al. (2006) state that in any case, the purpose of service recovery is to retain existing customers, rather than attract new ones. Service failure has the potential to destroy customer loyalty (Mattila, 2001 in Valenzuela et al. 2006).

**Relationship Quality**

Relationship quality means that quality is perceived based on the warmth of a relationship (Chan in Kasali 2003). With the existence of high quality relationships, customers can rely on the integrity of a seller or service provider and have confidence in the performance of a service provider in the future because the level of performance of a service provider in the past has been consistently satisfying. According to Lovelock, Patterson and Walker (2004) this quality relationship has several dimensions such as trust, satisfaction, perception, effectiveness of communication, social ties/friendship. Meanwhile, according to Auruskeviciene et al. (2010) the quality of relationships is a dimension of the effectiveness of communication.
trust, the benefits of special treatment, social benefits, commitment, these factors that have consequences for customer loyalty.

**Purchase Intention**

Before make the planning marketing, the companies need to identify consumers, consumer goals and decision processes. In consuming a product or service there are stages that are carried out by consumers. Knowing about this stage can help marketers or companies to understand consumer behavior (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2011: 58).

A product can be said to have been consumed by consumers if the product has been decided to be purchased. The decision to buy is influenced by the value of the product being evaluated. If the benefits that are felt are greater than the sacrifices to get them, then the drive to buy is higher (Ramli, 2012). Conversely, if the benefits are smaller than the sacrifice, usually the buyer will refuse to buy and generally switch to evaluating other similar products.

In most people, consumer buying behavior is often initiated and influenced by the amount of external stimulation, both in the form of marketing stimuli and stimuli from the environment. These stimuli are then processed in accordance with their personal characteristics, before the purchase decision is finally made. The personal characteristics of consumers used to process these stimuli are very complex and one of them is the motivation to buy.

Kotler (2012: 88) says, consumer decisions are a process carried out by consumers in purchasing a product or service. Understanding purchasing decisions is the stage in the decision making process where consumers actually buy.

Some experts like Engel et al. (1994) and Hawkins et al. (2010) refer to consumer decisions as a process that consumers make in purchasing a product or service. The term purchase decision describes how individuals carefully evaluate various types of attributes of a particular product, brand or service and rationally choose which one meets their needs (Ramli, 2013).

According to Kotler and Keller (2012: 207) decision making is an activity of individuals who are directly involved in obtaining and using the goods offered. The purchase decision process is a consumer behavior to determine a decision development process in buying a product. There are 5 stages, namely Problem recognition, Information search, Evaluation of alternatives, Purchase decision, post-purchasing behavior; (Picture 1) in consumer purchasing decisions. Every consumer goes through these five
stages to make a purchase. The five stages of the purchasing decision process can be seen in the following picture:

**Picture 1:** Stages of the Purchasing Decision Process

1. **Problem Recognition**
   It is the first stage in the purchasing decision process that consumers recognize problems or needs.

2. **Information Search**
   At this stage consumers are driven to find more information, consumers can more easily conduct active information searches. When more information is obtained, the awareness and knowledge of consumers about goods or services will increase.

3. **Evaluation of Alternatives**
   Consumers use information to evaluate alternative brands in the mind set.

4. **Purchase Decision**
   At this stage consumers actually buy a product.

5. **Post-purchase Behavior (Behavior after purchase)**
   After purchasing products, consumers will experience a certain level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. If the product meets expectations, the consumer is satisfied. If it exceeds expectations, consumers are very satisfied. If it does not meet expectations, consumers are not satisfied. Consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a product will influence subsequent behavior. If the consumer is satisfied, he will show a higher probability of buying the product again.

Kotler (2012) says in purchasing decisions, there are generally five roles that a person performs. The five roles include:

1. **Initiator**
   Initiator is the person who first realizes that there is an unfulfilled desire or need and proposes an idea to buy a particular item or service.
2) **Influencer**

Influencers are people who give views, advice, or opinions so that they can help with purchasing decisions.

3) **Decider**

Decider is a person who determines purchasing decisions, whether to buy, what to buy, how to buy, or where to buy it.

4) **Buyer**

Buyer is the person who actually purchases (real).

5) **User**

Users are people who consume or use goods or services that have been purchased.

**Previous Research**

Wang et al. (2014) examined the retaining of customers after service failure recovery: a contingency model. The aim of the study is to empirically test customer retention models in service failure settings. In particular, the study investigated how the influence of service recovery satisfaction affects the quality of relationships that are moderated by transition costs. The research sample was 303 bank customers, and data analysis used structural equation modeling (SEM). The results of the study found that service recovery satisfaction had an effect on purchase intention and behavior through the quality of the relationship. In addition, the transition costs moderate the effect of relationship quality on purchase intentions.

Huang et al. (2015) examined the understanding of the impact of service failure and recovery justice on consumers’ satisfaction and repurchase intention. Respondents are masters and doctoral students, the criteria of respondents are students who have experienced failure in online services. Data analysis was done by multiple linear regression. The results of the study found that perceived justice proved to influence consumer satisfaction and purchase intention.
Conceptual Framework

Picture 1: Conceptual Framework

Formulation of Hypothesis

Blodgett et al. (in Kau and Loh, 2006) argue that, customers may be satisfied with the type of recovery strategy offered but customers will be more pleased if the process of seeking compensation is easy. Research conducted by Badawi (2012) and Ellyawati, et al. (2012) each stated that, procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on satisfaction after handling complaints.

H1: There is a positive procedural justice effect on service recovery satisfaction

Prihartami (2011), and Badawi (2012) state that, the perception of interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction after handling complaints.

H2: There is a positive interactional justice effect on service recovery satisfaction

Research conducted by Badawi (2012), Korry (2010), Kau and Loh (2006), and Ellyawati, et al. (2012) states that, distributive justice has a positive and significant influence on customer satisfaction after handling complaints.

