

**REPORT ON A SURVEY OF
COMPLAINT HANDLING
IN THE
WESTERN AUSTRALIA PUBLIC SECTOR**

December 1999



OMBUDSMAN

Western Australia

CONTENTS	Page Number
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
SURVEY METHOD & RESPONSE RATE.....	7
SURVEY FINDINGS.....	9
EXTENT TO WHICH <i>AS 4269</i> MET.....	21
SURVEY IMPLICATIONS.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	24
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	24
Appendix: Complaint Handling Reference List	

List of tables

Table 1: Complaint System Documentation.....	9
Table 2: Methods of Publicity.....	10
Table 3: Number of Publicity Methods Used.....	11
Table 4: Function of Complaint Officer.....	12
Table 5: Number of Complaints Received and Consumers – 1997/8.....	14
Table 6: Source of Complaint Data Collected.....	15
Table 7: Range of Complaint Data Collected.....	16
Table 8: Data Analysis Methods.....	17
Table 9: Preparation of Complaint Data Reports.....	17
Table 10: Receipt of Complaint Reports.....	18
Table 11: Use of Complaint Data.....	19
Table 12: Agencies Appearing to Meet <i>AS 4269</i>	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ombudsmen are interested in how well public sector agencies handle complaints. Agencies with good systems - meeting the *Australian Complaint Handling Standard AS 4269 (1995)* - will handle most complaints well and quickly. Only a minority of the more complex complaints should require external review by a person such as an Ombudsman.

This survey was conducted to give a better understanding of the current development of complaint management by Western Australian government departments, statutory authorities and local governments.

Survey Method and Findings

We surveyed 99 State government agencies and 50 of the largest local governments. The response to the survey was excellent, yielding 135 survey forms – 86 from agencies and 49 from local governments.

The majority of respondents had some sort of a process to deal with individual complaints. Formal policies and procedures were in place in 75% of agencies and 50 % of local governments. However, 22% of respondents did not publicise their complaint system at all. Only one third of agencies were benefiting from complaint feedback in any systematic way. Even where agencies did record and analyse complaints, this information was not always reported to the CEO and senior management. As a result there was little opportunity to evaluate the underlying causes of complaints and to take action to rectify them. This is the main reason why we considered that only 25% overall of the agencies surveyed appeared to meet *AS 4269*.

Good complaint-handling was generally associated with quality improvement systems. These were noticeable in the health and TAFE sectors. Only nine agencies outside these two sectors met the Standard. Problems included limited publicity, outdated customer service charters and consumer information, narrow complaint definitions, failure to collate all complaints received and complaint data not being used for service improvement.

Conclusion

Although the survey brought to light some excellent complaint management systems, 75% of respondents need to give attention to their processes for handling complaints. They need to be more aligned with current standards of customer service as well as *AS 4269*. This will require commitment - the first element in *AS 4269* - from CEOs and senior management. Implementing a complaint system is not complex but it requires resources, an appropriate model for the clients served, staff training, and supportive senior management which determines the underlying causes of complaints and has the will to rectify them.

The survey will be repeated in 2001. To assist agencies to improve their complaint-handling, recommendations are made which address strategies for reviewing complaint management, training, and customer focus.

INTRODUCTION

1. Ombudsmen usually see themselves as places of last resort – becoming involved in disputes between citizens and public sector bodies only after all other avenues to resolve the matter have been tried and have failed. In almost every case the public sector body should have the opportunity to resolve the dispute by means of an internal complaint-handling process before an external person such as an Ombudsman becomes involved.
2. Ombudsmen will, therefore, have a close interest in the extent and quality of internal complaint systems of the agencies within their jurisdiction. An effective complaint system will assist all concerned – the citizen, the agencies and the Ombudsman. Service users will feel confident that the agency will be responsive to their concerns and will endeavour to “put things right” for them. Agencies will generate goodwill among the users of their services and gain a source of free consumer feedback which they can use to improve their services. A larger proportion of complaints investigated by the Ombudsman will come from people who really need an external review of their problem. This should allow more time for preventative and systemic approaches to citizens’ complaints.
3. Understandably, Ombudsmen will be reluctant to refer a complainant to an agency that is known to have no complaint-handling system – or one that is unlikely to address the complainant’s problem in a helpful way. Experience in my Office indicates that the quality of complaint management by agencies varies considerably. In order to gauge the extent and quality of complaint-handling systems in Western Australian public sector agencies my Office conducted a survey of such systems during 1999. In particular, the survey sought to assess whether the complaint systems that did exist met the

