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Abstract

This paper examines the ‘outcomes’ of employing internal cleaning employees versus contract cleaning employees, employed in similar roles, in parallel organisations. In particular the focus of this research is in the areas of: the benefits/risks to the organisation; the management and control of contract workers; training and development; teamwork; job satisfaction; organisational commitment, the psychological contract; and the quality of service (tangible/intangible).

The research approach adopted for this thesis includes a case study of five University of Otago owned residential colleges – two of whom employ internal cleaning employees, and three of whom employ contract cleaning employees. Such a study is important in order to ascertain whether there is any variation in cost (particularly in the current economic climate) and furthermore to test for any differences between the two models of cleaning.

The research methods consisted of a wide review of relevant literature on contract employees versus internal employees on the afore mentioned research foci, coupled with the collection and analysis of relevant empirical data including data analysis, student surveys, and interviews with college management staff and cleaning staff.

The findings from this research provide evidence in relation to the research objectives and hypotheses between these two groups of employees. The findings underline that generally there is little difference in the cleaning service provided by internal cleaners and contract cleaners in terms of the quality of cleaning in the residential colleges. The main conclusions drawn from this study of cleaning employees are that both models (internal and contract) provide a very good to excellent level of cleaning. Costs comparisons were based on 2011 actual costs prorated over 44 weeks to equate to a cost per day, per student amount and also over 40 and 44 weeks respectively to calculate a cost per week, per student.
Generally it was found, based on the results from the comparative analysis, than on average contract cleaning is more cost effective than internal cleaning employees, when the number of locations and distance are factored in. There are also no HR costs associated with contract cleaners that internal employees attract. The findings underline that using contract cleaners is a more flexible arrangement, did not pose additional risk for the organisation nor was the management and control of contract cleaners an issue. Conversely these findings point to all of these factors aforementioned being a benefit of employing contract cleaners rather than internal employees.

As all University Colleges have the opportunity to host functions (internal and external to the University) in their respective colleges and to operate 52 weeks of the year – this aspect needs to be considered not only in the determination of using internal cleaners versus contract cleaners but also in the decision making of where functions should be held.

Although contracting out of services can expose an organisation to market forces there did not appear to be as many negative connotations as first thought when reviewing the literature in relation to contract employees for example: risk; lack of control; quality; staff turnover; teamwork, loyalty and commitment. This thesis recommends that organisations review their requirements and needs of the business and adopt the model that best serves their circumstances and the wider environment.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

Traditional work arrangements or standard work arrangements is the model of full-time work, carried out at the employer’s place of work, and under direction. Many factors affected the move from the ‘traditional or standard work’ arrangements and these changes began during the 1970’s, as a result of global economic changes which increased competition amongst businesses, and drove the need for flexibility. Non-standard or non-traditional employment relations refers to types of work arrangements that differ from standard or traditional work arrangements such as part-time, contract work, temporary, flexible, off-site etc. – sometimes referred to as alternative work arrangements (Kalleberg, 2000).

During the 1980’s, deregulation of the economy in New Zealand had a significant impact on the labour market, and resulted in major restructuring in many New Zealand organisations. The Employment Contracts Act 1991 (ECA) was introduced by the National Government “to promote an efficient labour market” (ECA, 1991). This contributed to the development of an environment where the “balance of power” shifted in favour of employers. High unemployment and weakened trade unions were also outcomes of the ECA and deregulation of the economy.

Employers actively pursued ways to improve the cost effectiveness in their workplace beyond the scope of employment legislation. Many businesses reviewed employment practices using the rationale of ‘restructuring’, ‘right sizing’, ‘downsizing’ in order to achieve greater efficiency, flexibility and to remain competitive in the market place. Economic uncertainty was the driver behind the need to review how businesses were operating with cost reduction being the primary objective to many of the changes.

The rationale behind these changes was to improve efficiency, and in turn promote the overall economy of the country. These types of changes were also taking place in the
United Kingdom and the United States with de-industrialisation in the UK resulting in huge levels of unemployment. There was also a change in economic activity; manufacturing of goods declined whilst service work increased. Other factors affecting the move were technological improvements in communication and IT systems which allowed for more flexible working arrangements, including off-site, and working from home opportunities (Saeger, 1997).

Prior to 1984, many New Zealand organisations could be viewed as being inefficient and labour was under-utilised. As change became necessary for New Zealand to be able to compete ‘globally’ in order to improve the New Zealand economy, the New Zealand Government set about an agenda of economic restructuring. Employers were encouraged to create flexible employment contracts suited to individual needs. Demographic changes in the workplace also played a part with more women returning to work, and older people who continued to work, preferring flexible working arrangements.

The public sector was where the most restrictive and inefficient employment practices were found, as previous governments had sought to combat national unemployment levels by merging employment in the public sector. Staff numbers in State Owned Enterprises (SOE’s) were halved between 1987 and 1991 (Kelsey, 1997). Part of the restructuring strategy resulted in the contracting out of some services and functions that were additional and able to be provided by existing external suppliers with what was perceived to be a competitive and cost-effective basis (Greene, 1999).

Flexible forms of labour such as casual, temporary labour or fixed-term employees is thought to expose organisations to less risk of ongoing employment, commitment and other associated costs. Contracting out or using independent contractors, rather than employees, shifts any risk to the contractor and sheds any employment issues.
Characteristics of flexible work may include:

- limited, extensive, irregular or uncertain hours of work;
- limited or uncertain duration of employment, thus giving relatively less job and income security;
- location of employment;
- poorer pay and working conditions;
- difficulty in identifying the employer. (Kalleberg, 2000)

The emphasis on businesses and organisations was to become more competitive and efficient, in order to meet the demands of domestic and global business environments, thus improving the NZ economy. Many businesses, in an effort to become more efficient, focused on labour costs and thus the growth of ‘flexible’ labour in the form of contracting out was perceived to be an attractive option.

While non-standard employment relations have been a feature of New Zealand labour market for some time, the introduction of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (ERA) resulted in some clarification to the nature of non-standard employment relations and widely publicised some issues relating to the use of non-standard employment arrangements (Dept. of Labour, 2005).

Alternative work arrangements impacts on a number of employment issues including organisation commitment and loyalty, the psychological contract, quality of work, management and control of work, impact on the social environment overall including culture, attitude, motivation, job satisfaction and teamwork.

1.2 Research Focus

This thesis will focus specifically on external employees (contractors) and internal employees, working in similar roles, in parallel organisations, and will seek to determine whether the outcomes are the same.
This study will be carried out in university owned residential colleges in Dunedin and therefore will fall within the ambit of New Zealand Employment Law.

Case studies of each organisation explore:

- Why the particular model was chosen;
- Has any thought been given to changing the model;
- What are the consequential advantages and disadvantages of the particular model;
  - For management?
  - For workers?
- Future considerations and possibilities.

The case studies and information gathering used interviews with college management staff, cleaning staff, and surveys of the students residing in the colleges.

1.3 Overall Research Aim and Individual Research Objectives

The purpose of the study is to determine whether it is more beneficial (tangible and intangible) for domestic (cleaning) staff in university owned residential colleges, to be directly employed by the colleges (i.e. university employees), or by employing external contract employees.

Currently, three university owned colleges have their own permanent domestic (cleaning) staff, whilst the remaining five university owned colleges employ external cleaning contracting companies.

There are varying schools of thought and debate on which method of service is more beneficial, not only in terms of costs, but also in relation to the impact on the respective college communities, and furthermore the management of the cleaning staff.

The focus of the study will be on service and quality within the college environment, and the outcomes for the students, college, division and university as a whole.
The information from the study will be of value to the colleges, the accommodation division and the University, to ascertain and measure, firstly the tangible benefits/costs and, secondly the impact the different types of employees, have on the college environment, and the variances within that, if any.

The study will consider:

- Benefits/Risks to the organisation including, tangible and intangible, between the different methods of service;
- Management and control of service provided;
- Impact on the social environment overall for example culture, loyalty, attitude, teamwork and the level, if any, of pastoral care provided to the students – focusing on the psychological contract, organisational commitment, job satisfaction and teamwork;
- Training and Development including Health and Safety;
- Quality of service provided (tangible and intangible).

This list is not exhaustive and many other aspects of HRM could be incorporated in the study, if it were not for time and resource constraints.

**Research Topic**

*Internal employees versus external employees (contractors): Are the ‘Outcomes’ the same?*

**Research Questions**

- *Does the use of a workforce comprising of university employed domestic cleaning staff result in a higher or lower level of service, and a higher or lower quality environment, as reported by college residents, than is the case where external (contracted) domestic cleaning staff are engaged?*
• Does the workers’ psychological contract, organisational commitment, job satisfaction, training/development and perspective, and teamwork in relation to their respective employment relationship, differ between the university employed cleaning staff, and the external cleaning staff, and if it does, to what extent?

This thesis does not try to suggest which is a better model i.e. internal employees or contract employees, but seeks to explore the differences and experiences of the two different employment structures. It aims to highlight objectives, advantages, disadvantages, considerations, risks and possibilities and may, in the future, suffice to provide a model for decision making in this area.

This thesis will contribute to an understanding as to why organisations may choose different options in terms of internal employees and contract employees.

Chapter 2 will focus on existing academic literature in relation to the research topic and will utilize the relevant areas to form and justify the research objectives in this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to review and examine existing academic literature to ascertain what is already known in the research area outlined in Chapter One. Existing literature will be used to develop an argument and justify why the research questions in this study are important and relevant. By exploring the relevant areas of literature, a significant contribution will be made to this research. The choice of using internal cleaners versus contract cleaners and the ensuing outcomes will be evaluated and examined. In effect, the value of studying the aforementioned literature areas will be to provide a meaningful discussion and analysis of the employment of two different types of employees described as internal and contract working in parallel organisations, in a structured way, to facilitate a critical understanding of any differences in the outcomes presented.

There are several reasons why organisations typically use external sources for the undertaking of work. These reasons can consist of: provision of specialist services; to absorb supply and demand; to reduce costs. Studies suggest that decisions to contract out are often made on an ad hoc basis (Greene, 1999). The threat of contracting out may be used to increase the efficiency and productivity of existing employees (Reilly and Tamkin, 1996; Pfeffer and Baron; 1988, Fevre, 1986).

This paper examines the ‘outcomes’ of external employees (contractors) versus internal employees, or non-standard employment relationships versus standard employment relationships. Literature defines ‘non-standard’ employment (also referred to as alternative work arrangements), as employment, that is not full-time or permanent (Tucker, 2002). ‘Non-standard’ work is increasing in New Zealand – data on trends in this area show a gradual increase in the last 15 years. There has also been an increase in ‘non-standard’ work in developed nations overseas (Tucker, 2002).
This paper focuses on contract workers versus internal workers, employed in similar roles, in parallel organisations. Of particular interest will be: the benefits/risks to the organisation; management and control of external/non-standard workers; psychological contract; organisational commitment; teamwork; job satisfaction; training and development, and service quality.

Recent empirical work has emphasised how outsourcing in certain sectors such as cleaning, catering and security has introduced a new regime of ‘precarious employment’ (Allen and Henry, 1997).

‘Precarious’ employment defined as employment that is low quality, and that encompasses a range of factors that put workers at risk of injury, illness and/or poverty (from low wages, low job security, limited control over workplace conditions and less opportunity for training and career progression (Burgess and Campbell, 1998; Rodgers and Rodgers, 1989).

Firstly this review seeks to identify any gaps in the research on the chosen topic and build arguments to justify the need for the research study and this review also emphasises the multidisciplinary nature of contributions to this field, including research by a variety of sociologists, psychologists, economists, labour markets, and organisations.

At the end of this major section it is hoped that a critical understanding of key issues is exhibited, that the reader is better informed in these areas and that there will emerge a clear focus, and justification, for empirical research in the field of the use of internal employees employee’s versus contract employee’s. This section will be addressed under the following headings:

- Benefits/Risks to the organisation;
- Management and control of service provided;
- Psychological contract, organisational commitment, job satisfaction;
Training and Development;
- Quality of service provided (tangible and intangible);
- Employment Relations Act.

2.1 Benefits to the organisation

One of the primary reasons for employment of contract staff is cost savings for an organisation, and the related benefits of a “hands-off” management approach, for example less recruitment costs, less performance management responsibilities, less commitment and support required from a managerial perspective, including supervision and training. “The decision to outsource is expected to lead to lower costs, better quality, or better service – preferably all three” (Allen and Chandrashekar, 2000:25).

As pointed out by (Kuvaas and Dysvik, 2009b; Moorman and Harland, 2002), the dilemma of the use of contract workers can be overcome by providing higher levels of organisational support, inducements and obligations, in turn, promoting greater positive behaviour and attitudes.

New Zealand organisations appear to be making decisions to contract out as a response to recessionary conditions rather than strategic initiative (Perry, 1990). Contracting out of activities had been significant during the period 1985-1991, and although more common in the public sector, increased significantly in the private sector between 1991 and 1995 (Brosnan and Walsh, 1996).

Abraham & Taylor (1996) found that contracting saved costs especially when used for activities undertaken by an organisation’s non-core workforce and inferred that there is little reason to pay high wages to workers who are easily monitored and replaced, or who perform work (such as janitorial services) that is peripheral to an organisation’s main activity.
Reilly and Tamkin (1996) assert that it could be perceived or presumed, that an activity can be provided more effectively if it is exposed to competitive pressure; that in-house service provision is, by mere definition, less efficient.

Flexibility in length of contract is an advantage for the management of the organisation, as this can be increased or decreased as required. From the management perspective there are cost savings in the form of fewer benefits needing to be provided to the employee, less commitment and less protection required for the employee.

The use of contract workers can reduce labour costs and time spent on hiring, training and evaluating employees (Gallagher and Sverke, 2005). Although there can be financial benefits with outsourcing, there are also nonfinancial benefits which have received less attention in the literature. Outsourcing can promote competition among external suppliers and it can also spread risk (Quinn, 1992), whereby the outsourcer is able to charge contractors/suppliers when market conditions demand outsourcing allows for a quick response to changes in the environment (Dess, Rasheed, McLaughlan, Priem and Robinson, 1995). Capacity management for an organisation is also an advantage, for example when internal employees may not be able to manage the logistics of a large function or conference, a contract company could call on additional resources to manage the extra work.

Blaxill and Hout (1991) argued that outsourcing peripheral activities would free up human and capital resources as well as allow for increased flexibility in the way labour is employed. Coyle-Shapiro and Purcell (1999) assert it is possible to envisage circumstances in which the consequences of outsourcing are seen as generally positive, rather than leading to ‘precarious’ forms of employment, it may provide greater stability and predictability.
2.2 Risks to the organisation

The perceived risks to the organisation are varied. They include: a perception of less commitment from the contract employee who may not have the same motivations as an internal employee. There is also less scope for a trust based relationship between the employee/employer, and in turn there may be lower levels of trust and commitment. There may be health and safety issues due to indifferent training on-site thus affecting performance, compared to inductions and socialisation an internal employee might receive.

Allen and Henry (1997) allude to outsourcing or contracting out of work may be associated to ‘precarious’ employment thus affecting employee attitudes, behaviour and commitment. In a study of the integration of contract workers with full-time host company employees, Pesek, Grunewald, and Reed (1997) reported that the contract workers received significantly lower training and orientation and were less conversant with the mission of the firm, resulting in some of these contract workers failing to perform.

Kochen, Smith, Wells, Rebitzer, (1994) in their investigations of contract work on petrochemical companies found that managers were advised by their lawyers not to train contract workers, or to supervise them closely, in order to avoid co-employment liabilities. This created a fragmented system of managerial responsibility for training, supervision, and overseeing direct-hire vs. contract workers. Rebitzer (1995) found that clients assumed that the contract companies trained their employees which was often a dubious assumption that resulted in more accidents involving contract workers. Kochan et al (1994) concluded that both these studies highlight some of the negative aspects of using contract workers, such as lack of training, low trust, and low commitment.
The use of contract workers can run conversely to ‘best practice’ human resource management practices, aiming at creating a highly committed and motivated workforce (Hall, 2006; Kuvaas and Dysvik, 2009b). There were also tensions between direct-hire and contract workers, and between management and labour, as unions charged that contract workers were used to reduce unions’ presence in firms, and to provide cheaper and less trained workers.

Other risks associated with the employment of contract (external) workers can be limited knowledge of the employee’s background for example skills, experience and knowledge. There may also be concerns with confidentiality and security as contract worker’s employment tends to be of a shorter duration than internal employee’s (Kochen, Smith, Wells, Rebitizer, 1994).

Allen and Chandrashekar (2000:31) contend that “a potential problem of utmost concern regarding outsourcing is the exposure of contract workers to proprietary or confidential information. The risk can occur at any time, such as when custodial workers are exposed in their routine, day-to-day tasks”.

Health and safety may be a concern associated with contractors due to lack of training and induction particularly of on-site hazards and site specific risks. Health and safety is relevant to the organisation, regardless of whether the employee is external or internal, however it could be assumed that the investment would be greater for internal employees, than external employees.

Beck (2000) described the growth of contract work as shifting the risk from the employing organisation to the individual, in other words, contract workers can be portrayed as marginal and disadvantaged. This has led the European Union legislation to ensure employment rights for contract workers parallel those for permanent employees.
It would appear that there are both benefits and risks to the organisation associated with the employment of contract workers. Perceived benefits of lower labour costs, training and recruitment costs, increased productivity and quality of service, less supervision, and flexibility are the main reasons organisations move towards non-standard working arrangements. In contrast, risks to the organisation may include low trust and commitment, loyalty, confidentiality and security, and health and safety issues depending on skills, experience and training.

