

Real Estate Operations Efficiency and Client Trust in Property Service Management

Sedfrey A. Dela Cruz¹ and Glenda G. Mina¹

¹ Northeastern College

sedfreyacostadelacruz@gmail.com, minaglenda@yahoo.com

Date Submitted:
April 19, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 27, 2026

Date Published:
June 11, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20643044

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how real estate operations efficiency influenced client trust in property service management. It focused on the operational areas of service responsiveness, communication clarity, transaction coordination, documentation accuracy, and concern resolution, and related these to client trust indicators such as service credibility, transparency, dependability, confidence in personnel, and willingness to continue engagement. A quantitative service-performance modeling design was used to determine both the level and predictive effect of operations efficiency on client trust. Data were gathered from clients of a realty services company through a validated and reliability-tested questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, composite index scoring, Spearman rank-order correlation, partial least

squares structural equation modeling, and importance-performance map analysis were employed. Results showed that real estate operations efficiency and client trust were both rated high, indicating generally favorable service performance and client confidence. However, concern resolution, documentation accuracy, transparency, and willingness to continue engagement received relatively lower ratings, showing areas where trust could still be strengthened. A strong positive relationship was found between operations efficiency and client trust, and the structural model confirmed that operations efficiency substantially predicted client trust. Communication clarity emerged as the strongest predictor, while concern resolution and documentation accuracy were identified as priority areas for improvement. The study concluded that client trust in property service management was shaped not only by prompt service but also by clear communication, accurate documents, transparent processes, and dependable follow-through.

Keywords: *Client trust, Communication clarity, Documentation accuracy, Operations efficiency, Property service management, Real estate*

INTRODUCTION

The real estate service sector has become increasingly shaped by the quality of day-to-day operations and the confidence clients place in the people who manage their properties, transactions, concerns, and service expectations. Real estate operations are no longer limited to leasing, selling, documentation, rent collection, or property maintenance. They now involve timely client communication, accurate handling of records, coordinated service delivery, transparent processes, complaint resolution, and the ability of service providers to make clients feel secure throughout the property service experience. In this context, operations efficiency becomes a practical measure of how well a realty services company delivers its commitments, while client trust reflects the extent to which clients believe that the company is competent, honest, responsive, and dependable.

Property service management depends heavily on the client's experience of service quality. Puçite and Geipele (2017) emphasized that customer satisfaction in real estate management is strongly connected to how service companies understand client needs and use customer feedback to improve the quality of services provided. Their work suggests that real estate management companies cannot rely only on technical property knowledge, because clients also judge service providers based on communication, honesty, accessibility, and the consistency of support they receive. This point is important for realty service companies, where clients often make decisions involving major financial value, long-term occupancy, ownership concerns, or investment interests. When operations are slow, unclear, or poorly coordinated, clients may begin to question not only the quality of service but also the credibility of the service provider.

The service nature of real estate makes operational efficiency especially important. Unlike simple product-based transactions, property services usually involve continuing contact between the company and the client. A client may need updates on property listings, clarification of fees, assistance in documentation, follow-up on repairs, coordination with owners or tenants, and support in resolving complaints. These tasks require organized internal systems and employees who can respond with accuracy and care. Chiang and Perng (2018) argued that service quality in the property management industry must be improved by identifying the service attributes that customers value and by classifying which aspects of service need the most managerial attention. This indicates that property service management should not treat all operational activities as routine administrative work. Instead, each activity should be viewed as part of the client's overall judgment of the company's reliability.

Real estate clients often associate efficient operations with professionalism. When requests are answered promptly, documents are prepared correctly, appointments are handled properly, and property-related concerns are resolved within a reasonable time, clients are more likely to feel that the company respects their time and protects their interests. Ojekalu et al. (2019) found that the service quality of property managers is linked with customer satisfaction and the possibility of repeat business. Their findings show that clients value not only the physical condition of properties but also the way property managers communicate, respond, and carry out service responsibilities. This has direct relevance to real estate operations because a company may have attractive property listings or strong market knowledge, but weak operational handling can still damage client confidence.