H3: There is a positive influence of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction

H4: There is a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality

H5: There is a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design
This study refers to research conducted by Huang et al. (2014) and Wang et al. (2014), namely a survey study that aims to test hypotheses regarding the influence of procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice on service recovery satisfaction and its impact on relationship quality and purchase intention on Volvo Indonesia truck cars. The research design is a survey with a causality analysis of quantitative methods. To find out and study the influence between variables, measure phenomena and find the main characteristics, solve problems with theory, and test hypotheses, while the observation method used in the study is single cross-sectional, namely the activity of collecting data from one respondent only at a time.

Variables and Measurements
In this research there are several variables to be studied. These variables consist of procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, service recovery satisfaction, relationship quality and purchase intention. The variables and measurement instruments used in this study adopted from Wang et al. (2014) are as follows:

**Procedural Justice factors** measured using the 4 statements adopted from Qin et al. (2012) are as follows:

1. The company responds quickly if a problem occurs
2. The company is quite flexible when handling customer complaints
3. The company has a set of management policies that are effective in solving problems
4. The company is very effective in handling customer problems

**Distributive Justice Factors** measured using 3 statements adopted from Qin et al. (2013) are as follows:

1. Financial compensation provided is in accordance with the loss I received.
2. In my opinion, the compensation given by the company for the losses I have suffered is fair.
3. I still get compensation during the problem solving process.
**International Justice Factors** is measured using the 5 statements adopted from Qin et al. (2013) as follows:

1. Employees of this company are polite and polite when dealing with customer complaints.
2. The employees of this company try to provide the best way to solve customer problems.
3. Employees are very concerned about customer problems.
4. Employees of this company understand the problem correctly.
5. This company employee is honest when processing customer requests.

**Service Recovery Satisfaction Factor** adopted from Wang et al. (2014) with 5 items used are as follows:

*Communication*

1. Employees express clearly in providing responses about customer complaints.
2. Employees convey clearly in providing responses about customer complaints.
3. When I complain about a company, employees help clarify the situation about poor service.
4. Employees very well understand customer needs.

*Empowerment*

1. The employee I complained about was not looking for someone else to solve the problem.
2. Employees are responsible for customer complaints.

*Feedback*

1. The company informs me about the progress of the problem solving process.
2. The company submitted an apology written to me.

*Atonement*

1. The employees of this company guarantee that I will be cared for.
2. Employees of this company are polite.

*Explanation*

1. Employees explain clearly the factors that cause a problem to occur.
2. The employees of this company provide a satisfying explanation of why a problem occurs.
Tangibles

1. The employees of this company are well-dressed.
2. The employees of this company work professionally.

Relationship Quality factor measured using 2 statements adopted from Wang et al. (2014) are as follows:

Satisfaction

1. I am happy with the services provided by this company.
2. I have good experience with the services provided by this company.
3. I will still choose to use the services of this company, if I have to compare it with other companies.
4. I am very happy with the services provided by this company.
5. Overall the service provided is very satisfying.

Trust

1. This company is very concerned about my security issues when making transactions.
2. The words and promises given by this company can be trusted.
3. The employees of this company show respect for customers.
4. This company fulfills its obligations to customers.
5. I am sure of the quality of service of this company.

Commitment

1. I am committed to this company, which makes adjustments as needed.
2. I am committed to this company, which offers personal services to meet customer needs.
3. I am committed to this company, which is quite flexible when the service changes.
4. I commit with this company, which is quite flexible in serving my needs.

Purchase Intention factor measured using 2 statements adopted from Wang et al. (2014) are as follows:

1. After receiving service improvements from this company, I will buy this company's products again in the future.
2. After receiving service improvements from this company, I decided to buy the company's products again in the future.
3. After receiving service improvements from this company, I intend to buy this company's products again in the future.

All of the above statements are measured using a Likert Scale which is rated 1-5 by using a 5-point scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Each respondent was asked to choose one of the five answer statement choices.

Population And Sample

This study uses primary data. Data collected by questionnaire distribution techniques, namely by giving written questions to respondents. Then the respondent gave a response to the question given.

This questionnaire is closed where the answer is available. The questions in the questionnaire are closed (closed question), where respondents are asked to make choices among the alternative answers given in the questionnaire. Closed questions are used because it can help respondents to answer quickly simply by choosing from alternative answers that have been provided, and helping researchers to encode information easily to analyze (Sekaran, 2011).

The sample is defined as the part of the object that can represent the population. The reason for using the sample is because the researcher is not likely to obtain data from the number of the population which reaches thousands (Sekaran, 2011). In this study the sampling method used was using a nonprobability sampling method. That is a sampling method that does not provide the same possibilities for each population element to choose from.

The reason for using the non-probability sample method is due to time and cost limitations. In addition, population numbers that are not available require researchers to use the method (Sekaran, 2011).

The part of non probability sampling used in this study is purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is carried out and used to meet the needs of getting samples in accordance with the objectives or research criteria.

The sample criteria in this study are:

1. Consumers of Volvo Indonesia truck cars
2. Consumers are buyers and users of Volvo Indonesia truck cars
3. Consumers have failed to service the Volvo Indonesia truck cars
The sample chosen in this study was visitors to Ancol Jakarta tourist attractions, where the determination of the sample size refers to the warpole formula with $\alpha = 5\%$. Due to limited data on the number of customers, the minimum sample size determination using the Warpole formula

$$n = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2 \cdot 2^2}{4e^2 \cdot 4 (0,1)^2}$$

Where $n = \text{number of samples}$

$$Z_{\alpha/2} = Z \text{ table coefficient numbers at } \alpha / 2 \text{ level}$$

$$e = \text{error rate that can be tolerated in this study}$$

By using an error tolerance number of 10\% and the number of coefficients in table $Z$ obtained for level $\alpha / 2$ of 4, then the minimum number of samples is 100.

