

# Improving Janitorial Contract Performance with Facility Management Performance Scorecards

Dhaval Gajjar,<sup>1</sup> Jake Smithwick,<sup>2\*</sup> Kenneth Sullivan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Clemson University

<sup>2</sup>University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 9201 University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 28223, United States

<sup>3</sup>Arizona State University

\*Corresponding Author: Jake.Smithwick@uncc.edu

---

## ABSTRACT

Facility Manager (FM) role requires expertise in various aspects of facility maintenance. Due to the diverse job functions as an FM, outsourcing and hiring external vendors is a common practice in the industry to gain additional expertise. Since a facility manager oversees the external vendor's contract and the performance of the external vendor directly affects the quality of a facility, the FM's performance is ultimately related to the performance of the outsourcing company. Hence, it is critical to measure performance and the quality of the services provided by the outsourcing company. One of the FM's at a corporation (XYZ Corporation) was faced with a challenge of low performance and poor quality on their outsourced janitorial contract. The literature review revealed that there has been very little research done with regard to outsourcing of the janitorial contract. In order to address the challenge of XYZ Corporation a performance measurement model was implemented using performance Scorecards at XYZ Corporation for janitorial contracts. The Scorecard was developed based on the previous experience of the FM group, the researchers and the specific areas targeted by XYZ Corporation that were part of janitorial vendors responsibility. This paper presents the impact of the performance measurement model on the quality and performance of the janitorial vendor and its expansion to other outsourcing contractors based on the lessons learned from the janitorial contracts. The study revealed that the implementation of a performance measurement model resulted in an overall improvement of the performance of janitorial vendor and the contractors.

---

## INTRODUCTION

The role of a facility manager (FM) involves diverse job functions that require expertise in every aspect of facility maintenance. Due to the high level of expertise required in facility maintenance a facility manager needs to outsource some of the services that require special skills. Hence, facilities management has shifted over the years from not only managing internal employees and their facility, but also managing service providers through outsourcing. It is estimated that over half of the non-core Facilities Management services are outsourced (Davis, 2004). The main reason for the companies to outsource is to minimize risk, reduce costs, and bring in additional expertise that can achieve higher performance (Wilson, 2002a; Ikediashi et. al., 2013; Lok 2015). The services within FM are also outsourced to increase and service quality (Guercini & Ranfagni, 2015). Although there are tangible advantages to outsourcing the services within a facility there are risks associated with it especially the procurement and the selection of the outsourcing companies (Wilson, 2002a; Rashid, 2016).

One of the most common methods of procuring an outsourcing agreement is through competitive bidding where the final selection of an outsourcing company is based strictly on price rather than performance and the

capability of the company being hired. Since there are no performance criteria and expectations set in place during procurement it presents a significant challenge for facility managers to manage and get the performance output expected which causes a strained work environment (Zelasko & Schexnayder, 2003). Since a facility manager's performance within the facility is directly related to the performance of the outsourcing company, the degree of interdependence needs to be mutually beneficial (Kaipai & Turkulainen, 2017). Hence, there is a need for facilities managers to continuously measure the outsourcing service providers performance and productivity. One of the most common services outsourced by the facility manager is the janitorial contract (Gorzig et. al., 2002) and is a critical component for a well-functioning facility. There has been very little research performed in regards to outsourcing of janitorial contracts in the FM industry.

The purpose of this research is to implement a performance measurement model through a survey questionnaire and generate a contractor performance Scorecard for a janitorial outsourcing contract to measure and improve the quality of the services provided by the outsourcing vendor for XYZ Corporation. Due to the success of performance measurement model implementation on the janitorial services, the model was also further implemented on general contractor, mechanical contractor,

electrical contractor and plumbing contractor which have been presented in this research.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

There has been extensive research in outsourcing and performance management in the last couple of decades within facility management. Performance measurement at an operational level is one of the important aspects of an FM that help in assessing the performance in terms of functionality, quality, added value and cost (Myeda, 2012). The literature review is broken into two sections, outsourcing and performance measurement. The authors evaluate risks, benefits, and guidelines for advantageous outsourcing, followed by the impacts of performance measurement.

