1

COLLECTING THEORIES TO OBTAIN AN INTERDISCIPLINARY UNDERSTANDING OF WORKPLACE MANAGEMENT

Vitalija Danivska and Rianne Appel-Meulenbroek*

1 Introduction

Workplace in general is understood as a “place where work is done” (WordNet-Online, n.d.). Workplace management, in one form or another, has been around since the first buildings dedicated to performing work-related tasks appeared. But only in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when office building construction boomed, the attention was directed to office layouts and ‘the best way to perform work tasks’, highly influenced by scientific management father Frederick Winslow Taylor. With improvement of building techniques and growth of employees’ rights, offices started changing and providing more personalization opportunities. Around the middle of the 20th century, dedicated managers for managing physical space (office buildings) started appearing. However, their focus remained on timely provision of square metres and they considered real estate users rather limitedly. Around the 1980s, the need to organise operations that were spread across multiple locations led to the birth of a new – facilities – management (FM) regime in research. Later in the 1990s, Joroff et al. (1993) introduced corporate real estate as the fifth resource, “whose strategic value is just emerging”, which led towards development of the corporate real estate management (CREM) research field. FM originally concentrated on a more operational level of building management, while CREM emphasized the financial management of real estate.

During the same time, organisational studies were developing knowledge about organisations and human behaviour in organisational settings. Already in the first half of the 20th century, organisational researchers introduced the idea that work performance relates to group dynamics and that the physical space is a factor that affects formal and informal relationships in the organisation. Studies on the social work environment started to criticise the scientific management approach, which is now considered as the beginning of the human relations field (Chanlat, 2006). In organisational studies, physical space is seen as part of organisational space, however, often only as a setting in which organisational relationships happen and can be studied.

*Corresponding author: danivska.v@buas.nl

Nonetheless, from the 1990s onwards, the number of studies on the employee–(physical) workplace relationship started to grow, showing the interest to align workplace design to employee needs as well.

Even though workplace management is widely discussed, there is no one definition used among academics and practitioners. The International FM Association (IFMA) defines workplace management as “the management of all resources needed to design & maintain appropriate, effective and economical workplace experiences that align to strategic business objectives and support people in doing their best work every day, wherever they are” (Jervis & Mawson, 2014, p. 10). Similarly, Redlein et al. (2020) define workplace strategy as “the alignment of the organisation’s workplace with the business strategy in order to optimise the effectiveness of its people and achieve its strategic business goals. It takes into account different dimensions of a company, its physical and virtual work environments, culture, business processes, technologies and other resources” (p. 179).

In practice, workplace management has been understood as one of the functions of facility management (FM), corporate real estate management (CREM), or human resource management (HRM) departments. Facilities management (FM) is now officially defined in a European Committee for Standardization (CEN) norm as “the integration of processes within an organisation to maintain and develop the agreed services which support and improve the effectiveness of its primary activities” (CEN, 2007, p. 5). Corporate real estate management (CREM) is not defined officially, but it generally is understood as the management of a corporation’s real estate portfolio by aligning the portfolio and services to the needs of the core business, with the ultimate goal to add value to the corporation (Dewulf et al., 2000). Human resource management (HRM) does not have a unified definition either but can be referred to as the policies and practices that influence employees’ behaviour, attitudes, and performance (De Cieri & Kramar, 2005). In most organisations, workplace management is the responsibility of one of these three departments. However, as Redlein et al. (2020) point out, it really needs a collaboration of HRM, FM, CREM, and also finance, marketing, IT, business unit leaders, employee advocates, and the C-suite to be able to create a workplace that is effective for the organisation and healthy for the employees. So, there seems to be agreement that workplace management is a collaborative task towards aligning the workplace with the organisation and the employees using it.

Various aspects of workplace (management) are studied in the fields of economics, organisational management, architecture, engineering sciences, medical sciences, and psychology. These different areas of research bring diverse approaches to workplace management, concentrating on either people, the environment, or the organisation. Each of these disciplines have their own focus on the mechanisms behind successful management of workplaces and how its different aspects relate to each other. In addition, academics from these different backgrounds (often working in different faculties and departments) tend to present their workplace-related research at different conferences and publish in specific disciplinary journals. This fragmentation leads to much knowledge being lost between disciplines and many insights not being integrated in an overall theoretical framework or used in workplace management in practice.

