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Abstract
Customer satisfaction with facilities changes is determined not only by the efficacy of a decision, but also by the communication and management of user expectations during its implementation. In every organisation there are unforeseen changes which bring about upheaval in the form of relocations, refurbishments or service changes. Such changes make it difficult for facilities managers to meet customer expectations. How can facilities managers satisfy the needs of customers when such needs change so frequently? Organisational justice theory advocates that where managers do not have the resources available to meet employee demands, the procedures used to divide what resources are available may be used to sustain satisfaction. Even in the face of mistakes and unsatisfied expectations, individuals will often be ‘won over’ by timely intervention and empathetic treatment. The strengths and weaknesses of different forms of procedural justice such as communication and participative decision making are discussed in the context of a multinational pharmaceutical organisation, and the theoretical background supporting the use of a service culture within facilities management is presented.
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INTRODUCTION
While many researchers have attempted to identify aspects of design and performance that most significantly affect end-user satisfaction, it may be argued that the management process involved in introducing such changes (e.g. a new facility or workplace) may be equally if not more influential. Finch (2004) proposed that customer satisfaction with facilities is determined not only by technical performance, but by “an intricate set of exchange processes” such as effective communication and management of expectations. Yet in every organisation there are uncontrollable variables and unforeseeable changes which result in alterations to deadlines and diminished resources. How can facilities managers satisfy the needs of customers when both these needs and the environment in which they are operating change so frequently? Uncertainties arise in (1) matching unpredictable space demands with supply; (2) managing refurbishment of outdated facilities; (3) conflicting approaches of in-house and contracted-out service providers; (4) dealing with the competing space and service demands of different departments; (5) combining long-term strategy (e.g. adjacency needs) with immediate requirements (e.g. arrival of new employees).

As the size of the organisation increases, so too does the complexity of the facilities strategy. Explaining to department heads that their needs have been built into the strategic plan and will be met over the coming four years is of little consequence when they have to deal with the imminent arrival of staff. So how can facilities and accommodation management groups appease their customers in the intermediate term? In this paper it is postulated that customer satisfaction can be achieved by adopting a service rather than a technical approach to the management of facilities, by focusing on organisational justice and maintaining perceptions of fairness amongst customers. More specifically, an emphasis is placed on procedural justice, as it is considered to be the most influential form of justice in the delivery of facilities management services.

The facilities management department participating in this research catered provided for over 7,000 employees in a multi-national pharmaceutical organisation. Over the course of the study,
more than 30 customers were interviewed as to their satisfaction regarding the facilities management services. In addition to this, the research team observed an established User Group Forum, composed of a cross-functional team of managers responsible affected by strategic and operational facilities management decisions.

The study provides an overview of organisational justice theory, before reviewing in detail the different forms that this may take. Each of the different forms of organisational justice is then considered individually, and discussed in the context of the participating organisation. Both the interviews that were conducted and observations that were made in the cross-functional decision making forum provided support for the theoretical framework that is presented. In this way, the paper addresses both the theoretical background of justice theory, and its application to the facilities management sector.

ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

Organisational justice may be defined as employee's perceptions of the fairness with which they have been treated by an organisation or organisations. There are a range of theoretical perspectives which examine the concept of organisational justice and the importance of maintaining perceptions of fairness in the workplace. Examples include equity theory (Adams, 1965), social exchange theory (Homans 1961), relative deprivation theory (Martin, 1981), justice motive theory (Lerner, 1977) and justice judgement model (Leventhal, 1976). Studies in these areas have shown that perceptions of injustice may not only lead to dissatisfaction, but also decreased job performance (Greenberg, 1988), poorer quality of work (Cowherd & Levine, 1992) and less co-operation with co-workers (Pfeffer & Langton, 1993). The two fundamental building blocks of organisational justice theory are distributive and procedural justice, which are now amongst the most widely researched concepts in this field. The primary distinction between these two forms of justice is that the former refers to what the outcomes of organisational decisions are, whilst the latter is concerned with how the decisions are made. A third dimension of organisational justice, called interactional justice, is concerned with the sensitivity with which information is communicated.