### Outsourcing

The phenomenon of outsourcing started in late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in the US (Baatartogtokh et. al., 2018). Outsourcing is defined as a potential tool or methodology for managing the provision of services for an organization (Flynn, 1999). It can also be defined as the transfer of activities and processes to an external party (Baatartogtokh et. al., 2018). The main advantages of outsourcing is improved cost efficiencies and productivity (Kaipai and Turkulainen, 2017). Activities such as auditing, maintenance, repair, transportation, janitorial and legal services are some examples of activities that are usually outsourced to firms (Gorzig et. al., 2002). A well-run in-house organization could conceivably perform at 10 to 15 percent less cost than an outside organization (Flynn, 1999). Flynn goes on to state that other primary goals of outsourcing include improving service levels, a major shift in responsibility, personnel, and other resources, increase in operational flexibility, and benefits from others' expertise and technology investments. However, in spite of the benefits of outsourcing there is a significant absence of established standards which makes the development of specifications difficult. One of the reasons is that organizations do not adequately document in-house standards, which results in over specification and unrealistic expectations (Wilson, 2002b). Over specification can cause an increase in costs since the company is not aware of the current costs (Wilson, 200b2).

One of the most critical components to ensure successful outsourcing is a well thought out and executed contract. It is estimated that on any given day a minimum of 40 percent of outsourced contracts are not in compliance with contract requirements (Incognito, 2002). Also, many facility executives consider not getting the correct level of service as one of the major challenges of outsourcing (Rashid, 2016). A study conducted on FM outsourcing also revealed that some of the risks associated with outsourcing are poor quality of services and inexperience among the vendors (Ikediashi et. al., 2012). Considerable planning should be taken to address the specific requirements and

concerns necessary in the agreement. Incognito points that need to be covered include:

- Make the outsourcing contract common ground with the provider.
- Become familiar with all contract terms and conditions.
- Develop a contract abstract with the provider that outlines all the critical points of the services to be provided.
- Do not develop the contract to use against the providers. Strategic alliances do not develop when the contract is utilized as a threat to the provider.
- The contract should be considered a business tool to be used to manage the relationship.
- The contract should provide both compliance check points and allow for added services and benefits.
- The contract should provide protection for both parties in the event of default or lack of compliance.
- The contract should be measurable and allow for penalties for lack of compliance.
- The contract should be treated as a dynamic document that needs to be amended and reviewed on a regular basis.

Other items to consider prior to outsourcing services include (Usher, 2004):

- Cost
- Quality
- Risk and Liability
- Responsibilities and Accountability
- Flexibility
- Innovation
- Investment
- Information
- Customer Orientation

Outsourcing is a strategic tool and if used appropriately it can generate significant improvements in service and cost for many organizations.

### Performance Measurement

Performance measurement systems help management to follow up, coordinate, control, and improve certain aspects of organizational activities (Elg, 2007). Amaratunda and Baldry (2002) identify facilities management measurement of performance as one of the three essential issues for the effective implementation of a facilities strategy. Moreover, the measurement provides the basis for an organization to assess how well it is progressing towards its predetermined objectives, helps identify areas to improve, and decide on future initiatives. Performance measurement also leads to improvement of quality and service (Gunasekaran et. al., 2015).

Strategic performance measurement refers to the monitoring of companies' long-range plans and success, and is an area of important research (Ukko et al., 2007). Many other performance measurement frameworks and performance improvement initiatives/methods exist [e.g., Balanced Scorecard, EFQM, just-in-time (JIT), benchmarking,

and activity-based management] (Bassioni & Hassan, 2004). However, quite often companies have applied performance measurement on lower levels of organization, such as departments, units, teams, and even individuals and not to external vendors and contracts (Ukko et al., 2007).

