

Innovations

Web Care Quality and Customer Justice Perception of Online Stores among Youths in South East Nigeria

¹ Okechukwu Nduka Duke Onyemachi; ² Chuka Uzoma Ifediora (Ph.D);

³ Chukwuemeka Udodirim (Ph.D)

^{1,2} Department of Marketing, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nigeria

³ Department of Marketing, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Abia State Nigeria

Corresponding Author: **Okechukwu Nduka Duke Onyemachi**

Abstract: Online customer complaints and reviews have increased significantly in recent years. The majority of these complaints, particularly those directed at online stores, concern issues such as digital payment failures, hidden charges, security concerns, delivery delays, product quality, and refund policies. The widespread adoption of the internet, especially social media, has enabled customers to publicly share their dissatisfaction and unmet expectations through negative reviews. These negative online reviews can adversely affect an organization's reputation, brand image, purchase intentions, and customer attitudes. In response, many companies have implemented online responses, a practice known as webcare, to address and mitigate the negative impact of such complaints. The evaluative dimensions, or webcare quality, used by customers to assess the effectiveness of online store responses to negative reviews are crucial. However, there is a lack of descriptive studies examining customer assessments of webcare quality among youths who have purchased phones or phone accessories in South East Nigeria. This study utilized a questionnaire to collect data and employed descriptive analysis to evaluate the opinions of 371 respondents. The findings indicate that respondents perceive online stores as providing webcare characterized by immediacy, ownership, comprehensiveness, civility, assurance, coherence, personalization, retention, and elaborateness. Based on these results, it is recommended that online stores design their webcare strategies to incorporate these dimensions, as they represent the criteria customers use to evaluate the quality of managerial responses to negative reviews.

Introduction

Customers reviews and complaints have increased in frequency recently, particularly within online retail environments. These complaints often focus on issues such as digital payment failures, hidden fees, security concerns, delivery delays, missing product information, poor product quality, refund policies, poorly designed product pages, and websites that are not optimized for mobile devices (Jung, Garbarino, Briley, & Wynhausen, 2017). Customers now extensively use social networking platforms to share their service experiences and evaluate market offerings, both with peers and with the companies involved. Customer feedback is highly visible across social media, online review forums, news website comment sections, and other interactive digital environments (Kerkhof & Dijkmans, 2019; Park & Park, 2013). In response, many businesses have adopted webcare, a practice involving the monitoring and management of negative online reviews through written responses aimed at mitigating adverse effects. Marketers are increasingly prioritizing webcare over traditional offline service recovery strategies (van Noort & Willemsen, 2011). Direct engagement with customers on social media has become standard practice (Kerkhof & Dijkmans, 2019).

The attributes that define standard webcare are critical. As Customers increasingly share their complaints, organizations must evaluate the quality of their responses. Ghosh and Mandal (2020) identified nine keywebcare quality: immediacy, ownership, comprehensiveness, civility, assurance, coherence, retention, personalization, and elaborateness. These attributes may be emphasized differently depending on the specific responses provided by marketers. This study focuses on these characteristics, as they represent the criteria used by complainants to assess the adequacy of organizational replies. Additionally, the study examines customer perceptions of fairness associated with these responses, known as customer justice perception. The idea of customer justice perception provides an important framework for understanding how customers respond to complaints (Blodgett et al., 1997).

This research is motivated by several issues. Firstly, most of the existing studies have been conducted outside Nigeria, leading to a contextual void concerning geographical areas. To the researcher's knowledge, the study by Ojiaku, Nkambebe, and Chibuike (2019) is the only research on webcare in Nigeria, which investigated the influence of webcare on students' intentions to leave online reviews. In this research, webcare was approached as webcare strategies rather than webcare quality. Thus, it is essential to gain an understanding of customers' views on webcare quality and customer justice perceptions in the context of Nigerian online stores. Secondly, webcare quality is a relatively new notion that has not been extensively researched. In fact, the metric for measuring webcare quality was developed only recently, within the last decade (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020; Sreejesh, Paul & Unnithan, 2020). This fundamental literature gap offers intriguing research opportunities to delve into an entirely new realm