Trust is also central in real estate because clients depend on service providers for information that may not be easily verified by ordinary buyers, sellers, tenants, or property owners. Clients expect honesty in property details, fairness in pricing or charges, confidentiality in personal and financial information, and transparency in the status of transactions. Sanderson (2019) showed that tenant loyalty in the private rented sector is influenced by satisfaction with landlords and property managers, including the willingness of tenants to renew leases and recommend the service to others. This shows that trust is not built only through formal agreements. It develops through repeated experiences in which the client sees that the property service provider can be relied upon. In real estate operations, every delayed response, unclear update, or unresolved concern may weaken that trust, while every efficient and respectful interaction may strengthen it.

Sanderson and Read (2020) explained that property managers can create value when they recognize the importance of customer service and adopt practices that support tenant satisfaction and real estate returns. This view is useful because it connects operational work with business outcomes. In a realty services company, efficient operations do not only reduce delays or internal workload. They also affect how clients judge the company, whether they continue using its services, and whether they recommend it to others. A company that manages client concerns well may develop a reputation for dependability, while a company with disorganized service delivery may lose trust even if it has competent personnel or competitive property offerings.

The increasing complexity of property services has also made responsiveness, assurance, empathy, reliability, and tangibility more relevant to client trust. Kumar and Lavy (2026) examined facility management service quality and found that service quality dimensions affect occupant satisfaction and property reputation in commercial properties. Although facility management and realty services differ in scope, both involve client-facing operations where people judge service providers based on the quality and consistency of service delivery. This supports the view that real estate service companies need to pay attention not only to completed transactions but

also to the client's experience while the service is being delivered. Clients remember whether they were updated, whether their concerns were taken seriously, and whether the company acted with competence and fairness.

In property service management, operational lapses can quickly become trust concerns. For example, delays in processing documents may be interpreted as lack of competence. Unclear communication about fees may be viewed as lack of transparency. Poor coordination between staff, property owners, and clients may be seen as lack of professionalism. These concerns show that operations efficiency and client trust are closely connected. Efficient operations provide visible proof that the company is organized, responsible, and capable. Trust, in turn, gives clients the confidence to continue relying on the company even when property transactions become complex or stressful.

Despite the growing importance of service quality in property management, there remains a need to examine how real estate operations efficiency relates specifically to client trust in property service management. Many studies focus on customer satisfaction, tenant loyalty, facility management, or service quality, but fewer studies directly connect the internal efficiency of real estate service operations with the trust formed by clients. This study seeks to address that gap by examining how operational practices in a realty services company may influence the trust of clients. The findings may help real estate service managers identify which areas of operations need improvement and how stronger service systems can support more dependable, transparent, and client-centered property service management.

Literature Review

Operational Efficiency in Real Estate Service Management

Operational efficiency in real estate service management refers to the capacity of a realty services company to deliver property-related services accurately, promptly, and consistently while maintaining client satisfaction. In the real estate setting, efficiency is seen in the proper coordination of property listings, client inquiries, site visits, documentation, payment monitoring, tenant or buyer concerns, contract processing, and after-service assistance. Chiang and Perng (2018) emphasized that property management firms need to identify the service attributes most valued by customers because service improvement should be guided by what clients actually experience and consider important. This view is useful in understanding real estate operations because clients do not evaluate efficiency only through speed. They also consider accuracy, clarity, dependability, and the smooth handling of their concerns. Puķīte and Geipele (2017) also noted that customer satisfaction in real estate management depends on how well firms understand client needs and use feedback to improve service delivery. Thus, operational efficiency in property service management is not merely an internal performance concern. It directly shapes the client's perception of whether the company is organized, competent, and worthy of continued engagement.

Service Quality and Client Satisfaction in Property Services

Service quality is a major basis for client satisfaction in real estate because property services require continuous interaction between clients and service personnel. Unlike ordinary retail transactions, real estate services often involve high-value decisions, legal documents, long waiting periods, property inspections, negotiations, and repeated communication. Ojekalu et al. (2019) found that the service quality of property managers influences customer satisfaction and repeat business, particularly when clients perceive property managers as reliable, responsive, and professional. In a similar way, Adi and Njo (2024) showed that tenant satisfaction and property reputation are affected by service quality, property management performance, and perceived rental value in trade center management. These findings indicate that clients tend to remember how services are delivered, not only whether a transaction is completed. When real estate personnel provide timely updates, explain requirements clearly, attend to concerns respectfully, and manage property-related processes properly, clients are more likely to feel satisfied with the company. Poor service quality, however, can create frustration, doubt, and hesitation even when the property itself meets the client's needs.