Distributive justice refers to the allocation of resources (Homans, 1961), or the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an individual receives from organisations (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Outcomes may be distributed on the basis of equality, need or contribution (Leventhal, 1976) and individuals determine the fairness of distribution through comparison with others. However, with the finding that the procedures used to determine outcomes can be more influential than the outcome itself, the emphasis has gradually shifted from distributive to procedural justice. Procedural justice, on the other hand, may be defined as the fairness of methods, mechanisms and processes used to determine outcomes (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), or the perceived fairness of the procedures used in making decisions (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Lind & Tyler (1988) investigated relational approaches to fairness and argued that norms that develop through identification with groups, lead individuals to develop a commitment to social procedures and power relations. These in turn are used to make decisions on procedural fairness. Fair procedures should be consistent, bias free, accurate, have correction mechanisms in the case of mistakes, take into account the concerns of all parties and be morally acceptable (Leventhal, 1980). Tyler & Bies (1990) identified five factors that influence employees' perceptions of procedural fairness in organisations; (1) adequate consideration of the viewpoints of others; (2) consistency in the criteria on which decisions are based; (3) bias-free; (4) the provision of timely feedback; and (5) effective communication of the basis for decisions. A sixth element which may be added to this (although it is perhaps arguable whether it represents and independent criterion) is whether decision makers themselves accept the terms which they are presenting to employees. Thibaut & Walker (1975) further subdivided procedural justice into two components, namely process control ("voice effect") and decision control ("choice effect"). Process control allows an individual to control the submission of evidence to support their case during the process, such as adjacency studies which require customers complete questionnaire that rate and explain the importance of working adjacent to specific work groups or departments. This information is then incorporated into the decision to relocate workgroups according to the needs specified. Decision control on the other hand refers to involvement in actual decision making, where for example department managers vote as to which workgroup should be given priority in the allocation of new space that has become available.
In terms of operational implementation of procedural justice, there are a number of forms which it may take and which can be placed on a continuum according to the level of employee involvement. Examples drawn from research conducted by Osburn et al. (1990) include;

Managers make decisions on their own, announce those decisions to employees, and then respond to questions

- Managers seek employees’ views before making decisions
- Managers formulate temporary work groups to recommend solutions to particular problems
- Managers meet regularly with groups of employees to identify and recommend solutions
- Managers establish and participate in cross-functional problem solving teams
- Ongoing work groups assume expanded responsibility for achieving specific organisational goals.

The levels of employee involvement listed above are comparable to Tannenbaum & Schmidt’s (1973) dimensions of leadership behaviour. They put forward a framework in which they specified gradients of (what we can now term) procedural justice, according to the use of authority by managers. These researchers identified seven different patterns that managers can choose from in relating to his or her employees, which can be placed on a continuum along the dimension of employee involvement:

- The manager makes the decision and announces it
- The manager “sells” his or her decision
- The manager presents his or her ideas and invites questions
- The manager presents a tentative decision subject to change
- The manager presents the problem, asks for suggestions and then makes the decision
- The manager defines the boundaries within which the decision must be made and passes the decision to the group
- The manager allows the group to make decisions within prescribed limits

Support for the beneficial effects of procedural justice and its supremacy to distributive justice in terms of influencing behaviour has emerged in a wide variety of settings. Thibaut & Walker (1975) examined the concept in a legal context and found that disputants were willing to accept a decision with which they had disagreed if they could see that the process by which it was decided was fair. Similarly, Tyler & Folger (1980) found in the context of police-citizen encounters, that individuals who felt they had been fairly treated had more positive evaluations of their dealings with the police, and of the police force in general, regardless of whether or not the police solved the problem which they had been called to address. It was reported by Greenberg (1987) that where outcomes or rewards were perceived as unfair, just procedures lead to an increase in the mean perceived fairness ratings of those outcomes. That is, perceptions of procedural justice can alter and influence perceptions of distributive justice. It was also demonstrated that fair procedures were perceived as fair independently of the outcomes of those procedures. This is consistent with the hypothesis put forward by Leventhal (1980) who proposed that “if the procedures are seen as fair, then the final distribution is likely to be accepted as fair even though it may be disadvantageous” (p. 36). Investigating this hypothesis in the context of a multi-national organisation, Kim & Maugbornge (1996) examined the effects of perceived procedural justice on manager’s commitment to implement decisions. They found that as perceptions of procedural justice of the decision making process increased, their commitment to implementing the decisions (i.e. the outcome of that process) increased.