concerning webcare quality and customer justice perception. Thirdly, the reviewed studies on webcare quality and customer justice perception have largely concentrated on customers as a whole across various age demographics (e.g., Ghosh & Mandal, 2020; Ghosh & Raju, 2018; Raju, 2019; Sreejesh, Paul & Unnithan, 2020). There is a lack of research examining webcare quality and customer justice perception specifically among customers within youth age. Investigating the perspectives of young customers regarding webcare quality and customer justice perceptions would be insightful. Finally, existing research on webcare and justice perception has typically focused on categories such as hotels and dining, air transport services, automotive products, banking services, convenience goods, hair styling and dry-cleaning services, telecommunications, and health services (e.g., Ghosh & Mandal, 2020; Raju, 2019; Kim & Tang, 2016; Umar, 2023; Komunda & Osarenkhoe, 2012; Yang & Peng, 2009; Chang, Lee & Tseng, 2008; Mattila, 2001). However, there seems to be a significant lack of research addressing webcare quality and customer justice perception in relation to phones and/or phone accessories product category among youthful customers in South East Nigeria. Therefore, this study aims to descriptively examine these gaps.

Review of Related Literature

Webcare

Webcare refers to the interactions that take place online between organizations and customers regarding complaints, and experiences related to the organization's offerings (Kerkhof & Dijkmans, 2019). It involves engaging with complaining customers by actively seeking out feedback on the web and keeping an eye on negative word-of-mouth online and taking corrective measures (Van Noort & Willemsen, 2011). Webcare comprises written online responses to customers who have had unsatisfactory experiences with products and services, especially in the form of negative reviews (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). Liebrecht and Van Hooijdonk (2022) characterized webcare as an organization's engagement in discussions with stakeholders on both public and private social networking platforms. It can further signify participation in online dialogues with customers and addressing customer reviews (Weitzl & Hutzinger, 2017). Thus, we define webcare as an organization's response - be it text, image, video, or audio - to customer complaints, reviews, questions, or concerns about products or services, aimed at reducing negative impacts, re-attracting customers, or managing the organization's public image.

Webcare Quality

Webcare Quality refers to the level of response quality that an organization demonstrates in online channels when addressing complaints or issues raised by dissatisfied customers through negative reviews (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). It can be understood as the perceived traits or features of webcare that define the quality and appropriateness of responses to online customer complaints. This represents a

perceived standard or benchmark utilized by customers who either lodge complaints or observe them to evaluate the acceptability or quality of the organization's replies to online reviews or concerns. The nine aspects of webcare quality identified by Ghosh and Mandal (2020) are elaborated upon below.

Immediacy

Immediacy pertains to how current and updated an online response is. It reflects the speed of the webcare service. The time gap between a customer's review and the marketer's response showcases immediacy. This indicates how swiftly an organization reacts to customer feedback. Additionally, it illustrates how soon after a review a webcare is provided. On the other hand, immediacy highlights the level of delay in addressing customer reviews. A shorter response time is generally viewed more favorably by customers. When a customer perceives webcare as timely, they receive prompt online feedback from the marketer (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020).

Ownership

The extent to which a marketer has control over a webcare or is accountable for its dissemination in online platforms is crucial. This ownership is shown through the essential contact information such as name, job title, email, and other details shared by the marketer alongside their written response. A customer who views the webcare as having a strong sense of ownership can easily ascertain from the response who to reach out to within the organization to resolve their issue (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). In simpler terms, ownership implies that the customer is aware of the source of the webcare. The origin of the response is clearly recognized. The identity of the individual(s) responsible for crafting the webcare is transparently communicated.

Comprehensiveness

Comprehensiveness refers to the degree to which efforts are made to thoroughly consider all possible recovery actions after a failure occurs. This is similar to exploring various strategic planning alternatives to identify the best course of action based on existing information (Papke-Shields et al., 2002). It reflects the thoroughness of information provided in webcare concerning all issues or inquiries raised by the customer. A webcare deemed high in comprehensiveness effectively addresses all grievances expressed by the customer (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). Comprehensiveness suggests that the information provided in the webcare is thorough, complete, and addresses every complaint raised by the customer.