Client Trust in Real Estate Transactions and Property Management

Client trust is especially important in real estate because clients depend on property service providers for information, guidance, documentation, and decisions that carry financial and personal consequences. Trust is built when clients believe that the company is honest, competent, transparent, and concerned with protecting their interests. Sanderson (2019) found that tenant loyalty in the private rented sector is shaped by satisfaction with landlords and property managers, including the willingness of tenants to renew leases and recommend the service to others. This suggests that trust grows through repeated service encounters where clients experience fairness, responsiveness, and dependability. Sanderson and Read (2020) further argued that customer-focused property management creates value because tenant satisfaction and good service relationships can contribute to better real estate outcomes. In the context of a realty services company, client trust may be strengthened when personnel give truthful property information, handle documents carefully, explain fees and procedures, and resolve concerns without unnecessary delay. On the other hand, delayed responses, unclear processes, inconsistent communication, and perceived lack of transparency may weaken trust even if the company has strong market knowledge or attractive property offerings.

Digital Transformation and Responsiveness in Modern Real Estate Services

Digital transformation has changed how real estate service companies manage operations and communicate with clients. Property listings, inquiries, client records, appointment scheduling, transaction monitoring, payment updates, and service requests are now increasingly supported by digital platforms and automated systems. Al-haimi et al. (2025) explained that digital technologies such as artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, blockchain, augmented reality, virtual reality, and digital twins are reshaping real estate operations, property management, investment evaluation, and consumer interaction. Kumar and Lavy (2026) also found that service quality dimensions in facility management affect occupant satisfaction and property reputation, showing that modern property users continue to value reliable, responsive, and service-oriented management even in technology-supported environments. These studies suggest that digital tools may improve operational efficiency by making records more accessible, communication faster, and service monitoring more organized. However, technology alone does not guarantee client trust. Clients still expect human accountability, honest explanation, privacy protection, and personal assurance, especially when property transactions involve important financial and legal concerns.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative service-performance modeling design. This design was selected because the study examined how real estate operations efficiency contributed to the formation of client trust in property service management. Rather than merely describing perceptions, the study analyzed the pattern of influence between operational service indicators and trust-related outcomes. The design allowed the researcher to determine which dimensions of real estate operations carried stronger explanatory value in relation to client trust. It was appropriate for the study because real estate service management involved interconnected processes such as inquiry handling, document processing, coordination, service responsiveness, transparency, and concern resolution. These operational practices were treated as measurable service constructs that could explain the level of confidence clients placed in the company. The design also supported a more refined interpretation of the findings because it identified not only whether a relationship existed, but also which operational areas mattered most in strengthening client trust.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in a realty services company engaged in property service management. The company provided services related to property listing assistance, client inquiry management, property viewing coordination, transaction documentation, leasing or selling support, client follow-up, and after-service assistance.

The locale was considered suitable because it represented an actual service environment where operational efficiency and client trust were directly experienced by clients. The setting also provided an appropriate context for examining the quality of property service processes, since clients regularly interacted with company personnel before, during, and after property-related transactions. The real estate service setting allowed the study to capture practical realities in property service management, particularly in terms of timeliness, coordination, clarity of communication, service dependability, and transparency.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of the study were clients who had engaged with the realty services company for property-related services. They included individuals who had experienced service transactions such as property inquiries, site viewing arrangements, leasing or buying assistance, document coordination, payment or billing clarification, and post-transaction communication. The study did not include internal personnel as respondents because the focus was on client-based evaluation of operations efficiency and trust. A criterion-based purposive sampling technique was used to select participants who had sufficient direct experience with the company's property service processes. This was supported by a service-experience screening procedure to ensure that only clients who had meaningful interaction with the company were included. Participants were selected based on their actual exposure to the services being measured, which strengthened the relevance of their responses to the objectives of the study.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-developed structured questionnaire designed to measure real estate operations efficiency and client trust in property service management. The instrument contained items that reflected the operational and relational aspects of real estate service delivery. The first major section measured real estate operations efficiency in terms of service responsiveness, transaction coordination, documentation accuracy, communication clarity, and concern resolution. The second major section measured client trust in terms of service credibility, transparency, dependability, confidence in personnel, and willingness to continue engagement with the company. Items were written in clear client-centered language so that respondents could answer based on their actual service experience.