Therefore one of the aspects examined in this research will be: *Do the beneficial outcomes of employing contract workers exceed the risks to the organisation?*

### 2.3 The Management and Control of Contract Workers

Managers must learn to ‘manage the contract, not the contractor’ i.e. the organisations manager has no direct authority to control or supervise the contract employee thus managers need to keep an arms-length relationship towards contract workers.

Allen and Chandrashekar (2000:25) state that “company managers agree that successful outsourcing requires a shift in mindset: They must manage paper (contracts) rather than workers”.

Other issues for managers of contract workers are:

- Monitoring and control resulting in a decline of service levels;
- Standard of service may vary or differ;
- Problem resolution;
- Disruption of new workers etc.;
- Unfamiliar with protocol and processes;
- Dilution of company culture and/or a clash of cultures between contractors/internal employees;
- Contractual limitations for example only perform stated duties or work to rule.
Management of contract workers requires different skills than the management of internal employees, and managers will need to adapt to this interface by “retraining and managing” its own employees. Managers will need to resist trying to manage contract workers as they would their internal employees, for example personnel problems with contract workers must be taken up with the contract company.

Co-employment occurs when contract workers assume the same roles and responsibilities as the organisations internal employees, but without the benefits and privileges internal employees accrue. Greene (1999) suggests that a main advantage to employers of employing internal employees is control; a relative lack of control is therefore a major disadvantage of using contractors. However economic conditions and supply and demand will have an effect on the relative power of the parties.

It would seem that the main advantage of managing internal employees over external employees is the function of control i.e. internal employees can be directed and controlled by their direct employer whereas contract employees can only be controlled in terms of ‘what to do’ rather than ‘how to do it’. Internal employees also have the advantage of the knowledge of the organisation’s culture, policies, work practices and procedures on formal and informal levels.

Where contract companies supervise their employees’ work, the degree of control exercised by the client may not always be clear-cut. Holmes (1996) purports that contracting arrangements are used for various reasons i.e. to meet increased demand, to provide skills that are not available in-house, and to reduce costs and these reasons may overlap as shown in Harrison and Kelley’s (1993) study of subcontracting in the meat working industry.

There can be tensions between direct-hire employees and contract employees, and between management and the employees where lines cross over in relation to authority and delegation.
Employing contractors raises questions about who controls the employee, gives direction, employs and dismisses. Contract workers or agency workers as referred to by (Biggs and Swailes, 2006) are in a triangular relationship between the employment agency who hires them, the organisation they work for, as well as themselves.

Therefore one of the aspects examined in this research will be: Does the employment of contract workers in an organisation make the overall management of the organisation more difficult because it involves a third party?

2.4 Psychological Contract

Psychological contracts exist between organisations and its members i.e. ‘the employment relationship’ which is about trust between the employee and the employer – usually an unspoken and unwritten contract or an “unwritten set of expectations”. The psychological contract has re-emerged as a framework for understanding the implications of current pressures on organisations and their responses on the employment relationship (Coyle-Shapiro and Purcell, 1999).

The psychological contract plays an important role between the employee/employer relationship, and represents individual beliefs in a reciprocal obligation, between the individual and the organisation (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994). Rousseau (1989) asserts psychological contracts are highly subjective as they are based on a particular individual/employee’s belief. The concept of a psychological contract is tied to the individual’s commitment to the organisation. Past research on the psychological contract focused on stable careers with one employer where employment was secure, promotional prospects and employee’s loyalty was valued. The psychological contract at no time encompassed casual and contract labour in such industries as tourism, construction, manufacturing sectors, the fashion industry and entertainment, nor industrial workers (Hendry and Jenkins, 2007).
As organisations change by downsizing, outsourcing and other efficiency drives – reported effects focus on the demise of the old and the emergence of a new psychological contract as the foundation for the employer-employee exchange relationship (Rousseau, 1989, 1995; Sims, 1994; Sparrow, 1996).

As the proportion of the workforce employed in non-standard employment agreements increases due to greater flexibility – “Such staff, (non-standard) has a different psychological contract with the organisation than their permanent counterparts. These differences, they argue, will influence staff attitudes and behaviour” (Rousseau and Libuser, 1997).

Increased use of non-standard working arrangements has implications for the psychological contract or the reciprocal relationship between employee and employer. Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2002) found that permanent employees reported significantly higher numbers of obligations and inducements than did ‘temporary’ employees which in turn affected levels of organisational support. “Advantages to workers of employee status are largely associated with job and income stability and security, employment benefits and opportunities for training and advancement” (Nisbet, 1997:465).

Rousseau and Parks (1993) infer there has been a shift from ‘relational contracts’ based on company-specific skills, long-term career development, and training – to ‘transactional contracts’ which focus on short-term financial relationships and low emotional commitment by employees. Research on human resource management practices suggests that two dimensions of employment relationships, trust and commitment, are preconditions for organisational innovation and productivity gains (Lowe, 1999). Guest (2004) espouses that there has been a limited number of studies exploring the relationship between employment contracts and the psychological contract.
The literature would suggest that alternative work arrangements or flexible work appear to offer limited scope for creating a trust-based relationship, compared with ongoing and full-time employment, thus affecting the psychological contract, and in turn organisational commitment. However available evidence suggests that the psychological contract of workers on flexible employment contracts was as positive and sometimes more so than workers on permanent contracts. Also it appeared that the state of the psychological contract is more strongly associated with attitudes and behaviour than is the employment contract.

Therefore one of the aspects examined in this research will be: *Is the psychological contract of contract employees weaker than internal employees, which in turn, affects the commitment to the organisation?*

### 2.5 Organisational Commitment

Organisational commitment influences employee behaviour and attitude thus affecting the overall culture and efficiency of the organisation. Literature suggests that the level of organisational commitment differs between permanent employees and contracted employees due to the different nature of the psychological contract between employee and the organisation.

Studies of the holiday industry undertaken by McDonald and Makin (1999) found obvious links between the psychological contract and the individual’s commitment to the organisation. The main objective of their study was to examine the differences between the psychological contracts of permanent and non-permanent employees. The results of their study were surprising and contradict Rousseau’s and other findings. Results identified were entirely unexpected: There were no significant differences between the permanent and non-permanent staff in the overall levels of the psychological contract. On the measure of commitment between the two groups of workers – the levels of commitment of the non-permanent staff were significantly higher than the permanent staff, and also the job satisfaction was higher among the
non-permanent staff. McDonald and Makin (1999) concluded that their findings may lie in the length of time the non-permanent staff have spent with the organisation and “anticipatory socialisation” i.e. the observance and commitment to the norms, symbols and rituals of the group because they have a high desire to become a permanent part of the group.

“Little is known about organisational commitment among employees working under contracted conditions” (Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow, 2006:3). According to Pfeffer and Baron (1998) contractors are perceived to have a lack of commitment, attachment or loyalty to the organisation. McClurg (1999) maintained that contract workers are expected to have a dual commitment to the contract company, and to the third party employer. McElroy et al (2001) propose there is evidence to suggest that contracted employees develop feelings of commitment toward the client organisation.

Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow (2006) examined how contracted employees regard their formal employer, the contractor, and, second, contracted employees’ perceptions of the client organisation. Results of this study indicated that fair treatment, organisational supportiveness and fulfilled promises are thought to create an obligation that employees seek to reciprocate. Specifically, employees can reduce their indebtedness by enhancing their affective attachment to the organisation.

The relationship between temporary employment and organisational commitment has been investigated, and affective commitment as an emotional attachment to the organisation, is an attitude that encourages lower absenteeism, turnover and associated intentions, higher job satisfaction, organisational behaviour in terms of culture and norms and job performance (Chambel and Sobral, 2011). Employees showing high organisational commitment display higher degrees of satisfaction, and are more likely to behave in such a manner that it enhances the organisational competitive advantage (Cohen, 2003; Meyer et al., 2002).
Previous literature has examined dual allegiance and multiple foci of commitment by examining the commitment of contingent employees to their agencies and client organisations (Liden, Wayne, Kraimer, Sparrowe, 2003). Liden et al (2003) sought to explore the dual commitment to agency and client organisation among contingent employees. Results supported the proposition that contingent employees develop attachments to both their agencies and their client organisations.

Findings were also consistent with the argument that individuals develop attachments to different areas of commitment (Becker, 1992: Reichers, 1986), and that those areas of commitment may differ in their impact on work-related outcomes (Becker, Billings, Eveleth and Gilbert, 1996).

Blau (1964) purports that perceived organisational support (POS) is grounded in social exchange and POS signals employees’ perceptions in terms of the organisation’s level of commitment to them, and in support of the norm of reciprocity, a positive relationship was found between POS and organisational affective commitment (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002).

Social exchange theory suggests that a person who receives a benefit is under a strong obligation to repay it in some way. Therefore when this is apparent in an employee/employer relationship for example, additional training, extra leave, this has a positive effect on commitment to the organisation and in turn linking with the psychological contract (McDonald and Makin, 2000).

Social exchange theory is one of the most influential conceptual frameworks for understanding attitudes and behaviours in organisations according to Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005). Shore and Wayne (1993) suggest that a growing strand of research on organisational commitment is based on social exchange theory. Gouldner (1960) implies that one framework that is grounded in social theory, is psychological contracts. Liden et al (2003) research also supported (Shore’s, 1995) findings that
Managers’ assessments of employee commitment are related to employee altruistic behaviour thus underscoring the importance of the dual commitment model.

Therefore research would imply the social exchange theory or reciprocity between the employee and the employer, affects the level of commitment to the organisation.

Studies undertaken by McClurg (1999), Smith (1998), Feather and Raute (2004) were inconclusive, finding no significant differences between the levels of organisational commitment between permanent and temporary workers. Ward et al (2001) argue that because agency workers are only working for a third party employer for a limited amount of time, their organisational (that they are doing the actual work for) commitment will be lower, than that of permanent workers.

In discussing findings from various studies of permanent workers, Biggs et al (2006:130) noted that “Organisational commitment had a strong positive correlation with job satisfaction. Being valued no matter what the employment contract or position was also associated with job satisfaction”.

There are mixed results from studies undertaken on whether organisational commitment is greater in standard (internal) employees than non-standard (contract) employees. Results suggest that the level of organisational commitment is linked to the psychological contract, and the social exchange theory, for both types of employees. Also that being valued at work, and having feelings of attachment, associate strongly with organisational commitment.

Research exists about the relative importance a worker may place on different aspects of work commitment as well as the measurement and interrelationships between the various forms of work-related commitment for example organisational vs. occupational commitment, or union vs. employer commitment, or in terms of a contract employee – client organisation or contract organisation commitment which this research will address.
Therefore one of the aspects examined in this research will be: *Do internal employees have greater commitment to the organisation (College) than contract (external) employees?*

### 2.6 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is relevant to both non-standard and standard employees in the organisation, and will impact on worker relationships, and in turn organisational commitment. This section will also incorporate teamwork in relation to internal cleaners and contract cleaners in respective organisations.

The relationship between organisational commitment and job satisfaction has received much attention and a moderate to strong correlation is usually observed (Bateman, Senior and Swailes, 2002).

Biggs et al (2005:138) found that “Organisational commitment had a strong positive association with being valued. Being valued no matter what the employment contract or position was also associated with job satisfaction. Demonstrating how worker relations, which in turn influence organisational commitment, have a large influence on the level of job satisfaction reported, even if the work is not particularly stimulating”.

Some of the factors affecting non-standard workers level of job satisfaction may be the lack of:

- Social interaction;
- Inclusion;
- Networking opportunities;
- Feelings of loyalty;
- Feelings of ‘belonging’.
A natural assumption would be that internal workers have greater job satisfaction than contract workers, primarily based on a ‘sense of belonging’, higher levels of trust, and social relationships.

Biggs et al (2005) found that both agency workers and permanent workers are likely to develop affective feelings about the same aspects of their job so general job satisfaction as a concept, is relevant to both parties. This assumption is based on internal employees’ perception of job security, employment rights and benefits and the advantage of being able to be in a collective group.

In a study of contract cleaners in Australia by Campbell and Peeters, (2008) results found that the dominant profile for cleaning work is low pay, compressed schedules and high work intensity. Problems faced by contract cleaners include short hours in individual jobs, broken and short shifts, high work intensity, high workloads, and the irregularity of jobs and schedules. The low wages are also eroded by costs of travel to various sites, often at unsocial hours. Contract cleaning jobs come with explicit workloads and norms of performance such as quality, work effort and cleaning a certain amount in a given timeframe.

Campbell and Peeters (2008) discuss the vulnerability of these workers i.e. contract cleaners in Australia and the competitive drive for contract cleaning companies which leads to work intensification and the lowering of existing employment standards. Cleaning of large premises for example office buildings, schools, and hospitals can be done within the framework of varied employment relationships. In the past, cleaning was generally undertaken by ‘in house’ employees, but nowadays the work is often outsourced to a company that provides cleaning services on a contract basis (Campbell and Peeters, 2008). Contract cleaners interviewed in their study indicated the hazards and complexities many had with juggling the low pay with welfare payments, and their willingness to put up with the poor pay and conditions to avoid the stigmatism associated with being on welfare.
Ryan (2012) explored ‘Teamworking’ and the reorganisation of work in commercial cleaning in Australia and said cleaning work is depicted as being an area of low pay, compressed schedules, underemployment, high workloads and high work intensity.

Whether cleaning is carried out by internal cleaners or contract cleaners – it is labour intensive work and often undervalued. In the residential colleges, cleaners ‘silently or invisibly’ make things clean, often while residents are sleeping or in class, so some may not see the desired outcome, as the cleaning in this type of environ is a moving target, as in any environ. However a number of these issues would be apparent for internal cleaning employees also in relation to low pay, part-time work, weekend rosters (at times), and high work intensity. Although some cleaning employees may be satisfied with short hours, linked to one contract or one employer – many cleaners are looking for employment that provides a living wage.

Kaiser (2002) explored job satisfaction among workers on different kinds of employment contract compared with permanent employees using data from the European Household Panel Survey for 1994-1997 to explore this issue across European countries. Kaiser (2002) found that those on permanent contracts reported higher overall job satisfaction but found that there was a lot of variation between countries.

Guest and Conway (2002) studied the impact the type of employment contract and the state of the psychological contract have on the measure of life satisfaction, including health. The results, replicated over several years, consistently show a significant association between the state of the psychological contract and life satisfaction in general, including assessments of health and work-life balance.

The literature reviewed suggests mixed results with regard to job satisfaction between different types of employee’s in relation to cleaning work.
In order to test the assumptions around job satisfaction differences between internal and external employees one of the aspects examined in this study will be: *Does job satisfaction differ between contract workers and internal employees?*

### 2.7 Training and Development

The growth of contingent work has important implications for training and human resource development within organisations. Firms are more likely to invest in employee training when anticipated payoffs are high (Lowe, 1999).

It is likely that internal employees will be involved in a more comprehensive training and induction plan which would include socialisation of norms and firm-specific training, that contract employees would normally be excluded from. This would in turn have an impact on the type of culture within the organisation, team building, loyalty and the feeling of being an ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’.

Investigations of contract work carried out by Kochan et al (1994) found that managers of petrochemical companies were advised not to train contract workers or to supervise them closely, in order to avoid co-employment liabilities. This created a fragmented system of managerial responsibility for training, supervision, and overseeing direct-hire vs. contract workers. Rebitzer (1995) found that clients assumed that the contract companies trained their employees, which was often a dubious assumption that resulted in more accidents involving contract workers.

Investment in employees (whether external or internal) may well have a positive impact on the employee’s attitude to the organisation, and consequently affect productivity and motivation. Training and development of employees also serves as an important intrinsic motivator associated with job satisfaction and moreover, organisational commitment.
McLean et al (1998) argue that the benefits from using externalised workers, such as lower labour costs and more scheduled flexibility (Houseman et al, 1998), come at a price for the organisation, in that externalised (i.e. part-time, contract, or agency) workers are less likely to internalise the organisation’s values, perhaps leading to lower productivity.

However mixed results from a number of studies indicated that it is the individual’s perception of whether or not he or she is an ‘outsider’, and not the fact of actually being an ‘outsider’, that influences attitudes and behaviours.

“During the initial employment entry process, workers are likely to form opinions about how the organisation treats employees. This is the time when psychological contracts, defined as beliefs about the expectations in the employee-employer relationship (e.g. Rousseau, 1989, 1995), may develop” (Stamper and Masterson, 2002:877).

One of the benefits to the organisation of employing contract workers is the lower costs associated with recruitment and induction/training costs incurred with internal standard employees. However, this initial training and socialisation may enhance the environment and safety of the organisation, and encourage a ‘sense of belonging’.

Training has been considered a critical human resource management tool for promoting employees’ affective commitment towards the organisation which may result on lower absenteeism, turnover, greater job satisfaction and general loyalty and allegiance towards the organisation (Chambel and Sobral, 2011).

The literature reviewed provided varied results in relation to the investment of training and development in internal employees and contracted employees and the consequent effect on employee commitment this may have.

Therefore one of the aspects examined in this research study will be: Does the level of training and induction differ between contract employees and internal employees?
2.8 Service Quality

Quality and service are issues that are often perceived to be in conflict with costs. Often the ability to provide cost efficient services will be perceived as providing a lower standard or quality of service. Compromised quality is a factor that may be associated with contractors, as a result of cost pressures (Benson, 1998; James, 1992).

