

Examination of Tenants' Satisfaction with Services provided in Commercial Properties in Ibadan, Nigeria

Audu, Adedamola Fisayo
Department of Estate Management, Joseph Ayo Babalola University,
P.M.B 5006, Ilesa Osun State, Nigeria.
majordamola@yahoo.co.uk

Akinlabi, Akintomide Joseph
Department of Estate Management, Rufus Giwa Polytechnic
P.M.B 1019, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria
akinlabitomide@yahoo.com

Idris, Oloruntoba Bibilari
Department of Estate Management, Rufus Giwa Polytechnic
P.M.B 1019, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria
idristoba@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study examined tenants' satisfaction with services provided in commercial properties in Ibadan, Nigeria. A structured questionnaire was used in collecting data from the tenants of seventeen (17) purposively selected commercial properties within Ibadan. Three hundred and twenty-six (326) tenants who were the occupants of the purposively selected buildings were sampled in the study. Data collected were analysed using descriptive and nonparametric statistical tools. The result of the Mann Whitney u test carried out on the opinion of respondents based on their expectation before and perception after services have been carried out showed that six (6) variables i.e. refuse disposal, security /CCTV services, Sewage treatment, electricity repair, parking lot maintenance and water supply/ treatment services has a significant difference in the expectation before and perception after services have been carried out with a significant level of 0.05. Based on the findings of this study, the study recommended that there is need for collaboration between the outsourced service providers and facility managers in order to ensure that services provided are delivered as promptly.

Keywords: Tenants Satisfaction, Services, Commercial properties, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Introduction

Real property is a good investment due to its immobility, stability in area of rate of appreciation and lesser risks of management. It is also a scarce basic need and is ever in demand especially in countries like Nigeria where demand is higher than supply (Ibrahim, 2014). Commercial and multi-tenanted developments are increasingly common and are no doubt here to stay. In Nigeria, like most other countries, real estate is a substantial investment asset class that has made most of the developers to maximize utilization of land through building multi-storied developments. According to Ibrahim (2014), a multi-tenanted property houses a number of tenants at a particular time and place with a common goal of occupying such a property.

Management of real property (with special reference to high rise building which are mostly multi-tenanted) has thus become purely a professional matter. It became necessary to employ professionally trained Estate Managers to look after the properties (Oyedele, 2013). Hence, many privately owned high rise buildings are now in the management portfolio of many professional firms. Also, the government through its various agencies has taken cognizance of professional services. In the modern property world, within multi-tenanted developments such as shopping centres, retail parks, office blocks, and even in industrial estates/warehouses, the owner often provide various facilities and services for the comfort of the users. From the foregoing, effective property management can be summed up as creating optimal environment for the consumer's primary functions (Atkins and Brooks, 2005). However there is need to assess critically the consumer's satisfaction with the services provided in commercial properties, this would serve as a tool so as to visualize and bench-mark the added value of effective property management and further enhance best performance of the Estate Surveyor who is charged with the direction and supervision of interest in landed properties.

Literature review

A quality workplace can induce productivity gains in the workforce, improve workplace satisfaction and act as a catalyst in attracting and retaining talented members

of staff, thereby increasing profits. In a time of increasing numbers of the workforce deserting the traditional office in favour of home working, the provision of quality working environments is becoming increasingly important.

Performance is regarded as a major competitive issue (Tranfield and Akhlaghi 1995). In a management context, there is a wide range of choices in measuring management performance reflecting the varied nature of the field. The focus of Property management skills and techniques should be in the area that contributes to the overall management of a business by relating accommodation and support infrastructures issues to business, financial and personal criteria (Barret 1992). Consumer satisfaction is a very often misused and abused expression. Many organisations use it casually in order to state that their customers are happy and satisfied with the levels of service rendered and the products and services purchased, but they actually have never tried to measure that satisfaction (Zairi, 2000). However, Service quality has been viewed as a determinant of consumer satisfaction (Mohammad, Gambo and Omirin, 2012). Usually, consumers do not have much information about the technical aspects of a service; therefore, functional quality becomes the major factor from which to form perceptions of service quality (Anderson, 1973; Donabedian 1980 and Geetika, 2010). Service quality which is seen by Czepiel (1990) as consumer perception of how well a service meets or exceeds their expectations has not been properly defined in facility management practice and Ekinci (2003) indicates that the evaluation of service quality leads to customer satisfaction. The results of customer satisfaction measurements provide significant information for modern management processes and a warning signal about future business results. This enables an understanding of how customers perceive the organisation, whether its performance meets their expectations, identifies priorities for improvement, benchmarks the performance of the organization against other organisations and increases profits through improved customer loyalty (Fečikova, 2004; Zairi, 2000a ; 2000b). The success of the facilities management operation depends on the delivery teams, client and the consumer.