1.1 A complex wicked problem

Workplace management is generally not considered to be a separate academic discipline. As both this introduction and the first chapter of the first book in this series demonstrate, workplace management needs input from many different disciplines, thus it could be considered as a ‘complex problem’ that needs to be seen as a whole rather than the sum of all the parts

(Appel-Meulenbroek & Danivska, 2021; Bernstein, 2015). Complex, real-world problems require knowledge from multiple disciplines and might suffer from fragmented knowledge and discipline-specific reasoning. Moreover, managing organisational workplaces can be considered as a wicked problem. Wicked problems are difficult to detect, and they are influenced by many social and political factors that change over time (Kreuter et al., 2004). The four characteristics of wicked problems that Kreuter et al. identified clearly apply to workplace management processes:

- 1 the nature of the problem is viewed differently depending on the perspectives and biases of those with a stake in the problem,
- 2 multiple stakeholders are involved which disagree about the problem and the optimal solution,
- 3 it is unclear when the problem is actually solved,
- 4 what works in one context does not necessarily work in another, similar context.

In other fields that deal with complex real-world problems, a transdisciplinary approach is proven to be effective. The term transdisciplinarity has been explained in detail in the first book of this series. To summarise its essence here: *Trans* means going “across the disciplines, between the disciplines, and beyond and outside all disciplines” with the goal to understand the complex world (McGregor, 2004, p. 2). Transdisciplinarity can be captured in two main aspects. First, it is a different manner of seeing the world (Max-Neef, 2005). It means that common patterns are searched instead of separate ideas, which leads to a deeper understanding of the world, opening up new perspectives and complexity of the world. Second, transdisciplinarity addresses the relation between science and society. It focuses on demand-driven research of real-world problems (Jahn et al., 2012). Only then the produced knowledge can be really shared with practice, as there is a common process of making sense of it all, which is what distinguishes interdisciplinary from transdisciplinary (Jahn et al., 2012).

A transdisciplinary approach is also the essence of this book series and its books. While several other books and journals are dedicated to workplace management and design, only very few open up a theoretical discussion across multiple theories from different disciplines. Moreover, there is a lack of a holistic interdisciplinary Workplace Management framework that ties such theories together. This research gap is precisely the goal of this second book in the series. This book provides insights in the (potential) application of 18 theories from multiple disciplinary fields towards managing the complex world of workplace, consisting of organisations, buildings, and people. Each chapter addresses one theory (or a set of related theories) that is (or can be) used in workplace research and practice. It explains the main assumptions of the theory and methodologies that are used in research. Moreover, it provides insights regarding how the knowledge stemming from each theory can benefit workplace managers in practice. The last chapter of this book starts the integration of these assumptions from 18 theories into a transdisciplinary framework towards a holistic Workplace Management theory. The set-up of this framework is based on an empirical concept-mapping study, involving authors of this book as respondents. Transdisciplinary research should not be considered as an opposing but rather a complementary approach to disciplinary, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary research. A transdisciplinary approach calls for a ‘mutual learning’ between academia, practice, as well as other stakeholders, with the aim to create new connections between distinct groups and achieve new forms of communication and knowledge (Jahn et al., 2012). This, in particular, is what motivated us to create the last chapter of this book – to create an overall framework for

workplace management that integrates the different theories described in the different chapters of this book.

The next sections of this introductory chapter will first introduce the different disciplines presented in this book and discuss the logic of the chapter order in the book. Then, a brief discussion of terminologies will follow to prevent cross-disciplinary confusions on terms. Last, the chapter set-up for the rest of the book will be described, together with the 35 co-authors of the different chapters.