Australian Complaint Handling Standard AS 4269 (1995). The survey sought information on the extent to which the public sector:

- welcomed individual complaints and responded positively to them; and
 - had a strategy in place to collect complaint data and use it to identify underlying problems and implement service improvements.
4. A number of initiatives in the past five years have attempted to promote quality complaint-handling in the Western Australian public sector, some examples of which are:
- The Customer Focus program, launched in 1994, required agencies to produce Customer Service Charters, introduce formalised ways to respond to consumer complaints, and submit annual customer service implementation progress reports.
 - Model complaint-management policies were produced for local governments and health services. The Ombudsman cooperated with the Western Australian Municipal Association (WAMA) and the Department of Local Government to produce the *Local Government Complaint Procedure* booklet in 1997. The Metropolitan Health Services Board released its policy and procedures in 1998.
 - Complaint-management training was provided by the Public Sector Management Office of the Ministry of the Premier and Cabinet in 1996 and by staff of the NSW Ombudsman in 1996 and 1997. The 1996 visit was sponsored by the Public Sector Management Office and the 1997 visit was sponsored by my Office and the Disability Services Commission. Over 200 staff in agencies and local government benefited from these visits.
 - A complaint-handling reference list, attached in the Appendix to this report, was developed by my Office in 1999.
 - Complaint management resource manuals were produced by the Disability Services Commission and my Office.

-
5. Surveying internal complaint systems is relatively new in Australia. The NSW Ombudsman conducted the first survey in 1991 and is undertaking a follow-up review. A large upsurge in implementing complaint systems since the first survey has been observed. Most agencies and councils had written complaint policies and procedures. While 89% of agencies were collecting and analysing complaint statistics, 17% were not using the information to prevent future similar complaints. The Commonwealth Ombudsman undertook the second survey when she reviewed the complaint documentation of agencies within her jurisdiction in 1996. Her survey found that about 22% of Commonwealth agencies were meeting *AS 4269*. In 1997 her Office responded to the survey findings by producing *A Good Practice Guide for Effective Complaint Handling* to assist agencies to improve their systems.

SURVEY METHOD AND RESPONSE RATE

6. We mailed a survey form and a letter of explanation to 99 State Government departments and statutory authorities (together referred to as “agencies” in this report) in this report and to 50 of the largest local governments. Responses were received from 50 (100%) local governments (including one which subsequently ceased to exist) and 86 (87%) agencies. We consider this to be an exceptional response in view of the fact that the failure to respond by 8 of the agencies was due to their ceasing to operate. The response rate is much appreciated.
7. A total of 135 surveys (86 agencies and 49 local governments) were reviewed plus supporting policies, procedures, customer service charters, feedback surveys and complaint data collection forms.
8. Surveys of complaint documentation are limited in their scope. An organisation may have excellent documentation but without appropriate staff



attitudes and skills its system will not be effective. Conversely, an organisation may have a poorly documented system but with sympathetic and aware staff they may well be able to deal with complaints effectively and make some improvements to service as a result of complaints. Nevertheless, we considered that a review of documentation was an appropriate means of gaining an overview of the extent, nature and quality of complaint-handling systems.



SURVEY FINDINGS

Formal processes

9. The existence of a complaint policy and documented procedures allows an organisation to inform consumers and staff about what can be expected of the complaint process. The survey asked if agencies and local governments had written complaint policies and formal procedures for handling complaints.

Table 1	Complaint System Documentation					
	Agencies <u>n = 86</u>		Local Govts <u>n = 49</u>		Total Surveys <u>n = 135</u>	
Written complaint policy	62	72%	24	49%	86	64%
Formal complaint procedure	65	76%	27	55%	92	68%

10. A higher proportion of agencies (76%) than local governments (55%) had formal complaint procedures of some sort with slightly lower percentages in both cases having developed a written complaint policy (72% and 49%). Conversely, over 25% of agencies and 50% of local governments had no written documentation. Even where agencies had written complaint procedures, many had not been updated for several years. In some cases the staff member completing our survey form gave explanatory answers which contradicted the information in the accompanying documentation. Many organisations' complaint systems were not consistent with current approaches to customer service and complaint-handling.