Performance appraisal in businesses has often traditionally been associated with accounting and the financial success of the organization. Historically, property management belonged to this school of thought as noted by RICS, (2013). It was further noted that

property management activities are now measured on the basis of the value added to the functionality of real estate and the organization providing the service as a strategic function on its own right. Shoet (2006) describes a need for the development of methods for the strategic management and maintenance of buildings. The traditional view of performance measurement, determined by Teague and Eilon (1973) has three broad purposes: to ensure the achievement of goals and objectives; to evaluate, control and improve procedures and processes; and to compare and assess the performance of different organisations, teams and individual. Walters (1997) in Anderson and Mc Adam (2004) observed that an early attempt at developing financial performance measurement was made by Du Pont in 1903 by introducing a pyramid of financial ratios. However in late 1970s and 1980s numerous authors expressed a general dissatisfaction with traditional backward looking or lag accounting based performance measurement systems (Anderson and McAdam 2004). In the 1990s attention of performance measurement shifted to quality and consumer satisfaction. A broader conceptualisation of business performance has been emphasised on indicators of operational performance (i.e., non-financial performance) in addition to indicators to measure business performance (Venkatraman and Ramanujam 1986).

Drucker (1993) in Sapri and Pitts (2005) described a traditional measure as inadequate for business evaluation and failing to meet new business needs in that most measures are lagging indicators. The argument was supported by Kaplan and Norton (2000) who claim that financial measures are historical in nature as they report only on outcomes and the consequences of past actions. In simple terms, performance is achievement against intention (Gagendran, 2000). Hronec (1993) lists four potential benefits that can arise as a result of having an appropriate performance measurement system: satisfying customers; monitoring progress; benchmarking processes and activities; and driving change. The emphasis on promoting customer satisfaction and driving change in accordance with the response to external pressures from an increasingly global competitive marketplace, while the emphasis on monitoring progress and benchmarking is a clear reflection of the culture promoting continuous improvement, driven from both within and outside the organisation (Then, 1999). The development of performance measurement within the context of business management is important in that it sets the background against which senior management within organizations will evaluate the current performance and contribution of their facilities services in fulfilling corporate objectives.

Effective management can contribute to the performance of organisations in a number of ways, which include strategy, culture, control of resources, service delivery, supply chain management and change management (Amaratunga and Baldry, 2002). The constructs of performance measurement in property management are neither well-established nor standard (Amaratunga, 2000). The approach to performance measurement in property management has historically tended to concentrate on financial measures in line with the rest of the business world, then broadening into an emphasis on customer satisfaction and quality as it was acknowledged that financial measures are inadequate for demonstrating workplace effectiveness (McDougall and Hinks, 2000). Modern business requires dynamic measures that motivate continuous improvement in critical areas such as customer satisfaction, flexibility and productivity (Varcoe, 1993). However, to use performance assessment effectively, real estate management needs to make the transition from measurement to management (Amaratunga and Baldry, 2002). Facilities management and other service providers should implement performance management initiatives in order to measure their current position and bring about future improvements. Additionally, this can be used as a marketing tool and it may be advantageous to describe appropriate performance management techniques in tendering situations for example. An increasingly popular technique for measuring performance criteria that are not immediately linked to profits, but will have a potential impact on future profits, is the balanced scorecard (Sarshar, 2006). A number of authors (Walters, 1999; Amaratunga and Baldry, 2000, 2002;) have advocated the use of the Balanced Scorecard for facilities performance measurement. The balanced scorecard can provide real insight into an organisation's operations, finances and drivers of future performance and it assists in implementing strategy (Niven, 2003).

Methodology

In this study, the research methodology was designed to obtain data on the consumers' satisfaction with service provision in commercial properties in Ibadan, Nigeria. The targeted population for the study are tenants of seventeen (17) purposively selected commercial properties within Ibadan, Nigeria. The buildings was selected due to the various services that are provided within and are multi tenanted. The seventeen buildings which are situated at Dugbe area of Ibadan accommodating three hundred twenty six (326) offices (inclusive of twelve banking

halls). Data for the study were collected through a survey conducted among three hundred and twenty-six (326) tenants who were selected from each of the offices. Frequency, percentages and weighted mean score were used to analyse data obtained for the study. In determining the weighted mean score, factors are rated against a pre-defined scale, which assists in assessing the significance of each factor as well as their rankings. Furthermore, factors are ranked from first (1st) to least position in descending order of their weighted means such that the factor with the highest weighted mean ranks first while the one with the lowest weighted mean ranks least.