2 Selecting theories

This book is dedicated to opening up the complexity of workplace management and to inspire academics and practitioners to look past their own fields and find more theories and concepts that can be applied towards a more holistic workplace management approach. Even though management science in itself is considered to be interdisciplinary (Van Baalen & Karsten, 2012), workplace management has been scattered across different disciplines for a long time, especially the physical versus the psychosocial environment. Moreover, for a long time, design of spaces had not been of interest from a management point of view at all. In workplace management, researchers and practitioners aim at finding the best ways to manage an organisation's resources through the (physical) work environment lens, which is a complex task trying to juggle between the needs of different stakeholders. To make it even more complex, the boundaries between physical and virtual environments are blurring, adding another perspective of time and space that needs to be managed. In addition, the role of human needs and behaviour has become more important than ever.

Management science first developed under the influence of mathematical, social, psychological, and natural sciences (Luthans, 1973). The theories in this book also represent various aspects of management fields such as performance management, decision-making, service management, etc. Some of the theories come from more distinctive fields, like building science or ICT, but many can be traced to multiple disciplines. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of workplace research, this selection of theories was not meant to be exhaustive. The nature of the workplace management 'problem' and its boundaries are endless, and the editors thus cannot oversee all potential contributions either. Therefore, the selection of theories happened in an uncontrolled, open manner; namely, the editors solicited suggestions for theories and accompanying authors from their networks and on social media (LinkedIn). As a result, the book presents an interesting selection of theories from several relevant fields and sub-fields:

- Management
 - Process management (Chapters 2, 9, 12, 14)
 - Decision-making in management (Chapters 7, 8)
 - Innovation management (Chapter 14)
 - Service management (Chapters 17, 18)
 - Operations management (Chapters 13, 17)
- Business
 - Human relations (Chapter 19)
 - Marketing (Chapters 11, 18)
 - Economics (Chapter 10)

- Others
 - Systems-thinking (Chapters 3, 4, 5)
 - Information science (Chapters 3, 15, 16)
 - Building science (Chapter 19)

Although the chaotic spread of the chapter numbers in this list may suggest otherwise, there is of course a logical reading order in the book. On purpose, the (sub)disciplines were not used to group the chapters, but instead the chapters were ordered based on a logical flow of their contents: first the organisational perspective and then the managing of people and/or buildings. The book starts by presenting the Corporate Real Estate Management (*CREM*) *Maturity model* and explaining how the role of real estate has been changing towards a stronger strategic role as a source of competitive advantage. Many see this model as the ‘birth’ of the CRE and workplace management field. The introduced model provides a nice introduction to the following chapters which discuss various issues related to organisational management as a way to align people and resources for achieving desired goals of different stakeholders.

The following chapter, on *systems-thinking theory*, introduces a philosophical view to organisations as holistic systems, which are composed of different interconnected system-components and properties. The chapter emphasizes the need of understanding relationships between the components for sustainable decision-making and managing workplaces properly. The *St. Gallen Management Model*, presented in the next chapter, can be seen as an adaptation of the systems-thinking approach into a framework that takes these relationships between organisations, environments and management into consideration. It is a useful tool to reflect on the complexity of the organisational world and to structure the work of management into operative, normative, and strategic aspects. The chapter on *socio-technical systems* theory continues the discussion on different levels of systems and introduces the aspect of time in relation to change. It explains that organisations influence their built environment at a different pace. Then, the chapter on *resilience* further deals specifically with systems that experience transitions, emphasising the need to understand the risks and identify mitigation actions. A longitudinal view of vulnerability is an essential component for a resilient organisation. Last, the *Strategy-as-Practice* chapter claims that organisational strategy is a social phenomenon and is highly influenced by interactions of people. Therefore, not only can organisational strategy affect the workplace solution, but workplaces can have an effect on organisational strategy as well.