The instrument underwent content validation by experts in research, business management, and real estate service operations. The validators reviewed the questionnaire in terms of clarity, relevance, construct alignment, wording, and suitability to the real estate service setting. Their comments were used to refine items that were too broad, repetitive, or unclear. The final validation result showed that the instrument had a high level of content validity, with a scale-content validity index of 0.91. This indicated that the items were strongly aligned with the constructs being measured.

A pilot test was conducted among clients with similar property service experience but who were not included in the final data gathering. The purpose of the pilot test was to determine whether the items were understandable, properly sequenced, and internally consistent. The pilot responses were subjected to reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. The real estate operations efficiency scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.94, while the client trust scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92. The overall reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.95. These values indicated excellent internal consistency and showed that the questionnaire was reliable for the final administration.

Data Gathering

The researcher first secured permission from the management of the realty services company to conduct the study among qualified clients. After approval was granted, the researcher identified eligible participants based on their actual experience with the company's property services. The purpose of the study, voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality safeguards, and expected time for answering the questionnaire were explained to the participants before the survey was administered. The questionnaire was distributed either through printed forms or a secure online form, depending on the accessibility and preference of the participants.

The respondents were given enough time to complete the questionnaire without pressure from the researcher or company personnel. Completed responses were checked for completeness, consistency, and eligibility. Responses with substantial missing answers or indications of careless responding were excluded from the analysis. The collected data were then encoded, cleaned, and prepared for statistical treatment. The researcher ensured that no personally identifying information was included in the final dataset. The data gathering process was conducted in a manner that protected the independence of client responses and minimized possible pressure from the company setting.

Data Analysis

The study used descriptive statistics, composite index scoring, Spearman rank-order correlation, and partial least squares structural equation modeling. Descriptive statistics, particularly mean and standard deviation, were used to determine the level of real estate operations efficiency and client trust. Composite index scoring was used to summarize the major dimensions of operations efficiency and client trust into interpretable service performance indicators. This allowed the study to provide a clearer picture of the strongest and weakest areas of property service management.

Spearman rank-order correlation was used to examine the association between real estate operations efficiency and client trust because survey responses were measured through ordinal rating scales and did not require the strict assumption of normal distribution. To provide a deeper and more publication-oriented analysis, partial least squares structural equation modeling was also applied. This method was appropriate because the study examined how several operational dimensions contributed to client trust as an outcome construct. The model assessed the strength, direction, and explanatory power of real estate operations efficiency in predicting client trust. Path coefficients, coefficient of determination, effect size, and predictive relevance were examined to determine how strongly operational efficiency explained variations in client trust. Importance-performance map analysis was also used to identify which operational dimensions had high importance but lower performance, thereby showing which service areas required stronger managerial attention.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed ethical standards in the conduct of research involving human participants. Participation was voluntary, and the respondents were informed that they could decline or withdraw from the study at any stage without any negative consequence. The purpose of the study, nature of participation, expected use of the data, and confidentiality measures were clearly explained before the questionnaire was answered. Informed consent was obtained from the participants before data collection.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained. No names, contact details, transaction identifiers, or personally sensitive information were reported in the study. The responses were used only for research purposes and were presented in summarized form. The researcher also ensured that the company had no access to individual responses to prevent any possible discomfort or pressure on the participants. The data were stored securely and were accessible only to the researcher. The study also avoided any misleading claims, coercive recruitment, or conflict of interest that could affect the integrity of the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Level of Real Estate Operations Efficiency in Property Service Management*

Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Rank
Service Responsiveness	4.08	0.61	High	1
Communication Clarity	3.97	0.64	High	2
Transaction Coordination	3.86	0.67	High	3
Documentation Accuracy	3.74	0.71	High	4
Concern Resolution	3.61	0.76	High	5
Overall Composite Mean	3.85	0.68	High	

Scale: 4.21 to 5.00 Very High, 3.41 to 4.20 High, 2.61 to 3.40 Moderate, 1.81 to 2.60 Low, 1.00 to 1.80 Very Low

Table 1 shows that the real estate operations efficiency of the property service company was generally rated high. This suggests that clients perceived the company as capable of delivering real estate services in a timely, organized, and generally dependable manner. Among the dimensions, service responsiveness obtained the highest mean, indicating that clients were mostly satisfied with how quickly the company attended to inquiries, arranged property-related schedules, and responded to immediate service concerns. This result suggests that the company had a functional front-end service system, particularly in handling initial client contact and routine follow-ups.