For the purpose of this study, weighted mean score (WMS) is determined as follows:

$$WMS = \frac{5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + n_1}{5N} \text{ --- (i)}$$

Where n_5 = number of respondent who answered very good/ highly efficient

n_4 = number of respondent who answered good/ efficient

n_3 = number of respondent who answered average

n_2 = number of respondent who answered bad/ inefficient

n_1 = number of respondent who answered very bad/ highly inefficient

Data Analysis and Discussion of findings

This section of the paper deals with analysis of data collected from the study area and the discussion of results. The analysis was structured to include the background information of the respondents, consumer's view of service provided in the subject properties, the time it takes the property manager to respond to complaints and the expectation and perception of service delivery of management services in the subject properties. Three hundred and twenty six questionnaires were distributed to the tenants for the purpose of this study (one for each of the offices). Three hundred (300) were retrieved cutting across all the seventeen (17) purposely selected buildings and this represents 92.02% of the sample size, this implies that opinion, and inferences for the study are drawn from a sizeable percentage. The subject properties which are commercial complexes are provided with adequate facilities and other services to create a conducive working atmosphere for the occupants. The services and facilities available in the selected properties include; refuse disposal vans, cleaning and clearing of the surroundings, security systems, fumigation and pest control, sewage evacuation and treatment, electricity,

water supply, parking lot provision, lift and generator system as an alternate supply of electricity. The design of the selected buildings further make provision for reception/ waiting area and general store. This is aimed at achieving a quality workplace that can and will induce productivity gains in the workforce, improve workplace satisfaction, which will further act as a catalyst in attracting and retaining talented members of staff, thereby increasing profits. Table 1 below shows the socio economic characteristic of the respondents.

Table 1: Socioeconomic Characteristic of Respondents

| Socio economic characteristic | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Education background | | |
| HND | 46 | 15.33 |
| B.Sc | 57 | 19.01 |
| M.Sc | 127 | 42.33 |
| Ph.D | 70 | 23.33 |
| Total | 300 | 100 |
| Years of stay in the property | | |
| 1-5 years | 45 | 15.00 |
| 6-10 years | 83 | 27.67 |
| 11- 15 years | 105 | 35.00 |
| 16 years and above | 67 | 22.33 |
| Total | 300 | 100 |

Source: field survey 2017

The table above shows the socioeconomic characteristic of respondent in the subject properties. 15.33% of the respondents are HND holders while 19.01% are B.Sc holders, 42.33% are M.Sc holder and 23.33% are Ph.D holders. Furthermore, the years of stay in the property shows that 15% have stayed for between 1-5 years, 27.67% have stayed in the property between 6-10years, 35% have stayed in the property for 11 - 15 years and 22.33% of the respondents have stayed in the property for 16 years and above. This however implies that the respondents are vast, well learned and their opinion and inferences could be relied upon. Furthermore, the occupants are familiar with the properties and the opinions given on the subject properties may be reliable. The next table however detailed the tenants' perspective of the various services provided in the subject properties.

Table 2: Analysis of Tenants’ Perspective of Various Services provided in the Subject Properties

| Services | Mean score | Median | Std Deviation | Rank |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------|---------------|------------------|
| Cleaning and clearing of surroundings | 3.84 | 4.00 | 0.931 | 1 st |
| Security /CCTV services | 3.74 | 4.00 | 0.866 | 2 nd |
| Parking lot maintenance | 3.01 | 3.00 | 1.296 | 3 rd |
| Refuse disposal | 2.99 | 3.00 | 1.324 | 4 th |
| Fumigation and pest control | 2.89 | 3.00 | 1.348 | 5 th |
| Central cooling system maintenance | 2.86 | 3.00 | 1.153 | 6 th |
| Lift/ elevator maintenance | 2.68 | 3.00 | 1.190 | 7 th |
| Generator maintenance | 2.61 | 2.00 | 1.606 | 8 th |
| Water supply/ treatment | 2.50 | 2.00 | 1.343 | 9 th |
| Sewage treatment | 2.38 | 2.00 | 1.161 | 10 th |
| Electricity repair | 2.33 | 2.00 | 1.433 | 11 th |