Decision-making is the focus of the next set of chapters as one of the core elements of management. First, a chapter on *Multiple Perspective Strategic Decision Making* introduces a systemic view to decision-making, including various dimensions to help decision makers with the complexity of the process. The discussed iterative process can be helpful in formulating workplace objectives too. Additionally, successful strategy implementation emphasises the role of alignment that is needed between organisational strategy and corporate real estate. The *alignment* chapter introduces models and model components for alignment between real estate-related activities and overall organisational strategy. This alignment between different organisational units can be affected by the relationships between them. Then, the *principal-agent theory* chapter reviews issues of the relationship between business and corporate real estate units and explains the main agency problems that might arise from it. The *branding* chapter expands this discussion by pointing out that it specifically should be communicated better how workplace decisions can support core business activities, in order to gain trust and a valued position within the organisation and among customers. The chapter on the *Value Adding Management model* completes the discussion on alignment by introducing the idea that buildings, workplaces, facilities, and services

can add value to organisations, but different values might be differently prioritized in different organisations.

The next set of chapters explain how workplaces can be improved through adjustments of the physical work environment. The chapter on the *Toyota Production System* discusses the challenges that CRE managers face while dealing with the usage of buildings. It promotes the reduction of overconsumption of resources and unwanted output, and better alignment on work, system, and employee levels. Next, the *radical innovation* chapter elaborates on the role of technology and combining physical and digital environments into the overall workplace. According to different innovation typologies introduced, technology can transform workplaces in multiple ways.

The last set of chapters address the aspects related to the end user of a workplace. They concentrate on the human perspective and emphasize the role of employees both as the users of a workplace and as the providers of workplace services. The *usability* chapter argues that the main purpose of a work environment is to support user activities and outcomes. The authors emphasize the role of user experience being more important than architectural or technical quality of the building. The *user-centric design thinking* chapter elaborates on this by explaining how workplace management decisions can be improved through understanding users' needs and preferences and incorporating their feedback into the decision-making process. Moreover, the *hospitality* chapter explains that user experience comes not only from experiencing the physical environment and facilities but also from the social atmosphere associated with it. Therefore, workplace management should be concerned with creating a hospitable workplace experience for employees. Similarly, the *service management* chapter argues that experience is affected by individual perceptions as well as the behaviour of service personnel and emphasises the relationship between human behaviour and organisational practices. Last, the *organisational socialisation* chapter explains how to integrate those employees that service providers have outsourced to support with the FM service activities, through socialisation. This helps them blend in, adapt fitting behavioural practices, and thus provide increased service to the client organisation and their employees.

Despite the introduced flow of the book, it is not necessary to read the book from the beginning to the end. One can pick up an interesting or unfamiliar theory and start reading there. One can also start with reading the final chapter about the overarching framework across the theories first and continue with selected theories later.

The next section explains the definitions of some terms used in this book. If you are familiar with them, you can move directly to Section 4 which introduces the authors and the common structure of the next chapters.

3 Relevant terminologies

This book introduces a list of theories, models, and frameworks that are (or could be) applied to workplace research. There is no uniform agreement in the scholarly world on what a theory is, but generally academics define theory as a way to describe a specific realm and explain how it works (e.g. Bunge, 2012; Kivunja, 2018; Lynham, 2002; Wacker, 1998). A theory should be able to help in predicting or examining why certain elements lead to certain outcomes. Corley and Gioia (2011) define theory as “a statement of concepts and their interrelationships that shows how and/or why a phenomenon occurs” (p. 12). The chapters in this book have tried to address different concepts and explain the interrelationships between them, also in the light of workplace management research on different levels of depth and in different ways. Based on the level of abstraction, generalizability, and role, a theory can also be assigned to multiple levels:

meta-, grand-, mid-range, and micro (Higgins & Moore, 2000). While metatheories represent more of a world view on the nature of knowledge and grand theories describe broad theoretical perspectives instead of a working theory, the mid-range theories are the ones social researchers usually understand as ‘real’ theories. Micro-theories explain a certain phenomenon within a limited scope, often also with a limited possibility to generalize. Some academics argue that they are better called models. For example, Nilsen (2015) states that models are theories with a more narrowly defined scope of explanation, which is descriptive and not as explanatory as a theory. Another closely related term is framework. Frameworks do not provide explanations but describe the phenomena by fitting them into a set of categories (Nilsen, 2015). This is what is produced in the last chapter of this book as the first step towards a grand workplace management theory.