Civility

Civility is a characteristic of communication that adheres to specific social customs outlining the proper ways to engage and interact (Bonotti & Zech, 2021). It encompasses the politeness, thoughtfulness, and expressions of regret found within

webcare. A customer assigns a high civility rating to a webcare when an organization sincerely acknowledges its errors or the harm it has caused and responds to the customer with respect. The civility of webcare is reflected in its level of politeness. A webcare demonstrates civility when it is delivered in a congenial manner. The respectful tone of the webcare illustrates its civility. Webcare that includes an organization's apology is considered to have elements of civility (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020).

Assurance

Assurance reflects the level of trust and confidence a brand can build in customers throughout their interactions (Zeithaml et al., 2006). It is the capabilities and expertise of employees that foster trust and confidence in customers, leading to a sense of safety and comfort during service delivery (Wu et al., 2015). It can be described as the ability of a webcare team to instill trust and confidence in customers that an issue will not arise again. Customers seek affirmative communication from companies that have made mistakes, which reassures them enough to return to the service provider. Assurance can be observed within a webcare when a company commits to avoiding future errors. This involves the webcare cultivating a sense of trust and confidence among dissatisfied customers, encouraging them to utilize the product/service once more. Assurance can be perceived through the webcare to such an extent that customers feel the organization will adhere to its standards (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020).

Coherence

Coherence refers to the quality of a webcare being logical, complete, and meaningful (Gamblin, Banks, & Dean, 2019). It is communicative rationality, which is the capacity for individuals to engage in discussions, constructive disagreements, and arguments aimed at reaching consensus. Coherence mainly reflects the level of rationality or validity of the explanations offered in the webcare by the organization. It involves clearly articulating the reasons behind a service failure. When these reasons are viewed as unambiguous and credible by the customer, they contribute to a higher level of coherence in the webcare (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020).

Retention

Customer retention refers to how likely a customer is to continue with a specific brand or service provider (Ranaweera & Neely, 2003). It encompasses all actions aimed at preserving the business relationship between the service provider and the customer (Seth et al., 2005). It represents a company's ability to convert customers into repeat purchasers and prevent them from migrating to competitors. It can also indicate the length of time customers remain loyal to a company. This concept includes all measures and strategies organizations implement to reduce the number of customers who leave (Vroman & Reichheld, 1996). In the context of webcare, retention signifies

the extent of a marketer's commitment to keep and foster long-term relationships with customers, as demonstrated through their webcare efforts. Responses must be crafted to portray the marketer as sincerely invested in retaining the dissatisfied customer, even after an incident of service failure (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020).

Personalization

Personalization refers to the degree to which a response is crafted for a particular person (Javornik et al., 2020). In the realm of webcare, personalization can be understood as the extent to which the webcare is tailored to align with an individual customer's preferences. It aims to ensure that customers feel the responses address their specific issues (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). The customization of webcare can focus on both the recipient (the complaining customer) and the provider (the company at fault). For the recipient, achieving personalization in webcare can involve the use of second-person pronouns such as "you" and "your," as well as directly recognizing the recipient (e.g., "Hi Okechukwu"). These methods invite recipients to engage in the dialogue (Willemssen et al., 2013). Similarly, from the company's perspective, webcare can be personalized by employing first-person pronouns like "I" and "we," and featuring human representatives who are identifiable by their name or photograph. Using these strategies makes the webcare appear to come from real people within the organization (i.e., individualized communication) instead of the company as a whole - a more impersonal communication (Kruikemeier et al., 2013).

Elaborateness

The elaborateness of webcare pertains to the amount of information conveyed, which is indicated by the response length. Responses that are more extensive and thoroughly address customer concerns are considered to have high elaborateness (Ghosh & Mandal, 2020). Marketers can effectively address negative feedback by delivering detailed replies, whereas positive feedback should be acknowledged with more concise responses. Giving an elaborate response to positive feedback might downplay the few negative aspects mentioned in those generally favorable reviews, potentially diminishing the positive impact of webcare (Chen et al., 2019).