Publicity

11. Obviously, consumers will be more likely to make use of a complaint service if they know it exists. A range of publicity methods is therefore desirable to make systems visible and accessible. We asked agencies to identify the number of different methods they used to inform consumers of their complaint systems. Overall, a somewhat surprising 12% of agencies and 22% of local governments used no publicity methods at all.
12. The more common methods used to advertise complaint services appear in Table 2. Despite agencies developing some creative ways to inform their consumers of their systems, 22% of agencies and 8% of local governments relied solely on customer service charter documents. Only three agencies listed their complaint officer's direct number in the telephone directory.

<u>Methods of Publicity</u>	<u>Agencies</u>	<u>Local Govts</u>
None	10	20
Customer Service Charter	49	11
Staff Advice	25	6
Complaint Pamphlet	13	3
Internet	12	4
Agency Pamphlet	9	0
Newspapers	0	9
Posters	8	1
Publications	5	1
Displays	4	1
Mail Out	2	0
Patient Directory	2	0
Student Diary	2	0
Telephone Directory	2	1
Other Methods	26	18

13. Table 3 shows that over 30% of agencies and 24% of local governments used three or more methods to advertise their process.

Number of Publicity Methods	Agency		Local Govts		Total	
0	10	12%	20	42%	30	22%
1	29	34%	12	24%	41	30%
2	19	22%	12	24%	31	23%
3	13	15%	1	2%	14	10%
4	10	12%	2	4%	12	9%
5	5	5%	0	0%	5	4%
6	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
No response	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
Total	86	100%	49	100%	135	100%

Complaint officers

14. The survey asked agencies whether a specific staff member had been nominated to act as “complaint officer” and requested information about training and support for these personnel. 54 agencies (63%) and 14 (29%) local governments replied that they had staff who acted as complaint officers. The question did not define the term “complaint officer” so the results are not conclusive.
15. Many agencies replied that the CEO was the complaint officer. These answers were not counted as a “Yes” - because complaint officers generally explain the agency’s complaint process so that people can understand what is involved before deciding to use it. Consumers would be unlikely to feel confident that

-
17. Eighty percent of agencies had broad definitions which would capture information about consumer problems with their policies, as well as decisions and actions of staff members. Where local governments had adopted a complaint definition it was usually the WAMA definition –

“An expression of dissatisfaction, however made, about the standard of service, actions or lack of action by the Council or its staff, affecting an individual customer or group of customers. The following shall not be registered as complaints:

- *requests for services;*
- *requests for information or explanation of policies or procedures; or*
- *lodging of an appeal in accordance with standard policy or procedure.”*

Scope of complaint system

18. The survey sought information on the extent to which consumers could complain about or lodge appeals against decisions, staff behaviour and agency policy - as most complaints fall into these three categories. The majority of agencies (86%) and local governments (73%) accepted complaints in all three areas. Where agencies limited the scope of their complaint system, it was usually to discourage complaints about agency policy.

Rate of complaint

19. Complaint systems will not benefit organisations if consumers do not make use of them. Organisations therefore need to estimate how many complaints they would expect to receive, given the number of consumers served, so that they can determine if their system is effective. We therefore asked agencies if they knew the number of complaints they had received and the consumers served for the previous financial year. Forty-nine agencies and seven local

governments stated that they knew both the number of complaints and the number of their consumers. Table 5 gives the details.

	Complaints Known		Consumers Known	
	<u>Agencies</u>	<u>Local Govts</u>	<u>Agencies</u>	<u>Local Govts</u>
Known	49 57%	7 14%	52 60%	4 8%
Known for some sections of agency	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Not known	32 37%	42 86%	28 33%	44 90%
No response	4 5%	0 0%	6 7%	1 2%
Total	<u>86 100%</u>	<u>49 100%</u>	<u>86 100%</u>	<u>49 100%</u>

20. Australian consumer complaint research, covering commercial and government organisations, shows that 3% to 19% of customers will have problems with a product or service. Whether or not they then make a formal complaint depends on the industry and the degree of risk caused by the problem (TARP Australia Pty Ltd – personal communication). The complaint to consumer ratio in our survey ranged from 1:7 to 1:139 000. Some agencies will expect a high volume of low complexity complaints – eg public utilities – whereas others will expect a low volume of high complexity complaints – eg health services. Complaint research also shows that for every complaint made there are likely to be 26 consumers who do not lodge a complaint (J Denham *Handling Customer Complaints* 1998). Public sector organisations should consider the nature of their consumer base and the nature of the interaction with it – and estimate the approximate rate of complaint they might expect in their industry. This may be no easy task, but the exercise would help provide

assurance that consumers have ready access to the system and an indication of the extent of consumer problems – real or perceived.