While reading the next chapters, several commonly used workplace and management terms will pass by. Although some of them have official definitions, the scope of the definition and the focus of it sometimes differ in different disciplines, in different countries, and/or due to historical reasons. Without aiming to pick the ‘best’ definition for each term, this section provides a brief discussion of the most relevant terms and their interpretations, to provide some context for the following chapters. The authors of the different chapters will use the terms in different ways as they see fit from their own disciplinary background and experience.

First, the two terms ‘workplace’ and ‘workspace’ are both used. It is important to point out that two terms are used differently, interchangeably, and as definitions of different scale levels of the work environment. The differences appear in the understanding of what is a space and what is a place, where the physical component of it appears and where the boundaries lie (see Appel-Meulenbroek and Danivska [2021] for a more extensive discussion in the first book of this series). ‘Total workplace’ or ‘organisational space’ are additional terms used in the organisational management field, referring to “built environments and the objects and social practices within them” (Luhman & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 135). It is a system of social and physical factors “which is experienced by users and providing the context in which they live their work lives” (Becker & Steele, 1990, p. 9). As this book contains authors from all mentioned disciplines, the editors did not want to force terminology definitions on them, so all these terms are used in different ways by the different chapters. More general terms like work environment or workstation are also used.

Both FM and CREM terminologies are used widely in the chapters of this book as well. There has been a long ongoing discussion between academics about the differences and the similarities between FM and CREM, and until this day, no agreement has been reached. However, van der Voordt and Jensen (2018, p. 178) annotate that “In both definitions of CREM and FM, supporting (business) processes and adding value to the organisation are key concepts”. Even though both FM and CREM concentrate on management activities and play a strategic role in achieving organisational goals, their focus can be said to be somewhat different. Redlein and Stopajnik (2020) present a new CREM triangle, based on Teichmann’s work, portraying FM as a part of CREM, bringing in the user perspective to the otherwise strong investor/owner-oriented Portfolio, Asset and Property Management activities of CREM. On the other hand, van der Voordt (2017) visualises the development of the CREM and FM relationship through time and shows that the perception changes, where CREM is considered as an activity that aligns asset management, cost control, and FM to general management for the best accommodation of people and FM is seen as the management of buildings-in-use. Redlein and Stopajnik (2020) write that FM (together with Property Management) is considered less strategic and more operative management. On the contrary, the CEN (2007) definition of FM indicates that FM tasks are defined at all three levels (strategic, tactical, and operational) of the organisation.

Redlein and Stopajnik (2020) and van der Voordt (2017) note that the differences in definitions are also country-specific due to different historical and cultural backgrounds throughout the development of disciplines. These differences in the definition and the scope can be noticed in different scientific journals and conferences too. While academics discuss similar topics in essence both related to CREM and to FM, they are often presented under different umbrellas in different academic societies (van der Voordt, 2017). These terms are in a way becoming synonyms used interchangeably while discussing the management of buildings, facilities, and services to support the performance of an organisation. Therefore, the authors contributing to this book also use the terms from their own perspective, and we do not distinguish CREM and FM terms rigorously.