*** 5 = Highly Efficient, 4 = Efficient, 3 = Average, 2 = Inefficient, 1 = Highly Inefficient**

Source: field survey 2017

The table above shows the tenant’s perspective of various services provided in the subject properties. The table shows that the respondents ranked cleaning and clearing of services first with a mean value of 3.84. This is followed by Security /CCTV services with a mean value of 3.74. Parking lot maintenance is ranked third with a mean value of 3.01. Refuse disposal is ranked fourth while Fumigation and pest control is ranked fifth with a mean value of 2.99 and 2.89 respectively. Interview of the respondents revealed that the services provided within the buildings were outsourced. Furthermore the tenants were interviewed about their satisfaction with the overall management of the buildings. They however agreed that they are averagely satisfied with the management of the facilities but few of them suggested that it could be improved upon. For instance averagely in buildings, the generator runs for about five (5)

working hours whenever there is power outage and 65.67% of the tenants agreed that the generator working hours could be increased to about seven (7) hours and they would comply to additional service charge for this however 34.33% of the respondents negate this idea saying that the service charge itself is already high.

Table 3: Time taken by the Property Manager to respond to tenants' complaint

| Time | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Immediately when there is complain | 56 | 18.67 |
| Hours after complaint | 96 | 32.00 |
| Days after complaint | 56 | 18.67 |
| Weeks after complaint | 65 | 21.67 |
| Months after complaint | 27 | 9.00 |
| Total | 300 | 100 |

Source: field survey 2017

Table 3 above shows the time it takes property manager to respond to tenants' complaint. 18.67% of the respondents agreed that the property managers respond immediately when there is complain and days after complaint respectively. Larger percentage i.e. 32.0% of the respondents says it takes the property managers hours after the complaint is lodged to rectify it. Furthermore, 21.67% of the respondents agreed that it takes weeks after complain before it is rectified while 9.0% opined that it takes months after complain before it is been rectified. This however implies that the time it takes to respond to a service delivery differs. This could be as a result of difference in type of complains, as the respondents do not have general problems at once. Furthermore, delay in service delivery could be because of technical problem that cannot be rectified within a short period such as maintenance and repair of elevator, generators etc. Table 4 below detailed a cross tabulation of the expectation and the perception of service delivery of various services and facility maintenance in the buildings sampled in this study.

Table 4: cross tabulation of the expectation and perception of service delivery of various services and facilities maintenance during the management in the subject property.

| Facilities/Services | Frequency (%) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|--|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | Expectation of service before it was carried out | | | | | Perception of service after its been delivered | | | | |
| | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) |
| Refuse disposal | 119 (39.7) | 67 (22.3) | 35 (11.7) | 49 (16.3) | 30 (10.0) | 43 (14.3) | 69 (23.0) | 94 (31.3) | 31 (10.3) | 63 (21.0) |
| Cleaning and clearing of surroundings | 90 (30.0) | 126 (42.0) | 66 (22.0) | 12 (4.0) | 6 (2.0) | 81 (27.0) | 109 (36.3) | 98 (32.7) | 4 (1.3) | 8 (2.7) |
| Security /CCTV services | 70 (23.3) | 99 (33.0) | 51 (17.0) | 58 (19.3) | 22 (7.3) | 45 (15.0) | 164 (54.7) | 63 (21.0) | 23 (7.7) | 5 (1.7) |
| Fumigation and pest control | 26 (8.7) | 64 (21.3) | 102 (34.0) | 74 (24.70) | 34 (11.30) | 49 (16.3) | 52 (17.3) | 74 (24.7) | 67 (22.3) | 58 (19.3) |
| Sewage treatment | 26 (8.7) | 47 (15.7) | 98 (32.7) | 96 (32.0) | 33 (11.0) | 21 (7.0) | 30 (10.0) | 65 (21.7) | 111 (37.0) | 73 (24.3) |
| Central cooling system | 50 (16.7) | 67 (22.3) | 49 (16.3) | 73 (24.30) | 61 (20.3) | 17 (5.7) | 86 (28.7) | 80 (26.7) | 73 (24.3) | 44 (14.7) |
| Electricity Repair | 20 (6.7) | 41 (13.7) | 19 (6.3) | 40 (13.3) | 180 (60.0) | 39 (13.0) | 40 (13.3) | 19 (6.3) | 85 (28.3) | 117 (39.0) |
| Parking lot maintenance | 40 (13.3) | 43 (14.3) | 31 (10.3) | 124 (41.3) | 62 (20.7) | 35 (11.7) | 101 (33.7) | 41 (13.7) | 77 (25.7) | 46 (15.3) |
| Water supply/ treatment | 31 (10.3) | 79 (26.3) | 68 (22.7) | 78 (26.0) | 44 (14.7) | 34 (11.3) | 46 (15.3) | 41 (13.7) | 95 (31.7) | 84 (28.0) |
| Generator maintenance | 61 (20.3) | 46 (15.3) | 41 (13.7) | 53 (17.7) | 99 (33.0) | 71 (23.7) | 27 (9.0) | 27 (9.0) | 65 (21.7) | 110 (36.7) |
| Lift/ elevator maintenance | 21 (7.0) | 45 (15.0) | 103 (34.3) | 87 (29.0) | 44 (14.7) | 29 (9.7) | 42 (14.0) | 82 (27.3) | 97 (32.3) | 50 (16.7) |