Measurement of service quality and processes is reliant, to a certain degree, on tangible and intangible dimensions. For example – cleaning in the university residential colleges, most of which is tangible and therefore can be measured by the standard of cleaning, security, reliability, quality and delivery, and privacy aspects. Tangible or ‘physical quality’ refers to physical facilities and features e.g. cleanliness, tidiness, comfort, service – that which can be measured. Intangible aspects would relate to the manner in which it is carried out, for example attitude, demeanour, teamwork, culture and friendliness which can be difficult to measure and quantify.

Empirical studies carried out by Santos (2002) showed that there is a positive relationship between the level of tangible components in a service industry, and the importance of a tangible dimension. Although intangibility is certainly a key characteristic of services, tangibility performs an important role, particularly in service industries which have high tangible components. A certain degree of tangibility and intangibility exists in both service process and service output.

Difficulties arise in measuring and controlling service quality due to:

- Service quality being difficult to measure as many factors affect perceptions of service quality between individuals;
- Most services have intangible elements which are difficult to measure thus making research results unreliable.

Often when measuring service quality outputs – end results are measured and the components contributing to this are neglected.
Service quality based on complaints from customers, reflect gaps between customer expectations and perceived service performance and, therefore, represent elements of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction and behavioural intentions. Although complaints can be viewed as a measure of service quality (or lack thereof), the more “visible” elements of the wider service offered are associated more with perceived service quality than with the actual service provided (Ozment and Morash, 1994). Further results from Santos (2002) studies suggested that managers did not always share the same perceptions as their customers and held differing views on how they perceived tangible and intangible dimensions of the service provided.

Johnson, Tsiros and Lancioni (1995) found that some companies take a more holistic view of the service production process. For example, McDonald’s audits over 12,000 restaurants that operate under the franchise worldwide on a quarterly basis. Included in this audit is an evaluation of physical facilities and other service production resources (e.g. atmosphere, cleanliness, seating arrangements, and operating hours), customer-employee interactions (e.g. politeness, friendliness, and courtesy of the sales staff), and end results (e.g. correctness of the order, quality and taste of the food, speed of order taking and processing; see The McDonald’s Corporation, (1992). “When there is a close interaction between a service employee and a customer, the manner in which the service is performed is often more important that what is actually delivered” (Ozment and Morash, 1994:354).

Whilst the cleaning service provided in residential colleges has tangible or physical qualities that can be measured, there is no tangible outcome that can be held physically nor measured. There is insufficient evidence from the literature to suggest that there is a difference in the service quality between contract employees and internal employees.

Therefore one of the aspects to be examined in this research study will be: Does the quality of service (tangible and intangible) differ between contract employees and internal employees?
2.9 Employment Relations Act 2000 (ERA) Part 6A Vulnerable Workers

The ERA defines some employees as “vulnerable workers”. These employees, who were deemed the ones most likely to be made redundant through “contracting out” of basic jobs, attract special protections if that occurs. Employees may elect to transfer their employment to the organisation where the work has been transferred. A vulnerable employee includes the following categories of employees:

a. Cleaning services, food catering services, caretaking or laundry services for the education, aged-care and health services;
b. Orderly services in the aged-care sector;
c. Cleaning services or food catering services in the public sector or local government sector;
d. Cleaning services or food catering services in relation to any airport facility or for the aviation sector, and
e. Cleaning services or food catering services in relation to any other place of work. The new employer must decide how to best manage their resources. This may involve making transferred employees redundant.

(N.Z. Employment Relations Act, 2000)

Therefore internal cleaning employees in the residential colleges would fall within this ambit and be deemed to be ‘vulnerable workers’ under N.Z. employment law.

In the past, cleaning was generally carried out by direct (in house) employees of the organisation, but nowadays the work is more often outsourced to a specialist company that provides cleaning services on a contract basis. Usually the work is tendered with specifications of the services required (including tasks, methods, and preferred hours of cleaning) and contract cleaning companies compete to win the tender. The competition is often fierce and normally the successful company will be the one offering the lowest prices. The use of contractors rather than employees allows
employers to ‘opt out’ and could be perceived as an easy option. Converting existing employees into contractors becomes an attractive strategy (Ryan and Herod, 2006).

Studies undertaken in Australia by Campbell and Peeters (2008) of contract cleaning companies and workers, suggest that these employees are vulnerable as contract cleaning companies and strive to survive in a very competitive industry. Contract cleaning is an industry that is relatively easy for individual workers as well as contract firms to enter because the industry is known for a constant turnover of contracts, firms and workers, minimal qualification and skill requirements, and jobs with hours that can be quite short, can be attractive to certain types of workers, such as students, second job holders, and individual supplementing their income from a benefit. The writers describe this industry as turbulent and unstable and whilst firms are often small and short-lived – this offers a favourable environment for illegal practices such as ‘cash jobs’ and avoidance of certain regulations such as employee’s visa conditions and/or the breach of the conditions in relation to social security benefits.

The power of the push towards intensification and lower standards seems particularly strong in Australia. According to Ryan and Herod (2006:494) “the dismantling of the award system and the growth of individualised contracts have meant that labour cost-cutting practices adopted by a number of firms are spreading widely and quickly”.

The union has identified clear cases of deterioration of wages and conditions (Walsh, 2004). Campbell and Peeters (2008) contend it is likely that the wages and working conditions of cleaners will continue to be exposed to downward pressure. Contract cleaners, who work for contract cleaning companies, are a significant group of low-paid workers in Australia.

This section on vulnerable workers is not addressed further in the research. It was included to inform and explain that internally employed university cleaners are deemed to be ‘vulnerable workers’ under N.Z. Employment law.
By using a case study I seek to explore the reason why each organisation chose to adopt the particular model of cleaning employee and the implications this model has for the organisation/management and the workers themselves.

2.10 Literature Review Summary

Research Topic: **Internal employees versus external employees (contractors): Are the ‘Outcomes’ the same?**

The following research questions will be addressed in the study:

- **Do the beneficial outcomes of employing contract workers exceed the risks to the organisation?**

- **Does the employment of contract workers in an organisation make the overall management and control of the organisation more difficult?**

- **Is the psychological contract of contract workers weaker than internal employees, which in turn, affects the commitment to the organisation etc.?**

- **Do internal employees have greater commitment to the organisation than contract employees?**

- **Does job satisfaction differ between contract employees and internal employees?**

- **Does the level of training and induction differ between contract employees and internal employees?**

- **Does the quality of service (tangible and intangible) differ between contract employees and internal employees?**
The following hypotheses will be addressed in this study:

**H1.** Contract cleaning employees in university owned residential colleges will be more cost effective than internally employed cleaners – including less time consuming and requiring less resources than the management of internal employees.

**H2.** Employment of contract cleaning employees is a more flexible arrangement than internal cleaning staff.

**H3.** Contract cleaning employees pose more risk for the client organisation as they have been employed by a third party.

**H4.** Management and control of contract cleaning employees, with regard to performance issues and problem resolution is more difficult as it involves a third party.

**H5.** Internal employees will have greater organisational commitment due to a higher level of psychological contract as a result of organisational benefits namely intrinsic and extrinsic benefits.

**H6.** Internal employees will have greater job satisfaction as they feel like an ‘insider’ in the organisation and therefore ‘belong’.

**H7.** Internal employees will have better internal induction, socialisation and on-site training specific to the organisation’s culture and expectations.

**H8.** There will be no significant difference between the two groups of employees with regard to the quality of service provided (tangible/measurable).

**H9.** Quality of service provided (intangible) will be greater from the internal employees due to greater commitment, job satisfaction, teamwork and a greater feeling of loyalty generated from ‘belonging’.
H10. The psychological contract will be stronger for the internal employees due to greater commitment, job satisfaction, and a greater sense of loyalty due to ‘belonging’.

Chapter 3 details the methodology adopted in answering these questions and exploring these issues.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses and justifies the research strategy (a case study) and data collection techniques (financial data, structured interviews, survey) to be adopted in the empirical collection of data for this study. Details on the sites and samples are provided, together with a framework for analysis of the qualitative data and quantitative data. In addition, the limitations of the adopted approach to this research are discussed, in terms of validity and reliability, as well as potential problems related to implementing a case study at University of Otago Residential Colleges.

The research strategy used to implement the empirical research is a case study. The case study will allow an in-depth study of an essential service provided in residential colleges owned by the University of Otago. Yin (2003:13) defines a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”. Within this definition Yin is trying to distinguish a case study from other research strategies. The case study approach provides the focus that is required and emphasizes the complexity of study which looks at employee’s views, the stakeholder’s views, and the over-arching consideration of efficiency and quality which goes hand-in-hand with research of this nature (Yin, 2003).

The case study is not without its limitations or critics and these need to be addressed i.e. the researcher needs to be aware of the difficulty of making generalisations from case studies (Adelman et al, 1977; Borg, 1981). Bassey (1981:85) is a strong supporter of the concept of relatibility “(where other institutions in relating to situational aspects of the case study and recognising similar issues and problems described in this research work can learn from the findings) and believes that ‘relatibility of a case study is more important than its generalisability’”. 
### 3.1 Research Areas and Methods of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Methods of Analysis</th>
<th>Methods of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Benefits/ risks to the organisation of the two types of employees including costs comparisons (tangible and intangible) between the two methods of cleaning service and the management of the service.** | Interview college management staff  
  Interview cleaning staff individually | Data analysis - review and analyse financial reports to ascertain recruitment and payroll Costs  
  Survey students |
| **Impact on the social environment incorporating psychological contract, organisational commitment, job satisfaction.** | Interview College management staff  
  Interview cleaning staff individually | Survey students  
  Data analysis |
| **Quality of service provided**                                               | Interview College management staff  
  Interview cleaning staff individually | Survey students  
  Data analysis |
| **Training and development**                                                  | Interview College management staff  
  Interview cleaning staff individually | Data analysis of results  
  Review procedures |
| **Internal employee/external employee relationship within the organisation**  | Interview College management staff  
  Interview cleaning staff individually | Data analysis of results  
  Compare employment contracts and arrangements |
3.2 Sampling Plan

Case studies were undertaken of five university owned residential colleges – two of whom directly employ their own domestic cleaning staff, and the other three colleges that employ contract cleaning staff. This study is of interest and value to the colleges, the accommodation division and the university, and it is envisaged that this increased participation levels and information sharing, particularly from the college staff.

The sampling units were the students, the management staff of the five colleges and the cleaning staff. The students were surveyed and the management staff were interviewed individually. The cleaners were interviewed individually. Quantitative analyses was undertaken of the financial data to make comparisons. Note LC2 cleaning staff were not interviewed at the request of the contract cleaning company due to English being a second language for the majority of these people.

Yin (2003:89) asserts that “interviews are essential sources of case study information, principally because most case studies are human affairs and that interviews can provide insights into complex situations”.

The residential colleges have been coded to maintain anonymity for all parts of the research:

**SC** = Small College, Contract Cleaning

**SI** = Small College, Internal Cleaning

**LC1** = Large College, Contract Cleaning

**LC2** = Large College, Contract Cleaning

**LI** = Large College, Internal Cleaning
The target populations considered for the purposes of this study are:

**SC** – 161 students, employ external contracted cleaning staff

**SI** – 187 students, employ their own cleaning staff

**LC1** – 401 students, employ external contracted cleaning staff

**LC2** – 313 students, employ external contracted cleaning staff

**LI** - 518 students, employ their own cleaning staff

### 3.3 Research Instruments

#### 3.3.1 Survey

On-line surveys were conducted with students living in the five residential colleges pertinent to this thesis. This survey consisted of five questions about the college cleaning and cleaners. The structure of the questions in the survey was identical for each college. This survey was an addendum to the annual residential college survey which are conducted on-line and managed by the Advanced Quality Unit at the University of Otago.

In studies undertaken by Cobanoglu, Warde, Moreo (2001:410) on comparisons of Mail, Fax, and Web-Based survey methods, results indicated “that web surveys have significant advantages over mail and fax surveys in terms of response rate and costs”.

Nair, Adams, Metova (2008:226) assert from their studies on student engagement in surveys found that “on-line surveys provide more qualitative information than paper-based surveys as students often provide more detailed information to open-ended questions in online surveys”.

Survey questions were closed and were structured on a 5-point Likert scale of Excellent to Poor for two questions. The second set of three questions were also closed
and based on a 5-point Likert scale of Definitely Agree to Definitely Disagree. There was also a section for any additional comments. Free text quotes have also been used from the main surveys to complement results or otherwise.

Results from three questions in the main student survey pertaining to cleaning in the colleges were also provided for the purpose of this thesis and were also based on a 5-point Likert scale of Excellent to Poor. Participants were given a brief written explanation for the five additional survey questions and a consent form. Participants were assured this part of the survey was anonymous and would be processed in confidence. It would have been preferable to have had the five additional cleaning questions included in the main survey or added on at the end as it was initially thought that the addendum would adversely affect the response rate. There was also the opportunity for participants to provide additional comments.

**Survey Questions**

A summary of questions:

**Main Survey**

1. Cleanliness of College
2. Cleanliness of bathrooms
3. Physical Environment

**Additional Questions**

1. Cleanliness of your bedroom
2. Cleanliness of common spaces
3. Cleaners respect personal privacy
4. Cleaners are friendly and considerate
5. Cleaners appear to be part of college team

Copies of the survey questionnaire are in Appendix C.
Questions 1-3 are questions included in the main residential college surveys and seemed relevant to include in this research. Questions 5-8 were particular questions assigned for the purpose of this research. These particular questions were to find out if internal cleaners were deemed to be more efficient, amiable and congenial than contract cleaners because as far as the students go, most would not be aware of the difference in employment status, and also are not thought to be fully aware of the impact of cleaners in other colleges.

Common thought in the residential colleges by those who employ internal cleaners is that this model provides ‘greater pastoral care’ to the students than contract cleaners so this also needed to be explored. Also if one type of cleaner is ‘happier’ than another and why this might be, and how they themselves felt about working in the college environment.

3.3.2 Interviews

All interviews were semi-structured, audio taped (where permissible) and transcribed where applicable and deemed to be necessary i.e. the HOC’s, Administrators and College Property Supervisors however the cleaners were not transcribed as the themes were apparent from the interview notes. All interviews were noted also and a specific set of questions was asked of all cleaners and cleaning supervisors.

Interviews provide qualitative data and interviewing different staff and contract employees allowed for cross-comparisons of responses and encouraging different perspectives to emerge. All participants in the interviews were encouraged to expand where necessary.

3.3.2.1 Heads of College Meetings

Initially informal meetings were held with the respective Heads of College (HOC) to gain background information and ascertain what could be gained from the study. All HOC’s interviewed were interested in the results of the study and consistent findings.
3.3.2.2. Heads of College (HOC)

Interviews were conducted with the respective HOC’s. These interviews were intended to determine why a particular college used either internal or contracted cleaners, whether they had considered changing the process and overall generally how satisfied they were with their current processes.

3.3.2.3 College Administrators

Interviews were conducted with the respective College Administrators with the intention of determining the amount of administration time spent on each respective group of cleaners i.e. internal and contract.

3.3.2.4 Property Supervisors

Interviews were conducted with three college Property Supervisors on the advice of the HOC as these people in their respective roles are the college point of contact for the cleaning supervisors. These interviews were to determine how much time/contact these people spent with the cleaning supervisors on a daily basis.

3.3.2.5 Cleaning Supervisors

Interviews were conducted with four Cleaning Supervisors. These interviews were to determine whether the supervisor cleaned as well as supervising the cleaning staff, find out how many cleaners they supervised, hours of work, who they report to at the college, and if they carried out any additional duties.
3.3.2.6 Cleaning Staff

Interviews were conducted with twenty three cleaners from four out of five colleges. The cleaners’ interviews were seeking information to answer the following:

1. Do contract cleaners feel any different than cleaners employed directly by the College?
2. Is the training/induction/support cleaners receive different for contract/internal cleaners?
3. Do cleaners feel like they are part of the College staff team?

3.4 Secondary Sources

Secondary sources used were contracts, HR and payroll information, financial reports, invoices, timesheets which provided background information and an understanding of the cleaning industry from a wider point of view.

3.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis was undertaken in order to make comparisons of specific costs in relation to university employees, and external contract staff. 2011 actual financial results were analysed to identify the costs and only costs associated with the cleaning of colleges in the academic year were used in this comparison. Data was obtained on the number of days that colleges carried out cleaning, whether bedrooms were cleaned and how often, number of weeks per year cleaning took place, hours per week, whether the cleaning supervisor also cleaned, total hours of cleaning per annum, number of separate locations/buildings per respective college, and any other additional outliers that could affect the results. All colleges across the division were analysed and a weighted average obtained. Final analysis was based on cost per student numbers, per day and per week in each college.
This study entails using more than one method or source of data in the study. Using a combination of methods across both quantitative and qualitative data to cross-check findings strengthens the understanding of the validity and reliability. Interviews with cleaning staff and staff turnover data may result in a measurement of commitment.

3.5.1 Further Data Analysis

Relationships between responses to particular questions from within each set of results were explored where it was anticipated that they might exist, based on logic and/or findings from the literature.

Data was loaded into SPSS statistical program and relationships explored by a T-Test to compare means of the survey results. Levene’s T-Test was also used to test for statistical significance and equality of variances in a one-way analysis of variance.