Complaint statistic collection and analysis

21. The survey asked if organisations had a system to collect complaint data and, if so, what complaints were included. Nearly one third of agencies (31%) and over half the local governments (55%) were not collecting statistics about their complaints. As complaints can be made in a number of different ways and managed in different sections of an organisation, some commitment to the task of collating statistics centrally is needed. For this reason the survey sought information about what complaints were included in a data collection system. Letters, “Ministerial” correspondence and complaints to complaint staff were most frequently recorded for central collation. Only 37 agencies and 18 local governments included complaints made by telephone. Table 6 shows the source of the complaint data collected.

Table 6	Source of Complaint Data Collected	
	<u>Agencies</u>	<u>Local Govts</u>
Letters	53	22
Ministerial correspondence	47	18
Complaint officer contact	41	10
Telephone	37	18
None	27	27
No response	0	1
Other	10	6

22. Table 7 shows the number of types of complaint data collected.

Table 7	Range of Complaint Data Collected			
	<u>Agencies</u>		<u>Local Govts</u>	
None	27	31%	25	52%
One type	8	9%	3	6%
Two types	7	8%	3	6%
Three types	13	15%	5	10%
Four types	28	34%	10	20%
Five types	3	3%	2	4%
No response	0	0%	1	2%
Total	86	100%	49	100%

23. Where agencies collect data from a range of sources, their estimate of total complaints received is likely to be more accurate. Thirty-one agencies and 12 local governments recorded complaints from four or more sources.

24. Although 82 organisations stated that they collate complaint data centrally, they did not all respond to the question requesting information about the method used to count and analyse the complaint data. Manual analysis was the most common method for analysing complaint data – 32 agencies and 15 local governments. Agencies using computerised systems were evenly divided between in-house systems (15) and commercial packages (15). Local governments had more in-house systems. The Metropolitan Health Services Board’s adoption of a proprietary complaint system probably boosted the number of agencies with commercial packages. Some agencies used more than one method to analyse complaint data. Table 8 shows the complaint data systems analysis methods.

	<u>Agencies</u>		<u>Local Govts</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Commercial package	15	24%	3	10%	18	19%
Correspondence tracking System	0	0%	1	3%	1	1%
In-house computer System	15	24%	12	39%	27	29%
Manual analysis	32	52%	15	48%	47	51%
Total	<u>62</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>100%</u>

Complaint statistic reporting

25. If organisations are to benefit from complaint feedback they will need to collate the information in a report of some kind for use within the organisation. The survey asked if agencies prepare reports on complaints. Forty-nine percent of agencies and 31% of local governments prepared some type of report on complaint statistics. Table 9 gives the details.

	<u>Agencies</u>		<u>Local Govts</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Reports prepared	41	48%	15	31%	56	41%
Reports prepared for some sections of agency	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%
No reports	43	50%	33	67%	76	57%
No response	1	1%	1	2%	2	1%
Total	<u>86</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>100%</u>

Where reports were produced, complaint officers were most likely to prepare them – agencies (54%) and local governments (38%).

26. The survey asked for details about who received reports about complaint statistics as this is an indicator of the agency's commitment to complaint-handling. The Corporate Executive most frequently received reports in the 41 agencies which stated that reports were prepared. The CEO and councillors most often received local government complaint reports. Complaint reports did not reach the CEO level in 16 agencies and in 5 local governments. Table 10 shows the range of staff and boards receiving complaint reports.

	Agencies		Local Govts		Total	
Corporate Executive	15	37%	1	7%	16	29%
CEO	7	17%	3	21%	10	18%
CEO and Council	0	0%	5	37%	5	9%
Director or manager	7	17%	3	21%	10	18%
Board	2	5%	0	0%	2	4%
Other	9	22%	2	14%	11	20%
No response	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%
Total	41	100%	14	100%	55	100%

Use of complaint data

27. The survey asked how the agency used the information in the complaint report. Answers indicated whether agencies understood one of the key purposes of a complaint system. Thirty-one agencies and 11 local governments use complaint data for identifying and rectifying underlying

problems. Other uses were to ensure that complaints were handled effectively. One agency was using complaints as a method of monitoring staff performance.