Other terms that are repeatedly used in the upcoming chapters define people, organisations or organisational units that affect or are affected by workplace management actions. The broadest terms you will encounter are ‘actor’ and ‘stakeholder’. Actor can be understood as an individual or a team (e.g. Zhou & Hoever, 2014). Generally, an actor can be defined as a human or non-human entity that can participate in the network or system (Bencherki, 2017). The term is most often found in social studies, typically relating to actor-network theory. An actor can be referred also as an agent. The term ‘agent’ is common while addressing the principal-agent relationship and refers to someone who acts on behalf of the principal (e.g. Baker, 2019). The term ‘stakeholder’ was first used in the early 1960s by the Stanford Research Institute and referred to as “groups without whose support the organization would cease to exist” (Freeman & Reed, 1983, p. 89). It is commonly used in the strategic management field to identify who are impacted by an organisation’s actions and decision-making. Key stakeholders from the FM perspective would be the customer, owner, community, society, and government (Coenen et al., 2013). Stakeholders commonly are grouped into primary (or internal) stakeholders, whose interest in a company comes from a direct relationship, and secondary (or external) stakeholders, who are somehow affected by the actions or outcomes of the company. Primary stakeholders that are often referred to in the organisational context are: shareholders of the organisation, customers, suppliers, and employees. The customer could be seen as a primary stakeholder in FM, while the owner, the community, the society, and the government are secondary stakeholders. An FM customer, however, can be separated into three sub-categories: client, customer, and end user. Client then refers to the organisation that orders the FM service, customer to the organisational (workplace management) unit that defines the order, and end user as the individual person (an employee) that receives facility services (CEN, 2007). Another way to categorise customers, used in some chapters of this book, is a division of customers into external and internal customers, stemming from the quality management and service marketing fields. External customer, then, refers to a customer who is not directly connected to the organisation (such as the one that consumes the product or service), and internal customer is the one who is directly (internally) connected to the organisation, such as the employees of an organisation (Tennant, 2001).

The term ‘user’ is also commonly used to discuss various stakeholders. According to the Cambridge dictionary, a user is “someone who uses a product, machine, or service” (“User”, n.d.). However, the definition is not as straightforward as it might seem at first sight. For example, users of buildings have also been referred to as all the people that have an interest in the building (Lindholm & Nenonen, 2006). Tagliaro (2018) discusses the complexity of the user definition in workplace management in depth in her PhD research and points out that users can be differentiated according to their values and needs, and their roles and responsibilities. All these differences in interpretations of the terms used to define different stakeholders, or the roles those stakeholders carry out, often come from disciplinary boundaries or perspectives that are

taken by the authors. Similarly, terms are also mixed up in practice. In the chapters of this book, workplace ‘user’ commonly refers to the internal end user of the work environment who uses a certain physical environment to perform work (typically, an employee of a certain organisation); however, all previously mentioned terms are used.

4 Set-up and authors of the rest of the chapters

To make it easier for the reader, all theory chapters of this book follow the same set-up. First, Section 1 of each chapter briefly explains a theory’s origin and its essence. In Section 2, authors discuss the theory’s applicability to workplace management. Sections 3 and 4 particularly aim at researchers, introducing relevant research methodologies and possible limitations in applicability to workplace research. Section 5, on the other hand, aims at practitioners, discussing the theory’s implications to workplace practice. All chapters end with some suggestions for further reading in case readers are inspired to read more about the specific theory.

Table 1.1 provides an overview of the different authors that contributed to this book. The authors represent 18 higher education institutions and one practice-based organisation in 12 different countries (mostly within Europe) and a vast amount of different disciplinary fields.

The final chapter of the book has a different structure from the rest of the chapters. It is based on an empirical concept mapping analysis of all theories in this second volume of the book series. An interdisciplinary workplace management framework is created from the basic assumptions of the individual theories. This is a first attempt at a more holistic approach towards workplace management that hopefully encourages more research on the topic.

Table 1.1 An overview of the different authors

Chapter	Authors	Country	University/organisation
1 Introduction	Vitalija Danivska Rianne Appel- Meulenbroek	Finland Netherlands	Aalto University Eindhoven University of Technology
2 Corporate real estate management maturity model	Jaap Wijnja Theo J.M. van der Voordt Jan Gerard Hoendervanger	Netherlands	Hanze University Groningen Delft University of Technology
3 Systems-thinking theory	Renuka Thakore Aino Kavantera Graeme Whitehall	UK	University College of Estate Management
4 St. Gallen Management Model	Annette Kämpf- Dern	Germany	RE-ER Real Estate Entrepreneurial Research
5 Socio-technical transitions theory	Jenni Poutanen	Finland	Tampere University
6 Disaster Resilience of Place (DROP) model	Keith G. Jones	UK	Anglia Ruskin University
7 Strategy-as-Practice theory	Matthew Thomas	UK	University of Birmingham

(Continued)