**Descriptive Object Research and Characteristics of Respondents**

Total of respondents used in this study were 100 consumers of Volvo Truck Indonesia at PT. Main Indotruck. So that it can be explained about the profile of respondents based on the categories presented in this study. The number of respondents based on gender, age, education and income per month will be explained based on Table 1 below.

| No | Demographic Characteristics | Amount | Percentage |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|------------|
| 1  | Gender                      |        |            |
|    | Male                        | 75     | 75\%       |
|    | Female                      | 25     | 25\%       |
| 2  | Age                         |        |            |
|    | < 30 Years                  | 12     | 12\%       |
|    | 31-40 Years                 | 29     | 29\%       |
|    | 41-50 Years                 | 37     | 37\%       |
|    | > 51 Years                  | 22     | 22\%       |
| 3  | Educations                  |        |            |
|    | Senior High School          | 13     | 13\%       |
|    | Diploma                     | 20     | 20\%       |
|    | Bachelor                    | 39     | 39\%       |
|    | Master/Doctor               | 28     | 28\%       |
Based on Table 1 above, can be seen the majority of respondents are male. This result is because respondents who stated male sex as many as 75 respondents (75%), and the remaining 25 respondents (25%) female sex.

Profile of respondents based on age, it can be seen that the majority of respondents included in the category aged 41-50 years as many as 37 respondents (37%), followed by respondents who entered the category aged 31-40 years as many as 29 respondents (29%). While respondents who were over 50 years old were 22 respondents (22%) and the remaining 12 respondents (12%) stated they were less than 30 years old.

Based on education it is known that respondents with high school education were 13 respondents (13%), respondents with D1/D2/D3 education were stated as many as 20 respondents (20%), then as many as 39 respondents (39%) had S1 education, and the remaining 28 respondents (28%) stated that he was educated S2/ S3.

The highest income per month of respondents is 38 respondents (38%) stating having a monthly income of 10-15 million, followed by respondents who have income per month 5-10 million, which is 28 respondents (28%). Whereas for respondents who stated that they had more than 15 million monthly income, namely 22 respondents (22%) and as many as 12 respondents (12%) stated that they had less than 5 million monthly income.

**Sources and Data Collection Techniques**

This study uses primary data. Data was collected by questionnaire techniques, namely by giving written questions to respondents. Then the respondent gave a response to the question given. This questionnaire is closed where the answer is available.

**Testing Instruments**

Before a questionnaire which is an instrument in research is widely used, a trial is conducted to measure the reliability and validity of a measuring instrument. To obtain data that is the basis for analyzing, beforehand data collection was carried out by

| Income per Month | Number | Percentage |
|------------------|--------|------------|
| < 5 Million      | 12     | 12%        |
| 5 – 10 Million   | 28     | 28%        |
| 10 – 15 Million  | 38     | 38%        |
| > 15 Million     | 22     | 22%        |
distributing questionnaires / respondents selected to be samples.

The results of this questionnaire were then coded and then analyzed with the help of SPSS 20 for Windows software to test the validity and reliability. Valid questions (Cooper and Emory, 2011) are questions with \( r \) (corrected item total correlation) value is positive, and \( r \) (corrected item total correlation) is greater than \( r \) table. If \( r \) results are greater than \( r \) table but are negative, the item is declared invalid.

After testing validity, then performed a reliability test. In this study, the reliability test of each variable was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. There are three reasons the researchers used the Cronbach’s alpha test. First, because this technique is the reliability testing technique of the most frequently used questionnaire (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Second, by carrying out the Cronbach’s alpha test, inconsistent indicators will be detected (Malhotra, 2012). Third, in previous studies by Elsingerich and Rubera (2010), reliability tests were used using Cronbach’s alpha.

**Validity Test**

According to Malhotra (2012), validity is an instrument in a questionnaire can be used to measure what should be measured, not systematic error. So that these indicators can reflect the characteristics of the variables used in the study. An instrument is said to have high validity if the tool carries out its measuring function in accordance with the intent in making these measurements. Cooper (2011) explains that the validity of the instrument shows the quality of the entire process of data collecting.

\[
r = \frac{n \sum x_{1i} y_{i} - \sum x_{1i} \sum y_{i}}{n \sum x_{1i}^2 - (\sum x_{1})^2 n \sum y_{i}^2 - (\sum y_{i})^2}
\]

Information:
- \( r \) = product moment correlation coefficient
- \( x \) = score of each question / item
- \( y \) = total score
- \( N \) = number of respondents

Product Moment correlation method, which correlates the value of each item or item with the total value of the item. Testing is done by comparing the product moment correlation value (\( r_{xy} \)) with \( r \) table value at \( \alpha = 5\% \) and \( n = 100 \). If \( r_{xy} > r \) table then the item or question item is declared valid, and if \( r_{xy} < r \) table then item or question item is
not valid and must be aborted from the questionnaire. The results of the validity of the research instruments can be seen in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Instrument Validity Test Results**

| Variable                  | Indicator | \( r \) count | \( r_{table} \) | Conclusion |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| **Procedural Justice**    | PJ1       | 0.774          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | PJ2       | 0.848          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | PJ3       | 0.881          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | PJ4       | 0.637          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
| **Distributive Justice**  | DJ1       | 0.545          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | DJ2       | 0.869          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | DJ3       | 0.834          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
| **International Justice** | IJ1       | 0.561          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | IJ2       | 0.710          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | IJ3       | 0.823          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | IJ4       | 0.618          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | IJ5       | 0.723          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
| **Service Recovery**      | COM1      | 0.791          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
| **Satisfaction**          | COM2      | 0.744          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | COM3      | 0.810          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | EMP1      | 0.872          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | EMP2      | 0.732          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | FBK1      | 0.760          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | FBK2      | 0.698          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | ATM1      | 0.632          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | ATM2      | 0.659          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | EXP1      | 0.662          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | EXP2      | 0.641          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | TGL1      | 0.619          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | TGL2      | 0.365          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | SAT1      | 0.395          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | SAT2      | 0.569          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | SAT3      | 0.649          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | SAT4      | 0.524          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | SAT5      | 0.279          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
|                           | TRS1      | 0.643          | 0.1946          | Valid      |
| Relationship Quality | TRS2    | 0,578   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|----------------------|---------|---------|----------|-------|
|                      | TRS3    | 0,831   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | TRS4    | 0,827   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | TRS5    | 0,509   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | CMT1    | 0,448   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | CMT2    | 0,542   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | CMT3    | 0,642   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | CMT4    | 0,761   | 0,1946   | Valid |
| Purchase Intention   | PI1     | 0,911   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | PI2     | 0,896   | 0,1946   | Valid |
|                      | PI3     | 0,849   | 0,1946   | Valid |

Based on Table 2 above, it is recognized that all indicators of each variable are Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, International Justice, Satisfaction of Service Recovery, Quality of Relationship, and Purchase Intention produce \( r^{\text{count}} > r^{\text{table}} \) (\( r^{\text{count}} > 0.1946 \)). Thus it can be questioned that all indicators in this study are valid so that no questions were aborted from the questionnaire.