	Agencies	Local Govts	Total
Systems improvement	31 76%	11 79%	42 75%
Monitoring effectiveness of complaint system	5 12%	3 21%	8 15%
No response or unclear purpose	2 5%	0 0%	2 4%
External reporting eg Auditor	2 5%	0 0%	2 4%
General			
Staff performance	1 2%	0 0%	1 2%
Total	41 100%	14 100%	55 100%

Complaint management training

28. The survey included a question about the extent and nature of training provided for complaint-officer staff. Responses included courses on dealing with difficult people, Customer Focus, mediation, dispute resolution, Aussie Host, Equal Employment Opportunity, conducting investigations and attending health complaint conferences and agency induction processes. Although courses such as these would be helpful for complaint officers and other staff who handle complaints, they would not give all the information and skills necessary to do the task. Only four agencies stated that their staff had received specific training in complaint management.

-
29. The survey also sought to ascertain interest in complaint management training should my Office run courses. Almost 90% of organisations were interested - which may reflect the limited amount of affordable complaint-handling courses in this State in recent years. I am aware of training courses that were cancelled in 1999 due to the lack of enrolments - which is surprising in view of the strong interest in complaint-handling training that my Office may offer in future.

Good practice examples

30. Numerous examples of good practice emerged from the documentation submitted with the survey, including:
- CEO endorsement clearly expressed in complaint documentation;
 - Evidence of resources for staff training, systems coordination, information technology and consumer complaint information;
 - Creative publicity methods increasing awareness regarding the complaint and feedback system, eg letterheads promoting feedback processes;
 - Staff who welcome telephone complaints and mail a copy of the complaint form to the consumer to ensure that the details were taken correctly;
 - Timeliness guidelines for acknowledgments and progress reports;
 - Clear guidelines about the remedies staff are authorised to offer;
 - Well constructed complaint data collection forms and appropriate information technology for central collation and reporting;
 - Quality improvement sections analysing complaint trends and senior management implementing service improvements and monitoring their effectiveness; and
 - Consumer complaint pamphlets giving information about appeal rights, including contact details for the Ombudsman.

EXTENT TO WHICH AS 4269 MET

31. Table 12 shows the extent to which we considered agencies were meeting *AS 4269* on the basis of documentation submitted. We considered that twenty-five percent of all respondents met the Standard – 33% of agencies but only 12% of local governments, despite the 1997 *Local Government Complaint Procedure* booklet. Many health and TAFE agencies had well developed complaint systems which we considered met the Standard. Only nine organisations outside those two sectors met the Standard.

	<u>Agencies</u>		<u>Local Govts</u>		<u>Total</u>	
Met Standard	28	33%	6	12%	34	25%
Partly met Standard	14	16%	6	12%	20	15%
Did not meet Standard	44	51%	37	76%	81	60%
Total	86	100%	49	100%	135	100%

32. The most common reason for not meeting the Standard was that agencies had no system in place to learn from complaint data. There was no central complaint data collation and analysis for service improvement. Other problems were the lack of written complaint policies (25% of agencies and 50% of local governments) and inadequate publicity of complaint procedures. Many agencies need to raise awareness of their systems. This could be achieved by using three or more publicity methods. Currently only 30% of agencies and 8% of local governments use three or more methods to inform consumers about their systems.

-
33. The survey asked detailed questions about the presence of complaint officers, their role and support through training and debriefing. These staff regularly cope with client anger but may also find that their colleagues do not welcome the feedback about agency problems provided by complaints. There has been anecdotal evidence of burn out and high staff turnover in these positions in recent years.
34. Survey responses dealing with training and debriefing for complaint officers were not clear. Some agencies provided information regarding any staff handling complaints whereas others confined the answer to the complaint officer. *AS 4269* does not require organisations to have designated complaint officers. Instead, it is based on a model of all staff being empowered to resolve customer problems and being required to document the issues for management analysis and service improvement. As a result, the relationship between having a complaint officer and meeting the Standard is interesting.
35. Agencies and local governments with complaint officer staff were more likely to meet the Standard than those without them. Overall 41% of organisations with complaint officers appeared to meet the Standard and a further 22% partly met the Standard. Only 9% of respondents that did not have a complaint officer appeared to meet the Standard. Complaint officers appear to have a useful role in:
- providing complainants with the choice of dealing with a person who was not involved in the matter being complained about;
 - actually dealing with complaints in complex government areas; and
 - promoting quality complaint management in the agency.