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Chapter	Authors	Country	University/organisation
8 Decision-making theory	Chiara Tagliaro Ying Hua	Italy USA	Politecnico di Milano Cornell University
9 Alignment theory	Monique Arkesteijn Chris Heywood	Netherlands Australia	Delft University of Technology Melbourne University
10 Principal-agent theory	Torben Bernhold Niklas Wiesweg	Germany	Münster University of Applied Sciences
11 Branding theory	Rianne Appel-Meulenbroek Abdul Jalil Omar	Netherlands Malaysia	Eindhoven University of Technology Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
12 Value Adding Management model	Per Anker Jensen Theo J.M. van der Voordt	Denmark Netherlands	Technical University of Denmark Delft University of Technology
13 The Toyota Production System	Tuuli Jylhä	Netherlands	Delft University of Technology
14 Radical innovation theory	Marko Lahti Suvi Nenonen Erkki Sutinen Nicolas Pope	Finland	University of Turku
15 Usability theory	Lukas Windlinger Deniz Tuzcuoğlu	Switzerland Turkey	Zurich University of Applied Sciences Eindhoven University of Technology
16 User-centred design thinking	Minyoung Kwon Hilde Remøy	Netherlands	Delft University of Technology
17 Hospitality theory	Brenda H. Groen Ruth Pijls Hester van Sprang	Netherlands	Saxion University of Applied Sciences
18 Service management	Vitalija Danivska Nora Johanne Klungseth	Finland Norway	Aalto University Norwegian University of Science and Technology
19 Organisational socialisation theory	Oluwatoyin Yetunde Aderiye	UK	Sheffield Hallam University
20 An interdisciplinary workplace management framework	Vitalija Danivska Rianne Appel-Meulenbroek Susanne Colenberg	Finland Netherlands	Aalto University Eindhoven University of Technology Delft University of Technology

5 References

- Appel-Meulenbroek, R., & Danivska, V. (2021). Gathering theories to explain employee-workplace alignment from an interdisciplinary viewpoint. In R. Appel-Meulenbroek & V. Danivska (Eds.), *A Handbook of Theories on Designing Alignment between People and the Office Environment*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, R. M. (2019). The agency of the principal – agent relationship: An opportunity for HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 21(3), 303–318. doi:10.1177/1523422319851274
- Becker, F., & Steele, F. (1990). The total workplace. *Facilities*, 8(3), 9–14. doi:10.1108/EUM0000000002099