Overall the level of response and careful analysis of the responses has enabled representative, valid and credible summaries to be made and discussed.

Chapter 4 will report on the findings and results from the case study.
Chapter 4: Case Study Findings/Results: Description, Analysis and Synthesis

This chapter reports on the findings from the case study. The research concentrates on five university owned residential colleges of varying sizes: three of whom employ contract cleaners and two of whom employ internal cleaners i.e. university employees.

It needs to be considered that two of the five colleges included in this study have had their bedrooms and main areas completely refurbished and painted recently. Therefore it is intuitively reasonable to assume that this may impact on the results and that the physical aesthetics of colleges could have caused bias. College LC2 is the next college in the upgrade plan so this should also be considered when viewing the results as this may have also caused bias in the results.

In the first instance, the result of the data analysis will be presented in a table format and discussed. Results of the interviews carried out will then be presented as per the findings, quotes and notes taken and further discussed. Following this the survey results will be presented in tables and discussed in terms of comparisons and generalisations made. Each survey question will be addressed individually and a summary of findings presented. Statistical analysis will also be presented in table format with tests and comparisons explained for each table based on the results of the survey questions.

This chapter will present the findings with respect to each individual hypothesis and a summary will be provided at the end of each respective hypothesis section. Interview questions can be found in Appendix A. Interview findings can be found in Appendix B. Survey questionnaires can be found in appendix C. The empirical findings will compare and contrast against the findings in the literature review. Thus, this chapter describes, discusses, analyses and synthesizes the empirical findings and the findings from the literature review.
H1. Contract cleaning employees in University owned residential colleges will be more cost effective than internally employed cleaners – including less time consuming, requiring less resources than the management of internal employees.

2011 Actual Cleaning Costs Comparison

Table 4.1: Per week per student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cleaning Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,710</td>
<td>$111,287</td>
<td>$253,328</td>
<td>$154,627</td>
<td>$339,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>$507.52</td>
<td>$595.12</td>
<td>$636.50</td>
<td>$468.57</td>
<td>$654.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Student per week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$11.53</td>
<td>$13.53</td>
<td>$14.47</td>
<td>$10.65</td>
<td>$14.88</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Student per week</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$12.69</td>
<td>$14.88</td>
<td>$15.91</td>
<td>$11.71</td>
<td>$16.36</td>
<td>$14.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 Notes

- Costs have been calculated from analytical data based on 2011 actual figures.
- Costs per week have been calculated based on 2011 total cleaning costs/number of weeks cleaned/number of students in residence.
- 40 and 44 weeks have been used as the mean as different colleges have differing needs.
- This table compares a weighted average of cleaning costs across 40 and 44 weeks respectively.
- All figures include cleaning products.
- College LI did not have a cleaning supervisor for the most part of 2011 and as this was budgeted for, this salary would not have been evident in the figures used in the calculations. Temporary cleaners were hired which would have somewhat offset the saving in the aforementioned salary but not entirely therefore total wage costs for LI for 2011 should have been higher.
- LI and LC1 both have cleaning supervisors who do not clean unless required to fill in thus this seems to have an effect on the cost.
- LC2, SC and SI all have cleaning supervisors who clean as well as supervise.
Table 4.2: Per week per day per student (based on number of days and weeks cleaning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Cost per Day</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Cost per Day per student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>$1,097.21</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>$2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>$959.58</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>$2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>$502.03</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>$503.86</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$265.29</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Notes

- Costs have been calculated from analytical data based on actual figures from 2011 year.
- Cost per day per student has been calculated based on 2011 total cleaning costs / number of weeks cleaned / number of days cleaned per week / number of student residents.
- In factoring the number of days cleaning takes place in each college – it needs to be recognized that only a minimal or skeleton clean takes place at the weekends (if at all) and thus this could distort the results.
- 44 weeks has been used as the mean for calculation purposes and equity in Table 4.2.
- All figures include cleaning products.
• College LI did not have a cleaning supervisor for the most part of 2011 so this salary would not have been evident in the figures, although temporary cleaners were hired which would have somewhat offset the saving in the aforementioned salary, the total amount of salaries would have been greater.
• LI and LC1 both have cleaning supervisors who do not clean unless required to fill in thus this seems to have an effect on the cost.
• LC2, SC and SI all have cleaning supervisors who clean as well as supervise.

Locations

• College LI has one main building with a lift and one block of twenty flats.
• College LC1 has four main buildings with lifts and a large number of locations spread around a 1km area which requires some walking travel time.
• College LC2 has one main building with a lift.
• College SI have four main buildings with a lift and 20 separate houses.
• College SC have two main buildings (no lift) and two houses and do not clean student bedrooms.

When comparing costs between colleges it should be recognised that all colleges are different, in terms of infrastructure, layout, location, separate buildings, age and conditions of buildings, distance between buildings, lifts, and aesthetics. Therefore within this research, given the variables described, it was difficult to compare “apples with apples”, and was somewhat subjective in terms of data analysis.

For example some colleges are one site and have lifts (which makes it easier for cleaners to move themselves and cleaning gear around. Other colleges may have a number of flats semi-attached and notwithstanding of various ages, states of repair etc. Some of these flats/houses involve climbing a lot of steep steps and hills which can be tiring and cold in the winter.
Although the academic year is 38 weeks, cleaners are employed prior to the start and following the end of this period in order to prepare rooms for student arrivals and following student departures. All colleges have the opportunity to hold additional functions for example conferencing, weddings etc. (external and internal to the University) in their respective colleges and operate 52 weeks of the year. Therefore for those colleges who host these types of functions there can be a quick turnaround period for room preparation.

In the main internal cleaners are employed for 52 weeks of the year including 5 weeks annual leave. Contract cleaners are employed on a ‘needs’ basis thus reducing any financial and non-financial impact of downtime etc.

As can be seen from Table 4.1 and 4.2 the results are mixed and a number of the factors mentioned above need to be considered when comparing the results. Results suggest that economies of scale and the number of locations have quite an impact on the costs. Interestingly the number of days cleaning takes place does not intuitively appear to have an obvious impact on the results. Although difficult to put a cost on a weekly vacuum of a bedroom this possibly would have some monetary effect on SC’s results as they do not clean bedrooms.

Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 based on two different calculation methods are provided to remove as much ambiguity as possible, and give another perspective on the comparison of costs. Results from the comparative analysis overall suggest that on average contract cleaning is more cost effective when the number of locations and distance are factored in.
Human Resource Management & Cleaning Staff

According to interviews carried out staff turnover seems to be 1-2 people per year whether internal or contract employees. There are no HR costs associated with contract cleaning staff as the contract company deals solely with this aspect.

For internal employee colleges there will be recruitment costs for example advertising, shortlisting, interviews, other administration costs, inductions, training, timesheets, booking of leave on the University Staff Web Kiosk, annual Professional Development Reviews (PDR’s). University employed cleaning staff are now part of the general staff agreement and therefore are now entitled to Long Service leave, Retirement Gratuity, all general staff annual increases, 5 weeks annual leave per year and accumulated sick leave.

Based on the information provided a cost per internal cleaner recruitment has been calculated as follows:

- PDR’s - 30 minutes per annum per cleaner
- Timesheets – 30 minutes per fortnight (for the total cleaners)
- Recruitment – 8-12 hours per cleaner (administration involved)
- Advertising Costs – Combination of Seek, Trade Me and Media (ODT) $550
- Average hourly rate of Administrator/Cleaning Supervisor  $26.66

Therefore costs of administration and recruitment based on 1 cleaner per year = $1,150 rounded; 1.5 cleaners per year = $1,725 rounded; 2 cleaners per year = $2,300.

Note - LI also provide lunches for the internal cleaning staff of which there are around 12 cleaners.

Based on interviews carried out with HOC’s, College Administrators, and Property Supervisors (where applicable) there is less administration involved with contract cleaning staff and generally contract cleaning staff just “go about their business”.
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If a contract cleaner is absent i.e. sick the contract cleaning company provides a replacement cleaner. If an internal cleaner is absent, for example sick, everyone pitches in to get the areas covered which may involve extra time paid and the cleaning supervisor (who does not normally clean) will also clean.

Farrell and Rusbalt (1981), Stumpf and Hartman (1984) ask whether employees of labour hire firms maintain commitment to their employer and to the firm at which they work. As poorly committed workers have been found to be less motivated and involved, have lower levels of job performance, are less likely to accept change, and are more likely to resign and be absent from work.

The literature suggests that there would be a higher staff turnover in contractors however this was not found to be the case. Both sets of employees (internal and contract) averaged 1-2 cleaners per year turnover.

All HOC’s interviewed commented on the relationship between the cleaners and the residents with regard to understanding and expectations of both parties roles. The HOC of SC said “sometimes the cleaners have difficulty understanding young people, for example students constantly leaving rubbish in bathrooms”.

Another HOC said “student expectations of the cleaners can be quite different to the cleaners i.e. the students expect the cleaners to tidy as well as clean and sometimes “instruct” the cleaners to clean something up”.

Students in residential colleges come from all different backgrounds and cultures with varying socio-economic environments thus it is understandable expectations can be mixed and misunderstood.
H2. *Contract cleaning employees is a more flexible arrangement than internal cleaning staff.*

Blaxill and Hout (1991) claims the outsourcing of peripheral activities would free up human and capital resources as well as allow for increased flexibility in the way labour is employed.

The following information is based on interviews held with the College management staff and cleaning supervisors.

In the event of absenteeism the contract cleaning supervisor phones the contracting company and a replacement cleaner is provided. This is also the case when cleaners are on long term leave due to holidays or medical and/or other reasons. Generally colleges with contract cleaners find this arrangement works well and a replacement cleaner is only minutes away thus not affecting the management of the operation adversely nor at any additional cost. This relationship is also useful when it is found that a contract cleaner may not be suitable to the college environment for any number of reasons. Again the contract company takes full responsibility and will replace the cleaner quickly and quietly. (This has happened on two separate occasions at two colleges).

Alternatively in the event of absenteeism in a college with internal cleaning staff the work is divvied up between existing cleaners and the cleaning supervisor helps out. There would also be the cost of sick leave or annual leave where applicable.

If an internal cleaning employee is found to be unsuitable to work in the college environment the process of employment performance management will ensue, affecting the employer/employee relationship, time resources and any other number of matters depending on the situation being dealt with. In the case of long-term internal staff absenteeism for example due to ill health – colleges have employed cleaners
through an employment agency and this incurs a ‘surcharge on top’ of the employee’s hourly rate of which can be around $6 per hour.

According to Pfeffer and Baron (1988) non-standard work arrangements i.e. part time, temporary and contract work suggest an organisation’s efforts to achieve flexibility by externalising some of their activities.

Generally the findings appear to support H2 in that the contract cleaning model does provide a more flexible arrangement than internal cleaning staff.
H3. Contract cleaning employees pose more risk for the organisation as they have been employed by a third party.

The literature would suggest that contract employees pose more risk and that this risk can be varied, and may include health and safety due to contractors lacking in training and induction, particularly of on-site hazards and site specific risks. (Note – The health and safety aspect will be discussed further in H7). Other risks associated with the employment of contract workers can be limited knowledge of the employee’s background for example skills, experience and knowledge. There may also be concerns with confidentiality and security as contract workers employment tends to be of a shorter duration than internal employees. Kochen, Smith, Wells and Rebitzer (1994) in their investigations of contract work found that some of the negative aspects of using contract workers such as lack of training, tensions between direct-hire and contract workers, and between management and labour, as unions charged that contract workers were being used to reduce unions’ presence in firms, and to provide cheaper and less trained workers.

All university residential college employees are police vetted as are all contract cleaning employees who work in residential colleges, therefore in this regard the same risk or lack of risk would exist for both types of employees, in relation to any criminal past for example. However there may well be risk that because the contract employee has not been recruited by the client organisation i.e. shortlisted, interviewed etc. then the employee may not be a ‘good fit’ with the existing team or the existing culture in the client organisation. As residential colleges are students ‘homes’ for the duration of the academic year it is imperative that the cleaner who has access to their bedroom is trusted and discreet. In the past there have been one or two issues with regard to breaches of trust on the cleaner’s behalf but this was evident in both a contract cleaner and an internal cleaner. Therefore this risk cannot necessarily be associated with the type of employee i.e. contract or internal and would suggest that the same risk exists for both types of employee in this rather sensitive employment situation.
H4. Management and control of contract cleaning employees with regard to performance issues and problem resolution is more difficult as it involves a third party i.e. the contract company.

The management of contract cleaners differs greatly to the management of internal employees. In the case of contract workers, managers must learn to ‘manage the contract, not the contractor’ i.e. the college management staff have no direct authority to control or supervise the contract employee, therefore managers need to keep an arms-length relationship with contract workers. According to Kalleburg (2000:352) “Contract employment also raises questions about who controls the employee, gives orders, directs work, hires and fires”.

Results of interviews carried out with college management staff employing contract workers did not agree with this hypothesis. All three HOC’s interviewed were very satisfied with the employment of contract cleaners in their respective colleges. One HOC of a large contract college (LC1) said “in management terms, it is perfect”. “All care no responsibility and no HR issues to deal with”. Another HOC of a large contract college (LC2) said “Day to day it largely runs itself”.

One HOC of a small contract college (SC) “considered internal cleaners three years ago as not happy with cleaners at the time (contract) but balanced this with the extra management involved and decided to go to tender and contract the services out again”.

HOC (LC1) said “there have been a couple of problems with contract staff provided over time but resolution was immediate on contact with the contract company”.

All three colleges who use contract cleaning staff have regular meetings with the off-site cleaning supervisor who visits 2-3 times a week and carries out spot checks.

There appeared to be a good relationship and good communication between the off-site cleaning supervisor, the college on-site cleaning supervisor, and the college management staff and evidence obtained during interviews supported this view.
Generally as gauged from the interviews there did not, or had not, been any issues with
problem resolution or performance issues and the contracting company was held in
high regard to this degree of resolution.

Pearce (1993) found no difference between contractor and internal (regular) employees
with regard to behaviours such as willingness to help with extra tasks and
organisational commitments.

Overall the control of contract employees did not appear to be an issue however this
seemed to be somewhat dependent on the on-site cleaning supervisor and their degree
of scope in the day to day operations i.e. it was gathered by the researcher that the
cleaning supervisor of the contract cleaning teams was the difference between a
successful team of cleaners and a successful relationship with the college management
staff.
H5. *Internal employees will have greater organisational commitment due to a higher level of psychological contract as a result of organisational benefits.*

H6. *Internal employees will have greater job satisfaction as they feel like an “insider” in the organisation and therefore “belong”.*

(As H5 and H6 have a similar theme the findings and results will be presented together).

Pfeffer and Baron (1998) purport that contractors are perceived to have a lack of commitment, attachment or loyalty to the organisation. However McElroy et al (2001) propose there is evidence to suggest that contracted employees develop feelings of commitment toward the client organisation.

Based on interviews undertaken with the cleaning staff - it was apparent that the internal cleaning staff felt 100% commitment to their college, whereas the contract cleaning staff overall felt commitment to the college and the contract cleaning company, suggesting dual loyalty.

Internal cleaners at all colleges receive good employment benefits and these have improved greatly over the past 2-3 years when college kitchen and cleaning staff have become part of the University General Staff employment conditions which affected pay rates, allowed benefits such as superannuation, annual pay increases, long service leave, 5 weeks paid annual leave, accumulative sick leave and retiring gratuity. Internal cleaners also receive a “substantial” uniform compared to contract cleaners.

In most cases contract cleaners receive a top from the contract company whereas at (LI) cleaners receive a four piece uniform consisting of skirt, top, polar fleece and jacket which they are very happy with. (LI) cleaners also have morning tea and lunch provided, and generally are employed all year aside from 5 weeks annual leave.
Internal cleaners are invited to a greater number of college staff functions than contract cleaners. Internal cleaners at (LI) are invited to all college functions including the college ball. Some said “they loved it”.

Contract cleaners in the main were invited to a Christmas function which they enjoyed but some noted “we used to be invited to more”. Staff benefits analysed between internal and contract cleaners appear to be very much greater for internal employees, which was expected. The internal employees have had significant benefits included in their contracts since they have come under the University General Staff ‘umbrella’.

Overall contract staff felt loyalty towards the college, but as some of these employees worked in excess of three cleaning jobs (in some cases); it is understandable that they feel their main loyalty is with the contract company.

The majority of internal cleaning staff did not have additional cleaning jobs and chose this occupation because it suited their point in life i.e. hours, flexibility, weeks of year etc. It needs to be said that the contract cleaning staff work for minimal wages and have relatively poorer employment conditions (compared to university internal employees), therefore it is difficult for them to feel that they “belong” to one establishment.

Most of these people saw themselves simply as “cleaners” regardless of where they were working. 60% of the cleaners interviewed at (LC1) said they “loved and enjoyed being part of the students culture” and 40% of those interviewed said “it is better than being on the benefit”, or “it’s a job and it pays the bills”. One contract cleaner at a small contract college (SC) said “staff at (SC) don’t treat me like a cleaner”. Although a small cleaning staff at (SC), they worked harmoniously, and as a team.

At (LC1) large contract cleaning college 50% of the cleaners interviewed felt they were part of the college staff team whilst the remaining 50% did not.
At (LC1) it was apparent that there was a strong team environment and the majority of these people had worked together at (LC1) for many years. Cleaners at this college respected their cleaning supervisor and said she was ‘fair’.

