

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**OUTSOURCING VERSUS
IN-HOUSE
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT:
FRAMEWORK FOR
VALUE ADDING SELECTION**

MYZATUL AISHAH KAMARAZALY

2007

OUTSOURCING VERSUS IN-HOUSE FACILITIES MANAGEMENT: FRAMEWORK FOR VALUE ADDING SELECTION

A research thesis presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Philosophy
(MPhil)
In
Construction

Institute of Technology & Engineering
College of Sciences
Massey University at Wellington
New Zealand

Myzatul Aishah Kamarazaly

2007

ABSTRACT

Investment in the physical infrastructure and the provision of facilities management (FM) services should be geared toward achieving the strategic objectives of an organization, which largely aim at value creation. Sole focus on the financials while choosing between outsourcing and in-house FM options excludes other non-financial measures such as the extent to which the FM route contributes to improving internal business processes and the overall strategic health of the organization.

This paper presents the results of investigations into a holistic perspective on the key variables to consider in choosing between outsourcing and in-house FM in order to provide value added service and improve organizational performance. The study was limited to the views expressed by facilities and property managers registered with the Property Institute of New Zealand Property and the Facilities Management Association of Australia. The descriptive survey method was used, which comprised qualitative data gathering using unstructured interviews and quantitative data gathering using structured questionnaires. Content analyses, multi-attribute methods and Spearman's rank correlation tests were used in the analysis of the data and the testing of the research propositions/ hypotheses.

Results showed that four broad categories constitute the holistic FM functional areas: strategic, operational, property development/project management and general services. Outsourcing was perceived to be more suited than in-house for providing operational, property development/ project management and general services; in-house was more suited for the provision of strategic FM functions. The relative importance of the value adding criteria underlying the broad categories of FM services, as well as the suitability of the use of outsourcing and in-house approaches in meeting each criterion were established. Using the concept of Overall Suitability Score, a process chart was developed for use in making a strategic choice between outsourcing and in-house FM service provisions. The use of this chart is recommended to property and facilities managers, and other stakeholders who may be faced with the dilemma of choosing between outsourcing and in-house approaches to providing FM services. The methodology developed in this study could be replicated in related contexts to resolving strategic decision dilemma involving making choices amongst competing alternatives.

Keywords: Facilities management; in-house FM, outsourcing, property management, strategic management.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to record my gratitude to my Supervisor, Dr Jasper Ikeokwu Mbachu, for his guidance in the research process and for his constant encouragement and advice.

Great appreciation is extended to the members of Property Institute of New Zealand (PINZ) and Facilities Management Association of Australia (FMAA), especially those registered as property and facility managers, for their willingness to participate in the research surveys and for their time in thoughtfully responding to the questionnaires.

I also wish to thank the Executive of the Institute of Technology & Engineering for providing supplemental funding for this research.

The approval granted for the undertaking of the questionnaire surveys by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC) is hereby acknowledged.

This research was strongly supported by Mara University of Technology (UiTM), Malaysia through the Young Lecturer Scheme grant, and for which I am very grateful.

Finally, my sincere thanks go to my parents and family for their blessings, unflinching faith and enormous support, which contributed to the successful completion of this research.

This research is dedicated to all those who helped in making this research work a success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF TABLES	VI
LIST OF FIGURES	VIII
LIST OF APPENDICES	IX
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	3
1.3 OBJECTIVES	4
1.4 PROPOSITIONS	4
1.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS	4
1.6 IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	5
1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION TO FM	7
2.1.1 FM IN CONTEXT	7
2.1.2 CLASSIFICATION OF FM WORKS	10
2.1.3 IMPACT OF MARKET PERSPECTIVE ON FM	13
2.1.4 KEY FM CONCEPTS	14
2.2 CONCEPT OF VALUE	14
2.2.1 DEFINITION OF VALUE.....	14
2.2.2 HOW CAN VALUE BE ADDED?	15
2.3 FM FUNCTIONS	16
2.4 FM COMPETENCIES	18
2.5 VALUE ADDITION IN FM FUNCTIONS	24
2.5 CRITERIA UNDERPINNING THE SELECTION OF OUTSOURCING OR IN-HOUSE FM APPROACH	26
2.6 OUTSOURCING IN FM	27
2.6.1 FM FUNCTIONS SUITABLE FOR OUTSOURCING.....	32
2.6.2 ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES OF OUTSOURCING.....	33
2.7 IN-HOUSE PROVISION OF FM FUNCTIONS	40
2.7.1 ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES OF IN-HOUSE DELIVERY OF FM FUNCTIONS	40
2.8 SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW	42

