

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Flow of research methodology	16
Figure 1.2: Research design	17
Figure 2.1: Total asset management manual towards best practice	24
Figure 2.2: A schematic diagram showing the relationship between maintenance management systems and poor service delivery, poor user satisfaction and maintenance backlogs	28
Figure 2.3: Types of maintenance	33
Figure 2.4: The numbers of maintenance projects awarded in Malaysia	34
Figure 2.5: Allocation for repair and maintenance works in the Tenth Malaysian Plan (2011-2015), Ninth Malaysian Plan (2000- 2010) and Eighth Malaysian Plan (2001-2005)	35
Figure 2.6: Direct Labour Organisation	52
Figure 2.7: The traditional way of contracting out a project	67
Figure 2.8: The partnering way of contracting out a project	69
Figure 2.9: A Procurement Delivery System (PDS) selection process	88
Figure 2.10: Processes in procurement selection	90
Figure 2.11: The process of implementing a sourcing strategy	94
Figure 3.1: Classification of decision analysis methods	102
Figure 3.2: MCDM process	104
Figure 3.3: Hierarchy of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)	115
Figure 3.4: Theoretical Framework	129
Figure 4.1: Sequential Design	139
Figure 4.2: Example of questionnaire with scale of 1 to 9 to perform pair-wise comparison	164
Figure 5.1: Distribution of universities' age	174
Figure 5.2: Distribution of annual maintenance budget of university	178
Figure 5.3: Ranking of procurement methods currently employed in Malaysia's public universities	185
Figure 6.1: Decision Making Framework for Procurement Method Selection of Building Maintenance Management for Public Universities	204
Figure 6.2: Steps for adapting Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)	205
Figure 6.3: Hierarchy structure for selecting the most appropriate procurement method for building maintenance management of public universities in Malaysia	207
Figure 6.4: A model tree view of the decision hierarchy in Expert Choice software	213
Figure 6.5: The numeric pairwise comparison in Expert Choice software	214
Figure 6.6: The verbal pairwise comparison in Expert Choice software	214
Figure 6.7: The graphical pairwise comparison in Expert Choice software	214
Figure 6.8: Location of inconsistency value in Expert Choice	215
Figure 6.9: Sensitive Displays for Performance, Dynamics, Gradient and Head to Head performed by Expert Choice Software	216

## List of Tables

Table 2.1: Facilities management failures on managing building features	26
Table 2.2: Categorization of public universities in Malaysia	41
Table 2.3: Allocation for Malaysian’s public universities management	44
Table 2.4: Expenditure on Maintenance of Public University Buildings	45
Table 2.5: Advantages and disadvantages of In-house strategy	53
Table 2.6: Advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing strategy	55
Table 2.7: Advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing asset maintenance	56
Table 2.8: Objectives and anticipated outcomes of outsourcing	58
Table 2.9: Main obstacles and problems of outsourcing	59
Table 2.10: Comparison between outsourcing and out-tasking	66
Table 2.11: List of procurement methods identified	70
Table 2.12: Main Procurement selection criteria	72
Table 2.13: Procurement selection criteria	73
Table 2.14: Procurement Method Selection Criteria	74
Table 2.15: Criteria that customer seeks as important in quality measures	96
Table 3.1: Sample matrix for pairwise comparison	116
Table 3.2: Scale for pairwise comparison matrix	119
Table 3.3: The consistency index of a randomly generated reciprocal matrix within a scale of 1 to 9	121
Table 4.1: Differences between qualitative, quantitative and mixed method	134
Table 4.2: Alternative Strategies of Inquiry	136
Table 4.3: Public Universities’ Maintenance Department Name	145
Table 4.4: Pilot testing comments	150
Table 4.5: The structure of the questionnaire	151
Table 4.6: Summary of the details pertaining to the administration of the preliminary questionnaire survey	156
Table 4.7: Selected universities for structured interview	161
Table 4.8: Interviewees Profiles	162
Table 4.9: Dates of structured interview	166
Table 5.1: Distribution of respondents’ position	170
Table 5.2: Distribution of respondents’ working experience in building maintenance works	170
Table 5.3: Distribution of number of university buildings have been managed the respondents before this university	171
Table 5.4: Distribution of respondents’ education background	171
Table 5.5: Distribution of respondents’ highest academic background	171
Table 5.6: Summary of respondent’s particular and background	172
Table 5.7: Ownership of the university	173
Table 5.8: Distribution of size of the university built area	173
Table 5.9: Distribution of number of full time employee in the maintenance organization	176
Table 5.10: Relationship between size of the university built area and number of full-time employee in the maintenance organization	177