**Validity Construct Testing**

Testing of construct validity for the questions is indicated by the value of \( t^{\text{count}} \) and standardized loading factor. The value of \( t \) must be above the critical value of 1.96 and the standardized loading factor is greater than 0.5 (Iqbaria et al., 1995). Questions that do not meet these valid criteria cannot be included in the next test. The factor load for each indicator for the latent variable is presented in the form of the relationships described in the path diagram obtained by running the LISREL 8.8 program. The output of the processing of LISREL 8.8 for each complete latent variable can be seen in the following table.
**Table 3:** Construct Validity Test Results

| Indicator             | Loading Factor | Error | t Value Count | Conclusion |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|---------------|------------|
| **Procedural Justice**|                |       |               |            |
| PJ1                   | 0.62           | 0.61  | 6.58          | Valid      |
| PJ2                   | 0.78           | 0.40  | 8.81          | Valid      |
| PJ3                   | 0.90           | 0.19  | 10.94         | Valid      |
| PJ4                   | 0.57           | 0.67  | 5.90          | Valid      |
| **Distributive Justice**|               |       |               |            |
| DJ1                   | 0.86           | 0.26  | 2.28          | Valid      |
| DJ2                   | 0.79           | 0.38  | 9.05          | Valid      |
| **International Justice**|               |       |               |            |
| IJ1                   | 0.62           | 0.61  | 4.16          | Valid      |
| IJ2                   | 0.79           | 0.38  | 8.86          | Valid      |
| IJ3                   | 0.87           | 0.84  | 10.21         | Valid      |
| IJ4                   | 0.85           | 0.28  | 1.98          | Valid      |
| IJ5                   | 0.86           | 0.26  | 4.16          | Valid      |
| **Service Recovery Satisfaction**|           |       |               |            |
| COM                   | 0.86           | 0.26  | 10.43         | Valid      |
| EMP                   | 0.85           | 0.28  | 10.25         | Valid      |
| FBK                   | 0.71           | 0.50  | 7.85          | Valid      |
| ATM                   | 0.64           | 0.59  | 6.93          | Valid      |
| EXP                   | 0.68           | 0.54  | 7.42          | Valid      |
| TGL                   | 0.56           | 0.65  | 6.24          | Valid      |
| ** Relationship Quality**|               |       |               |            |
| SAT                   | 0.58           | 0.66  | 5.80          | Valid      |
| TRS                   | 0.79           | 0.37  | 8.47          | Valid      |
| CMT                   | 0.73           | 0.47  | 7.62          | Valid      |
| **Purchase Intention**|                |       |               |            |
| PI1                   | 0.87           | 0.24  | 10.29         | Valid      |
| PI2                   | 0.83           | 0.30  | 9.70          | Valid      |
| PI3                   | 0.77           | 0.40  | 8.71          | Valid      |
Based on the table above, it is concluded that all indicators in the Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, International Justice, Service Recovery Satisfaction, Relationship Quality, and Purchase Intention variables are valid because they have a loading factor value of > 0.5 and the t value is above the critical value 1.96.

**Data Reliability Test**

Reliability is an index that shows the extent to which a measuring device can be trusted or reliable. Measurements are considered reliable, if they show no bias or error-free and guarantee consistency of size over time. According to Malhotra (2012) reliability is a situation where the scale produces consistent results if repeated measurements are made.

In this study, the reliability test of each variable was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. Cronbach’s Alpha is a measure of reliability that has values ranging from zero to one (Hair et al, 2006). According to Eisingerich and Rubera (2010: 27) the minimum Cronbach’s Alpha level of reliability is 0.70. Cronbach’s Alpha level of reliability can be shown in the following table (Table 4).

**Table 4: Level of Reliability Based on Alpha Value**

| Cronbach’s Alpha value | Reliability level |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| 0.0 - 0.20             | Less reliable     |
| >0.20 – 0.40           | Rather reliable   |
| >0.40 – 0.60           | Pretty reliable   |
| >0.60 – 0.80           | Reliable          |
| >0.80 – 1.00           | Very reliable     |

The instrument reliability test results can be seen in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Instrument Reliability Test Results**

| Variable                  | Cronbach’s Alpha | Level of Reliability |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Procedural Justice        | 0.795            | Reliable             |
| Distributive Justice      | 0.624            | Reliable             |
| International Justice     | 0.720            | Reliable             |
| Service Recovery Satisfaction | 0.909         | Very reliable        |
Relationship Quality  0.847  Very reliable
Purchase Intention  0.862  Very reliable

The reliability test results explain that each variable produces the Cronbach’s Alpha value > 0.60. Based on reliability criteria, the Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, and International Justice variables have reliable reliability. Meanwhile, Service Recovery Satisfaction, Relationship Quality, and Purchase Intention have a very reliable level of reliability. From these results show that all data can be trusted or can be relied upon in measuring research variables.

**Construction Reliability Test**

Construct Reliability test aims to know consistency of the questions / statements contained in the questionnaire of each observed variable (Hair et al., 1995). If the results of the construct reliability calculation are greater than 0.70, it can be said that the reliability of the construct is good (Wijanto, 2008). A summary of the results of the Construct Reliability calculation for each latent variable is presented in the following table.