Communication clarity also received a high rating, which implies that clients generally understood the information given to them regarding property details, requirements, schedules, fees, and service procedures. This is important in property service management because unclear communication may easily create doubt, confusion, or mistrust, especially when clients are dealing with documents and financial commitments. Transaction coordination was likewise rated high, showing that clients recognized the company's ability to connect the different steps of property service delivery, such as inquiry handling, property viewing, document preparation, and coordination with property owners or representatives.

However, the lower-ranked dimensions revealed areas that required closer attention. Documentation accuracy, while still interpreted as high, received a lower mean than responsiveness, communication, and coordination. This suggests that some clients may have experienced minor errors, repeated requests for documents, delayed checking of requirements, or uncertainty in the completeness of paperwork. Concern resolution obtained the lowest rating among all dimensions, although it remained within the high range. This indicates that while the company was generally responsive at the beginning of transactions, some clients may have felt that more complicated concerns were not always resolved as quickly or as completely as expected. The result points to a common operational issue in real estate services: companies may perform well in initial client handling but may experience service strain when concerns require follow-through, interdepartmental coordination, or negotiation with third parties.

Table 2. Level of Client Trust in Property Service Management

Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation	Rank
Confidence in Personnel	4.05	0.59	High	1
Service Credibility	3.96	0.63	High	2
Dependability	3.89	0.66	High	3
Transparency	3.72	0.73	High	4
Willingness to Continue Engagement	3.68	0.78	High	5
Overall Composite Mean	3.86	0.68	High	

Scale: 4.21 to 5.00 Very High, 3.41 to 4.20 High, 2.61 to 3.40 Moderate, 1.81 to 2.60 Low, 1.00 to 1.80 Very Low

Table 2 presents the level of client trust in property service management. The overall result was high, indicating that clients generally trusted the realty services company in terms of its personnel, service credibility, dependability, transparency, and future service relationship. The highest-rated dimension was confidence in personnel. This means that clients generally viewed the company's staff and representatives as knowledgeable, approachable, and capable of assisting them in property-related matters. In a service industry where clients often rely on personnel for explanations, updates, and guidance, this finding is favorable because trust often begins with the perceived competence and professionalism of the people representing the company.

Service credibility and dependability were also rated high. These results show that clients generally believed the company could provide reliable property information and carry out its service commitments. Such findings are meaningful because real estate clients often face uncertainty when making decisions about property viewing, leasing, purchasing, documentation, or payment-related matters. When a company is perceived as credible and dependable, clients are more likely to feel secure in continuing the service relationship.

However, the dimensions of transparency and willingness to continue engagement received relatively lower means. This does not mean that clients distrusted the company, but it shows that trust was not yet maximized. The lower rating for transparency suggests that some clients may have wanted clearer explanations about timelines,

service charges, document movement, property status, or reasons for delays. The relatively lower rating for willingness to continue engagement also suggests that client loyalty may still depend on how consistently the company improves its service follow-through. Clients may have trusted the personnel and basic service process, but their decision to continue using or recommending the company appeared to be affected by unresolved issues in transparency and concern resolution.

Table 3. *Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Between Real Estate Operations Efficiency and Client Trust*

Variables	Spearman's rho	p-value	Strength of Relationship	Decision
Real Estate Operations Efficiency and Client Trust	0.742	< .001	Strong Positive Relationship	Significant

Table 3 shows a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between real estate operations efficiency and client trust. The Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.742 indicates that clients who rated the company's operations more favorably also tended to report higher levels of trust in the company's property service management. Since the p-value was less than .001, the relationship was statistically significant.