Table 5.11: Relationship between age of university and annual maintenance budget of university	179
Table 5.12: Relationship between the size of the university built area and annual maintenance budget of university	180
Table 5.13: Distribution on method to estimate universities' maintenance budget	180
Table 5.14: Ranking of procurement selection criteria	182
Table 5.15: Ranking of building maintenance procurement method	183
Table 5.16: Distribution on procurement methods currently employed in Malaysia's public universities	184
Table 5.17: Distribution on ways to select procurement method	186
Table 5.18: Distribution on reason to outsource building maintenance services	188
Table 5.19: Respondents' opinion on the adequacy of the number of employee for the selected procurement	189
Table 5.20: Respondents' opinion on the reasonability of procurement adapted	189
Table 5.21: Respondents' satisfaction with the procurement method employed	190
Table 5.22: Respondents' opinion on the statement that In-house is the most suitable procurement strategy for university as university should not expose to external parties	191
Table 5.23: The availability of guidance to select the most suitable procurement method	191
Table 5.24: The availability of decision making theory or tools in selecting procurement strategy for university	192
Table 5.25: The availability of useful procedure to select the most appropriate procurement method for building maintenance	193
Table 5.26: The suitability of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to be used as a tool to select the most suitable procurement method	194
Table 5.27: Ranking of measure of procurement method performance	195
Table 6.1: Final Procurement Method Selection Criteria	201
Table 6.2: Final Procurement Method Alternative	202
Table 6.3: List of criteria	208
Table 6.4: List of alternatives	209
Table 6.5: Scale for pairwise comparison matrix	211
Table 6.6: The Consistency Index (RI) of a randomly generated reciprocal matrix within a scale of 1 to 9	212
Table 6.7: Interviewees Profile	219
Table 6.8: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	223
Table 6.9: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	224
Table 6.10: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	224
Table 6.11: Result of Selection	225
Table 6.12: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	228
Table 6.13: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	230
Table 6.14: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	231
Table 6.15: Result of Selection	232

Table 6.16: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	235
Table 6.17: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	236
Table 6.18: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	238
Table 6.19: Result of Selection	239
Table 6.20: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	243
Table 6.21: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	244
Table 6.22: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	244
Table 6.23: Result of Selection	245
Table 6.24: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	249
Table 6.25: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	250
Table 6.26: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	250
Table 6.27: Result of Selection	251
Table 6.28: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	256
Table 6.29: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	257
Table 6.30: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	257
Table 6.31: Result of Selection	258
Table 6.32: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	261
Table 6.33: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	262
Table 6.34: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	263
Table 6.35: Result of Selection	264
Table 6.36: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	268
Table 6.37: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	269
Table 6.38: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	269
Table 6.39: Result of Selection	270
Table 6.40: All vector of priorities for main criteria, sub criteria and alternative	274
Table 6.41: Vector of overall priorities and ranking of Clients' Requirements sub criteria	275
Table 6.42: Vector of overall priorities with respect to main criteria	275
Table 6.43: Result of Selection	276
Table 6.44: Summary results to compare all interviewees' priority vector to select the most appropriate procurement method for different type of building maintenance services	277
Table 6.45: Summary results to compare all interviewees' priority vector to select the most appropriate procurement method for different type of building maintenance services	277
Table 6.46: Procurement Methods Comparison (Actual versus Proposed)	279
Table 6.47: Nine universities evaluation towards Decision Making Framework for Procurement Method Selection of Building Maintenance Management for Public Universities	281
Table 7.1: List of final procurement selection criteria	289

Table 7.2: List of final alternative	290
Table 7.3: Selected procurement selection criteria and procurement options for the proposed decision making framework	294