Although everyone has their own designated area in the college to clean – they all help each other out. Cleaners were quoted as saying “a terrific bunch of girls”, “great team”, “we help each other out”, “if a new cleaner comes along and they don’t fit in – then they leave”. 70% of the contract cleaning staff have additional cleaning jobs, with some having two additional jobs.

Contract cleaners in Australia were examined by Campbell and Peeters (2008) who depict that problems faced by contract cleaners include short hours in individual jobs, broken schedules, labour intensive work, and irregularity of work and schedules. There was also the instability in cleaning jobs leading to constant pressure on wages and working conditions.

This was consistent with many of the contract cleaners interviewed for this study i.e. some had 2-3 other cleaning jobs and were purely trying to make a living wage. However this group of cleaners did work as a team and appeared to have a strong culture despite being contract cleaners and working on additional sites.

**Small Internal Cleaning College (SI)**

At college (SI) all cleaners interviewed said “it was a good team to work in”, “everyone helps each other out”, “friendly team”, “have fun”, “awesome team”. All cleaners at (SI) felt part of the college staff team and all had loyalty towards the college, and pride in the areas they were individually responsible for.

One cleaner at (SI) used to work for a contract cleaning company and said “you have a lot of bosses”, “don’t know who the boss is”. All of the cleaners at (SI) liked working with the students and liked having their own designated cleaning areas as they could get to know the students in that area and vice versa.
Large Internal Cleaning College (LI)

Only 50% of the college cleaners at (LI) agreed to be interviewed. Those interviewed said “they loved their jobs and enjoyed the students”. All cited the students as the reason they “still worked here” and most had worked at this college between 5-15 years so longevity was apparent.

Once again all cleaners interviewed like having their own areas to clean as “you get to know the students and they get to know you”. Although they had their own areas they still worked as a team. None of the cleaners at (LI) had a second job. All said they loved the uniform and thought it was substantial (4 pieces). The cleaners at this college are invited to all college functions and this makes them feel “special”.

One of the cleaners at this college had previously worked for a contract cleaning company and was now very happy working at (LI) college. This particular cleaner said and “we get invited to everything”. All of the staff interviewed at (LI) felt part of the college staff team, felt loyal towards the college and take pride in their respective areas of cleaning.

Large Contract Cleaning College (LC2)

Unfortunately the cleaning staff and cleaning supervisor were unable to be interviewed at (LC2) as permission was not granted by the contract cleaning company due to most of the cleaners at this college having English as their second language.

Summary

Generally staff turnover numbers appear to be consistent for contract cleaners and internal cleaners employed in colleges i.e. 1-2 cleaners per annum.
Cleaning staff at contract and internal employed colleges all said “they like to be appreciated and recognised for their work”, and “valued” by the HOC and/or their respective cleaning supervisor. All cleaning staff appreciated being invited to college functions even if sometimes they did not go.

The literature around organisational commitment among contracted workers is mixed and various views exist on whether the level of commitment differs between permanent (internal) employees and contract employees based on the different nature of the psychological contract between employee and the organisation.

Research implies that the social exchange theory or reciprocity between the employee and the employer, affects the level of commitment to the organisation (for both types of employees). Being valued at work, and having feelings of attachment, associate strongly with organisation commitment.

Job satisfaction is relevant to both internal and contract employees in the organisation, and impacts on worker relationships, and in turn organisational commitment.

Teamwork was apparent in both models of cleaning and did not appear to be stronger in any one type of cleaning model. It also appeared to be somewhat dependent on the cleaning supervisor as to whether the team was well functioning and happy.

Thus organisational commitment has a strong positive correlation with job satisfaction (Biggs et al. 2006). Biggs et al (2005:138) asserts “that worker relationships which are dependent on job satisfaction, in turn influence organisational commitment, even if the work is not particularly stimulating”.

Although it is a natural assumption that internal employees would have greater job satisfaction than contract workers, primarily based on a ‘sense of belonging’, higher levels of trust, and social relationships. Biggs et al (2005) found that both contract and internal workers are likely to develop affective feelings about the same aspects of their job so general job satisfaction as a concept, is relevant to both parties.
**H7. Internal employees will have better internal induction and on-site training specific to the organisation’s culture and expectations.**

The literature suggests that it is likely internal employees will be involved in a more comprehensive training and induction plan which would include socialisation of norms and firm-specific training, which contract employees would normally be excluded from. They assert that this would in turn have an impact on the type of culture within the organisation, team building, loyalty and the feeling of being an ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’. Rebitzer (1995) found that clients assumed that the contract companies trained their employees which was often a dubious assumption that resulted in more accidents involving contract workers.

Based on the responses from interviews carried out with college management staff, cleaning supervisors and cleaning staff (internal and contract), for the most part, and contrary to the hypothesis, contract cleaners were found to have more comprehensive training off-site and whilst on-site at the college. Internal employees either were not sure about training received or could not remember (if it was some years ago). Some internal employees attend first aid training every 2 years. In contrast contract employees and cleaning supervisors receive chemical training from the contract company and the chemical company. They also receive on-going training in cleaning products and chemicals.

Colleges included in the research were asked about any health and safety incidents that occurred in 2011 and there were either none or an odd incident none of which was relevant enough to be able to make correlations and comparisons between contract cleaners and internal cleaners training/incidents. At (LC1) (contract cleaning college) a monthly health and safety meeting is also held on-site to discuss any incidents and damage that may have occurred and everyone i.e. all cleaners, cleaning supervisor and the property manager attend this meeting.
If nothing else, the formal monthly meetings give employees a ‘voice’, and allows them an opportunity to share and communicate with others.

Benson (1998:359) asserts “that contract employees require appropriate training before that can satisfactorily perform their duties and that much of this training takes place on the job. Similarly provision of adequate resources to allow contract employees to carry out their work can also be problematic”.

The provision of resources to enable cleaners to carry out their job adequately did not appear to be an issue as it was not raised during interviews.

In summary, H7 was not supported by the evidence from the research and conversely it was found that the contract cleaners receive a greater amount of formal training and follow-up than internal cleaners. This area will be further addressed in the recommendations section.
H8. There will be no significant difference between the two groups of employees with regard to the quality of service provided (tangible/measurable).

Literature around the difference in quality of service provided by internal employees and contract employees found that although tangible and measurable – opinion differed and was inconclusive on which type of employee provided a better quality of tangible service.

Note – Survey results were not available per gender/college analysis. This would have been useful to gauge how important particular areas such as bathrooms were to a particular gender. HOC’s report that bathroom cleanliness is very important to students and this would seem pertinent to students coming from a home environ where they may only have to share a bathroom with family members, to sharing a “floor” bathroom with a large number of students and usually of mixed gender.

Of the colleges surveyed for the research project, results will be presented based on each questions (7 in total) and discussed. Free flow comments will also be included where appropriate and relevant.

Student Survey Response Rate

Response rates were as follows:

- SC - 93% or 143/153 students
- SI - 78% or 138/177 students
- LC1 – 56% or 216/386 students
- LC2 – 62% or 195/313 students
- LI – 90% or 440/489 students

Note for the purpose of the student survey – Residential Assistants have been excluded as they are deemed to be employees of the College (hence the difference in total numbers of students in this section to the methodology section).
The average response rate across all residential colleges surveyed i.e. not just the five surveyed for the purpose of this research was 76%. Overall this is a very good response rate for a survey questionnaire methodology.

Note - It needs to be considered that two of the five colleges’ bedrooms and main areas have recently been completely refurbished and painted. Therefore it is intuitively reasonable to assume that this may impact on the results and that the physical aesthetics of colleges could have caused bias. Also in relation to the results and bias, College (LC2) is the next college in line for refurbishment and this is apparent in the condition and age of college interior and could account for some of the less than average responses to the survey questions.

Also the response rate for college (LC1) differed for both sets of survey questions. For the main survey questions the response rate was 84% but for the additional five cleaning survey questions the response rate was lower at 56%. This was because the cleaning survey questions were inadvertently omitted at the first stage of the survey therefore they had to be circulated when the students at this particular college returned from semester break. This ultimately had the effect of lowering the response rate given that the students had to go back on-line to answer the five additional cleaning questions.

Internal Cleaners and Contract Cleaners $t$-test

A T-Test was used to compare means of the two different groups i.e. internal cleaners and contract cleaners and to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores for the two groups. Note the T-Test was performed on the results rather than the raw data therefore as the sample size was so small the standard deviation and the standard error of the mean were not able to be identified for this particular test. Results will be presented as per each respective survey question.
A T-Test was used to compare means of the two different groups of colleges i.e. small and large to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores for the two groups regardless of what type of cleaner they used i.e. internal and contract cleaners. As this test was performed on a larger sample the standard deviation and the standard error of the mean were able to be computed. The standard deviation is an index of how much the mean scores deviate or differ ‘on average’ from the average set of scores of which they are members. Results will be presented as per each respective survey question.

Levene’s Test was used to test the equality of variances as an independent samples test to compare means. “Levene’s test is the usual T-test for equality of means computed on pseudo-observations, which one defines as the absolute deviations of the data points from an estimate of the group ‘centre’” (Carroll and Schneider, 1985:191). The two variables chosen for further descriptive reporting were ‘internal’ and ‘contract’ referring to the different types of cleaners used in the respective residential colleges included for the purposes of this research.

Hypotheses:

Null: The means of the two groups are not significantly different.

Alternate: The means of the two groups are significantly different.

The results of this test will be addressed and presented as per each respective survey question.

The following questions (one to three) formed part of the main residential college survey and were not part of the five questions added pertaining to the research for this thesis.
Q1. Cleanliness of College

Table 4.3: College Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>% of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows the mean for the *Cleanliness of College* question across the five colleges included in this research was **1.6** for this question with 1 = Excellent and 5 = Poor. (LC1) and (SI) both averaged 1.4, (SC) averaged 1.6 and (LI) 1.7, (LC2) 2.1 respectively.
Free text comments:

“Superb cleaning and appreciate the efforts of the cleaners” (LC1). “Overall I find the cleanliness good but often on a Sunday morning the college is not clean (after Saturday night) but that is not a cleaning staff problem” (LI). “Facilities are great, clean and tidy” (LC1). Free text comments: “my floor gets pretty disgusting on the weekends” (SI).

Table 4.3a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of College</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the overall cleanliness of colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners ($M = 1.6$) and internal cleaners ($M = 1.4$). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.

Table 4.3b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of College</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>.2121</td>
<td>.1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.3606</td>
<td>.2082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An independent- samples \( t \)-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners (\( M = 1.5, \ SD = .21 \)) and contract cleaners (\( M = 1.7, \ SD = .36 \)).

Table 4.3c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges \( t \)-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>小</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.1414</td>
<td>.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>.3512</td>
<td>.2028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples \( t \)-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of colleges between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges (\( M = 1.5, \ SD = .14 \)) and large colleges (\( M = 1.7, \ SD = .35 \)).
### Table 4.3d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of College</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>-.1500</td>
<td>.2911</td>
<td>-1.0763, .7763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the means test is .381 therefore it can be assumed that the variances are approximately equal. The value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .642 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Q2 Cleanliness of Bathrooms

Table 4.4: College Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 Residential College Survey Question</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Number of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C % of College answered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cleanliness | 2 | Cleanliness of Bathrooms | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 |

Table 4.4 shows the mean for the *Cleanliness of Bathrooms* question across the five colleges included in this research was **2.0**. (LC1) averaged 1.7 and (SI) averaged 1.8. (SC) met the average of 2.0. (LI) averaged 2.1 and (LC2) averaged 2.3 respectively.
Free text comments:

“The residents completely mess up the bathrooms at the weekends” (LC2). “The bathrooms get pretty disgusting at the weekends” and “the bathrooms should get cleaned at the weekends” (SI). “The bathrooms are always dirty” (SC). “The bathroom is not as clean as it could be” (LI). “The bathrooms get pretty messed up at the weekends” (SI). “Bathrooms need more attention “(SI). “I am very pleased with the cleanliness of the bathroom” (SI). “I think they should clean the bathrooms in the weekends” (SI). “At the weekends the bathrooms get really messy, it would be really nice if they were cleaned at the weekends as well” (LC1).

Table 4.4a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bathrooms</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the overall cleanliness of bathrooms between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners ($M = 2.0$) and internal cleaners ($M = 1.8$). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.
Table 4.4b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bathrooms</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>.2121</td>
<td>.1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.3000</td>
<td>.1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of bathrooms between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners ($M = 1.9$, $SD = .21$) and contract cleaners ($M = 2.0$, $SD = .30$).

Table 4.4c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of Bathrooms</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>.1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>.3055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of bathrooms between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges ($M = 1.9$, $SD = .14$) and large colleges ($M = 2.0$, $SD = .30$).
Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the means test is .724 therefore it can be assumed that the variances are approximately equal. The value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .854 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Q3 Physical Environment

The decision was made to include this question as it was thought to be relevant in explanation of the results based around aesthetic arguments.

Table 4.5: College Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 Residential College Survey Questions</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Physical Environment</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 shows the mean for the *Physical Environment* question across the five colleges included in this research was *1.5*. (SI) averaged 1.2. (SC) and (LC1) both averaged 1.4. (LI) averaged 1.7 and (LC2) averaged 1.9 respectively.

Table 4.5a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons *t*-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the overall physical environment aspect of the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners (*M* = 1.4) and internal cleaners (*M* = 1.2). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.
Table 4.5b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>.3536</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>.2887</td>
<td>.1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the physical environment aspect of the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners (M = 1.4, SD = .35) and contract cleaners (M = 1.5, SD = .28).

Table 4.5c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>.1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>.2517</td>
<td>.1453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the physical environment aspect of the colleges between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges (M = 1.3, SD = .14) and large colleges (M = 1.6, SD = .25).
Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the means test is .724 therefore it can be assumed that the variances are approximately equal. The value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .709 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.

The following two questions were additional questions for the purpose of research for this thesis. The questions were based on a 5 point scale with 1= Excellent and 5= Poor.

### Table 4.5d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>-.1167</td>
<td>.2846</td>
<td>-1.0225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances

\[ t \text{-test for Equality of Means} \]
Q4 Cleanliness of your Bedroom

Table 4.6: College Cleaning Survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Statistics</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cleanliness of your bedroom</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows the mean for the Cleanliness of your bedroom question across the colleges (only the colleges included for the research) was 1.8. (SC and SI) both averaged 1.6. (LC1) met the average of 1.8. (LI) averaged 1.9 and (LC2) averaged 2.1 respectively.
Interestingly both of the colleges who scored higher than average had major bedroom refurbishment carried out during the 2011/2012 summer period (completed in time for the 2012 intake). Also of note one of these colleges (SC) does not undertake any cleaning of bedrooms throughout the year. Therefore these results would suggest that it does not matter whether bedrooms are cleaned or not, it is the aesthetically ‘new’ and ‘clean’ appearance of the bedrooms that produced the higher than average results.

Notably (LC2) has the poorest condition of bedrooms of all colleges so this could also suggest the aesthetic impact on the results of 2.1.

Free text comments:

“I would like to be able to vacuum my own room more often as I am a bad asthmatic. However my cleaner has made adjustments for me” (LI). “Access to the vacuum cleaner so we can make a good job of our rooms” (LI). “My room does not get vacuumed, I would be happy to do it myself” (LI). “Please clean the bathrooms more often” (LC2). “The other residents are inconsiderate at the weekends and they completely mess up the toilets” (LC2).

Table 4.6a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bedroom</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the overall cleanliness of bedrooms in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners (M = 1.6) and
internal cleaners (M = 1.6). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.

Table 4.6b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bedroom</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.2121</td>
<td>.1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>.2517</td>
<td>.1453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of bathrooms in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners (M = 1.7, SD = .21) and contract cleaners (M = 1.8, SD = .25).

Table 4.6c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bedroom</th>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>.1528</td>
<td>.0882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of bedrooms in the colleges between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges (M = 1.6, SD = .00) and large colleges (M = 1.9, SD = .15).
Table 4.6d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners \( t \)-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Bedroom</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>( t )-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>( \text{Sig.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the means test is .787 therefore it can be assumed that the variances are approximately equal. The value in the \( \text{Sig. 2-tailed} \) column is .728 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Q5 Cleanliness of Common Spaces

Table 4.7: College Cleaning Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Statistics</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cleanliness of common spaces</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows the mean for the *Cleanliness of common spaces* question across the colleges (only the colleges included for the research) was **1.8**. (SC) average 1.7 and (SI) averaged 1.4. (LC2) averaged 2.1 and (LC1) averaged 2.1 respectively. There were no results for this question for (LI) as the results for this question were inadvertently omitted.
Common spaces at (SC) and (SI) have also been refurbished in recent times so this could also be related to the aesthetic impact on the better than average results for these two colleges. Free text comments: “Please clean the corridors more often” (LC2).

**Table 4.7a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons $t$-test output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness of Common Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the overall cleanliness of common spaces in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners ($M = 1.7$) and internal cleaners ($M = 1.4$). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.

**Table 4.7b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness of Common Spaces</strong></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>.2309</td>
<td>.1333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of common spaces in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups).
There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners (M = 1.4, SD was not available) and contract cleaners (M = 1.9, SD = .23).

Table 4.7c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of Common Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>.2121</td>
<td>.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples t-test was conducted to compare the cleanliness of bedrooms in the colleges between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges (M = 1.5, SD = .21) and large colleges (M = 2.1, SD = not available).
Table 4.7d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness of Common Spaces</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig,</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-2.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>-.5667</td>
<td>.2667</td>
<td>-1.7140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results give no means test for this question. The value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .168 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 2 degrees of freedom.

