

Identifying and measuring customer value:

Case multi-locational worker

Purpose & conclusions of the paper

Our paper presents measurements approaches by reviewing models and frameworks that can be utilised in identifying and measuring customer value in the context of multi-locational work.

With this paper we wanted to understand how value is created for customers and present measurement approaches that can be utilised in identifying and measuring customer value in the context of multi-locational work.

Although the focus was on multilocal working, it was noticed that the same methods and tools can be utilised in both single-location as well as multi-locational working contexts. This might indicate that there is a need for developing tools more precisely for the multi-locational working.

The authors



TAMPERE
UNIVERSITY OF
TECHNOLOGY

Suvi Nenonen
Tytti Vasell
Maiju Vuolle
Main contact: tytti.vasell@tut.fi



Tuuli Jylhä



Vitalija Petrulaitiene

The four different roles of the customer and related measurement approaches

1. CUSTOMER AS AN EMPLOYEE AND THE END-USER OF THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

Customer experience, customer journey and value



Employee turnover, employee complaints, well-being, individual and group productivity, cost and time savings, employees satisfaction and productivity related to work environments, e.g., Leesman Index, SmartWoW and WODI.

2. CUSTOMER AS A TECHNOLOGY USER

User experience and technology evaluation models for measuring virtual and mobile work environment.



EmplUser experience and context of use
Technology Acceptance Model, Task-Technology Fit

3. CUSTOMER AS A CONSUMER

Customer experience, customer journey and value



Net Promoter Score, NPS
Customer Effort Score, CES
Customer Satisfaction, CSAT
Service experience - EXQ
Value in experience – VALEX
Kano model

4. CUSTOMER AS AN ORGANISATION

Multi-dimensional performance measurement system and KPIs.



FM Value Map
Balanced Scorecard
Value-creation functions

Key references

- Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Kemperman, A., Kleijn, M. and Hendriks, E., (2015). To use or not to use: which type of property should you choose? Predicting the use of activity based offices, *Journal of Property Investment & Finance*, 33(4), 320 – 336
- Blakstad, S.H (2015)Work isn't where it used to be in Arja Ropo Perttu Salovaara, Erika Sauer, and Donatella De Paoli, Eds. Leadership in Spaces and Places
- Jensen, A. P., JM van der Voordt, T., Coenen, C., and Sarasoja, A. L. (2014). Reflecting on future research concerning the added value of FM. *Facilities*, 32(13/14), 856-870
- nonen, S.; Airo, K.; Bosch, P.; Fruchter, R.; Koivisto, S.; Gersberg, N.; Rothe, P., Ruohomäki, V. & Vartiainen, M. (2009). Managing Workplace Resources for Knowledge Work, the final report of ProWork-project, Available at <http://www.proworkproject.com/prowork/final-report>
- Jensen P.A, (2010),"The Facilities Management Value Map: a conceptual framework", *Facilities*, 28(4), 175 – 188
- Kano, N., Seraku, N., and Tsuji, S. (1984) Attractive Quality and Must-Be Quality, in the proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the Japan Society of Quality Control.
- Vicher, J.C. (2006). The concept of workplace performance and its value to managers. *University of California, Berkeley*, 49(2).