An area of discontent for the facility professional has been the lack of measurable criteria for the outsourced provider in the original outsourced contract (Incognito, 2002). Incognito also mentions that the measurement criteria will be the largest cultural change for the external services provider. Some of the key aspects of measuring performance of outsourced service providers include (Incognito, 2002):

- Personalities and emotions should be kept in check.
- Always look for win/win outcomes in resolving issues.
- Document all expectations with measurements.
- Use benchmarking standards for measurements.
- Develop Scorecards to measure performance.
- Use a compliance manager.
- Keep the performance measurements simple and realistic.

There are expectations from upper management to appropriately measure performance in the organization (Amaratunda and Baldry, 2002). The measurements need to be clearly defined and communicated to all affected parties. Cycle time, delivery times, quality, customer satisfaction, cost containment, and value-added activities are all part of the performance measurement process. Through a performance management system an FM organization monitors both its current performances and its efforts to improve processes, motivate and educate employees, and enhance information systems - that is its ability to learn and improve (Amaratunda and Baldry, 2002). Similar performance measurement systems need to be implemented for external vendors and contracts as well.

## BACKGROUND

The subject company (titled XYZ Corporation to retain anonymity for the purposes of this study) has facilities in Texas and Arizona. The facilities in Arizona were the basis for this study. XYZ Corporation has approximately 1,500,000 square feet of office, lab, and manufacturing space. The site consists of multiple major campuses housing the divisions of the company. The Arizona facilities organization has approximately 50 full time employees and uses a fluctuating staff of contractors via outsourcing contracts. The Facilities Operations department for the XYZ Corporation is responsible for the operations and maintenance of the entire campus and for providing engineering and construction services for budgeted capital projects. The Facilities department is divided into three major functional units: Operations and Maintenance, Tenant and Site Services, and Engineering and Construction Services. The Facilities department has evolved from a workforce of full time employees performing the facilities services to a primarily outsourced

method of providing critical services such as janitorial, landscaping, general construction, mechanical, and electrical construction. Since the janitorial services were not performing at an optimal level and required more management time improving the performance of the janitorial service became the primary focus of the research.

To begin the research, a comprehensive review of the janitorial service was completed to document opportunities for improvement in the services. The researchers identified and documented the following issues with the janitorial services provided to the XYZ Corporation:

1. Multiple cleaning schedules were in place and used by both the vendor and the XYZ Corporation facilities management. There were no official documents of record for contract requirements and each party used what they believed to be the official version. This created confusion and conflict between the vendor and owner, and led to mis-aligned expectations.
2. There was no specified floor schedule for the routine cleaning, stripping, and waxing of the floors on a periodic basis. The vendor often resorted to the response of “it will get done before the end of the year.” However, without a formal tracking method it was difficult to determine if the work was being accomplished as required by the contract.
3. There was no window schedule prescribing the frequency of window cleaning tasks. It was at the discretion of the janitorial provider to clean the windows some time before the year ended. As expected, this created confusion and difficulty in creating an effective cleaning schedule with the building occupants.
4. The exact responsibilities of the supervisors were not understood by either the janitorial supervision staff or the owner. This presented a major problem when addressing performance issues.
5. Expectations for performance were unclear and lacked documentation. There were no performance specifications in place to address even minimum requirements. In this environment, the owner was accepting high levels of risk that the service would meet occupant satisfaction expectations.
6. Staffing hours were not established or documented causing staggered start times for janitorial employees. This created confusion about when the janitorial staff was on the site and how to get response in emergency situations.
7. Some areas within and on the exterior of the building were not being cleaned. This was a direct result of the confusion supervision had with not having a clear definition of performance expectations.
8. Customers often made complaints requiring the owner to spend a large percentage of their day dealing with and solving the issues.
9. For some of the janitorial staff, the workers were confused and not sure of their duties. Morale and motivation were affected by the uncertainty of what constituted an acceptable level of performance.