The following three questions were additional statements specific to this research. Results were based on a 5 point scale with 1 = Definitely Agree to 5 = Definitely Disagree.
Q6 Cleaners respect personal privacy

Table 4.8: College Cleaning Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basic Statistics</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>% of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td>Cleaners respect personal privacy</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 results show the mean for the Cleaners respect personal privacy question across the colleges (only the colleges included for the research) was 1.6. (SI) averaged 1.3 and (SC) averaged 1.4. (LI) and (LC1) averaged 1.6 equal to the mean and (LC2) scored 1.9, lower than the mean.
Free text comments:

“Cleaners need to show a bit more patience when entering rooms and not just entering with heads down” (LI). “Need to provide more notification” and “wait a little longer after knocking before entering” (LI). “The cleaners talk too loudly with a vacuum cleaner on early in the mornings “(LC2).

Table 4.8a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners respect personal privacy</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$- test was conducted to compare the mean between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners ($M = 1.4$) and internal cleaners ($M = 1.3$). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.

Table 4.8b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners respect personal privacy</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>.2121</td>
<td>.1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>.2517</td>
<td>.1453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the mean between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners ($M = 1.4$, $SD = .21$) and contract cleaners ($M = 1.6$, $SD = .25$).

**Table 4.8c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges $t$-test output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners respect personal privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>.0707</td>
<td>.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.1732</td>
<td>.1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the mean between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges ($M = 1.3$, $SD = .07$) and large colleges ($M = 1.7$, $SD = .17$).
Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the mean is .787 and the value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .463 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Q7 Cleaners are friendly and considerate

Table 4.9: College Cleaning Survey Questions

2012 College Cleaning Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Statistics</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average not weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners 7 Cleaners are friendly and considerate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 results show the mean for Cleaners are friendly and considerate question across the colleges (only the colleges included for the research) was 1.6. (SI) averaged 1.3 and (LI) and (LC1) both averaged 1.5 so all achieving better results than the mean. (SC) averaged 1.7, one point lower than the mean. (LC2) averaged 2.1, 5 points lower than the mean.
Free text comments: “The cleaning staff deserve better treatment and appreciation” (LI). “Our cleaner *** is the nicest lady ever; just like 2\textsuperscript{nd} mum always checking up on us cute” (LI). “I would like to say that our cleaner **** is wonderful to our floor” (LI). “The cleaners keep me happy living here, they are kind and courteous” (LI).

Table 4.9a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners are friendly and considerate</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the overall cleaners are friendly and considerate in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners ($M = 1.7$) and internal cleaners ($M = 1.3$). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.
Table 4.9b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners are friendly and considerate</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.1414</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>.3055</td>
<td>.1764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleaners are friendly and considerate in the colleges between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners ($M = 1.4$, $SD = .14$) and contract cleaners ($M = 1.7$, $SD = .30$).

Table 4.9c: Group Comparisons between Small and Large Colleges $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners are friendly and considerate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.2828</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.3464</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleaners are friendly and considerate in the colleges between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges ($M = 1.5$, $SD = .28$) and large colleges ($M = 1.7$, $SD = .34$).
Table 4.9d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners are friendly and considerate</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the mean is .323 and the value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .223 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Q8 Cleaners appear part of the college team

Table 4.10: College Cleaning Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Statistics</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC1</th>
<th>LC2</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cleaners appear part of college team</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 results show the mean for Cleaners appear part of the college team question across the colleges (only the colleges included for the research) was 1.8. (SI) averaged 1.4 and (LI) and (LC1) both averaged 1.6. (SC) averaged 2.0 and (LC2) averaged 2.3 respectively. These results would correspond with the results from the
cleaner’s interviews with regard to “belonging” and loyalty to the college as to what the students perceive to be the case however not significantly different.

Table 4.10a: Contract and Internal Cleaners Mean Comparisons t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners appear part of college team</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples t- test was conducted to compare the overall cleaners appear to be part of the college team between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for contract cleaners (M = 2.0) and internal cleaners (M = 1.4). The standard deviation was not available due to the small sample size.

Table 4.10b: Group comparison between internal and contract cleaners t-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners appear part of college team</th>
<th>Contract internal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.1414</td>
<td>.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>.3512</td>
<td>.2028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent- samples t-test was conducted to compare the cleaners appear to be part of the college team between contract cleaners and internal cleaners (as two groups). There was no statistically significant difference in scores for internal cleaners (M = 1.5, SD = .14) and contract cleaners (M = 1.9, SD = .35).
An independent-samples $t$-test was conducted to compare the cleaners appear part of the college team between small colleges and large colleges. There was no statistically significant difference in scores for small colleges ($M = 1.7$, $SD = .42$) and large colleges ($M = 1.8$, $SD = .40$).
Table 4.10d: Independent Samples Test of Internal and Contract Cleaners $t$-test output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleaners appear part of college team</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test was used to test the means between contract cleaners and internal cleaners. Results show the mean is .369 and the value in the Sig. 2-tailed column is .185 therefore there is no statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the two groups tested. There are 3 degrees of freedom.
Table 4.11: Total Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 College Cleaning Survey Questions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Statistics</strong></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Number of students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> % of College answered</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cleanliness of your bedroom</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cleanliness of common spaces</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleaners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cleaners respect personal privacy</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cleaners are friendly and considerate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cleaners appear part of college team</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of findings from the student survey questions

Overall the survey results formed a positive response for the colleges involved in the research. With 1 = Excellent and 5 = Poor, the poorest response in one college (LC2) was 2.3, and this question was not to do with the quality of the cleaning rather ‘whether the cleaners appeared to be part of the college team’.
On average, bathroom cleanliness had the poorest response in terms of how this was viewed with the overall average across the colleges in this research being 2.0 however still matching ‘Very Good’ on the 5 point scale.

Of interest were the very high averages for the two colleges (SC) and (SI) which have been redecorated prior to the 2012 year student intake. The results from the survey would intuitively suggest that the aesthetic appearance of the colleges does have a correlation with how ‘clean’ they viewed the college to be. This is tested by the high average for the question ‘Cleanliness of your Bedroom’ where (SC) averaged 1.6 and this is the college where bedrooms do not get cleaned.

All Table 4.a’s results between internal cleaners and contract cleaners showed all results to the questions to be slightly higher for internal cleaners than contract cleaners.

All Table 4.b’s results between internal cleaners and contract cleaners showed all results to the questions to be slightly higher for the group of internal cleaners than the group of contract cleaners.

All Table 4.c’s results between small colleges and large colleges showed all results to the questions to be slightly better for small colleges than large colleges.

All Table 4.d’s results of Levene’s T test for equality of variances significance was based on the group statistics of mean comparisons between the group of internal cleaners and the group of contract cleaners. The results for all but one question tested resulted in no significant statistical difference in the mean scores between the two groups of cleaners. Question 5 ‘Cleanliness of Common Spaces’ however did not produce results for the Sig-1 Test and this may have been the result of one college results for this survey question not being available.

The literature in relation to the quality of service provided between contract employees and internal employees was mixed and within this there is also the perception of the measurement of quality of services given. Often it is the manner in which the service is
given rather than the actual service itself, and the measurement of service also strongly relates to one’s own standards and expectations, and therefore is subjective. Based on the student survey results, the overall service quality was found to be very similar between the internal employees and the contract employees, although the internal employees were slightly higher in all aspects.
H9. Quality of service provided (intangible) will be greater from the internal employees due to greater commitment, job satisfaction, and a greater feeling of loyalty generated from “belonging”.

H10. The psychological contract will be stronger for the internal employees due to greater commitment, job satisfaction and a greater sense of loyalty due to “belonging”.

(As H9 and H10 have a similar theme the findings and results will be presented together).

Santos (2002:292) defined “intangibility as one of the distinctive and fundamental characteristics of service. Santos investigated four service industries in order to reflect tangible components and the degree of intangibility in both service process and output”. Cowell (1984) noted with regard to intangibility that services are not possible to taste, feel, see, hear or smell before they are purchased or obtained.

Although some criticism surrounds the tangible/intangible dimension, importance and customer’s ability to understand – intangibility is still regarded as one of the most important service characteristics.

Based on interviews carried out with the cleaners, college management staff and student surveys undertaken, it will be ascertained, where possible, the level of commitment, job satisfaction and loyalty the cleaners “feel” they have towards the organisation (college), and are “perceived” to have by the students and management staff. These interviews also emphasized the importance and impact the cleaning supervisor had on the cleaning teams of both internal and contract cleaning employees. This was also evident in the college management staff views.
“The psychological contract has significant implications for employee attitudes and behaviour. Theory suggests that contracts for services are more indicative of a more transactional contract, focused on simple, measurable, economic outcomes and that this has a very limited psychological contract” (Peel and Boxall, 2005:1678). Rousseau and Libuser (1997) lament that contract staff have a different psychological contract with the organisation than their permanent counterparts.

Based on interviews carried out with the cleaning staff and the cleaning supervisors, results indicate that the psychological contract was somewhat stronger for internal employees than contract employees. Contract employees had loyalty towards both their contract company and the respective college they work in. Although one might expect the contract employees to be moved around different sites – this was not found to be the case which is beneficial in building the relationship and rapport with college staff and students and within the cleaning team.

Also as a number of contract cleaners have additional cleaning jobs it is difficult for these particular people to feel loyalty towards any one specific site. However it was clear that the contract cleaners who had been working at a particular college for a number of years were more loyal and had a greater sense of “belonging” then their newer (often younger) colleagues who viewed this type of work as more of a temporary or fill-in role whilst studying or between travels etc.

This concurs with McDonald and Makin (1999) who concluded from their studies that there were no significant differences between the permanent and non-permanent staff in the overall levels of the psychological contract and concluded that these findings may lie in the length of time the non-permanent employees had spent with the organisation.
Working conditions also differ between contract cleaners and internal employees in that internal employees are paid a higher hourly rate and receive additional employment benefits such as accumulated sick leave, 5 weeks annual leave, superannuation, retiring gratuity, long service leave and annual wage increases and food, for example morning teas and lunches in one college, also a more substantial uniform for internal employees.

All cleaners achieved job satisfaction and took pride in their particular area they clean although it could sometimes be a “thankless” task when you leave it clean and the next day you come back and it is a “mess” again.

All cleaners had commitment to the respective college but it was more apparent with the internal cleaners that cleaning in colleges was preferable to cleaning elsewhere, and also better than working for a contract cleaning company, due to the additional benefits provided.

In a study carried out by Benson (1998) on dual commitment of contract works in Australia – 71% of contractor workers indicated they would prefer to work directly for a company (rather than the contractor). Mottaz (1998); Reichers (1985) found that a friendly and supportive work environ has been instrumental in developing commitment. However this does not concur with the evidence reported from the cleaning staff interviews.

It was important to all cleaners (contract and internal) that the ‘team’ was happy and supportive of each other and that they felt appreciated by the college management staff in the work that they do. All cleaning staff liked being invited to college functions and having a Christmas function whether it was a BBQ or a nice lunch at the College.

(LC2) interviews with the property manager and the administrator revealed that the relationship with the contract cleaners had been somewhat difficult in the past and the property manager decided that the college needed to work on this relationship hence he
has taken on this role of meeting informally with the cleaning supervisor each morning to address any issues they may have in the college. It was reported that this had enhanced the relationship and it was now much better. Based on English being the second language for the majority of the cleaners at this college, this may well support the effect this has on communication issues and understanding between college staff and the cleaners.

All college management staff reported having a very good relationship with the contract company off-site manager who regularly visits 2-3 times per week and carries out spot checks on the cleaning.

The literature was mixed with regard to the level of commitment contract staff and internal employees have to the client organisation, and for the contract staff the level of commitment they have towards the contract company i.e. dual commitment expectations for contract staff.

The level of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards contract cleaners receive compared to internal employees could also have an impact on their sense of ‘belonging’ to the client organisation. Also general involvement and daily communication with college staff seemed to influence how the cleaning staff (contract and internal) felt about their respective client organisation thus relating to the social exchange theory.

Chapter 5 will present a summary of the findings in relation to the specific research objectives and the literature reviewed.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter revisits the overall aim and specific objectives of this research study.

The findings are summarised and related to the specific research objectives: *Internal employees versus contract employees: Are the ‘Outcomes’ the same?*

Research Questions

- *Does the use of a workforce comprising of university employed domestic cleaning staff result in a higher or lower level of service, and a higher or lower quality environment, as reported by college residents, than is the case where external (contracted) domestic cleaning staff are engaged?*

- *Does the workers’ psychological contract, organisational commitment, job satisfaction, training/development and perspective, and teamwork in relation to their respective employment relationship, differ between the university employed cleaning staff, and the external cleaning staff, and if it does, to what extent?*

Or specifically to determine whether it is more beneficial (tangible and intangible) for domestic (cleaning) staff in university owned residential colleges, to be directly employed by the colleges (i.e. university employees), or by employing external contract employees.

Conclusions from this research work are derived and linked to the research objectives and the literature reviewed, and based on these conclusions, recommendations will be made where applicable. The limitations of this study are also highlighted.
Research Objectives: Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the employment of internal employees and the employment of contract employees, in cleaning services of five university owned residential colleges, produced the same outcomes.

There were a number of objectives examined in this study with regard to tangible and intangible outcomes and for various stakeholders i.e. students, cleaners, colleges management staff, Accommodation Services Division, and the wider University.

Firstly, the tangible costs were analysed and compared in order to ascertain cleaning costs per student per college, and compare this with an overall weighted average.

Also within the scope of the study, staff turnover rates were assessed to determine any difference between internal employees and contract employees, on an average staff turnover per annum basis. HR costs associated with the employment of internal employees versus contract employees were also analysed and will be discussed.

The flexibility of contract employees compared to internal employees will also be discussed and whether there is greater risk associated with contract employees as the literature alluded too. The aspect of training comparisons between internal and contract employees will also be addressed and considered.

Management and control of contract employees compared to internal employees was addressed and findings will be presented. Another foci of the study involved ascertaining internal employees versus contract employees to assess loyalty towards the client organisation (residential college), teamwork, job satisfaction, and the level of psychological contract.

Quality of service (tangible and intangible) was also examined in relation to the assumption from the literature that internal employees will provide a better quality of service due to factors such as having greater commitment to the organisation,
teamwork, greater job satisfaction, and be more loyal based on their feeling of ‘belonging’. As a result of these factors the strength of the psychological contract will be assessed (where possible) between the two groups of employees.

Limitations of the study

Some limitations of this study need to be acknowledged.

One of the limitations found when conducting interviews with the cleaning supervisors and cleaners was in relation to my position as the Business Analyst for the Accommodation Services Division at the University of Otago. In this dual role as both student researcher and Business Analyst for the Accommodation Services Division of the University, the Analyst role could have posed a potential significant influence on respondents who may have felt intimidated by this. The dual role also posed a potential conflict of interest as it was important to balance and maintain the line between applied academic research and a consultancy report.

Approval was sought and approved from the Ethics Committee of the University of Otago, Accommodation Services Divisional Office, College staff, Contract cleaning companies and staff and Ngai Tahu Research Consultation Committee.

At times I felt that some cleaners were only telling me what they thought I wanted to hear. Also there was an undercurrent from some cleaners that I was there to review their jobs and (surprisingly) this feeling was stronger amongst contract cleaning staff.

The same limitation could be applied to the interviews conducted with the college management staff who may have also thought “I was wearing two hats” so responses may have been guarded in some situations. With the college management staff it would have been difficult to view me as the ‘researcher’ rather than a colleague and this may have affected objectivity. There may be concern that as the researcher and the business analyst I may be influenced by prior knowledge and impartiality.
It was surprising how little most people interviewed had to say and this was contrary to what I expected i.e. I thought there would be more free flow comments and chat but the interviews are quite formal and a number of cleaning staff did not want to be audio taped and this was perhaps due to the interviews being quite structured.

Another limitation was not being given permission to interview the contract cleaners at LC2 due to the majority of the cleaners employed there having English as their second language. Due to this, an additional large contract college was added to the original sample size which took this up to 5 colleges and included 38 interviews, so consequently additional data to analyse and discuss.

The student survey was managed by the Quality Advancement Unit at the University of Otago and is an annual survey carried out in residential colleges that I was able to add my cleaning questions too. Whilst this was a great advantage for this research I was limited to the type and number of survey questions I could add. One of the survey results that would have been useful to my research would have been the gender of the student answering the survey however this did not form part of the main survey. Also (LC1) was inadvertently missed from the main survey and had to be surveyed at a later date which impacted on the response rate at this college. There were no results for the survey question “Cleanliness of common spaces” for (LI) so this impacted on the statistical analysis and data comparisons – I understand it was because this question was asked in a different format at this college.

**Why Outsource?**

Firms outsource their non-core functions in an attempt to improve efficiency and reduce costs (Benson and Ieronimo, 1996; Plunkett, 1991). The economic benefits are usually achieved by lower labour costs and work intensification (Rees and Fielder, 1992). The consequences of outsourcing are seen as generally positive (Purcell, 1996), and noted that it was possible to identify situations where outsourcing may provide greater stability and predictability for employees (Coyle-Shapiro and Purcell, 1999).
“Economic efficiencies and arguments may explain a large amount of management decision-making in relation to meeting the needs of the firm. Often an employment contractual relationship might be preferred in particular circumstances” (Peel and Boxall, 2005:1676).