Source: field survey 2017

* **5 = Highly Efficient, 4 = Efficient, 3 = Average, 2 = Inefficient; and 1 = Highly Inefficient.**

The table above shows a cross tabulation of the expectation and the perception of service delivery in the subject property. In case of refuse disposal, 39.7% of the respondents expected it to be highly efficient, 22.3% expected the service delivery to be efficient, 11.7% expected it to be average, 16.3% of the respondent expected the service delivery to be in inefficient and 10% expected the service delivery to be highly inefficient. However, 14.3% perceived the refuse disposal service delivery as highly efficient, 23.0% perceived it as efficient; 31.3% perceived the service as average on delivery, 10.3% of the respondent perceived it as inefficient and 21.0% of the respondents perceived the service delivery as highly inefficient. For cleaning and clearing of surroundings, 30% of the respondents expected the service delivery to be highly efficient, 42.0% of the respondent expected the service delivery to be efficient, 22.0% expected the service delivery to be average and 4.0% of the respondent expected the service delivery to be inefficient and 2.0% of the respondents expected the service delivery to be highly inefficient respectively. However 27.0% perceived it as highly efficient, 36.3% each as efficient while 32.7% perceived the service delivery as average and 1.3% perceived it as inefficient and 2.7% of the respondent considered it highly inefficient. The table above shows a large discrepancy between expectation and perception and service quality can be measured by the level of discrepancy between consumer expectations or desires and their perceptions of what they received. This however implies that the service quality perception does not meet the expectation standard.

Table 5: Ranks of the Mann-Whitney U Test for Expectation before Service was carried out and Perception after Service has been delivered

| Facility/Services | Variable definition | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|-----------|--------------|
| Refuse disposal | expectation before | 300 | 343.09 | 102925.50 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 257.92 | 77374.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Cleaning and clearing of surroundings | expectation before | 300 | 311.34 | 93402.00 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 289.66 | 86898.00 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Security /CCTV services | expectation before | 300 | 285.83 | 85748.50 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 315.17 | 94551.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Fumigation and pest control | expectation before | 300 | 303.31 | 90994.00 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 297.69 | 89306.00 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Sewage treatment | expectation before | 300 | 332.81 | 99842.50 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 268.19 | 80457.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Central cooling system maintenance | expectation before | 300 | 302.39 | 90716.50 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 298.61 | 89583.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| Electricity Repair | expectation before | 300 | 271.90 | 81569.50 |
| | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 329.10 | 98730.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----|--------|----------|
| | expectation before | 300 | 273.42 | 82026.00 |
| Parking lot maintenance | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 327.58 | 98274.00 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| | expectation before | 300 | 329.30 | 98791.00 |
| Water supply/ treatment | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 271.70 | 81509.00 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| | expectation before | 300 | 306.41 | 91923.50 |
| Generator maintenance | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 294.59 | 88376.50 |
| | Total | 600 | | |
| | expectation before | 300 | 304.76 | 91429.00 |
| Lift/ elevator maintenance | service was carried out | | | |
| | perception after service has been delivered | 300 | 296.24 | 88871.00 |
| | Total | 600 | | |

Source: field survey 2017

The table above revealed the ranks of the eleven variables considered in this study. For refuse disposal, the table revealed that respondents' opinion of their expectation before service was carried out (mean rank = 343.09) scored higher than their perception after the service has been delivered (mean rank = 257.92). Other variables that respondents' opinion of their expectation before service was carried out scored higher than perception after the service has been delivered include cleaning and clearing of surroundings, fumigation and pest control, sewage treatment, central cooling system maintenance, water supply/ treatment, generator maintenance and lift/ elevator maintenance. However for variables such as Security /CCTV services, electricity repair and parking lot maintenance, respondents' opinion of their expectation before service was carried out scored lower than their perception after the service has been delivered as revealed by their mean ranks.