FIGURE 1.—FM Services Performance Model

10. There were no inspections or QA/QC conducted by the janitorial management or supervision. This further complicated the performance of the janitorial service by not providing periodical performance, quality, and compliance inspection of the site.
11. Client management involvement continued to be an on-going issue with little to no resolution. Due to the lack of clearly defined performance expectations, the management time continued to escalate.
12. Low morale was being observed in the janitorial supervision and bottom line workers. This was noticeable to the building occupants and caused turnover rates for employees to be an issue.

The janitorial service was procured through low price and minimum standards which were identified as the main reason for low performance. The price-based system makes no allowances for awarding construction contracts to the best-performing contractors who deliver the highest quality projects (Scott, 2005). Since the janitorial vendor was already contracted with XYZ Corporation the researchers proposed an implementation of performance measurement model to provide a service expectation to the service vendor and continually track and improve the quality of the service.

**PERFORMANCE INFORMATION MODEL**

After identifying the issues and their causes the researchers proposed a performance information model as outlined in Figure 1.

**Stage 1 – Current Assessment**

The performance model is initiated through current assessment of a facility with the use of a survey collected from current building occupants.

The data to be collected through the survey was targeted at four major areas that aligned with the FM’s expectations at XYZ Corporation: quality, productivity, reliability, and availability. Quality measures performance in all physically cleaned areas such as restrooms, floors, lobbies, break areas, conference rooms, and office areas. Productivity measures the amount of work accomplished. Reliability measures the degree that the specified work is completed. Availability measures the level of resources available to complete the work.

The survey also included other key quality indicators for other building services, which are not included in the scope of this research. The survey asked the following questions to measure the level of performance by the janitorial services vendor:

TABLE 1.—Tenant and Site Survey Top Box

Criteria	Walls, Floors & Ceilings	AC Air Quality	Elevators & Stairs	Parking & Landscape	Janitorial Service Desk Contact	Restroom	Janitorial Service Desk Clarity	Conference Room & Lobbies	Overall Janitorial	Janitorial Service Desk Response	Common Areas	Work Areas	Janitorial Service Desk Courtesy
Total # of Respondents	195	195	190	192	133	198	129	193	194	128	199	199	133
Total # of Top Box	36	38	43	44	35	54	36	58	59	42	69	72	54
Percentage of Top Box*	18%	19%	23%	23%	26%	27%	28%	30%	30%	33%	35%	36%	41%

\* Table sorted by descending order of % Top Box

Service Provided: Janitorial				Evaluation Period: Year 1				Customer: XYZ Corporation						
Contractor Name:				Evaluator: George Mansor				Location: Scottsdale Site						
Category	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual Score	Average Score
Quality														
Productivity														
Reliability														
Availability														
Supervision														
Safety														
Visitor Lobbies														
Executive Offices														
General Offices														
Conference Rooms														
Lab & Manufacturing														
Restrooms & Showers														
Health Services OHR														
Break Areas														
Elevators														
Corridors														
Stairwells														
Windows														
Janitor Closets														
Café Kitchen														
Café Dishwasher Rooms														
Café Serving Areas														
Outside Patios														
Receiving Guard Shacks														
Shipping/Receiving Docks														
Compound/Yard														
<b>Monthly Total Score</b>	0													0.0
<b>Monthly Avg Score</b>														
<b>Performance Metric</b>	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	182.0	2184	182.0
<b>Rating Identification</b>	<b>Comments:</b>													
1-2 = Unsatisfactory	Any rating of 1 to 4 will require an improvement action plan.													
3-4 = Improvement Needed														
5-6 = Good														
7-8 = Very Good														
9-10 = Excellent														

FIGURE 2.—Janitorial Monthly Performance Scorecard

- The overall appearance and cleanliness of the restrooms and the adequacy of supplies provided to the areas.
- Common areas serviced by the janitorial vendor such as lobbies, stairs, elevators, and conference rooms. Common areas are accessed by all building occupants.
- Quality and performance of trash removal, vacuuming, dusting, and windows for individual work spaces.
- Overall satisfaction with the janitorial services for all services provided to the site.