Customer Justice Perception

Generally, customer justice perception refers to how customers assess whether a company has met its promise to deliver the expected outcomes and benefits (Bowen et al., 1999). In particular, it involves customers' feelings about the fairness of the results (or compensation) from their service experiences, their view on the fairness of the company's policies and processes, and their perceptions of how fairly they were treated by service staff (Blodgett et al., 1997; Tax, Brown, & Chandrashekar, 1998). Customer justice perception pertains to how an individual evaluates the fairness of a company's online customer service interactions. This concept is multidimensional,

consisting of three aspects: distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Furby, 1986; Homburg & Fürst, 2005; Smith et al., 1999). Distributive justice involves perceptions regarding the fairness of the compensation or outcome provided by the companies that have caused dissatisfaction. Examples of such compensation include refunds, discounts, coupons, gifts, replacements, and apologies (Tax et al., 1998). Procedural justice pertains to customers' perceptions of how fair the complaint handling process is (Tax et al., 1998). This process encompasses the procedures, policies, and criteria utilized by companies to determine the outcome of a customer complaint (Blodgett et al., 1997). Interactional justice reflects customers' perceptions of the fairness of the behaviour displayed by the employees of the company in question (Tax et al., 1998). This perceived fairness is influenced by five behavioural factors: providing an explanation for the service failure, honesty, the effort made to resolve the issue, politeness, and empathy (Tax et al., 1998).

Research Methodology

A survey research design was employed for this study, which was conducted in the southeastern states of Nigeria: Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo. Primary data were collected, and Cochran (1963) formula was used to determine a representative sample size of 384. The sample size for each state was allocated based on the estimated youth population for 2024, using 2006 population figures and state-specific growth rates (NPC, 2010; NBS, 2022). A judgmental sampling technique was adopted, as respondents needed to meet specific criteria: being youth aged 15 to 29 (FMYSD, 2019), made online complaint on purchased phones and/or phone accessories from an online store in the last one year, and received a response. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with close-ended questions on a five-point Likert scale. Field-based surveys were conducted with the assistance of research assistants, utilizing the drop-and-pick method in two major cities per state. Ghosh and Mandal (2020) and Smith, Bolton and Wagner (1999) scales for webcare quality and customer justice perception respectively were adapted. The research instrument was validated through face and content validation. Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's alpha were used to assess the research instrument reliability. Descriptive analysis was applied to evaluate webcare quality and customer justice perception. Decision rule to accept or reject any construct is based on the principle of simple majority of the opinions of the respondents. In other words, at least 51% of them and this translate to at least the grand mean being ≥ 2.55 . In other words, any construct response with grand mean score of ≥ 2.55 was accepted while any construct response with grand mean score of < 2.55 was rejected.

Results and Discussion

All the constructs depicted in Table 1 exceeded 0.708 benchmark for reliability as recommended by Hair et al. (2017). Consequently, all the study's constructs checked were reliable and consistent. Face and content validity were used in the study.

Table 1: Reliability Test

| Variables | Cronbach's α | CR |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Immediacy | 0.886 | 0.888 |
| Ownership | 0.964 | 0.966 |
| Comprehensiveness | 0.926 | 0.927 |
| Civility | 0.917 | 0.918 |
| Assurance | 0.911 | 0.913 |
| Coherence | 0.918 | 0.915 |
| Retention | 0.919 | 0.921 |
| Personalization | 0.962 | 0.963 |
| Elaborateness | 0.892 | 0.897 |
| Customer justice perception | 0.933 | 0.934 |

Source: AMOS SEM output

The results below show descriptive analysis of respondents' opinions on webcare quality and customer justice perception of online stores among youths in south east Nigeria.

Table 2. Immediacy

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|--|-----|------|---------|
| IMM1 | The response I got from the online store to my complaint was prompt | 371 | 2.71 | 1.018 |
| IMM2 | The response I got to my complaints was quick | 371 | 2.82 | .935 |
| IMM3 | The response I got to my complaints was not delayed | 371 | 2.93 | .964 |
| IMM4 | The response I got from the complaints was provided soon after I posted the complaints | 371 | 3.10 | 1.003 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.89 | .847 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Immediacy in Table 2 indicates that the grand mean is > 2.55 decision rule benchmark. This shows agreement that online stores were quick in responding to customers

complaints. This is in tandem with Ghosh and Mandal (2020), Sreejesh et al (2020) and Smith et al (1999) where they observed that immediacy was paramount in assessing webcare quality. When a webcare provided is fast, immediate, prompt, and is not delayed, the customers consider such as fundamental ingredient of webcare quality.