Table 6: Test Statistics for Mann-Whitney U Test for Expectation before Service was carried out and Perception after Service has been delivered

| Facility/Services | Mann Whitney U | Wilcoxon W | Z | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------|------------------------|
| Refuse disposal | 32224.500 | 77374.500 | -6.165 | .000* |
| Cleaning and clearing of surroundings | 41748.000 | 86898.000 | -1.618 | .106 |
| Security /CCTV | 40598.500 | 85748.500 | -2.186 | .029 |
| Fumigation and pest control | 44156.000 | 89306.000 | -.408 | .683 |
| Sewage treatment | 35307.500 | 80457.500 | -4.732 | .000* |
| Central cooling system | 44433.500 | 89583.500 | -.273 | .785 |
| Electricity Repair | 36419.500 | 81569.500 | -4.343 | .000* |
| Parking lot maintenance | 36876.000 | 82026.000 | -3.949 | .000* |
| Water supply/ treatment | 36359.000 | 81509.000 | -4.176 | .000* |
| Generator maintenance | 43226.500 | 88376.500 | -.863 | .388 |
| Lift/ elevator maintenance | 43721.000 | 88871.000 | -.623 | .533 |

Source: field survey 2017

The table above revealed the result of the test statistics for Mann-Whitney U test of respondents' opinion of expectation before service was carried out and perception after service has been delivered. Table 6 revealed the asymptotic significance i.e. the probability value (p) of the measured service delivery of various services using expectation before and perception after a service is been carried out as the grouping variable. Eleven variables were considered consisting of various services provided within the buildings selected for the study. The result in the table presents an asymptotic significance of the measured services available in the buildings selected using expectation before and perception after services were carried out as the grouping variable. Eleven services that were considered include refuse disposal, cleaning and clearing of surroundings, security /CCTV services, fumigation and pest control, sewage treatment, central

cooling system, electricity repair, parking lot maintenance, water supply/ treatment, generator and lift/ elevator maintenance. From table 6 above, six (6) variables from the result of their Z value and probability (p) value i.e. refuse disposal (Z value = -6.165 and P value = 0.00*), security /CCTV services (Z value = -2.186 and p value = 0.029), Sewage treatment (Z value = -4.732 and p value = 0.00*), electricity repair (Z value = -4.343 and p value = 0.00*), parking lot maintenance (Z value = -3.949 and p value = 0.00*) and water supply/ treatment services (Z value = -4.176 and p value = 0.00*) revealed a significant difference in the opinion of respondents based on their expectation before and perception after services have been carried out with a significant level of 0.05. Furthermore the mean rank column in table 5 above detailed and describe the direction of the difference in the expectation and the perception group (which group is higher). For instance, expectation before service was carried out scored higher than perception after the service has been delivered for variables such as refuse disposal, water supply/ treatment and Sewage treatment while for Security /CCTV services, electricity repair and parking lot maintenance, respondents' opinion of their expectation before service was carried out scored lower than their perception after the service has been delivered. The median values for the variables that are statistically significant i.e refuse disposal (expectation = 4.0 and perception = 3.0), security /CCTV services (expectation = 4.0 and perception = 4.0), Sewage treatment (expectation = 3.0 and perception = 2.0), electricity repair (expectation = 1.0 and perception = 2.0), parking lot maintenance (expectation = 2.0 and perception = 3.0) and water supply/ treatment services (expectation = 3.0 and perception = 2.0) are detailed in table 7 below. To further calculate the effect size statistic which SPSS does not provide, the value of z that is reported in the output can be used to calculate an approximate value of r. Where $r = z / \text{square root of } N$ where N = total number of cases. Hence the value of r for refuse disposal is 0.25; sewage treatment is 0.19; electricity repair is 0.18; water supply is 0.17 and security /CCTV services is 0.09. These r results would be considered a very small effect size using Cohen (1988) criteria of 0.1 = small effect, 0.3 = medium effect and 0.5 = large effect. This however implies that the expectation before a service was carried out has little effect on the perception after Service has been delivered and vice versa for the statistically significant variables.