A further form of organisational justice which facilities managers may use to influence levels of satisfaction amongst customers. Inter-actional justice is defined as the quality of inter-personal treatment that an individual receives during the enactment of organisational procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986). Simply put, it is the manner in which information is communicated. In the context of facilities management, this involves taking on board the concerns of customers, listening to their needs, and displaying empathy and understanding. Bies & Moag (1986) reported that treating individuals affected by a decision in a courteous and civil manner helped to maintain perceptions of fairness. There are two distinct components of inter-actional justice, namely interpersonal sensitivity and social accounts (Folger & Cropanzano,1998). The former refers to maintaining a polite and considerate approach to others, whilst the latter includes the provision on adequate
explanations for undesirable outcomes. There has been much debate as to whether this represents an independent construct or whether it is a sub-type of procedural justice, but regardless of such debate, the results of research to date suggest that courteous treatment of individuals contributes to perceptions of fairness.

**Dimensions of Procedural Justice in Service Provision**

So what impact do these findings have on the role of facilities managers and their ability to sustain customer satisfaction? The findings highlight employees understanding that while managers are often unable to control outcomes, they can influence the procedures involved. Facilities managers do not have at their disposal the resources to satisfy the needs of all facilities management customers (i.e. the ability to maintain perceptions of distributive justice), however they do have the ability to affect how resources and services are distributed and allocated amongst customers in the organisation. As specified by Osburn et al. (1990), forms of procedural justice can be graded according to the level of employee involvement, or in this case, customer involvement. Customer participation in facilities management activities can range from one-way communication to participative decision making, to ongoing customer focus groups that recommend appropriate courses of action and engage in problem solving activities. Indeed, levels of input can even be increased so far as to grant customer focus groups authority to make decisions over which facilities managers have a veto.

---

**Figure 1: Graded Dimensions of Procedural Justice in Facilities Management Service Provision**

**ONE-WAY AND TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION**

Communication may be seen as a form of process control (i.e. voice effect), or as a means of allowing employees to express their views on decisions affecting them. Simply put, it provides individuals with an opportunity for self-expression. Gibson (1981) proposed that there are two reasons why communication is of key importance within organisations. It is fundamental to the meeting of both economic needs (in the interests of survival or further progress, firms must communicate with their employees), and social needs (employees need to be consulted and involved in the business). According to Folgers (1986) referent cognitions theory, adequate explanations allow individuals to place their under compensation in context by helping them to understand that things could have been much worse. Supportive communication also reduces perceptions of uncertainty and reduces stress by helping employees to develop a sense of perceived control (Albrecht & Adelman, 1987). Numerous studies have demonstrated that communication represents a highly effective means of upholding the perceptions of fairness necessary to maintain satisfaction. Greenberg (1987) reported that even when individuals were unhappy with the outcome of a process, open communication lead to less dissatisfaction and fewer dysfunctional outcomes. Redding (1972) reported a positive correlation between a manager’s open communication and employee's satisfaction with the relationship. In 1990, Greenberg conducted a study in which employees were informed that they would be receiving a 15% pay cut either with or without an explanation. He examined the effects on turnover and office theft and found a significant increase in both variables amongst employees who had not been provided with an explanation for the pay cut. Levels of turnover and theft amongst employees were parallel to the control group where employees were provided with a full explanation and an open questions-and-answers forum was held.
The benefits of effective communication are not confined to increased satisfaction. The Institute of Directors (1981) investigated organisational responses to the introduction of communication programmes and found that 65% of managers reported increases in productivity, 80% reported that there were improvements in morale and organisational loyalty, 46% reported reduced employee turnover, 41% reported decreases in absenteeism and 68% reported fewer industrial disputes. Only 3% of the 115 managers interviewed found that the introduction of a communication programme was ineffective in bringing about improvements. Some channels of communication (e.g. team briefings) were found to be more effective than others (e.g. company publications).