This finding confirms that client trust was closely connected to how clients experienced the company's operational processes. Efficient handling of inquiries, clear communication, proper coordination, accurate documentation, and effective concern resolution were all related to stronger trust. In practical terms, clients appeared to trust the company more when services were not only completed but completed in a manner that felt organized, transparent, and dependable. The result also implies that trust in real estate services is not formed through promises alone. It is built through repeated operational experiences that show clients that the company can manage property-related concerns properly.

The strength of the relationship suggests that operational efficiency was not a minor support function in property service management. Instead, it served as a direct foundation of client confidence. This is particularly important in real estate services because clients are often dealing with high-value decisions, legal or financial documents, and long-term property concerns. When operational processes are weak, trust may decline even when the company has good property offerings. On the other hand, when the company consistently delivers services with clarity, accuracy, and responsiveness, clients are more likely to believe that the company can protect their interests.

Table 4. *PLS-SEM Path Model Results*

Path	Path Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Real Estate Operations Efficiency → Client Trust	0.781	18.426	< .001	Significant Positive Effect

Model Fit and Predictive Measures

Indicator	Result	Interpretation
R ² for Client Trust	0.610	Substantial explanatory power
Adjusted R ²	0.604	Stable explanatory value
f ² Effect Size	1.564	Large effect
Q ² Predictive Relevance	0.412	Strong predictive relevance
SRMR	0.061	Acceptable model fit

Table 4 displays the PLS-SEM results showing the predictive effect of real estate operations efficiency on client trust. The path coefficient of 0.781 indicates a strong positive effect, meaning that improvements in real estate operations efficiency were associated with higher client trust. The t-value of 18.426 and p-value below .001 confirmed that the effect was statistically significant. This result supports the view that client trust in property service management was strongly influenced by the quality of operational performance.

The model explained 61.0 percent of the variance in client trust, as shown by the R² value of 0.610. This means that real estate operations efficiency accounted for a substantial portion of the differences in client trust ratings. The adjusted R² of 0.604 further indicates that the model retained strong explanatory value even after

adjustment. The f^2 value of 1.564 showed a large effect size, suggesting that operations efficiency was a major contributor to client trust rather than a weak or incidental factor. The Q^2 value of 0.412 also indicated strong predictive relevance, meaning that the model had practical value in predicting client trust based on operational efficiency. The SRMR value of 0.061 was within the acceptable range, showing that the model had an adequate fit.

These findings suggest that improving real estate operations is likely to produce meaningful gains in client trust. The result also shows that trust in property service management should not be treated only as a public relations outcome or as a matter of personal rapport between clients and agents. It is largely shaped by the system behind the service. When the company has organized procedures, timely communication, accurate documents, and responsive concern handling, clients are more likely to view the company as credible and dependable. However, since the model did not explain all variance in client trust, other factors may also contribute, such as pricing fairness, market reputation, previous client experience, property quality, and personal rapport with individual service personnel.

Table 5. PLS-SEM Path Coefficients by Operational Efficiency Dimension

Operational Efficiency Dimension	Path Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Communication Clarity → Client Trust	0.284	5.912	< .001	Significant Positive Effect
Concern Resolution → Client Trust	0.263	5.204	< .001	Significant Positive Effect
Documentation Accuracy → Client Trust	0.219	4.331	< .001	Significant Positive Effect
Service Responsiveness → Client Trust	0.176	3.487	.001	Significant Positive Effect
Transaction Coordination → Client Trust	0.139	2.806	.005	Significant Positive Effect

Table 5 presents the predictive contribution of each operations efficiency dimension to client trust. All five dimensions had significant positive effects, meaning that every measured area of operational efficiency contributed to the formation of client trust. However, the results also show that some operational dimensions had stronger influence than others.

Communication clarity emerged as the strongest predictor of client trust. This suggests that clients trusted the company more when information was explained clearly, requirements were understandable, updates were consistent, and property-related matters were communicated without confusion. In real estate services, clients often deal with unfamiliar procedures, financial decisions, property terms, and document requirements. Clear communication therefore reduces uncertainty and gives clients a stronger sense of control. The result shows that trust was strengthened when clients felt properly informed.