**Table 6: Construction Reliability Test Results**

| Variable                      | Value ≥ 0.70 | Conclusion |
|-------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Procedural Justice            | 0.815        | Reliable   |
| Distributive Justice          | 0.878        | Reliable   |
| International Justice         | 0.870        | Reliable   |
| Service Recovery Satisfaction | 0.868        | Reliable   |
| Relationship Quality          | 0.746        | Reliable   |
| Purchase Intention            | 0.866        | Reliable   |

Table 6 explains that Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, International Justice, Service Recovery Satisfaction, Relationship Quality, and Purchase Intention variables have reliable data because they have reliability construct values > 0.70. It can be concluded that all variables have reliable data and can be trusted in further testing.
Data Analysis Method

Data analysis using structural equation modeling (SEM) to assess hypotheses because it has the ability to estimate various relationships and relationship interrelationships when explaining measurement errors in the estimation process (Hair et al., 2006). Researchers are interested in SEM because SEM provides a conceptually interesting testing method for a theory. If a researcher reveals a theory in a relationship between the variables measured, then SEM will assess how the theory fits the reality as illustrated in the data (to find out how the research variables affect each other).

1) **Exogenous Constructions**

Exogenous constructs are independent variables that are not influenced by other variables in the model. In this study, variables included in the category of exogenous constructs are service recovery satisfaction, relationship quality, and purchase intention.

2) **Endogenous constructs**

Endogenous constructs are dependent variables (not free) that are influenced by one or several other variables in the model. Endogenous constructs can affect one or several other endogenous constructs, but this endogenous construct can only be causally related to endogenous constructs. (Hair et al., 2006). In this study there are 3 endogenous constructs, namely: procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice.

Research Model with Structural Equation Model (SEM)

Structural Equation Model (SEM) is a multivariate statistics technique that is able to analyze latent variables, indicator variables and measurement errors directly. With SEM researchers are able to analyze the relationship between latent variables and indicator variables, the relationship between one latent variable and another latent variable, also knowing the size of the measurement measure. Besides unidirectional causal relationships, SEM also allows to analyze two-way relationships that often appear in social science and behavior (Hair et al., 2006).
The Structural Equation Model (SEM) in this study can be described as follows:

**Picture 3: Full Structural Equation Model**

Then it can be explained, namely:

a) There are three exogenous latent variables (exogenous latent constructs) or $\varepsilon_1$ (procedural justice), $\varepsilon_2$ (distributive justice) and $\varepsilon_3$ (interactional justice), which are measured by indicators or manifests. The manifest symbols for exogenous variables are $X_1$, $X_2$, and $X_3$, and the error value (measurement error) is called $\delta$ (Delta) or $d$ from the dimensions of the exogenous contract.

b) There are three endogenous variables (endogenous latent constructs) $\varepsilon_1$ (service recovery satisfaction), $\varepsilon_2$ (relationship quality) and $\varepsilon_3$ (purchase intention). Measured by indicators or manifest error values (measurement error) are called epsilon (Epilson) or $e$.

c) The value of the endogenous latent variable is given an error or residual regression with the symbol $\delta$ (Zeta) or $z$ error in the equation, which is between the exogenous / endogenous variables.

d) The regression coefficient between exogenous latent variables and endogenous latent variables is given the symbol $\gamma$ (Gama) by giving the notation of exogenous latent variables to endogenous latent variables, namely:

From $\varepsilon_1$ to $\varepsilon_2$

From $\varepsilon_2$ to $\varepsilon_2$
From ε3 to ε2,

e) The regression coefficient between endogenous latent variables to other endogenous latent variables is given the symbol β (beta) or b by giving a notation. From ε2 to ε1 = b2
From ε2 to ε3 = b2

f) The loading factor value of the latent matrix regression coefficient construct according to the loading factor on the exogenous latent variable given the symbol λx (Lambda x), and the loading factor value from the latent construct or regression coefficient matrix according to the loading factor on endogenous latent variables λy (Lambda y).

g) From the Endogenous variable (ε1-3), the indicator includes 12 questions, consisting of procedural justice variables (4 questions), distributive justice (3 questions), and interactional justice (5 questions).

h) Exogenous Variables, ε1 (Eta1), ε2 (Eta2), and ε3 (Eta3) consist of 30 items of questions, namely service recovery satisfaction (13 questions / 6 dimensions), relationship quality (14 questions / 3 dimensions), and purchase intention (3 questions).

**Tabel 7: Model Suitability Test Measure (Gof)**

| GOF Measure     | Formulation                  | Description                                                                 |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square Value| $X^2 = \frac{(N-1)}{FML}$   | Suitability model based on maximum likelihood (ML). It is expected that the value is low so that a high P value of more than 0.05 is obtained. The value of $X^2 = 0$ and the value of $P = 1$, identify the model fit perfect. |
|                 | $FML = tr (\Sigma^{-1}) - (p + q) + In$ |                                                                           |
|                 | $\Sigma = S$                |                                                                           |
|                 | $S$ = estimation correlation matrix |                                                                           |
|                 | $N$ = sample size           |                                                                           |
|                 | $(p + q)$ = number of manifest variables |                                                                           |
| Goodness of Fit | GFI = $1 - \frac{1}{2}tr(S^{-1})$ | The dimensions of the suitability of the model are selectively. GFI ≥0.90 indicates that the fit model or model is acceptable. |

| Statistical Measure | Description |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | The approximate value of the average square root error. The value is expected to be low. RMSEA ≤ 0.08 means the model is fit with data. |
| Expected Cross Validation Index (ECVI) | The measure of suitability of the model if the estimated model is tested with a different sample but of the same size. |
| Cooperatif Conformity Measure | |
| Adjusted GFI (AGFI) | Customized GFI value. AGFI ≥ 0.09 indicates the model is fit with the data. |
| Normal Fit Index (NFI) | The measure of suitability of the model on a comparative basis to the base line or the null model. The null model is generally a model that states that between the variables that have the estimated nature of the model are not interconnected. According to this size, the model is fit if NFI is ≥ 0.90. NFI = 0.90 means the model is indicated to be 90% better than the null model. |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | Size based suitability model comparative with the null model. CFI values range from 0.0 to 1.0 CFI ≥ 0.90 is said to be a model fit with data. |