Methods of communication which may be employed by Facilities Managers include: meetings with line management; e-mails to the customers involved; a help desk to provide telephone support; and web based systems which allow customers to view the status of their requests. Based in a multi-national pharmaceutical organisation, over 30 semi-structured interviews were undertaken with facilities management customers across a wide range of departments. Customers were questioned as to the types of information they wished to receive, the mediums through which they would like it to be communicated, and the shortcomings of the existing communication process. The results revealed the strengths and weaknesses of the aforementioned mediums of communication between facilities management service providers and their customers. Whilst meetings with departmental managers lead to satisfaction at a managerial level, in practice, this information was not always disseminated amongst employees, particularly in larger departments. Meetings were also reported to be a highly time consuming method of communicating facilities management information with managers reporting that only 20 - 25% of agenda items were of direct relevance to their department. Whilst personal e-mails were welcomed, customers reported that circular e-mails were ineffective and reading them was not considered to be of high priority. The introduction of a web-based system to track requests was received positively by customers with the condition that it was accompanied by a personal point of contact, and it was emphasised that an automated system to which individuals could not respond should be avoided. A manned help desk which customers could contact to receive updates was the favoured medium of communication. The help desk should be able to provide customers with information on when their request will be completed, the reasons for alterations to timescales and should guide the customer through the procedures involved in processing their request.

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING AND THE USE OF FOCUS GROUPS

Continuing along the dimension of increased customer involvement, participative decision making (PDM) represents a powerful method for enabling procedural justice. PDM is defined by Heller et al. (1998) as “the totality of forms, i.e. direct (personal) or indirect (through representatives or institutions) and of intensities; i.e., ranging from minimal to comprehensive, by which individuals, groups, collectives secure their interests or contribute to the choice process through self-determined choices among possible actions during the decision process.” (p. 42). The 1990s saw a trend in the decentralisation of decision making power, with organisations such as AT&T, General Electric, Eastman Kodak, Fiat, Motorola, United Technologies, Xerox and Ford moving decision rights to lower levels of the hierarchy (Dessein, 2002). Management studies have found the benefits of increasing employee involvement in decision making include lower job strain and dissatisfaction (Parker et al., 2002). It has been linked to increases in satisfaction (Miller & Monge, 1986), innovativeness (Hurley et al. 1998), motivation, commitment and communication of information (see Locke et al. (1997) for review). Studies have also reported PDM to be related to competence and efficiency as well as reduced costs (Hunt & Vogt, 1988; Marchington & Loveridge, 1979). Ashmos et al. (2002) argued that it not only provides a means to enhance motivation and commitment, but also knowledge generation and connectivity in an organisation. Other benefits include improved quality of decisions (Frost, Wakeley & Ruh, 1974) and increases in trust which in turn can reduce resistance to change amongst employees (Gabris & Kenneth, 1986; Carnevale & Wechsler, 1992).

Cropanzano & Folger (1989) demonstrated the beneficial effects of PDM as a form of procedural justice. They conducted a study in which participants were asked to perform two tasks, one of which would count towards earning a reward. One group were allowed to choose which of the two tasks would count whilst for the second group, the experimenter chose which task would count. Although all participants were informed that they had been unsuccessful on the task, feelings of unfair treatment were absent amongst participants who had been involved in the
decision making process. They concluded that when subjects were involved in decision making, feelings of unfair treatment were absent regardless of the outcome of the procedure. Researchers have shown that employee interest in participating in decision making is highest when decisions affect their own positions (Gardell, 1977) or when decisions directly impact on the work environment (Bartolke, Eschweiler, Flechsenberger & Tannenbaum, 1982). Placing PDM in the context of the current case study, the participating organisation established a User Group Forum which inputted into the decisions made by the facilities management department. In this forum, senior representatives from each department met with Facilities Managers at scheduled intervals to receive updates as to the organisations facilities management strategy, and to allocate available resources (primarily accommodation) to work groups. This afforded the managers participating in the User Group Forum the opportunity to voice their concerns, to input into the decision making process, and to view their own needs in the context of the needs of others in the organisation.

BARRIERS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING

Yet whilst there is strong theoretical support for the use of PDM, there are many barriers to the successful implementation of such processes. Management may resist PDM where it is seen to lead to a perceived loss of control. Dickenson (1982) reported evidence that managers were more supportive of PDM if it did not have a negative impact on their perceived power relative to others in the organisation. There is also a risk that such innovations will merely have 'lip-service' paid to them, when in reality the hierarchical control over decisions is maintained. Hecksher (1995) argued that PDM cannot decrease bureaucracy in an organisation unless it occurs together with redesign of work. Indeed, management may even encourage employee involvement in low level decisions in an effort to deflect interest from top level management (Drago & Wooden, 1991). Although it can be argued that power is not a zero-sum phenomenon, and that introducing PDM may therefore increase rather than decrease a manager's influence over his or her subordinates, coaching management to support such views is necessary if PDM initiatives are to succeed.