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	44
3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN	44
3.2 RESEARCH STRATEGY	45
3.3 TARGET POPULATION & SAMPLING FRAME.....	46
3.4 DATA GATHERING	46
3.5 DATA ANALYSIS.....	46
3.6 RESEARCH MODEL / CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	50
3.7 RESEARCH PROGRAMME.....	51
3.8 ETHICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCH.....	53
3.8.1 CLEARANCE FOR RESEARCH UNDERTAKING.....	53
CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS ..	54
4.1 OVERVIEW	54
4.2 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	54
4.2.1 SURVEY RESPONSES.....	54
4.2.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS	55
4.2.3 LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS	56
4.2.4 PURPOSE GROUPS OF BUILDINGS / FACILITIES MANAGED BY RESPONDENTS ..	57
4.2.5 CATEGORIES OF OWNERS OF FACILITIES MANAGED BY RESPONDENTS	58
4.2.6 RESPONDENTS' STATUS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS	59
4.3 CRITERIA UNDERPINNING VALUE-ADDING FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SERVICE	59
4.4 LINKING THE BROAD CATEGORIES OF THE FM FUNCTIONS WITH THE FM COMPETENCIES.....	68
4.5 SUITABILITY OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE APPROACHES IN PROVIDING FM FUNCTIONS.....	70
4.5.1 SUITABILITY OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE IN PROVIDING STRATEGIC FM FUNCTIONS	70
4.5.2 SUITABILITY OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE IN PROVIDING OPERATIONAL FM FUNCTIONS	73
4.5.3 SUITABILITY OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE IN PROVIDING PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT/PROJECT MANAGEMENT FM FUNCTIONS	75
4.5.4 SUITABILITY OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE IN PROVIDING GENERAL FM SERVICES	77
4.6 FRAMEWORK FOR CHOOSING BETWEEN OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE FM ROUTES	79
CHAPTER 5: TESTS OF PROPOSITIONS.....	82
5.1 OVERVIEW	82
5.2 TEST OF PROPOSITION 1	83
5.3 TEST OF PROPOSITION 2.....	84
5.3.1 PROPOSITION 2.1	85