Table 3. Ownership

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|--|-----|------|---------|
| OWN1 | After reading the response to my complaints, I know whom to contact in the online store | 371 | 2.79 | 1.178 |
| OWN2 | The response to my complaint has contact details about the person who have written it | 371 | 2.92 | 1.169 |
| OWN3 | The response to my complaints provides details of the designation of the person who have written it. | 371 | 2.91 | 1.173 |
| OWN4 | The response to my complaint provides clarity on the source. | 371 | 2.92 | 1.191 |
| OWN5 | There is no ambiguity regarding the source of the response to my complaints | 371 | 2.89 | 1.194 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.89 | 1.104 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Ownership in Table 3 has grand mean > 2.55. This affirms that the respondents place high premium on webcare that shows ownership. This result is validated by Ghosh and Mandal (2020), Raju (2019), Gelbrich and Roschk (2011) where they observed ownership as a critical constituent of webcare quality. Customers adjudges the quality of webcare provided if its source is clearly known.

Table 4. Comprehensiveness

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|--|-----|------|---------|
| COM1 | The response provided by the online store was complete. | 371 | 2.74 | .924 |
| COM2 | The information in the response to my complaint was exhaustive. | 371 | 2.83 | .931 |
| COM3 | The response to my complaint addressed all the issues raised in the complaint. | 371 | 2.92 | .974 |
| COM4 | All my concerns/problems have been addressed in the response to my complaint | 371 | 2.98 | 1.016 |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------|------|
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.87 | .870 |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------|------|

Source: Field survey, 2025

Comprehensiveness quality of webcare in Table 4 has grand > 2.55. This indicates agreement that webcare should show comprehensiveness in its characteristics. This result is confirmed by Clementson and Xie (2021), and Ghosh and Mandal (2020) where they observed that comprehensive is a major feature of a quality webcare.

Table 5. Civility

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|-----------------|---|----------|-------------|----------------|
| CIV1 | The response to my complaint by the online store was courteous. | 371 | 2.73 | .937 |
| CIV2 | The response to my complaint was written in friendly manner. | 371 | 2.76 | .903 |
| CIV3 | The response to my complaint was polite in its style. | 371 | 2.84 | .928 |
| CIV4 | The online store apologised through the response it gave to my complaint. | 371 | 2.90 | .958 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.80 | .834 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 5 depicts civility with grand mean > 2.55. This indicates online stores were civil in responding to customers complaints. This result is supported by Ghosh and Mandal (2020), Yang and Peng (2009), Jung and Seock (2017) where they found that the element of civility is germane in evaluating webcare quality. Customers rate webcare to be high on civility if it regrettably acknowledges mistakes and appears respectful and friendly.

Table 6. Assurance

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|-----------------|---|----------|-------------|----------------|
| ASS1 | The online store promised no further mistakes in its response to my complaint. | 371 | 2.89 | .914 |
| ASS2 | The response to my complaint incites trust in me that I can avail the product/service again. | 371 | 3.01 | .927 |
| ASS3 | The response to my complaint incites confidence in me that I can avail the product/service again. | 371 | 3.01 | .936 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----|------|------|
| ASS4 | After reading the response to my complaint, I feel that the online store would not violate its standards. | 371 | 3.04 | .918 |
| Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | | 2.99 | .820 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 6 depicts assurance with grand mean > 2.55. The youths concur that the online stores webcare provided assurance. This result is supported by Sreejesh et al (2020), Ghosh and Mandal (2020), and Sacan and Ozdemir (2023). The young digital natives in south east Nigeria seek webcare that promise that the online stores would not violate its standards of service delivery and not allow service failure happen again in the future.

Table 7. Coherence

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----|------|---------|
| COH1 | The response to my complaint provided reasonable explanations behind the problems that happened. | 371 | 2.79 | .913 |
| COH2 | The reasons behind the mistakes committed by the online store were logical. | 371 | 2.93 | .899 |
| COH3 | The actions of the online store were justified in the response to my complaint in a rational manner. | 371 | 2.95 | .896 |
| COH4 | After reading the response to my complaint, I understood why the problem occurred. | 371 | 2.98 | .916 |
| Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | | 2.91 | .811 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 7 captures coherence with grand mean > 2.55. This indicates that the youths in south east Nigeria agree that coherence is a critical element of webcare. This result is supported by Chang et al (2008), Ghosh and Mandal (2020), Karatepe (2006), and Sacan and Ozdemir (2023) where they observed that sound and logical reasons for service failure forms an important constituent of a quality webcare.