ECVI = \frac{x^2 + \frac{2(k)}{N-1}}{N-1} + \frac{2(k)}{N-1}

k = parameter estimated total

\text{AGFI} = 1 - \frac{p+q}{d_f} (1-GFI)

NFI = \frac{x^2_{null} - x^2_{proposed}}{x^2_{null}}

CFI = 1 - \frac{x^2_{null} - x^2_{proposed}}{x^2_{null} - df_{null}}
Parsimonious Suitability Measures

| Normed Chi-Square (NCS) | \( \frac{x^2}{df} \) | The measure of conformity that is parsimony, which is testing whether the number of coefficients estimated has a requirement to achieve an NCS fit model ranging from 1.0-5.0 indicates the model is fit with the data. |

| Parsimonious Normed Fit Index (PNFI) | \( \frac{df_{proposed}}{df_{null}} \times NFI \) | Measures of parsimony suitability as a correction to AGFI, PGFI ≥, 90 indicate more parsimony models |

Overall Model Compatibility

Structural model analysis in SEM begins with testing the suitability of the overall model seen based on the Goodness-of-fit Index (GFI) indicator of LISREL output (Hair et al., 1998). Overall a summary of the critical values of the fit tests for the entire model can be seen in the summary in Table 8.

Table 8: Model Suitability Test Results

| Size Degree of Match | Value | Acceptable level of compatibility | Information |
|----------------------|-------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Goodness of Fit Indices (GFI) | 0,97 | GFI > 0,9 | Fit |
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | 0,073 | RMSEA ≤ 0,08 (good fit) | Fit |
| Normed Fit Index (NFI) | 0,90 | NFI > 0,90 | Fit |
| Adjusted GFI (AGFI) | 0,70 | AGFI ≥ 0,09 | |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | 0,96 | CFI > 0,9 | Fit |
| Incremental Fit Index (IFI) | 0,96 | IFI > 0,90 | Fit |
| Relative Fit Index (RFI) | 0,97 | RFI > 0,90 | Fit |
From the detailed data, it can be seen that the research model meets the suitability requirements of the model. For the GFI value of 0.97>0.90 shows that the Fit model. RMSA value of 0.073<0.08 indicates that the Fit model.

On measuring the degree of compatibility by determining the CFI value shows that the model is fit. According to Bentler (1990) in Ghozali and Fuad (2007: 316) a model is said to be good if it has a CFI value close to 1 and 0.96 indicating the model is fit. Measuring the degree of compatibility with NFI of 0.90>0.90 also shows that the model is fit.

The results of the model fit are confirmed by the acquisition of an IFI value of 0.96, which according to Byrne (1198) in Ghozali and Fuad (2007), the IFI value that is close indicates that the data is fit. Meanwhile, regarding Relative Fit Index (RFI), Glozali and Fuad (2007: 316) states that RFI ranges from 0 to 1 where the value close to 1 shows the model fit. The model in this study obtained an RFI value of 0.97, it can be said that the model is close to 1 so that it can be said that the model is fit.

**DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH RESULTS**

**Descriptive Data**

Descriptive statistics according to Sugiyono (2009: 169) are statistical methods used to analyze data by describing or describing data that has been collected as it is without the intention of making conclusions that apply to general or generalization. In this study descriptive statistics were used to use the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values of the data on the variables used in this study.

**Table 9: Descriptive Statistics Test Results**

|                | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean     | Deviation Std. |
|----------------|----|----------|---------|----------|----------------|
| Procedural     | 100| 1.75     | 5.00    | 3.5425   | .66861         |
| Distributive   | 100| 2.00     | 5.00    | 4.0432   | .59289         |
| International  | 100| 1.60     | 5.00    | 3.4580   | .69124         |
| Service        | 100| 1.70     | 5.00    | 3.5350   | .61453         |
| Relationship   | 100| 2.29     | 5.00    | 3.7906   | .36961         |
| Intention      | 100| 1.00     | 5.00    | 3.6604   | .72611         |

Valid N (listwise) 100
Based on Table 9, can be explained that the procedural justice variable produces a minimum value of 1.75 and a maximum of 5 produces a mean value of 3.5425 and a standard deviation of 0.66861. Distributive justice variable produces a minimum value of 2 and a maximum of 5. From these results known that the mean is 4.0432 and the standard deviation is 5.9289. Meanwhile, the interactional justice variable produces a minimum value of 1.60 and a maximum of 5 produces a mean value of 3.4580 and a standard deviation of 0.69124.

The service recovery satisfaction variable known have a minimum value of 1.70 and a maximum of 5 produces a mean value of 3.5350 and a standard deviation of 0.61453. The relationship quality variable produces a minimum value of 2.29 and a maximum of 5 with a mean of 3.7906 and a stander deviation of 0.36961. The purchase intention variable produces a minimum value of 1 and a maximum of 5, with a mean value of 3.6604 and a standard deviation of 0.72611.

**Research Results Analysis**

Data analysis in this study uses structural equation models (SEM) to assess hypotheses because they have the ability to estimate various relationships and relationship interrelationships when explaining measurement errors.

Testing hypothesis in this study is done by looking at the critical value (CR) at a 95% confidence level or 5% error, then the CR value received is 1.96 (Hair, et.al., 2006: 390). The test results in this study can be seen in the following picture.
Based on Figure 4 above, structural equations are obtained as follows:

\[
\text{SERVICE} = 1.74 \text{PROC} - 0.57 \text{DIST} + 0.44 \text{INTRA} + e
\]

\[
\text{PELATION} = 0.61 \text{SERVICE} + e
\]

\[
\text{PURCHASE} = 0.45 \text{SERVICE} + e
\]

The equation in the structural model (1) shows that the procedural justice variable has a positive relationship with service recovery satisfaction of 1.74. While the distributive justice variable has a negative relationship with service recovery satisfaction of 0.57, and interactional justice has a positive relationship with service recovery satisfaction of 0.44.