Research has also indicated that the efficacy of participative management techniques may be dependent upon organisational culture. Harrison & Stokes (1992) put forward a typology of 4 organisational cultures; (1) a centralised power culture, (2) a bureaucratic role culture, (3) a more autonomous task culture, and (4) an egalitarian person-support culture. Placing these on a continuum according to the level of autonomy and control that is granted to employees, it is logical to assume that PDM would be more consistent and more successful in cultures which encourage the distribution of power. More specifically, Sagie & Aycan (2003) have argued that the success of employee participation in decision making processes will differ along the dimensions of individualism/collectivism (i.e. the extent to which people define their identity as individuals versus as part of their normative group) and power distance (i.e. the extent to which a society considers the hierarchical distribution of power to be acceptable). These cultural dimension not only influence managements willingness to delegate decision making power, but also employee's willingness to participate. These researchers identified four methods of PDM employed by organisations; Face-to-face PDM (characterised by high individualism and low power distance), collective PDM (low individualism and low power distance), pseudo-PDM (high power distance and high individualism) and paternalistic PDM (high power distance and low individualism). They reported that the most common method in English speaking countries was face-to-face PDM, a finding which again offers support the argument that PDM acts as a form of procedural justice by providing employees with voice/choice effects.

Where there are limited resources, competing will undoubtedly be the dominant reaction from parties, resulting in dissatisfaction of those that are unsuccessful. Over the course of this research study, such difficulties became apparent at The User Group Forum as managers conflicted in the struggle to defend the interests and requirements of their work teams. So how can facilities management's facilitate a more collaborative approach to resource distribution? Yeung (1997) argued that in order for PDM to be effective, managers need to act as facilitators employing conflict resolution strategies such as "account giving, group choice, sympathising with dissenting viewpoints, hedging and attending to multiple standards." In addition to this, overcoming such conflicts requires setting of super-ordinate goals which highlight the common interests and operational interdependencies on the groups involved, encouraging them to not to look at what is most suitable for their group, but what is most profitable for the organisation. This
may be achieved by aligning facilities management activities with the organisation's business strategy.

Both research and history have demonstrated the power of super-ordinate goals in uniting disparate groups with conflicting interests. Goal setting theory offers a theoretical framework for harvesting the benefits of participative decision making whilst limiting interpersonal or inter-group conflict between parties. By setting super-ordinate goals which are clearly aligned with the business strategy, facilities managers may increase customer satisfaction through the use of a powerful form of procedural justice whilst minimising conflict and self interest of the parties involved in this process.

**PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING AND GOAL SETTING IN FM**

The majority of the research reviewed thus far suggests that PDM offers an opportunity for facilities managers to maintain customer satisfaction even in the face of unsatisfied expectations. However, with all the complexities involved, is the process of establishing super-ordinate goals, managing conflict and overcoming cultural obstacles justified by the positive outcomes? In spite of the strong theoretical support, in practice, there are difficulties with the implementation of PDM techniques that offer strong arguments against their use in the field of facilities management. Observations at the User Group Forum in the participating organisation indicated that whilst it afforded individuals the opportunity to input into facilities management decisions, conflict was inevitable as many managers continued to defend the interests of their individual department rather than looking to prioritise facilities management resources in accordance with organisational goals. In some cases managers were receiving complaints from their subordinates on a daily basis, and their priority during these forums was therefore to minimise these complaints by 'winning' the resources necessary to deal with them, rather than looking at business benefit of resource allocation to the wider organisation. There were also complaints from participants that the forums represented a time consuming process which distracted from their primary functions. Whilst this is just one example of a PDM forum in the facilities management industry, it highlights that in reality, there are implementation difficulties of this form of procedural justice which limit its potential to increase customer satisfaction.

**ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SERVICE CULTURE**

“While, in the past, customer service may have been considered an afterthought to the primary facility management functions, there is no doubt that customer service today should be viewed as an integral strategy for increasing a facility department’s effectiveness and value to the company it services” (Bandy, 2003, p. 323). Although PDM does not appear to represent the most suitable option, it is still argued that finding the appropriate level of customer involvement, and addressing and implementing organisational justice strategies in line with this will not only lead to increased customer satisfaction, but will help to transform the culture of facilities management into that of the service industry.