Concern resolution was the second strongest predictor. This is important because Table 1 showed that concern resolution received the lowest mean among the operations efficiency dimensions. The combination of high predictive importance and lower performance suggests that concern resolution was a critical area for improvement. Clients appeared to place strong value on how the company handled problems after they were raised. Even if initial communication and responsiveness were strong, unresolved concerns could weaken confidence and limit future engagement.

Documentation accuracy also had a significant positive effect on client trust. This result is expected because real estate services involve documents that may affect ownership, occupancy, payment, authorization, and legal compliance. Clients are likely to feel safer when documents are prepared correctly, checked carefully, and explained properly. Errors or delays in documentation may create anxiety because clients may interpret them as signs of weak control or insufficient professionalism.

Service responsiveness and transaction coordination also significantly predicted client trust, although their effects were lower compared with communication clarity, concern resolution, and documentation accuracy. This indicates that quick responses and coordinated service steps mattered, but clients placed greater trust in the company when communication was clear, problems were resolved, and documents were handled accurately. The result suggests that speed alone does not fully build trust. In property service management, responsiveness must be matched with careful explanation, accurate paperwork, and reliable follow-through.

Table 6. Importance-Performance Map Analysis of Real Estate Operations Efficiency Dimensions

Operational Dimension	Importance Score	Performance Score	Priority Interpretation
Communication Clarity	0.284	79.40	Maintain as key strength
Concern Resolution	0.263	72.20	Highest improvement priority
Documentation Accuracy	0.219	74.80	High improvement priority
Service Responsiveness	0.176	81.60	Maintain performance
Transaction Coordination	0.139	77.20	Monitor and refine

Table 6 presents the importance-performance map analysis of the operational efficiency dimensions. The results show which dimensions carried stronger importance in predicting client trust and how well the company performed in each area. Communication clarity had the highest importance score and a strong performance score, suggesting that it was both influential and reasonably well managed. This means that the company should maintain its strength in explaining procedures, giving updates, and making property-related information understandable to clients.

Concern resolution had the second highest importance score but the lowest performance score. This makes it the most urgent area for improvement. Although clients generally rated the company positively, the lower performance in concern resolution suggests that some concerns may not have been addressed with the speed, completeness, or consistency expected by clients. Since concern resolution strongly influenced client trust, weaknesses in this area could eventually affect client retention, referrals, and reputation. The result suggests that the company may need a more formal concern-tracking system, clearer escalation procedures, and stronger monitoring of unresolved client issues.

Documentation accuracy also appeared as a high improvement priority. Its importance score was substantial, while its performance score was lower than communication clarity and service responsiveness. This indicates that clients considered documentation accuracy important to trust formation, but the company still had room to improve in checking documents, avoiding errors, clarifying requirements, and preventing repeated submissions. In real estate services, documentation problems can quickly create discomfort because clients may worry about legal, financial, or transaction-related consequences.

Service responsiveness had the highest performance score but a lower importance score compared with communication clarity, concern resolution, and documentation accuracy. This does not mean responsiveness was unimportant. Rather, it suggests that the company was already performing well in this area, and additional improvement may not produce as much increase in client trust as improvements in concern resolution and documentation accuracy. Transaction coordination had moderate importance and acceptable performance, which indicates that the company should continue refining coordination practices while prioritizing the areas with higher trust impact.

Table 7. Summary of Targeted Results Based on the Service-Performance Model

Targeted Result	Main Finding	Interpretation
Level of real estate operations efficiency	High overall efficiency	The company delivered generally organized and responsive property services.
Level of client trust	High overall trust	Clients generally viewed the company as credible, dependable, and professionally capable.
Relationship between operations efficiency and client trust	Strong positive significant relationship	Better service operations were associated with stronger client trust.
Predictive effect of operations efficiency	Significant and substantial effect	Operations efficiency explained a large portion of client trust.
Strongest operational predictor	Communication clarity	Clear and consistent communication had the strongest direct contribution to client trust.

Targeted Result	Main Finding	Interpretation
Main operational weakness	Concern resolution	The company needed stronger follow-through in resolving client problems.
Key improvement priority	Concern resolution and documentation accuracy	These areas had strong trust impact but relatively weaker performance.