Table 8. Retention

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|---|-----|------|---------|
| RET1 | After reading the response to my complaint, I understood that the online store aimed at maintaining a long-term relationship with me. | 371 | 2.82 | .926 |
| RET2 | The response to my complaint urged me to continue my relationship with the online store. | 371 | 2.89 | .899 |
| RET3 | The response to my complaint encouraged me to avail the product/service again. | 371 | 2.92 | .891 |
| RET4 | After reading the response to my complaint, I understood that the online store was keen to retain me as a valued customer. | 371 | 2.93 | .935 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.89 | .819 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Responses on retention in Table 8 show the grand mean > 2.55. This indicates agreement that retention is an important element of acceptable webcare. This result is supported by Sacan and Ozdemir (2023) and Ghosh and Mandal (2020) where they found that webcare goes beyond resolving a complaint to building business relationship between online stores and customers.

Table 9. Personalization

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|--|-----|------|---------|
| PER1 | The response to my complaint addressed my specific comments, which were made in my complaint. | 371 | 2.74 | 1.170 |
| PER2 | The response given to me was not similar to other responses given by the online store to other customers. | 371 | 2.87 | 1.175 |
| PER3 | The response was unique to my complaint that I posted. | 371 | 2.90 | 1.185 |
| PER4 | The response to my complaint was written specifically for me. | 371 | 2.91 | 1.193 |
| PER5 | After reading the response, I felt that it had given personalised or individual attention to my issues/concerns. | 371 | 2.89 | 1.225 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.86 | 1.108 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Table 9 depicts personalization with grand mean > 2.55 . This shows agreement that personalization is a significant dimension of acceptable webcare. This result is reinforced by Ghosh and Mandal (2020), Sreejesh et al (2020), and Istanbuluoglu, Leek and Szmigin (2017) where they observed that customization of webcare to suit individual peculiarities is pivotal part of webcare quality.

Table 10. Elaborateness

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|--|-----|------|---------|
| ELA1 | The online store response to my complaint was written in an elaborate manner using many words. | 371 | 2.60 | .938 |
| ELA2 | The response to my complaint was long and detailed. | 371 | 2.64 | .893 |
| ELA3 | The response had been extensively written to address my issues/concerns. | 371 | 2.70 | .955 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 2.65 | .842 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Elaborateness dimension in Table 10 depicts grand mean > 2.55 . This indicates agreement that elaborateness is a weighty element in customers contemplation of a quality webcare. This result is backed by Ghosh and Mandal (2020) where they found that elaborateness is germane in customers assessment of webcare quality.

Table 11. Customer Justice Perception

| Item No. | Item description | N | Mean | Std Dev |
|----------|---|-----|------|---------|
| CJP1 | The compensation I received from the online store was fair. | 371 | 3.81 | .873 |
| CJP2 | I did not get what I deserved. | 371 | 3.85 | .828 |
| CJP3 | In resolving the problem, the online store gave me what I wanted. | 371 | 3.88 | .848 |
| CJP4 | The compensation I received was not right. | 371 | 3.89 | .868 |
| CJP5 | The length of the time taken by the online store to resolve my problem was longer than necessary. | 371 | 3.83 | .829 |
| CJP6 | The online store showed adequate flexibility in dealing with my problem. | 371 | 3.88 | .838 |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|-----|------|------|
| CJP7 | The employee of the online store was appropriately concerned about my problem. | 371 | 3.79 | .861 |
| CJP8 | The employee did not put proper effort into resolving my problem. | 371 | 3.84 | .833 |
| CJP9 | The employee's communication with me was inappropriate. | 371 | 3.88 | .805 |
| CJP10 | The employee did not give me the courtesy I was due. | 371 | 3.90 | .851 |
| | Grand Mean/Standard Deviation | | 3.85 | .671 |

Source: Field survey, 2025

Customer Justice Perception in Table 11 depicts grand mean > 2.55. This indicates that the online stores were fair in webcare compensation, process and interaction. Ghosh and Mandal (2020) lent credence to this result by observing that the three dimensions of perceived justice were adjudged fair in the way organizations handled customers complaints.