The equation in the model (2) shows that service recovery satisfaction has a positive relationship with relationship quality of 0.61. Meanwhile, the model equation (3) shows that service recovery satisfaction has a positive relationship with purchase intention of 0.45.

Furthermore, hypothesis testing in this study was carried out by looking at the critical value (CR) at a 95% confidence level or 5% error, then the CR value received was 1.96 (Hair et al., 2006: 390). The results of hypothesis testing regarding the effect of procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice on service recovery satisfaction. And the influence of service recovery on relationship quality and purchase intention. The results in this study can be seen in the following figure:
Based on picture 5, the results of testing the model with t-value can be seen that procedural justice produces a t-value of 2.54 > 1.96, which means there is a positive effect of procedural justice on service recovery satisfaction. Distributive justice variable produces a t-value of -0.94 < 1.96, which means there is no positive influence of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction. Meanwhile, the interactional justice variable produces a t-value of 2.13 > 1.96, which means there is a positive interactional justice effect on service recovery satisfaction.

The results of the t-value test on the service recovery satisfaction variable produce a value of 4.29 > 1.96, meaning that there is a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality. Meanwhile, the calculated t value of the service recovery satisfaction variable on purchase intention results in a t-value of 4.08, meaning that there is a positive effect of service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention.

**Discussion of Research Results**

From the results of hypothesis testing using the method of structural equation model (SEM) analysis in the previous sub-chapter. Can be summarized as follows.

**Table 10**: Hypothesis Results Calculation

| Path                  | Loading | Critical Ratio |
|-----------------------|---------|----------------|
| procedural justice →  | 1.47    | 2.54           |
| distributive justice →| -0.57   | -0.94          |
**Hypothesis #1**

The first hypothesis that influences the relationship of procedural justice to satisfaction service recovery. The null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) are arranged as follows:

**Ho1:** There is no positive influence on procedural fairness towards service recovery satisfaction

**Ha1:** There are positive procedural justice effects on service recovery satisfaction. The results of the first hypothesis indicate that the hypothesis is accepted because it has a loading value of 1.47 and a CR of 2.54 > 1.96, so Ho1 can be rejected and accept Ha1, which means there is a positive effect of procedural justice on service recovery satisfaction. This shows that if procedural justice increases it will lead to an increase in service recovery satisfaction.

These results support the study of Badawi (2012) and Ellyawati, et al. (2012), each of which states that procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on satisfaction after handling complaints. Huang et al. (2015) which shows that perceived justice is proven to influence consumer satisfaction and purchase intention. Prihartami (2011), and Badawi (2012) state that, the perception of interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction after handling complaints. The findings of this study are in line with the results of research by Kau and Loh (2006) and Deria (2009) which show that the handling of computers in procedural justice has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

According to Ghoniyah (2012) procedural justice refers to perceptions of fairness of policies and procedures in an effort to handle service recovery. There is evidence that procedural justice affects the outcome of the service recovery process. Likewise with the results of the research that has been carried out, concluding that the value of justice is inherent in the reliability of the complaints process. The value of procedural justice as
measured by responsibility, speed, convenience, follow-up, the process of supervision and knowledge of processes is able to increase customer satisfaction after handling complaints at PT Indotruck Utama as one of Volvo Trucks Indonesia's dealers.

**Hypothesis #2**
The second hypothesis examines the effect of Distributive Justice on Service Recovery Satisfaction. The null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) are arranged as follows:

Ho2: *There is no positive effect of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction*

Ha2: *There is a positive influence of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction*

The second hypothesis results show that the hypothesis is rejected because has a loading value of -0.57 and CR obtained at -0.94 < 1.96, so Ho2 is acceptable and rejects Ha2 which means there is no positive influence of distributive justice on service recovery satisfaction. This means that the good perception of distributive justice by consumers does not affect satisfaction after handling complaints.

The results of this study are not cloudy in previous studies conducted by Badawi (2012), Korry (2010), Kau and Loh (2006), and Ellyawati, et al. (2012) respectively stating that distributive justice has a positive and significant influence on customer satisfaction after handling complaints.

Contrast with Vinartha's (2015) study based on the results of the hypothesis, it can be explained that distributive justice has no significant effect on satisfaction after handling complaints. This research is not in accordance with the research conducted by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) stating that distributive justice has an effect on satisfaction due to service recovery and overall satisfaction.

Similarly, Goodwin and Ross (1992) and Tax et al. (1998) found that distributive justice affects satisfaction with handling complaints. Distributive justice has a greater effect (compared to procedural justice and interactional justice) on customer satisfaction after service recovery, repurchase desire and loyalty (Blodgett and Granbois, 1992; Boshoff, 1997; Conlon and Murray, 1996; Smith et al., 1999; Tax et al., 1996 in Oliver et al., 2010).

In this study PT Indotruck Utama consumers did not pay much attention to the results of discussion or debate, negotiations, and decisions involving both parties between the customer and PT Indotruck Utama when the service was restored, even though PT
Indotruck Utama had implemented it as an effort to provide financial compensation that is in accordance with consumer losses fairly.

**Hypothesis #3**
The third hypothesis examines the influence of Interactional Justice on Service Recovery Satisfaction. The null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) are arranged as follows:

**Ho3**: There is no interactional justice positive effect on service recovery satisfaction  
**Ha3**: There is a positive interactional justice effect on service recovery satisfaction

The results of the third hypothesis indicate that the hypothesis is accepted because it has a loading value of 0.44 and CR of 2.13 > 1.96. then Ho3 is rejected and accepts Ha3, which means there is a positive interactional justice effect on service recovery satisfaction.

These results indicate that an increase in interactional justice will cause an increase in satisfaction after handling complaints. The results of the study support the study of Prihartami (2011), and Badawi (2012) which states that the perception of interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction after handling complaints.

This research is also supported by Deria (2009) and Astuti (2011) that, the handling of complements by means of interactional justice has a positive and significant effect on customer and patient satisfaction. Interactional justice relates to interpersonal behavior in the form of procedures and delivery of results, which include explanation, honesty, politeness, effort and empathy provided by the service provider. The action in this case is the company’s response to the complaint pointed out by the customer, the complaining customer can turn into a loyal customer if the company responds to the complaint well (Kau and Loh, 2006).