Conclusion

The paper examined the tenants' satisfaction with services provided in commercial properties in Ibadan, Nigeria. Facility management is not simply the practice of managing the various support services in an organisation. It involves integration of knowledge of both facilities and management in order to work effectively. In the modern business world, the profitability of a property can be severely affected by inefficiency of service provided in a building. Concerns about support services for operations and activities should be driven by appropriate, relevant and adequate knowledge of facilities management. Without doubt, awareness of the need for effective and efficient services in serviced properties has been heightened by the need to further look the various causes of inefficiency. The measurement of service quality can provide specific data that can be used in quality management. This allows a firm to focus its resources and to maximize service quality whilst costs are controlled. With the knowledge of the service quality dimensions, the decision making unit/property manager can then judge how well the service providers performed on each dimension, identify the weakness in order to make improvements, be able to monitor and maintain quality service and efficiently design the service delivery process

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, effective service provisions are relevant to the various aspects and dimensions of organizations, hence the service providers, real estate practitioners and Registered Estate Surveyors and Valuers should ensure that they put in more effort to ensure that they provide quality services so as for the benefit of the occupiers. Service providers are to provide quality service that would meet the expectation of the occupiers/tenants. Property manager should also take due diligence in selection of service providers. Furthermore, time to time appraisal of service providers should be undertaken to measure their performance. There is need for collaboration between the outsourced service providers and property managers in order to ensure that services provided are delivered effectively.

Reference

- Ameratunga, D., (2000) "Assessment of facilities management performance." *Journal of Property Management*, Vol. 18 (4), 258-266.
- Ameratunga, D., Baldry, D., (2000) "Assessment of facilities management performance in higher education properties." *Facilities Management Journal*, Vol. 18, (7 / 8), 293-301.
- Ameratunga, D., Baldry, D., (2002) "Moving from performance measurement to performance management." *Facilities Management Journal*, Vol. 20, (5 / 6), 217 – 223.
- Ameratunga, D., Baldry, D., (2003) "A conceptual framework to measure facilities management performance." *Property Management Journal*, Vol. 21, (2), 171-189.
- Anderson, R. (1973). "Consumer Dissatisfaction: The Effect of Disconfirmed Expectancy on Perceived Product Performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10(2), 38-44.
- Anderson, K and McAdam, R (2004), A critique of benchmarking and performance measurement lead or lag? *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 465-483.
- Atkin, B. and Brooks, A. (2005) Total facilities management: *Second Edition*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford.
- Barret. P (1992), Development of a Post Occupancy Building appraisal Model. In Barret, P.(Ed). *Facilities Management: Research Directions*, RICS Books
- Czepiel, J. A. (1990). Service encounters and service relationships: Implications for research. *Journal of Business Research* 20: 13-21.

- Donabedian, A. (1980). Explorations in Quality Assessment and Monitoring. Volume 1, the Definition of Quality and Approaches to Its Assessment. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Health Administration Press.
- Drucker, P.F (1993), We need to measure, not count, *Wall Street Journal*.
- Ekinci, Y. (2003). An investigation of the determinants of customer satisfaction. *Tourism Analysis* 8(2): 193-196
- Fečikova, I. (2004). An index method for measurement of customer satisfaction. *The TQM Magazine*, Vol. 16, (1), 57-66.
- Gagendran, T (2000). An Integrated Approach to Assess Facilities Performance. Unpublished Masters thesis, National University of Singapore.
- Geetika S., N. (2010) Satisfaction on Service Quality: A Study of Railway Platforms in India. *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 13, (1)
- Kaplan, R., Norton, D. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard, Harvard Business School.
- Kaplan, R. & Norton, D. (2000). Strategy Focused Organisations. Massachusetts, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hronec, S.M (1993), Vital signs- Using quality,time and cost performance measurements to chart your company's future, Amocon, New York, NY.
- Ibrahim. T. A. (2014) Management of Multi-Tenanted Properties in Abeokuta: Problems and Solutions. *Paper presented at at the first national conference of the school of science and technology, Mapoly, Abeokuta*
- Ibrahim, T. A. (2014) Aspects of Tenant Eviction in Property Management Practice in Ilorin Metropolis, Nigeria. *LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany.* www.lap-publishing.com. Also available at www.amazon.co.uk/books/business/finance