-
36. The survey indicated that the complaint officer assists both the client and the agency. However, they do require adequate training, debriefing and support from management which is committed to quality complaint-handling.
 37. It is interesting to compare the results of this survey with other surveys. The overall result of 25% of all organisations appearing to meet the Standard is broadly comparable with the 22% found in the Commonwealth Ombudsman's 1996 survey. The results of the NSW Ombudsman's 1999 survey suggest that formal complaint systems are more developed in both agencies and local governments in that State.

SURVEY IMPLICATIONS

38. The survey identified some good complaint management systems among the 25% of respondents which we considered met *AS 4269*. Good systems were particularly evident in agencies with active quality improvement programs. The TAFE and health sectors stood out.
39. More commitment to complaint systems is required in the majority of agencies and local governments. CEOs need to ensure that the agency understands the elements of a quality complaint system and that the required resources are devoted to its implementation. This would ensure responsiveness to service users and agencies would gain maximum benefit from the complaint feedback received.
40. The apparent lack of affordable complaint-handling training in recent years may also be a factor in the current limited development of public sector complaint systems. Complaint officers and staff who handle complaints need the skills and knowledge to carry out this task. The provision of appropriate training is a high priority.

-
41. The survey itself appears to have generated renewed interest in public sector complaint management. Six agencies recognised that their systems needed further development and sought information on resources to assist with this. Other agencies indicated they had made some adjustments to their systems in the two to three weeks prior to returning the survey form and documentation. As surveys of this nature promote system improvements we will repeat the survey in 2001.

CONCLUSION

42. In recent years Western Australian public sector agencies have been required to provide evidence of the efficiency and effectiveness of their services. Many agencies have done so by providing information from consumer feedback gained through satisfaction surveys. The results of our survey of public sector complaint systems show that agencies are not deriving maximum benefit from the feedback they can and should receive as a result of consumer complaints. To remedy this situation about 75% of agencies need to give their complaint systems urgent attention. The resulting quality internal complaint systems would not only help agencies to improve their services but should also increase the satisfaction of their consumers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

43. It is recommended that the Chief Executive Officers of all Western Australian public sector agencies and local governments:
- (a) Recognise that encouraging consumers to submit complaints and handling those complaints in a quality way can generate considerable

consumer goodwill and opportunities to identify ways to improve organisational performance;

- (b) Review their organisation's complaint management system to see if it satisfies *AS 4269*, or can otherwise be improved;

- (c) Review the training currently provided to their staff about customer service generally and customer complaints specifically and take advantage of any training opportunities available – perhaps by combining resources with other agencies;

- (d) Foster a culture of encouraging and responding positively to complaints in their organisation;

- (e) Ensure that all complainants are informed of their right to seek a review by the Ombudsman if the organisation's own complaint system is unable to resolve the problem.

Murray Allen

OMBUDSMAN

13 December 1999

COMPLAINT HANDLING REFERENCE LIST

Books / Articles

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Barlow J and Moller C | A Complaint is a Gift
Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, 1996 |
| Commonwealth Ombudsman | A Good Practice Guide for Effective Complaint Handling
Commonwealth of Australia 1997 |
| Denham J | Handling Customer Complaints – Turning Challenges into Opportunities
Prentice Hall Sydney 1998 |
| Health Issues Centre, Victoria | Complaint Handling in Victoria’s Hospitals Towards a Consumer Focus in Health Issues
29 December 1991 pp23-26 |
| Health Services Liaison Association | Every Complaint is an Opportunity
Tel 03 9803 0973 for purchase details |
| Martin William B | Quality Customer Service
Crisp Publications, Inc. California 1993 |
| Office of NSW Ombudsman | Effective Complaint Handling Guidelines
Tel 02 9286 1000 for purchase details |
| Office of NSW Ombudsman | Dealing with Difficult Complainants
September 1998
Tel 02 9286 1000 for purchase details |
| Standards Australia | Australian Standard Complaints Handling
AS 4269 – 1995
May be purchased from Standards Australia
165 Adelaide Tce, Perth Tel 9221 6700 |
| TMI | A Complaint is a Gift
A TMI Tool
Tel (03) 9859 7400 for purchase details |
| Videos – Resource Materials | |
| Aussie Host | New Complaints Handling
May be purchased from Small Business Institute
Training Centre Albert Facey House Perth
Tel 9321 5177 |
| Steele D | First Impressions Count – A Kit for Complaint Handlers
May be borrowed on Inter-library loan from
Western Australia public libraries. May be
purchased from D Steele PO Box 379
SUBIACO WA 6904 |