**Hypothesis #4**
The fourth hypothesis tests the effect of service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality. The null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) are arranged as follows:

**Ho4**: There is no positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality  
**Ha4**: There is a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality
The results of the fourth hypothesis show that the hypothesis is accepted because it has a loading value of 0.61 and CR of $4.29 > 1.96$, then $H_{04}$ is rejected and accepts $H_{a4}$, which means that there is a positive effect of service recovery satisfaction on relationship quality.

The results of this study indicate that with good quality relationships, customers can rely on the integrity of a seller or service provider and have confidence in the performance of a service provider in the future because the performance level of a service provider in the past has been consistently satisfying.

This study supports Wang et al. (2014), the results of his research show that satisfaction with service recovery has an effect on purchase intention and behavior through the quality of the relationship. As Sundarti and Atika (2013) argue that service recovery is an important part in shaping the quality of relationships.

Service recovery is a specific action that is carried out to ensure that customers get a reasonable level of service after normal service problems occur. Service recovery is a result of thought, plan, and process to make up for the disappointment of customers being satisfied with the organization after the service provided has a problem (failure). For this reason, if there is an error or a customer complaint, the company needs to handle it properly and if necessary do recovery so that the customer does not leave the company.

Many researchers believe that if this service failure is not immediately dealt with quickly it will incur large costs in its recovery and lead to consumer displacement (Kotler, 2000; Maxham, 2001; Roos, 1999). The most important benefit of service recovery is maintaining customers, because the cost of retaining customers is less than the cost of finding new customers, and the longer a person becomes a customer, the person is more profitable for the organization (Lewis and Spyrokopoulos, 2001).

**Hypothesis #5**

The fifth hypothesis examines the effect of service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention. The null hypothesis ($H_0$) and the alternative hypothesis ($H_a$) are arranged as follows:

$H_0$: *There is no positive effect of service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention*

$H_a$: *There is a positive influence on service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention*
The results of the fifth hypothesis show that the hypothesis is accepted because it has a loading value of 0.45 and CR of 4.08 > 1.96. Then Ho5 is rejected and accepts Ha4, which means there is a positive effect of service recovery satisfaction on purchase intention.

This shows that satisfaction recovery services performed by companies are able to increase purchase intentions. These results support the study of Huang et al. (2015) showed that perceived justice proved to influence consumer satisfaction and purchase intention.

These findings are in line with the study conducted by Wirtz and Matilla (2004), and Wen et al. (2011), and Akhtar (2010) who found that satisfaction after complaint handling had a positive and significant effect on purchase intention.

According to the researchers, the economic results achieved by increasing customer satisfaction are indicative of long-term effects and have a direct effect on buying interest. Service recovery is a positive response to consumer needs and may improve the relationship between consumers and the company.

However, it is important to note that the service recovery strategy that is not implemented carefully may lead to consumer dissatisfaction, also emphasizes the importance of effective service recovery for increasing customer satisfaction when a problem or error occurs (Agustin, 2011)

**CONCLUSION**

By paying attention to the discussion and analysis that has been carried out, some conclusions can be made as follows:

1. Procedural justice proved to have a positive effect on service recovery satisfaction at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers. The results of hypothesis testing show that the hypothesis is supported because it has a loading value of 1.47 and the CR value obtained is $2.54 > 1.96$.

2. Distributive justice does not have a positive effect on service recovery satisfaction at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers. Hypothesis testing results show that the hypothesis is rejected because it has a loading value of $-0.57$ and CR obtained at $-0.94 < 1.96$.

3. Interaction justice proved to have a positive effect on service recovery satisfaction at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers.
The results of hypothesis testing show that the hypothesis is supported because it has a loading value of 0.44 and a CR value of 2.13 > 1.96.

4. Service recovery satisfaction has proven to have a positive influence on relationship quality at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers. The results of hypothesis testing show that the hypothesis is supported because it has a loading value of 0.61 and a CR value of 4.29 > 1.96.

5. Service recovery satisfaction proved to have a positive influence on purchase intention at PT. Indotruck Utama as one of the Volvo Trucks Indonesia dealers. The results of hypothesis testing show that the hypothesis is supported because it has a loading value of 0.45 and a CR value of 4.08 > 1.96.

6. From the results of testing the above hypothesis almost everything is accepted, only H2 is rejected. This is because the consumer characteristics of Volvo truck customers are more oriented towards the process and manner of dealer communication in handling customer complaints.

**MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Based on the above conclusions, suggestions for managerial parties are presented below.

1. Effective service recovery strategies need to be well planned by PT. Indotruck Utama as one of Indonesia’s Volvo Trucks dealers, because this strategy is well used as a medium to restore customer trust.

2. PT. Indotruck Utama, as one of Indonesia’s Volvo Trucks dealers, needs to pay more attention to distributive justice, especially in providing discounts, refunds, and other forms of compensation. This is because distributive justice has a greater effect (compared to procedural justice and interactional justice) to customer satisfaction after service recovery, repurchase desire and customer loyalty.

3. Handling complaints in service recovery after service failure is used as a way to establish sustainable and beneficial relationships for PT. Main Indotruck. Management should seek customer satisfaction.

4. To the maximum extent possible to provide a sense of comfort and satisfaction for consumers, an effective complaint handling provided by Volvo Trucks
Indonesia’s dealer management through service recovery can strengthen the quality of positive relationships that attract consumers to make purchasing decisions on Volvo products.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR NEXT RESEARCH**

1. Samples do not present populations because the population is too large and the number of samples is not large enough. For further research, the population is narrowed down or the number of samples is added.
2. The factors that influence purchasing decisions in this study are only measured from service recovery satisfaction and the quality of relationships with consumers. For further research, it is recommended to conduct research in a wider scope, for example by adding other related variables such as Word of Mouth (WOM) and marketing performance.
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