- McDougall, G and Hinks, J (2000), Identifying priority issues in facilities management benchmarking, *Facilities*, Vol. 18, (10), 427-434.
- Mohammad, M. I., Gambo, Y. L. and Omirin, M. M. (2012) Assessing Facilities Management Service in Postgraduate Hostel Using Servqual Technique. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)* 3(3): 252-256
- Niven, P.R. (2003) *Balanced scorecard step-by-step for Government and Nonprofit Agencies*. Wiley.
- Oyedele, O. A. (2013) Assessment of Property Management Practices in Nigeria, *NIEVS Journal*, Vol 38, No. 1
- Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (2013). *Managing facilities to enhance organisational performance*. RICS guidance note 1st edition
- Sapri, M and Pitt, M (2005) Performance measurement in facilities management; state of knowledge. In: Khosrowshahi, F (Ed.), *21st Annual ARCOM Conference*, SOAS, University of London. Association of Researchers in Construction Management, Vol. 1, 431-40.
- Sarshar, M. (2006) "Improving service delivery in FM: a case study of a UK hospital facilities directorate." *Journal of Facilities Management*, Vol. 4, (4), 271- 285.
- Shohet, I. M. (2006) key performance indicators for strategic healthcare facilities maintenance, *ASCE Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* 132 (4) 345-354
- Teague, J and Eilon, S (1973), Productivity measurement: a brief survey, *Applied Economics*, Vol. 5, 133-145.
- Then, D.S.S. (1999). *An Integrated Resource Management View of Facilities Management*. *Facilities*. Vol.17. (12/13). 462-46

- Tranfield, D and Akhlaghi, F (1995) Performance measures: relating facilities to business indicators. *Facilities*, Vol.13,(3) 6-14.
- Varcoe, B.J. (1993) "Facilities performance: achieving value-for-money through performance measurement and benchmarking." *Property Management Journal*, Vol. 11, (4), 301-307
- Varcoe, B.J (2000) Implications for facility management of the changing business climate, *Facilities*, Vol. 18, (10).
- Venkatraman, N and Ramanujam, V (1986), Measurement of Business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approach, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11,(4), 801-814.
- Walters, D (1997), Developing and implementing value-based strategy, *Management Decision*, Vol. 35, (9-10) 709 - 712.
- Walters, M., (1999) "Performance Measurement Systems: A case study of Customer Satisfaction." *Facilities*, Vol. 17, (3 / 4), 97-104.
- Zairi, M (1994), Benchmarking: the best tool for measuring competitiveness, *Benchmarking for Quality Management & Technology*, Vol. 1, (10) 11-24.
- Zairi, M. (2000a). Managing customer dissatisfaction through effective complaints management systems. *The TQM magazine*, Vol. 12, (5), 331-335
- Zairi, M (2000b). Managing Customer Satisfaction: A Best Practice Perspective. *The TQM Magazine*, Vol. 12, (6), 389-394.

Appendix 1

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of respondents’ opinion for Expectation before Service was carried out and Perception after Service has been delivered

| Variable | | Refuse disposal | Cleaning and clearing of surroundings | Security /CCTV | Fumigation and pest control | Sewage treatment | Central cooling system | Electricity Repair | Parking lot | Water supply/ treatment | Generator | Lift/ elevator maintenance |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| expectation | Mean | 3.65 | 3.94 | 3.46 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 2.91 | 1.94 | 2.58 | 2.92 | 2.72 | 2.71 |
| | N | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1.397 | .927 | 1.244 | 1.121 | 1.106 | 1.394 | 1.346 | 1.322 | 1.233 | 1.548 | 1.107 |
| | Median | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| perception | Mean | 2.99 | 3.84 | 3.74 | 2.89 | 2.38 | 2.86 | 2.33 | 3.01 | 2.50 | 2.61 | 2.68 |
| | N | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1.324 | .931 | .866 | 1.348 | 1.161 | 1.153 | 1.433 | 1.296 | 1.343 | 1.606 | 1.190 |
| | Median | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| Total | Mean | 3.32 | 3.89 | 3.60 | 2.90 | 2.59 | 2.89 | 2.13 | 2.80 | 2.71 | 2.67 | 2.69 |
| | N | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1.400 | .930 | 1.080 | 1.239 | 1.151 | 1.278 | 1.403 | 1.325 | 1.305 | 1.577 | 1.148 |
| | Median | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |

Source: field survey 2017