Table 7 summarizes the major findings of the service-performance model. The study showed that real estate operations efficiency and client trust were both rated high, indicating that the company had a generally favorable service standing among its clients. However, the results also revealed that the company’s strengths were not evenly distributed across all areas of service delivery. Responsiveness and communication were comparatively stronger, while concern resolution and documentation accuracy required more focused improvement.

The relationship and PLS-SEM findings confirmed that operational efficiency had a significant and substantial effect on client trust. This means that client trust was strongly shaped by how clients experienced the company’s service system. The company’s operational practices did not merely support client trust indirectly. They served as a major basis for whether clients perceived the company as credible, dependable, transparent, and worthy of continued engagement.

The most important insight from the model-based analysis was that the company’s greatest trust-building opportunities were found in concern resolution and documentation accuracy. These areas carried strong importance but had weaker performance relative to other dimensions. This result suggests that the company should not only continue what it is already doing well but should also improve the parts of service delivery where client confidence may be most vulnerable. A more systematic approach to tracking client concerns, monitoring document movement, checking requirements, and communicating case updates may help strengthen long-term client trust in property service management.

CONCLUSION

Real estate operations efficiency played a significant role in strengthening client trust in property service management. The company demonstrated a generally high level of operational efficiency, particularly in service responsiveness, communication clarity, and transaction coordination, which showed that clients recognized the company’s ability to manage property-related services in an organized and timely manner. Client trust was also rated high, especially in terms of confidence in personnel, service credibility, and dependability, indicating that clients generally perceived the company as professional, competent, and worthy of reliance. However, the relatively lower ratings in concern resolution, documentation accuracy, transparency, and willingness to continue engagement revealed that trust was not yet fully maximized.

The strong positive relationship and significant predictive effect between operations efficiency and client trust confirmed that clients were more likely to trust the company when services were clearly explained, documents were accurately handled, transactions were properly coordinated, and concerns were resolved with consistency. It is therefore recommended that the company strengthen its concern resolution system by establishing a formal client issue-tracking mechanism, assigning clear accountability for unresolved matters, and setting reasonable response timelines. The company should also improve documentation accuracy through stricter document review procedures, standardized checklists, and regular staff training on transaction requirements. Moreover, transparency may be enhanced by providing clients with clearer updates on service progress, fees, timelines, and possible causes of delay. While the company should maintain its strong performance in responsiveness and communication, greater attention should be given to service follow-through, since client trust in real estate is shaped not only by quick responses but also by accuracy, honesty, and dependable completion of commitments.

References

- Adi, R., & Njo, A. (2025). Tenant satisfaction and property reputation of trade centers in Surabaya, Indonesia. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 23(2), 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-02-2023-0023>
- Al-haimi, B., Khalid, H., Zakaria, N. H., & Jasimin, T. H. (2025). Digital transformation in the real estate industry: A systematic literature review of current technologies, benefits, and challenges. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 5(1), 100340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijime.2025.100340>
- Chiang, T.-Y., & Perng, Y.-H. (2018). A new model to improve service quality in the property management industry. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 22(5), 436–446. <https://doi.org/10.3846/ijspm.2018.5226>
- Kumar, A., & Lavy, S. (2026). Impact of facility management service quality on occupants' satisfaction and property reputation: Evidence from Indian commercial properties using SERVQUAL model. *Property Management*, 44(3), 515–538. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-04-2025-0034>
- Ojekalu, S. O., Ojo, O., Oladokun, T. T., Olabisi, S. A., & Omoniyi, S. S. (2019). Service quality of property managers of shopping complexes in Ibadan, Nigeria: Empirical evidence. *Property Management*, 37(3), 310–326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-04-2018-0029>
- Puķīte, I., & Geipele, S. (2017). Determining customer satisfaction in the real estate management sector in Riga. *Baltic Journal of Real Estate Economics and Construction Management*, 5(1), 226–237. <https://doi.org/10.1515/bjreecm-2017-0017>
- Sanderson, D. C. (2019). Winning tenants' loyalty in the private rented sector. *Property Management*, 37(3), 390–417. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-08-2018-0050>
- Sanderson, D. C., & Read, D. C. (2020). Recognizing and realizing the value of customer-focused property management. *Property Management*, 38(5), 749–764. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-04-2020-0029>