- Bencherki, N. (2017). Actor – network theory. In C. R. Scott, J. R. Barker, T. Kuhn, J. Keyton, P. K. Turner & L. K. Lewis (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*. doi:10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc002
- Bernstein, J. H. (2015). Transdisciplinarity: A review of its origins, development, and current issues. *Journal of Research Practice*, 11(1), 1–20. <http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/510/436>
- Bunge, M. (2012). *Scientific Research II: The Search for Truth*. Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.
- CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2007). *Facility Management – Part 1: Terms and Definitions (EN 15221–1)*. London: British Standards Institution.
- Chanlat, J.-F. (2006). Space, organisation and management thinking: A socio-historical perspective. In S. R. Clegg & M. Kornberger (Eds.), *Space, Organizations and Management Theory*. Denmark: CBS Press.
- Coenen, C., Alexander, K., & Kok, H. (2013). Facility management value dimensions from a demand perspective. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 11(4), 339–353. doi:10.1108/JFM-10-2012-0049
- Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 12–32. doi:10.5465/amr.2009.0486
- De Cieri, H. L., & Kramar, R. (2005). *Human Resource Management in Australia: Strategy, People, Performance* (2nd ed.). North Ryde NSW: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Dewulf, G., Krumm, P. J. M. M., & De Jonge, H. (2000). *Successful Corporate Real Estate Strategies*. Nieuwegein: Arko.
- Freeman, R. E., & Reed, D. L. (1983). Stockholders and stakeholders: A new perspective on corporate governance. *California Management Review*, 25(3), 88–106. doi:10.2307/41165018
- Higgins, P. A., & Moore, M. S. (2000). Levels of theoretical thinking in nursing. *Nursing Outlook*, 48(4), 179–183. doi:10.1067/mno.2000.105248
- Jahn, T., Bergmann, M., & Keil, F. (2012). Transdisciplinarity: Between mainstreaming and marginalization. *Ecological Economics*, 79, 1–10. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.04.017
- Jervis, G., & Mawson, A. (2014). *The Workplace Management Framework*. IFMA. https://community.ifma.org/cfs-file/_key/telligent-evolution-components-attachments/13-467-00-00-01-05-79-18/2017_5F00_The-Workplace-Management-Framework_5F00_Research.pdf
- Joroff, M., Lourgand, M., & Lambert, S. (1993). *Strategic Management of the Fifth Resource: Corporate Real Estate*. Atlanta, GA: IDRC.
- Kivunja, C. (2018). Distinguishing between theory, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework: A systematic review of lessons from the field. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(6), 44–53. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v7n6p44
- Kreuter, M. W., De Rosa, C., Howze, E. H., & Baldwin, G. T. (2004). Understanding wicked problems: A key to advancing environmental health promotion. *Health Education & Behavior*, 31(4), 441–454. doi:10.1177/1090198104265597
- Lindholm, A.-L., & Nenonen, S. (2006). A conceptual framework of CREM performance measurement tools. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 8(3), 108–119. doi:10.1108/14630010610711739
- Luhman, J. T., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2013). Agency theory. In *Key Concepts in Organization Theory* (pp. 135–140). doi:10.4135/9781473914643.n26
- Luthans, F. (1973). The contingency theory of management: A path out of the jungle. *Business Horizons*, 16(3), 67–72. doi:10.1016/0007-6813(73)90026-8.
- Lynham, S. A. (2002). The general method of theory-building research in applied disciplines. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3), 221–241. doi:10.1177/1523422302043002
- Max-Neef, M. A. (2005). Foundations of transdisciplinarity. *Ecological Economics*, 53(1), 5–16. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.01.014
- McGregor, S. L. T. (2004). *The Nature of Transdisciplinary Research and Practice*. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.595.8127>
- Nilsen, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Science*, 10(1), 53–79. doi:10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0
- Redlein, A., Höhenberger, C., & Turnbull, P. (2020). Workplace management. In A. Redlein (Ed.), *Modern Facility and Workplace Management*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Redlein, A., & Stopajnik, E. (2020). Facility management: An important industry sector. In A. Redlein (Ed.), *Modern Facility and Workplace Management*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Tagliaro, C. (2018). A Place for the Workplace to Work. A System of Performance Indicators for Strategic Design, Management and use of the Workplace (Doctoral dissertation). <http://hdl.handle.net/10589/142109>
- Tennant, G. (2001). Understanding the customer. In *Six Sigma: SPC and TQM in Manufacturing and Services*. London: Routledge.

- User. (n.d.). *Cambridge Business English Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/user>
- Van Baalen, P., & Karsten, L. (2012). The evolution of management as an interdisciplinary field. *Journal of Management History*, 18(2), 219–237. doi:10.1108/17511341211206861
- van der Voordt, T. (2017). Facilities management and corporate real estate management: FM/CREM or FREM? *Journal of Facilities Management*, 15(3), 244–261. doi:10.1108/JFM-05-2016-0018
- van der Voordt, T., & Jensen, P. A. (2018). Measurement and benchmarking of workplace performance. Key issues in value adding management. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 20(3), 177–195. doi:10.1108/JCRE-10-2017-0032
- Wacker, J. G. (1998). A definition of theory: Research guidelines for different theory-building research methods in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 16(4), 361–385. doi:10.1016/S0272-6963(98)00019-9
- WordNet-Online. (n.d.). *Free Dictionary and Thesaurus of English. Definitions, Synonyms, Antonyms and More*. Retrieved from www.wordnet-online.com/workplace.shtml
- Zhou, J., & Hoeber, I. J. (2014). Research on workplace creativity: A review and redirection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 333–359. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091226