However the focus on economic efficiency will not explain human behaviour, particularly the psychological and sociological dynamics of complex relationships.

One of the primary reasons for employing contract staff is cost savings for an organisation, and the related benefits of a “hands-off” management approach, for example less recruitment costs, fewer performance management responsibilities, less commitment and support required from management which includes supervision and training. “The decision to outsource is expected to lend to lower costs, better quality, or better service – preferably all three” (Allen and Chandrashekar, 2000:25).

Reilly and Tomkin (1996) view was that an activity could be provided more effectively if it was exposed to competitive pressure; that in-house service provision is, by mere definition, less efficient.

**Discussion**

The main objective of the study was to examine the differences between internally employed cleaners and contract cleaning employees with a view to understanding if the outcomes were the same as perceived by student residents, college management staff, cleaning supervisors and the cleaners.

With regard to the literature reviewed for this study and the research questions formed from this, the results were somewhat surprising and contrary in some instances in relation to some of the research questions, but concurred with the results in other research questions.

Results will now be discussed in relation to the research hypotheses questions.
H1. **Contract cleaning employees in University owned residential colleges will be more cost effective than internally employed cleaners – including less time consuming, requiring less resources than the management of internal employees.**

Cost Comparisons based on 2011 Actual Figures

Refer Table 4.1 Page 50 and Table 4.2 Page 52

Notes

- Costs have been calculated from analytical data based on actual figures from 2011 year.
- Cost per day per student has been calculated based on 2011 total cleaning costs / number of weeks cleaned / number of days cleaned per week / number of student residents.
- 44 weeks has been used as the mean for calculation purposes and equity.
- All figures include cleaning products.
- College LI did not have a cleaning supervisor for the most part of 2011 (which was budgeted for), therefore although temporary cleaners were hired meaning there would be some offset, there would still be savings in the aforementioned salary giving a lower wage figure for calculation purposes.
- LI and LC1 both have cleaning supervisors who do not clean unless required to fill in thus this seems to have an effect on the cost.
- LC2, SC and SI all have cleaning supervisors who clean as well as supervise.

Locations

- College LI has one main building with a lift and one block of twenty flats.
- College LC1 has four main buildings with lifts and a large number of locations spread around a 1km area which requires some walking travel time.
- College LC2 has one main building with a lift.
• College SI have four main buildings with a lift and 20 separate houses.
• College SC have two main buildings (no lift) and two houses and do not clean student bedrooms.

As can be seen from Table 4.1 and 4.2 there were significant differences between the comparative analyses of cleaning costs for the 2011 year for the five residential colleges included in this research.

Difficulties and limitations arise within these comparisons due to all of the sampled colleges being different in infrastructure, layout, location, number of buildings and distance, age and condition of buildings, lifts/no lifts and general aesthetics, so these variances need to be considered when comparing the colleges.

Therefore within this research, given the variables described, it was difficult to compare “apples with apples” thus assumptions made are somewhat subjective. For example some colleges are one site and have lifts (which makes it easier for cleaners to move themselves and cleaning gear around. Other colleges may have a number of flats semi-attached and notwithstanding of various ages, states of repair etc.

As can be seen from Table 4.1 and 4.2 the results are mixed and a number of the factors mentioned above need to be considered when comparing the results. Results suggest that economies of scale and the number of locations have quite an impact on the costs. Interestingly the number of days cleaning takes place does not intuitively appear to have an obvious impact on the results.

Although difficult to put a cost on a weekly vacuum of a bedroom this may have impacted favourably on SC’s results as they do not clean bedrooms.

Results from the comparative analysis overall suggest that on average contract cleaning is more cost effective when the number of locations and distance are factored in.
**HR Costs**

Research findings were clear that HR costs for internal employees were greater than for contract employees as predicted in Hypothesis 1. Recruitment costs for an internal cleaner averaged $1,150 per year, per cleaner.

(Benson, 1998:355) asked “if contract employees maintain commitment to their employer and to the client organisation at which they work”. The literature suggests that poorly committed workers were found to be less motivated and involved, have lower levels of job performance, are less likely to accept change, and are more likely to resign, and be absent from work. Thus suggesting that contract employees may have a higher turnover of staff due to the intrinsic measures they may not be receiving. However based on the research for this thesis, this was not found to be the case and it was reported that staff turnover of cleaners averaged 1-2 people per year, both for internal cleaning employee’s and contract cleaning employee’s respectively.

Internal cleaners also have the added costs of annual general wage increases, 5 weeks annual leave, retirement gratuity, long service leave, parental leave, superannuation and accumulated sick leave. In the last 2-3 years domestic staff and kitchen staff at university residential colleges have become part of the University General Staff Agreement allowing them the benefits all other University staff enjoy.

Employee related costs or ‘problems’ include employment legislation; dismissal complexities; and risk and liability. Special leave (sick and bereavement); holidays; parental leave; and work related injury leave all present difficulties for the employer, as all paid leave represents payment for no return, plus additional employees to maintain the work levels. Leave, particularly parental leave, may require temporary cover for the absent employee, which involves administration. The administration of all types of leave also involves cost and effort. Therefore, generally H1 was proven that contract cleaners are overall more cost effective than internal cleaners.


**H2. Contract cleaning employees is a more flexible arrangement than internal cleaning staff.**

Employer responses to changing economic and market conditions has seen the development of more ‘flexible’ forms of labour, as a means of increasing efficiency and ultimately reducing costs. Results showed that more flexibility exists for those colleges using contract cleaners particularly in so far as the management of cleaners i.e. when a contract cleaner is absent, the contract company will provide another cleaner to fill in, immediately and at no additional cost.

Colleges with internal cleaners normally cover this absence with existing cleaners working additional hours or the cleaning supervisor steps in to help. Additional costs are also evident with internal cleaners as sick leave etc. still has to be paid, whereas in the case of the contract cleaner, sick leave is “picked up” by the contract company, therefore no extra costs as a result of the absenteeism.

Also if a contract company employee is found to be unsuitable to the college environment for any number of reasons – the contract company will replace the cleaner quickly and quietly. Examples of this have happened at two colleges.

In a college with internal employed cleaners this would become a performance issue that would require management, which would have significant costs and resources involved, notwithstanding the effect on the employee/employer relationship.

Flexible workers provide an organisation with the ability to match labour with demand without a commitment to regular or on-going employment and the added costs and administration. Contracting out to existing suppliers has been a model adopted widely, particularly by public sector organisations (Reilly and Tomkins, 1996). Commonly contracted out activities are ancillary services (such as cleaning, security and maintenance).
Organisations have adopted this approach in order to reduce costs. However this and the flexibility advantage must be considered to be beneficial. The contracting out model is also viewed as not only being more flexible but also to improve productivity.

From the research carried out for this study, efficiency and productivity were difficult to pinpoint when comparing the various organisations in the case study, all with differing infrastructures and environments.

However with regard to flexibility, H2 was proven in that contract cleaners were found to be a more flexible arrangement than internal cleaning staff.
H3. *Contract cleaning employees pose more risk for the organisation as they have been employed by a third party.*

Literature reviewed suggests additional risks with contract employees with regard to training and perceived health and safety. It was perceived that health and safety may be a concern associated with contractors due to a lack of training and induction particularly of on-site hazards and site specific risks. Peek, Grunewald and Reed (1997) reported that the contract workers received significantly lower training and orientation and were less conversant with the mission of the client organisation, resulting in some of those contract workers failing to perform. Kochen et al (1994) found that contract employment relationships can affect stress with potentially serious effects on safety.

As indicated in the findings of this research – results were contrary to the literature that supported the likelihood that internal employees will have a more comprehensive training and induction plan than their contracted counterparts.

It was found that contract cleaners received training from the Contract Company and chemical company before commencing work on-site at the client organisation and there is on-going training. Monthly health and safety meetings were also held on-site at one college which all cleaners and cleaning supervisors attended. This meeting covers all incidents, damages and any other issues. On the contrary internal employees appeared not to have any specific training although some had first aid training – other did not. This was found to be an area that could be strengthened and will be discussed further in the recommendations section.

As each cleaner (contract or internal) has their own particular area to clean in each respective residential college – it is a likely outcome that they will become familiar and acquainted to a certain degree with the students who reside in that area.
As students of different gender and culture ‘live together’ and share common spaces and bathrooms in residential colleges (for the most part – some colleges do have same gender floors set aside for cultural reasons but not all colleges have this), and also the cleaners are of different genders and culture – some degree of risk could be associated with this due to different ethnic beliefs, expectations and cultural awareness.

However it was not found to be the case that contract cleaners pose more risk for the organisation than internally employed cleaners.
H4. Management and control of contract cleaning employees is more difficult as it involves a third party i.e. the contract company.

It is clear from the literature that the management of contract workers requires different skills than the management of internal employees, and that managers will need to adapt to this interface. Managers need to resist managing contract workers as they would manage internal employees.

Biggs and Swailes (2006) assert that contract workers or agency workers are in a triangular relationship between the employment agency who hires them, the organisation they work for, as well as themselves. Kalleberg (2000:358) purports “the emergence of triangular employment relations constitutes a major challenge to labour law, unionisation and other aspects of industrial relations systems”.

Findings from the research undertaken for this study strongly indicate that the control of contract employees is not more difficult, conversely there seems to be a very good relationship with on-site supervisors, off-site supervisors, and sound communication with all parties involved. Employee related ‘problems’ such as unions, leave, redundancy and dismissal are all avoided in the contract relationship. Liability and obligation extends only to the commercial and contractual relationship between the two parties.

Literature suggests that one of the advantages associated with internal employees was the function of control i.e. employees are subject to the direction and control of their employer and thus are obliged to carry out employer instructions.

Employers had the right to control the manner in which employees did their work; contractors could be controlled in terms of ‘what to do but not how to do it’. Internal employees have knowledge of the organisation’s culture, policies, work practices and procedures on both formal and informal levels (Greene, 1998).
It has been suggested that one of the main advantages of internal employees is control and that by using contractors infers a relative lack of control as a major disadvantage.

However this was not found to be proven in any of the organisations included in this research.
**H5. Internal employees will have greater organisational commitment due to a higher level of psychological contract as a result of organisational benefits.**

**H6. Internal employees will have greater job satisfaction as they feel like an “insider” in the organisation and therefore “belong”.**

(As **H5 and H6 have common themes the results of the research will be presented together**).

According to various researchers in Felfe et al (2008) employees expressing high organisational commitment show higher levels of satisfaction, are more likely to engage in behaviours that contribute to an organisation’s competitive advantage.

Research findings tended to gravitate towards internal cleaners having greater organisational commitment which it is thought stems largely from intrinsic and extrinsic benefits received. Job satisfaction appeared to be greater for internal cleaners and once again perhaps due to the greater “inclusion” and more generous intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The sense of “belonging” ascertained from the cleaners interviews did not appear to be stronger for the internal cleaners than the contract cleaners. Teamwork appeared to be important regardless of whether the cleaning team were internal employees or contract employees, and the impact and influence the cleaning supervisor had on the team was also important.

Contrary to thought – contract cleaners are not continually moving from site to site therefore they are able to maintain longevity at a particular college, thus ensuring the same ‘team’ is employed at the same site, which is beneficial to the feeling of bonding and commitment to the team, and the respective College. Although contract cleaning employees are invited to some college staff functions and embraced this – “to be seen as an employee of the college” – many still see themselves as a “contract cleaner”.
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Internal cleaners who came from a contract cleaning background were very happy to have an “internal” cleaning job in the residential college. One cleaner said “I have found my niche”. They also felt “special” being invited to college staff functions.

Another internal cleaner interviewed had worked at various places over the years for a contract company and now loved being an “internal” employee and the sense of “belonging” to the college that came with this.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990:171) define “commitment towards an organisation as a bond or linking of the individual to the organisation”. Porter et al (1974:604) said “commitment can be characterised by three factors: a belief in and an acceptance of the organisations goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort; and a desire to maintain organisational membership”.

Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow (2001:3) purport “that employees working under contracted conditions resemble temporary workers but their expectation of employment with a single client over an extended time makes their situation unique but increasingly common”.

Benson (1998) in research of dual commitment contract workers in Australia espoused that the commitment of contract labour had not been the subject of sustained research and that little was known of how committed contractors are, and any factors that affect this commitment. Benson (1998) also found evidence of dual commitment to their employer and to their host organisation, and that commitment to the host organisation was considerably higher than commitment to the contract company employer.

In the research carried out for this thesis, dual commitment was also discovered following interviews with the cleaners, and often this level of commitment or difference was related to how long the person had been working for the host organisation or the residential college in this instance.
Cooper and Hartley (1991:23-4); James (1992:49) purport “that it is important that the employer recognises that commitment to a job or work group may be more important than commitment to the employing company”. Cooper et al (1991) also espouse that given the dual nature of employment for contract employees – greater employee involvement and training may also improve commitment to the employer.

Therefore in summary, studies indicate that contract employees can have dual commitments, and this commitment to the employer and the host company can be affected by different factors. (Benson, 1999)

In the research undertaken for this study, results indicate that because the contract cleaners are not moved around to different sites and can be cleaning in the same residential college for many years, this is thought to have a significant impact on the loyalty and commitment extended towards the college. The opposite of this was evident in contract cleaners who did 2-3 different cleaning jobs.

Studies undertaken by Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow (2006), on organisational and client commitment among contracted employees, moot that it is in both the contractor and client organisations best interests to create co-employment situations where employees are favourably disposed towards both i.e. the contractor and the client.

Other studies cite the social exchange theory as a basis for understanding organisational commitment. Gouldner (1960:171) depicts the process of exchange is governed by the norm of reciprocity “where an individual is obligated to return favourable treatment received from a donor” – i.e. there is an expectation that by providing another with benefits, an obligation has been created, whereby the recipient will reciprocate the benefits received.

The psychological contract is also grounded in social exchange theory i.e. an individual’s perception of the mutual obligations that exist between the person and their employer (Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow, 2006).
Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow, (2006:578) note “that industrial relations indicate that dual commitment is more likely where relations between management and unions are positive and constructive thus the employee does not have to choose between when it comes to loyalty”.

Based on the interviews undertaken with cleaning staff (both internal and contract) findings did appear to be more positively consistent with greater job satisfaction and organisational commitment for the internal employees than the contract workers. However whether this can be wholly attributed to the intrinsic rewards internal employees receive in comparison to contract employees is debatable.

It should be noted that contract employees also had job satisfaction, organisational commitment and this appeared to be contributed to the psychological contract and the social exchange theory, but not to the same extent as internal employees who have far greater employment rewards, ‘privileges and perks’, which those who had previously been contract workers, acknowledged.

Therefore findings strongly suggest that extrinsic rewards are important especially in this type of employment where it is labour intensive, low wages and job satisfaction factors can be challenging or put simply ‘a little bit goes a long way’ in terms of endorsement, appreciation, recognition etc.

In essence H5 and H6 were found to be proven in terms of internal employees having greater organisational commitment as a result of organisational benefits thus affecting the psychological contract, and slightly more job satisfaction because they are an ‘insider’ to the organisation.
**H7. Internal employees will have better internal induction and on-site training specific to the organisation’s culture and expectations.**

Within the literature reviewed additional risks were associated with contract employees in regard to training and perceived health and safety. Peek, Grunewald and Reed (1997) reported that the contract workers received significantly lower training and orientation and were less conversant with the mission of the client organisation, resulting in some of those contract workers failing to perform. It was perceived that health and safety may be a concern associated with contractors due to a lack of training and induction particularly of on-site hazards and site specific risks.

As indicated in the findings of this research – results were contrary to the literature that supported the likelihood that internal employees will have a more comprehensive training and induction plan than their contracted counterparts. A lack of training may contribute to enhanced risk. Ryan (1992); Atkinson and Meager (1986a) assert that skills and training is often an area that may be recognized in the drive for cost cutting, and also an investment that organisations are unwilling to make in uncertain conditions. Kochen et al (1994) found that contract employment relationships can affect stress with potentially serious effects on safety. Belous (1989); Pfeffer and Baron (1991) espouse that the use of contractors as opposed to employees provides a source of savings in terms of training.

It was found that contract cleaners received training from the Contract Company and chemical company before commencing work on-site at the client organisation and there is on-going training. Monthly health and safety meetings were also held on-site (at one contract cleaning site) which all cleaners and cleaning supervisors attended. This meeting covers all incidents, damages and any other issues. On the contrary internal employees appeared not to have any specific training although some had first aid training, others did not. This was found to be an area that could be strengthened and will be discussed further in the recommendations section.
H8. There will be no significant difference between the two groups of employees with regard to the quality of service provided (tangible).

Refer Table 4.11 Total Survey Results Page 104

The tangible quality of service was measured by interviews with the college management staff and by conducting student surveys in the residential colleges.

One aspect of the studies of quality of service to note is – each respective residential college has their own set of cleaners, their own residential students, and management staff therefore there is no benchmark standard that students were surveyed against i.e. the students residing in each respective college only know the cleaning standard in that particular college. For the majority of these students it is their first year away from home so it is difficult to understand and measure their different expectations and depending on their socio-economic background and other factors, this could have an impact on their judgment of the services provided. Therefore, there are difficulties in measuring and controlling service quality, as many factors affect perceptions of service quality between individuals and thus can be subjective.