Conclusion and Recommendation

In designing webcare, online stores should ensure that the nine highlighted elements are integrated and implemented in webcare provision and they are perceived to be fair.

The study therefore recommends that:

1. online stores should provide webcare that are prompt.
2. Online stores should clearly show they own webcare they provide by appending their contact details, employees' names, designation, and pictures.
3. Online stores should ensure that webcare provided addresses every issue raised in customers complaints.
4. Online stores should ensure webcare provided are courteous, friendly, and apologetic.
5. Online stores should craft webcare to incite trust and confidence in customers.
6. Online stores should ensure that the explanations in the webcare are rational and understandable to aggrieved customers.
7. Online stores should provide webcare geared towards long-term relationship building with customers.
8. Online stores should provide customized webcare for every customer.
9. Online stores should seek elaborate webcare that address customers concerns.

References

1. Blodgett, J. G., Hill, D. J., & Tax, S. S. (1997). *The Effects of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice on Post complaint Behaviour*. *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (2), 185-210.
2. Bonotti, M., & Zech, S. T. (2021). *Understanding Civility. Recovering Civility during COVID-19*, 37-64.
3. Bowen, D.E., Gilliland, S.W., & Folger, R. (1999). *HRM and service fairness: How being fair with employees spills over to customers*, *Organizational Dynamics*, 27 (3), 7-23.
4. Chang, H.S., Lee, J.C., & Tseng, C.M. (2008). *The Influence of Service Recovery on Perceived Justice under Different Involvement Level - an evidence of retail industry*. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(1), 57-82
5. Chen, W., Gu, B., Ye, Q., & Zhu, K. X. (2019). *Measuring and managing the externality of managerial responses to online customer reviews*. *Information Systems Research*, 30(1), 81-96.
6. Clementson, D.E. & Xie, T. (2021). *On the Merits of Transparency in Crisis: Effects of Answering vs. Evading through the Lens of Deception Theory*. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 15(1), 1-17.
7. Federal Ministry of Youth and Sports Development (2019). *National Youth Policy – Enhancing Youth Development and Participation in the Context of Sustainable Development*. www.prb.org.
8. Furby, L. (1986). *Psychology and Justice*. In: R.L. Cohen (eds.), *Justice. Critical Issues in Social Justice* (153-203). Springer.
9. Gamblin, D.M., Banks, A.P., & Dean, P.J.A. (2019). *Affective responses to coherence in high and low risk scenarios*. *Cognition and Emotion*.
10. Gelbrich, K., & Roschk, H. (2011). *A meta-analysis of organizational complaint handling and customer responses*. *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (1), 24-43.
11. Ghosh, T., & Mandal, S. (2020). *Webcare quality: conceptualisation, scale development and validation*. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 36(15-16), 1556-1590.
12. Ghosh, T., & Raju, A. G. (2018). *Gulping the poison: How webcare attributes reduce damages to brands caused by negative reviews*. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 17(3), 216-254.
13. Homburg, C., & Fuerst, A. (2005). *How organizational complaint handling drives customer loyalty: an analysis of the mechanistic and the organic approach*. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3), 95-114.
14. Istanbulluoglu, D., Leek, S., & Szmigin, I. (2017). *Beyond Exit and Voice: Developing an Integrated Typology of Consumer Complaining*. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(5-6), 1109-1128.