The survey question responses were designed with the following measurement scale: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied, and N/A for neutral responses. In total, the surveys were sent to all 4,000 employees working at the Scottsdale site. Responses were received from 200 employees (5% of the total population). The survey clearly identified performance issues in several areas of concern: Service, Cleanliness, Quality, and Supervision. It also provided the geographical identification of where problems with performance existed.

Table 1 provides a summary of the survey responses where the participants responded as very satisfied known as “top box”. As part of the survey results, the top box scores in Table 1 show that the janitorial service was considerably deficient in performance scoring. The highest score

received by the janitorial service was 41 percent of the top box for the service desk courtesy and the lowest score for the walls, floors, and ceilings at 18 percent top box indicating performance weakness in all areas. Moreover, the survey results indicate the “Overall Janitorial” rating to be at 30 percent which was a concern for the FM. Based on the data it was imperative that performance improvement for the janitorial services at the Scottsdale site had to be improved.

**Stage 2 – Contractor Performance Scorecard**

As a result of the survey, the researcher developed a Contractor Performance Scorecard (Figure 2). The Scorecard was developed based on the previous experience of the FM group, the researchers and the specific areas targeted by XYZ Corporation that were part of janitorial vendor’s responsibility. The Janitorial Monthly Performance Scorecard is a measurement tool that clearly identifies all major categories of services required at the XYZ Corporation buildings. The development of the Scorecard was completed by the use of a cross-functional team including Operations and Maintenance, Supply Management, and Tenant and Site Services representatives within XYZ Corporation.

TABLE 2.—Annual Percent of Improvement for 2006

Category	Initial Rating	Final Rating	% Improvement
General Cleaning	6.1	6.8	10.8%
Productivity	5.0	6.4	27.3%
Reliability	6.0	7.6	27.3%
Availability	7.0	7.6	9.1%
Average	6.3	7.1	18.6%

The goal of a Scorecard was to allow for the internal monthly review of performance and to both document and communicate performance ratings with the service provider monthly. To quickly identify the overall performance results of the Scorecard, a metric is used to show a numeric level of performance on a scale of 1 to 10. The baseline for minimum performance was set at 7. The performance level of 7 was determined to be optimal based on the evaluation and recommendation of the team. Any category below the baseline required an improvement action plan and corrective actions be implemented by the service provider to bring the level to, or above, the level of expected performance.

On a monthly basis, the team walked and evaluated the facility and provided the score for each category. The team then also met with the janitorial vendor in a separate monthly meeting to share the results of the Scorecard. The monthly meeting and performance Scorecard allowed the vendor to specifically target those areas identified as being weak and to focus on those categories that were rated below the performance baseline. The janitorial service contractor found the Scorecard to be a positive and beneficial resource to identify strengths and opportunities for improvements. The Scorecard allowed the contractor to specifically target those areas identified as being weak and to focus on those categories that were rated below the performance baseline.

The Janitorial Scorecard was completed for a 12-month period beginning in January and ending in December. The performance was measured by taking the January rating and comparing it to an average of the next eleven months. January was established as the baseline for identifying the degree of improvement over the average of the consecutive months. The Scorecard showed an average improvement of 18.6% for the annual performance evaluation period for Year 1. A summary for the percent of performance improvement for the year is shown in Table 2. As can be seen in the table, the performance has increased in each measurable category as per the monthly Scorecard.

### Stage 3 – Vendor Monthly Quality Checklist

In addition to the monthly Scorecard the janitorial service contractor was also required to complete and maintain a Monthly Quality Checklist (Appendix A).