In her research into the development of service standards in the facilities management environment, Bandy (2003) described five steps involved in achieving customer satisfaction; (1) understanding customer’s needs through research, (2) setting service standards, (3) communicating through leadership, (4) delivering the service, and (5) maintaining the service culture. As customer needs are constantly changing, the first of these stages needs to be monitored constantly. The second stage involves the development of service level agreements with the customer through the analysis of performance measurement of the facilities management department itself. The dimensions of service quality which should be monitored include accessibility, communication, competence, courtesy, credibility, reliability, responsiveness, security, tangibles and understanding of the customer. The third stage requires departmental managers to act as representatives for the customers, demonstrating their commitment to customer service by actively defending the customer’s interests on a daily basis. Delivering the service involves putting the first three stages into place, motivating employees in the facilities management department to perform, and providing them with a senior manager to whom they can refer if a customer complaint escalates to a level where they no longer feel they can deal with it. Maintaining the service culture requires long term investment in the training, development and management of staff within the facilities management department to ensure that they have the skills and knowledge required to deliver the service.
APPLICATION OF SERVICE CULTURE TECHNIQUES IN FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Whilst Bandy's (2003) model represents the ideal path to achieving customer satisfaction, this model serves to highlight the difficulty first introduced in the beginning of this article. Bandy's approach represents a long term strategy which can be successfully implemented only when facilities managers have the resources available to meet customer demands. Understanding customer needs through the use of techniques such as adjacency studies and predicted headcount models is a valuable but time consuming process. Setting service standards involves performance management measures of key variables. In the present study, the timescales involved in processing requests were identified by customers as the most important information that needed to be communicated. Therefore, these needed to be monitored, as did the variables which acted as predictors of these timescales, and process improvements implemented where timescales were not deemed to be satisfactory. The ten dimensions of service quality identified by Bandy (2003) also need to be examined on an on-going basis if customer satisfaction is to be maintained in the longer term. Communicating through leadership is a cultural change which again takes time to implement, particularly where at the customer-facing end of the business, increasing satisfaction has fallen secondary to the more technical areas of facilities management. In short, the improvement of service quality is a large scale operation and facilities managers still need to appease customers in the intermediate term. It is here that the use of procedural justice techniques plays a key role.

Observations in the participating organisation suggest that in the short term, two-way communication is the most appropriate form of organisational justice. Effective communication integrates the concept of interactional justice into the process as customers need to be treated with understanding, particularly when it has not been possible to meet their demand. Interviews with customers suggested that the information they considered to be most important were the precise timescales for the implementation of facilities management changes. Communication of more abstract information, such as the strategic facilities management plans (as opposed plans for their operational implementation), was not a priority with customers reporting that they were more interested in changes which would impact directly upon their own department. Using the company intranet as a medium of communication was not a favoured option. Customers commented that in organisations of that size, the volume of information stored on the Web was such that facilities management data relating specifically to their department would be too time consuming to locate. User Group Forums were time consuming and on occasion lead to conflict situations. Instead it was reported that the most appropriate medium for this communication was a help desk which actively contacts customers with updates as to the status of their requests.

Whilst there is strong theoretical support for the use of procedural justice techniques which have a greater level of customer involvement such as participative decision making, in practice there are many barriers to the successful implementation of such processes. Evidence of these difficulties emerged in the User Group Forum where conflicts arose regarding the distribution of facilities management resources. As a consequence, there were delays in decision making and ultimately in service delivery, indicating that PDM processes can in fact create more inefficiencies than efficiencies. Whilst there is evidence that setting super-ordinate goals which are in line with the organisations business strategy can unite the interests of disparate groups, a detailed understanding of the customer’s long term facilities management needs is required before this can be achieved.

CONCLUSION

This review of organisational justice and its application to facilities management lends strong support to the argument that it is not just what is delivered that is important, but also the way in which it is delivered. Whilst meeting targets is not always possible, maintaining high levels of customer satisfaction can still be achieved through the effective use of procedural justice techniques. There are still many questions about the application of a service industry approach to facilities management that remain unanswered; Are the positive effects of improving communication with the customer sustained in the longer term or confined to the short term? How much time do procedural justice techniques “buy” the service provider? How beneficial is a customer-relations approach in maintaining satisfaction where expectations are continuously unmet? Applying the methods detailed in this paper to the delivery of services and developing appropriate quantitative measures of customer satisfaction will help to quantify and understand the benefits of the proposed approach and to fine tune the procedural justice techniques that will facilitate increased customer satisfaction.
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