15. The effect of conversational human voice and reply length on observers' perceptions of complaint handling in social media. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 50, 100-119.
16. Jung, K., Garbarino, E., Briley, D. A., & Wynhausen, J. (2017). Blue and Red Voices: Effects of Political Ideology on Consumers' Complaining and Disputing Behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44(3), 477-499. www.jstor.org.
17. Jung, N. Y., & Seock, Y. (2017). Effect of service recovery on customers' perceived justice, satisfaction, and word-of-mouth intentions on online shopping websites. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 37(4), 23-30.
18. Karatepe, O.M. (2006). Customer complaints and organizational responses: the effects of complainants' perceptions of justice on satisfaction and loyalty. *Hospitality Management*, 25, 69-90.
19. Kim, E., & Tang, R. (2016). Rectifying Failure of Service: How Customer Perceptions of Justice Affect Their Emotional Response and Social Media Testimonial. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25(8), 897-924.
20. Komunda, M., & Osarenkhoe, A. (2012). Remedy or cure for service failure? Effects of service recovery on customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Business Process Management Journal*, 18(1), 82-103.
21. Kruikemeier, S., van Noort, G., Vliegenthart, R., & de Vreese, C.H. (2013). Getting closer: the effects of personalized and interactive online political communication. *European Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 53-66.
22. Liebrecht, C.C., & van Hooijdonk, C.M.J. (2022). Webcare across public and private social networking sites: How stakeholders and the Netherlands Red Cross adapt their messages to channel affordances and constraints. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 26(1).
23. Mattila, A. S. (2001). Effectiveness of service recovery in a multi-industry setting. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15(7), 583-596.
24. National Bureau of Statistics (2023). *Demographic Statistics Bulletin 2022*. National Bureau of Statistics. www.nigerianstat.gov.ng.
25. Ojiaku, O. C., Nkamnebe, A. D., & Chibuike, N. B. (2019). Effect of 'Webcare' on Students' Online Review Intention: Implications for Customers' Purchase Intention. *Nigerian Academy of Management Journal*, 14(2), 79-90. Retrieved from: namj.tamn-ng.org.
26. Papke-Shields, K. E., Malhotra, M. K., & Grover, V. (2002). Strategic manufacturing planning systems and their linkage to planning system success. *Decision Sciences*, 33(1), 1-30.
27. Park, S.B., & Park, D.H. (2013). The effect of low-versus high-variance in product reviews on product evaluation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(7), 543-554.
28. Raju, A. (2019). Can reviewer reputation and webcare content affect perceived fairness? *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 13(4), 464 - 476.

29. Ranaweera, C., & Neely, A. (2003). Some moderating effects on the service quality customer retention link. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 23(2), 230–248.
30. Saçan, N., & Özdemir, O.U.S. (2023). The Impact of Webcare Quality on Buying Behaviour: A Study in Çanakkale. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 10(102), 3622-3629.
31. Seth, N., Deshmukh, S. G., & Vrat, P. (2005). Service quality models: A review. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 22(9), 913–949.
32. Smith, A.K., Bolton, R.N., & Wagner, J. (1999). A model of customer satisfaction with service encounters involving failure and recovery. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36(3), 356–372.
33. Tax, S.S., Brown, S.W., & Chandrashekar, M. (1998). Customer evaluations of service complaint experiences: implications for relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 60–76.
34. Umar, R.M. (2023). Service recovery efforts' influence on consumers' desire to reciprocate and forgiveness: the mediating role of perceived justice. *South Asian Journal of Marketing*, 4(1), 74–91.
35. van Noort, G., & Willemsen, L.M. (2011). Online damage control: the effects of proactive versus reactive webcare interventions in consumer-generated and brand-generated platforms. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(3), 131–140.
36. Vroman, H. W. & Reichheld, F.F. (1996). *The Loyalty Effect: The Hidden Force Behind Growth, Profits, and Lasting Value*. Academy of Management Perspectives, 10 (1). Harvard Business School Press: 88–90.
37. Weitzl, W., & Hutzinger, C. (2017). The effects of marketer-and advocate-initiated online service recovery responses on silent bystanders. *Journal of Business Research*, 80, 164–175.
38. Willemsen, L. M., Neijens, P. C., & Bronner, F. A. (2013). Webcare as customer relationship and reputation management? Motives for negative electronic word of mouth and their effect on webcare receptiveness. In S. Rosengren, M. Dahlen, & S. Okazaki (Eds.), *Advances in advertising research* (pp. 55–73). Springer.
39. Wu, Y.C., Tsai, C.S., Hsiung, H.W., & Chen, K.Y. (2015). Linkage between frontline employee service competence scale and customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 29, 224–234.
40. Yang, H.-E., & Peng, K.-H (2009). Assessing the Effects of Service Recovery and Perceived Justice on Customer Satisfaction with SEM. *International Conference on Management and Service Science, Beijing, China, 2009*, pp. 1–4.
41. Zeithaml, V.A., Bitner, M.J., & Gremler, D.D. (2006). *Services Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus across the Firm* (4th Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.