The purpose of the checklist was to shift the accountability to the vendor to take ownership of identifying and quantifying the quality of service monthly. The items listed in the checklist are required submittals combined in a report by the janitorial contractor each month. The reports document the contractor's performance and allows the

TABLE 3.—Summary of Contractor Q1 and Q2 Scorecard Evaluations

Contractor	Q1 Rating	Q2 Rating	% Improvement
C1	95.5%	95.5%	0%
C2	90.9%	100%	+9.1%
C3	90.9%	82.6%	-8.3%
C4	90.9%	95.5%	+4.6%
Average	92.0%	93.4%	1.4%

contractor to provide feedback to the XYZ Corporation on actions taken above and beyond the performance expectations. The contractor can specifically identify ways they are contributing to efficiencies and meeting the customer satisfaction expectations that are beyond the performance requirements. The vendor monthly Scorecard was then evaluated against current assessment identified in Stage 1. An example of excellent performance was the response made to clean up a major flood in the building resulting from a broken pipe. The vendor quickly implemented a clean-up process and brought in the necessary labor resources to bring the flooded area back into production. To validate performance in meeting the floor maintenance standards, the vendor was responsible for providing a monthly metric showing progress made in completing the work planned compared to actual work performed allowing the contractor to demonstrate their own performance and validate their value as a service provider.

### FURTHER USAGE

XYZ Corporation also had other time and material contracts with a general contractor (C1), mechanical contractor (C2), electrical contractor (C3) and plumbing contractor (C4). As a result of the successful implementation of the janitorial measurement and metric process, the company continued the process and applied it to these services.

The performance measurement model was modified for the new group of contractors where the survey was based on a yes or no scale to clearly identify the performance and the performance reviews were conducted on a quarterly basis. The performance expectation communicated by the FM to the contractors was to achieve a rating at or above the 90% rating level. The performance ratings were collected from all associated facilities team members on a quarterly basis. The final scores were based on combining all the score evaluation from the facility team members and the documentation of any issues or areas where performance exceeded expectations. Table 3 shows the summary of the performance ratings for the Q1 and Q2 periods and the percent increase. Overall performance improvement was demonstrated in three of the four contractors rated. All contractors participating in the performance Scorecard process were accepting of the results. The only exception is a C3 contractor that had a decrease in performance by -8.3% due to not following up on an action item from the Q1 performance rating. Since then this action item has

been corrected and is expected to be reflected in Q3 performance rating. It is anticipated that the score for the C3 contractor will rise to a level above 90% as a result of the corrective action for Q3.

## CONCLUSION

Time required for managing and dealing with the service providers' performance issues was an increasing problem for XYZ Corporation. When problems arose with house-keeping issues, it became a common practice for the on-site janitorial supervisor to claim the service was not part of the contract. The problems were becoming a daily issue consuming the Corporation FM team members' time and impacting the ability to manage other critical functions and activities.

As a result of the implementation of the janitorial performance evaluation rating system using Scorecards, the expected results were obtained. Without a performance evaluation system or process, there is no way to formally document the performance of the vendor being measured. By having the formal process, it is possible to track performance levels, communicate issues, and document improvement actions and progress. The selection of measurement and rating criteria is crucial in implementing a common system to evaluate performance. Using this methodology greatly enhances the ability to establish performance baselines and levels of performance expectations. By using the formalized performance evaluation process, the research provided the following results:

- Evaluation, documentation, and tracking of performance levels over a periodic basis;
- Increased communication of issues with the vendor or contractor via a formal monthly performance review process;
- Documentation of improvement actions and remediation actions performed by the vendor;
- Accountability of the vendor

Although janitorial performance did have an overall improvement for the annual period, it did not reach the level of performance expected by XYZ Corporation. This may be the result of the vendor not being able to reach the level of performance desired by XYZ Corporation or as a result of the Corporation's expectations being too high due to not having any previous standards. However, the

research results were still successful in providing a positive change in the performance of the vendors providing services at the XYZ Corporation. The benefits of the research include the following areas addressed:

- The research provided an understanding and the application to solving a performance problem with the janitorial services.
- The research provided a uniform and objective process for measuring the performance of the service vendors and construction contractors.
- The research documented the level of performance being provided by the service vendors and contractors.
- The research provided a method to evaluate, measure, document, and drive continuous improvement actions for incumbent janitorial and construction service providers.
- Overall performance and quality increased for all service vendors and construction contractors.
- There was an added benefit of increased vendor and contractor safety at the XYZ site.
- The client management effort was greatly reduced with an added benefit of reduced stress.
- Overall motivation of the building service vendors and construction contractors improved by use of the process.
- The service vendors and construction contractors present cost-savings ideas.
- Customer satisfaction increased as a result of the performance measurement process.
- Efficiency of the vendor increased by continuous performance measurement.
- The research also resulted in the vendor assuming more risk and responsibility for poor performance.

Based on the results of the initial performance improvement research, the researcher identified an additional opportunity for improvement and successfully increased performance of the construction contractors providing services to the site by using the same methodology. The benefits resulting from the research continue to be realized as the implementation is expanded to all outsourced companies providing services in support of the FM department at the XYZ Corporation. Due to the success of the janitorial and construction services XYZ Corporation plans to expand the Scorecard performance process to other vendors such as security, landscaping and movers.



- Flynn, M. J. (1999). Outsourcing 101: A few simple instructions. *Facilities Design & Management*, 18, 38–41.
- Görzig, Bernd; Stephan, Andreas (2002) : Outsourcing and Firm-level Performance, DIW Discussion Papers, No. 309, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin
- Guercini, S., & Ranfagni, S. (2015). Buyer-seller interaction in facility services. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 25(2), 162–180. doi:10.1108/jstp-07-2013-0139
- Gunasekaran, A., Irani, Z., Choy, K., Filippi, L., & Papadopoulos, T. (2015). Performance measures and metrics in outsourcing decisions: A review for research and applications. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 161, 153–166. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.12.021
- Ikediashi, D., Ogunlana, S., & Bowles, G. (2013). A Conceptual Model for Analysing the Impact of Outsourcing Decision on FM Service-Level Performance. *Iccrem 2013*. doi:10.1061/9780784413135.1
- Ikediashi, D. I., Ogunlana, S. O., Boateng, P., & Okwuashi, O. (2012). Analysis of risks associated with facilities management outsourcing. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(4), 301–316.
- Incognito, J. D. (2002). Outsourcing: Ensuring survival with strategic global partners. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 1, 7–15.
- Kaipia, R., & Turkulainen, V. (2017). Managing integration in outsourcing relationships — The influence of cost and quality priorities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 61, 114–129. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2016.04.001
- Lok, K. L., & Baldry, D. (2015). Facilities management outsourcing relationships in the higher education institutes. *Facilities*, 33(13/14), 819–848. doi:10.1108/f-05-2014-0043
- Myeda, N. E. (2012). The sphere of performance measurement in strategic facilities management. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(3). doi:10.1108/jfm.2012.30810caa.001
- Rashid, H. (2016). Tools and methods to implement an effective outsourcing process to obtain a quality service: A case study of Itis shopping centre (Master's thesis). Laurea University of Applied Sciences.
- Sign, D., & Tiong, R.L.K. (2006). Contractor Selection Criteria: Investigation of Opinions of Singapore Construction Practitioners. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 132, 998–1008.
- Ukko, J., Tenhunen, J., & Rantanen, H. (2007). Performance measurement impacts on management and leadership: Perspective of management and employees. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 110, 39–51.
- Usher, N. (2004). Outsource or in-house facilities management: The pros and cons. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 2, 351–359.
- Wilson, D. (2002a). A facility for friction. *Supply Management*, 7, 17.
- Wilson, D. (2002b). Getting your facilities in order. *Director*, 56, 42.
- Zelasko, S. & Schexnayder, C. (2003). Competitive bid versus negotiated bid in commercial construction industry - One contractor's perspective. *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction*, 8, 118–121.