5.3.2 TEST OF PROPOSITION 2.2	86
5.4 SUMMARY OF THE TESTS OF PROPOSITIONS.....	92
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	93
6.1 CONCLUSIONS	93
6.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS TO FM INDUSTRY AND PRACTICE	94
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	95
6.4 SUMMARY OF KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	96
REFERENCES	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
APPENDICES	105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: CLASSIFICATION OF FM TASKS (SOURCE: THEN AND AKHLAGHI, 1990, P.45)	12
TABLE 2: REVIEW OF FM PRACTICE (SOURCE: COLLINGS, 2007, P.20)	13
TABLE 3: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006).....	19
TABLE 4: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006) (<i>CONTINUED</i>).....	20
TABLE 5: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006) (<i>CONTINUED</i>).....	21
TABLE 6: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006) (<i>CONTINUED</i>).....	22
TABLE 7: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006) (<i>CONTINUED</i>).....	23
TABLE 8: FM COMPETENCIES (SOURCE: IFMA, 2006) (<i>CONTINUED</i>).....	24
TABLE 9: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING VALUE ADDITION IN FM FUNCTION (SOURCE: USHER, 2004, P.353-354).....	25
TABLE 10: USER-PERCEIVED ADVANTAGES OF OUTSOURCING IN RANKING ORDER (SOURCE: BARRET AND BALDRY, 2003, P.136).....	36
TABLE 11: REASONS TO OUTSOURCE AND RELATED BENEFITS (SOURCE: GREAVOR, 2007)	37
TABLE 12: USER PERCEIVED DISADVANTAGES OF OUTSOURCING IN RANKING ORDER (SOURCE: BARRET AND BALDRY, 2003, P.137).....	39
TABLE 13: RESEARCH PROGRAMME: SNAPSHOT AS AT DECEMBER 2006	52
TABLE 14: STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT FM FUNCTION.....	62
TABLE 15: OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT FM FUNCTION.....	64
TABLE 16: PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT / PROJECT MANAGEMENT FM FUNCTION	66
TABLE 17: GENERAL SERVICES FM FUNCTION.....	67
TABLE 18: SUITABILITY RATINGS OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN- HOUSE FM APPROACHES FOR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS..	72
TABLE 19: SUITABILITY RATINGS OF THE USE OF OUTSOURCING AND IN- HOUSE FM APPROACHES FOR OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT FUNCTION	74
TABLE 20: SUITABILITY RATINGS FOR THE USE OF OUTSOURCING OR IN- HOUSE APPROACHES FOR PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT / PROJECT MANAGEMENT FUNCTION	76
TABLE 21: SUITABILITY RATINGS FOR THE USE OF OUTSOURCING OR IN- HOUSE APPROACHES FOR GENERAL SERVICES FUNCTION	78
TABLE 22: CROSS TABULATION FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 1.0	83
TABLE 23: CROSS TABULATION MATRIX FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 2.1.....	85
TABLE 24: CROSS TABULATION AND SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 2.2.....	88
TABLE 25: CROSS TABULATION AND SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 2.2.....	89

TABLE 26: CROSS TABULATION AND SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 2.2.....	90
TABLE 27: CROSS TABULATION AND SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR TESTING PROPOSITION 2.2.....	91
TABLE 28: OVERALL RESULT OF TESTS OF PROPOSITION 2.2.....	92

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: TOP TEN REASONS COMPANIES OUTSOURCE (SOURCE: OUTSOURCING INSTITUTE'S 8TH ANNUAL INDEX, 2005).	31
FIGURE 2: TOP TEN ACTIVITIES BEING OUTSOURCED (SOURCE: OUTSOURCING INSTITUTE ANNUAL OUTSOURCING INDEX, 2005).	33
FIGURE 3: FLOWCHART OF THE PROCESS USED IN CARRYING OUT THE RESEARCH PROJECT FROM CONCEPTION TO COMPLETION.....	45
FIGURE 4: RESEARCH MODEL / CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	51
FIGURE 5: PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF RESPONDENTS	55
FIGURE 6: RESPONDENT'S LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE	56
FIGURE 7: PURPOSE GROUPS OF BUILDING/FACILITIES MANAGED BY RESPONDENTS	57
FIGURE 8: CATEGORIES OF OWNERS OF FACILITIES MANAGED BY RESPONDENTS	58
FIGURE 9: RESPONDENTS' STATUS IN RESPECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS	59
FIGURE 10: BROAD CATEGORIES OF FM SERVICES	60
FIGURE 11: LINKAGES BETWEEN BROAD CATEGORIES OF FM FUNCTIONS AND FM COMPETENCIES.....	68
FIGURE 12: FLOW CHART PROCESS FOR CHOOSING BETWEEN OUTSOURCING AND IN-HOUSE APPROACHES IN MEETING THE FM NEEDS	80
FIGURE 13: SNAPSHOT OF RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS	82

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: DOCUMENTS USED IN PLANNING AND CONDUCTING PILOT INTERVIEWS	106
APPENDIX B: DOCUMENTS USED IN PLANNING AND CONDUCTING QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY.....	112
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING CHARTS AND TABLES.....	120
APPENDIX D: MUHEC LOW RISK NOTIFICATION APPROVAL	129
APPENDIX F: RESEARCH AWARDS.....	134
APPENDIX E: ACCEPTANCE LETTER FOR THE PUBLICATION OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS IN A CONFERENCE PROCEEDING	137
APPENDIX F: PUBLICATIONS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	142