The quality of cleaning in the residential colleges is important and forms part of the service provided to fee paying residents. There is also the hygiene aspect to consider when so many people reside in such close environs. Therefore not only is the quality of cleaning important as perceived by residents and visitors – it is also a critical aspect of ensuring the residents and staff are living and working in a healthy and hygienic environment.

Ozment and Marsh, (1994:354) said “that when there is a close interaction between a service employee and the customer, the manner in which the service is performed is often more important that what is actually delivered”.
Clearly this would incorporate the intangible aspect of the service delivered and in the case of cleaner/student in a residential college could well be very important if the student has formed a close bond/rapport with their cleaner which can occur.

According to Santos (2002) and Mersha & Adlakha, (1997) service quality is a multidimensional concept that can mean different things to different people. Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1993) suggested that ‘tangibles associated with the service’ lead to customers inferences about what the service should be like, and will be like, and therefore help to form customer expectations.

Mixed evidence from literature around the importance of the ‘tangible’ dimension of both customers service providers could be related to cultural differences and/or sampling differences. “As there is no physical dimension or outcome such as the quality of cleaning, measurement is based on tangible evidence rather than the core service. Tangibles then can be viewed as perceived value from the consumer’s perspective” (Santos 293:295). Quality and service are issues that are often perceived to be in conflict with price. Zeithaml (1988:14) perceived value as “the consumers overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given”.

As there is no tangible product apart from visual evidence – quality of cleaning therefore can only be evidenced by opinions, and is therefore subjective and difficult to quantify, so this needs to be considered when reviewing the findings. That said – based on the findings in Table 4.11, survey results ranged from 1.6 to 1.8 average and varied between colleges irrespective of whether a particular college used internal or contract cleaners and given that the range was 1 = Excellent, 5 = Poor, this was a very good result for all colleges.

Therefore hypothesis 8 is proven that there is no distinct difference between the internal and contract cleaners in terms of quality of service.
H9. Quality of service provided (intangible) will be greater from the internal employees due to greater commitment, job satisfaction, and a greater feeling of loyalty generated from “belonging”.

H10. The psychological contract will be stronger for the internal employees due to greater commitment, teamwork, job satisfaction, and a greater sense of loyalty due to “belonging”.

(As H9 and H10 have common themes the results of the research will be presented together).

Often the way a service is provided is more important than the service actually being provided. This aspect of the research was to ascertain, mainly from the student surveys, whether there was a perceived difference in how they viewed the cleaners, if there was any difference between their perceptions of internal versus contract cleaners, and frankly if they cared, or noticed.

Interviews with college management staff also focused on their perceptions of how important internal/college cleaners were to their respective colleges. There has always been a long held view from each respective model of cleaning i.e. internal or contract – that “their way” is the best way thus there is a lot of interest in what the findings of this research will conclude. The foci of research questions H9 and H10 was based on anecdotal evidence in relation to the level and amount of pastoral care that cleaners provide in colleges.

“Pastoral care is the practice of supporting the academic, personal and social wellbeing of a student. It includes providing opportunities to address challenges to effective academic performance as well as promoting personal growth and development. Pastoral care is not a complementary service. It is an inclusive function, integrated within the structures and cultures of the University” (University of Otago Pastoral Care Review, 2012).
Therefore the intangible measurement of cleaning service provided needed to be tested as to whether there was a difference between what the internal cleaners provided and what the contract cleaners provided and whether one was deemed to be better than the other in intangible terms. The level of intangible service provided is even more subjective and difficult to measure than tangible service therefore there will be some discretion of measurement and of results taken into account. Literature highlights intangibility as one of the fundamental characteristics of services.

Johnston (1995) argued that the intangible aspects of the staff-customer interface have significant effects, both negative and positive, on service quality. A certain degree of tangibility and intangibility exists in both service processes and service outputs. Santos (2002:300) asserts “the degree of tangibility or intangibility does have a significant effect on consumers’ perceptions of service quality”.

Coyle-Shapiro and Purcell (1999:6) purport “the psychological contract has re-emerged as a framework for understanding the implications of current pressures on organisations and their responses on the employment relationship. – defined as an individual’s belief regarding the mutual obligations between themselves and the organisation”. Rousseau (1989:125) asserts “the concept of a psychological contract is tied to the individual’s commitment to the organisation. Commitment being characterised by three factors: acceptance of the organisation’s values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation, and desire to remain an employee. Individuals have psychological contracts, organisations do not”.

As new employee-employment relationships are presently evolving and taking on new forms involving the use of third parties who place employees with ‘host’ or ‘client’ organisations on a long-term basis (Connelly & Gallagher, 2001); (George, 2003); (Lepak Takeneh & Snell, 2003), these arrangements can be confusing to employees with regard to who they regard as their employer i.e. the contractor or the client organisation.
Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow (2006:16) based on study results assert “the organisational commitment is rendered more complex when considered in the context of alternative or non-traditional employment contracts”. Findings of this study were consistent with the proposition that contracted employees develop attachments to both their employers and their client organisations.

Fair treatment, organisational supportiveness and fulfilled promises are thought to create an obligation that employees seek to reciprocate.

Hall (2006); Kuvaas & Dysvik (2009b) claim that the use of contract workers may counter “best practice” human resource management practices, aimed at creating a highly committed and motivated workforce. However Kuvaas, Dysvik (2009b); Moorman & Harland (2002) maintain this difficulty can be overcome if contract workers are provided with higher levels of organisation support, inducements and obligations, which may in turn, encourage greater positive attitudes and behaviours.

Extrinsic rewards play an important role in the strength of the psychological contract particularly when the work undertaken i.e. cleaning is repetitious, labour intensive, boring and sometimes revolting, suggest that the intrinsic rewards would be minimal in this field of work. As wages and salaries are a primary concern for all employees, the internal cleaners were slightly more ‘well-off’ than the contract cleaners in terms of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Greene (1999) claims the strongest benefits to workers of being an ‘internal’ employee are security, employment rights and benefits and the right to collectivise.

Liden et al (2003) and Coyle-Shapiro et al (2006) pointed out that working for two organisations simultaneously makes understanding contracted employees more complex than the study of standard employees.
As contract workers form views of their exchange relationships, both with their client organisation and with their temporary employment agency, this in turn may affect their behaviours and attitudes towards both organisations, thus indicating some form of dual commitment on behalf of the contract workers (Liden et al., 2003); (Coyle-Shapiro et al., 2006). Studies undertaken by Buch, Kuvaas, Dysvik, (2010:98) on dual support in contract workers triangular employment relationships found that “contract workers, who see a high degree of support from their temporary employment agency and who perceive that their client organisation invests in them, will reciprocate by way of increased work effort and ‘good’ organisational behaviour and attitude”.

Therefore this would imply that both organisations are reciprocated i.e. not only do the contract workers repay the client organisation for its investment, but they also repay the temporary employment agency by displaying a good attitude and being a sound representative for the agency. These studies also found that conversely, contract workers who see lower levels of organisational support from the temporary employment agency seem less inclined to repay the client organisation for its investments in their development. Kuvaas and Dysvik (2009b) research aligns with these findings, when they also found that contract workers who perceive high levels of investment in standard workers were more likely to form a social exchange relationship with the client organisation.

Both models of cleaning employees were found to have job satisfaction and took pride in their own area, and their respective college in its entirety. Teamwork was apparent in both types of employees and did not appear to be greater for internal or contract employees. In fact from observations and interviews, teamwork may be stronger in contract employee groups as they feel ‘apart’ from the other internal employees at the college, therefore form a stronger bond in their own group. Loyalty was apparent in both models of employees, albeit the contract employees having dual commitment to both the client organisation and the contract company.
Social Exchange Theory and the Psychological Contract

Although differing views of social exchange have emerged, theorists agree that social exchange involves a series of interactions that generate obligations (Emerson, 1976).

“One of the basic beliefs or principles of social exchange theory (SET) is that relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal, and mutual commitments. In order for this to happen, the parties must abide by certain ‘rules’ of exchange or otherwise known as reciprocity rules” Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005:875).

Rousseau (1989:124) said “psychological contracts stem from an individual’s beliefs in a reciprocal obligation between the individual and the organisation. The belief for an individual that reciprocity will occur can form the beginning of the development of a psychological contract. The concept of a psychological contract is tied to the individual’s commitment to the organisation”.

Coyle-Shapiro, Morrow and Kessler (2006) explored the employment relationships of contracted employees titled ‘serving two organisations’. Their findings indicated that favourable commitment and attitudes are simultaneously possible and can, respectively, be influenced by enhanced perceptions of organisational support that instil a felt obligation. Thus put simply, dual commitment to the client organisation and the contract organisation is possible, and should be encouraged as this provides the best possible outcome for all parties.

Coyle-Shapiro, Morrow and Kessler (2006) also assert that the client organisation, whilst not the ‘formal employer’, would find it in their best interests to promote a supportive environment for contract employees, as there are added benefits to be gained in terms of service delivery.

Based on research undertaken Guest (2004) claimed findings need to be taken into context of different types of employees and the meaning of flexible employee contracts, particularly if the type of work is highly skilled or knowledge work.
Conversely these findings may be quite different for contract employees in low skilled work with little option or choice.

These studies underscore the results of the research undertaken for this thesis in that, dual commitment did exist for all contracted employees and this appeared to have a dependent relationship with the length of time the particular contract employee had been working at the respective client organisation, in forming their level of “belonging”.

Chapter 6 will provide a summary of the findings, results, conclusion and recommendations.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

The overall aim of this research was to examine two models of cleaning employees working in university owned residential colleges. The two models - consisting of internal employees and contract employees. This chapter will summarise the results and provide a synopsis to address the research questions and hypotheses.

Recommendations will also be provided where appropriate and relevant.

**Conclusion 1:** Overall contract cleaning is more cost effective than internal cleaners when the number of locations and distance are factored in. Contract cleaners do not have any additional costs of leave, administration or employment issues to deal with. Staff turnover was on average similar for both types of employees, and contract employees were not moved around to different sites, therefore maintaining consistency in the relationship. Additional and on-going costs associated with internal employees need to be considered, some which are not clearly able to be quantified easily.

Internal cleaners are normally employed for 52 weeks inclusive of 5 weeks annual leave. Contract cleaners are employed on a ‘needs’ basis, usually from 40-44 weeks per annum. As all University Colleges have the opportunity to host functions (internal and external to the University) in their respective colleges and operate 52 weeks of the year – this aspect needs to be considered in the determination of colleges undertaking additional function work outside of the academic year.

**Recommendation:** That the Accommodation Services Division considers residential colleges who employ internal cleaning staff for 52 weeks of the year (rather than contract cleaning staff) be encouraged to facilitate the additional functions as the cleaning costs are already a sunk cost/overhead for the operation.
**Conclusion 2**: The employment of contract cleaners was found to be a more flexible arrangement than the employment of internal cleaners. There are also no additional costs associated with a contract cleaner being on leave as there is with internal cleaners and the contract company provides a replacement at no additional cost to the organisation. Contract cleaners are able to be employed on a ‘supply and demand’, or ‘as required’ basis.

**Conclusion 3**: Contract cleaning employees did not pose more risk for the organisation due to having been employed by a third party. Contract cleaners were found to have had off-site and on-site training and were regularly updated on health and safety issues. If a contract employee did not fit in with the organisations culture then they could be replaced quickly and quietly. However there may be risk associated with the use of one contracting company.

**Recommendation**: That the contract cleaning services contract is tendered annually and a divisional contract negotiated.

**Conclusion 4**: The management and control of contract cleaning employees was not found to be more difficult due to third part involvement. At all colleges researched there was a good relationship with the off-site contract company manager, the on-site cleaning supervisors, and the college staff. Communication among all parties was found to be sound, robust and collaboratively seeking the best results with regular meetings held and issued raised.

**Conclusion 5 & 6**: Internal cleaners were found to have slightly more job satisfaction due to the additional inclusion factors of attending functions, and greater intrinsic and extrinsic rewards which contribute to greater organisational commitment and a feeling of ‘belonging’. Contract cleaners were found to have dual commitment i.e. commitment to the client organisation and commitment to the contract company.
**Conclusion 7:** Contrary to the literature and the hypothesis based on this – internal cleaning employees were not found to have better internal induction and on-site training specific to the organisation’s culture and expectations. Rather, the contract cleaning employees had more extensive off-site and on-site training and follow-up than their counterparts. One contract cleaning college also had monthly health and safety meetings with the Property Manager and all cleaning staff to follow up on any outstanding issues or hazards.

**Recommendation:** This is an area that could be strengthened in colleges that employ internal cleaners. If some form of training was held at the start of the year it could also be incorporated as a team building exercise which would be a worthwhile course of action to enhance team culture.

**Conclusion 8:** There was found to be no significant difference between the internal cleaners and contract cleaners in terms of quality of service (tangible). All results pointed to the cleaning in the five colleges included in this research to be well above average, and in the main, very good to excellent in all aspects. However there was a substantial amount of feedback about cleaning either not being undertaken in the weekends, or if it was, the level of cleaning. When comparing small and large colleges for quality of service – small colleges rated higher than large colleges regardless of whether they used internal or contract cleaners.

**Recommendation:** That cleaning is either initiated or increased in the weekends to meet the needs of the residents.

**Conclusion 9 & 10:** Although difficult to measure, internal cleaning employees were found to have a slightly greater sense of commitment to the respective college they work in. Internal cleaning employees also felt more strongly that they ‘belonged’ and this appeared to be the result of receiving greater intrinsic and extrinsic rewards than the contract employees and therefore were ‘better off’.
The contract employees were found to have dual commitment i.e. to the college and to their contract company and this appeared to be stronger (towards the college) depending on the amount of time the contract employee had been working at the client organisation.

**Recommendation:** That contract cleaning staff that clean at a number of locations have the use of a waterproof jacket/wet weather gear whilst they are moving around outside.

The conclusions are based on an extensive review of related literature and a case study, which means that the conclusions are linked to these two sources only. One is not generalizing that what was concluded in this research automatically applies to all other institutions. Instead this research is appealing to the concept of relatability: that what was researched in this study will be of interest to other researchers and institutions interested in the research topic – *Internal employees versus external employees (contractors): Are the ‘Outcomes’ the same?*

This study has a wide range of implications for all organisations as most would employ cleaners whether internal or external and there is mixed opinion on costs, quality, level of service and the level of commitment and loyalty the different types of employees would have. Currently a certain amount of bias exists around which type of cleaner is ‘better’ therefore this research provides some insight into this area and may dispel some bias to a certain extent.

Limitations of the findings may expose occupational differences between the cleaning service provided at the University of Otago Residential Colleges and other organisations in that the Colleges provide a safe, warm, friendly environment with daytime working hours as opposed to other cleaning jobs which may be carried out at night, often alone and in cold non-residential buildings.
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Appendix A: Interviews

Appendix A contains the collection of structured questions used for interviews with Heads of Colleges, College Administrators, College Property Managers, Cleaning Supervisors, and Cleaning Staff.

Appendix A1 Head of College Interviews Allow 1 Hour

1. Do you have contract cleaners or internal employees?
2. If contract – what firm do you use?
3. Have you always used the same type of cleaners? E.g. contract/internal?
4. Have you given any thought to changing this? If so why? Did you make the change? Was it worthwhile? In what way? In what way has the change affected the management and control of your operation? Good/bad? Better/worse?
5. Is the management of the cleaning of the college a big part or small part of your role as Head of College? Why?
6. Do you have a cleaning supervisor? Do they clean? What else do they do?
7. Do you or your Deputy have your house cleaned as part of the college cleaning?
8. Generally how satisfied are you with your cleaning staff? Very, Fairly, Not satisfied
9. What aspects would you change if you could?
10. Are there any issues with cultural differences e.g. language between yourself/cleaners/supervisor/other staff/students? If yes, what type of problems does this cause e.g. understanding of expectations?
11. Do you have any communication issues with your cleaner/cleaning supervisor? Resolution or not?
12. What do you provide for your cleaning staff? E.g. uniform, breaks, food, drink, etc.?
13. What happens if a cleaner does not come to work? Is that your problem? Or whose problem?
14. Was the contract tendered? If so how often is it tendered?
15. Is there anything else you would care to add or that I have not covered?
16. Do you cleaners go in to the students bedrooms? If so for what purpose?

**Internal Cleaners**

1. How many cleaners do you have? What hours do they work? Are they salary or hourly rated?
2. How have you found the change in cleaners employment contracts (to be in line with University General Staff) has affected the college fiscally? To what extent each year?
3. Who manages the recruitment? How much time is involved in this? How much cost? E.g. advertising, interviewing etc., what is the staff turnover of cleaners?
4. Do you do the performance management of the cleaners? Or who does? How much time is involved in this process? (PDR)

**Is there anything else I have not covered?**
Appendix A2 College Administrators Interviews 30 minutes taped

1. How much do you have to do with the college cleaning staff? A lot? Expand on this or Not much?
2. How many cleaners do you have? What hours do they work? How many days/weeks? Bedrooms?

Contract Cleaners

1. Do you process the invoices for payment?
2. Do you sign off the timesheets for payments? How often? How many?
3. Who provides the cleaning products? Who orders them? Where from? Who pays?
4. Any other time you spend on the cleaning staff? How much? Why

Internal Cleaners

1. How much administration is involved within your job (to do with the cleaners)?
2. Are any other administrators involved? If so, how much time?
3. Do you process timesheets for payroll for the cleaners? If so how much time?
4. Recruitment – are you involved in this? To what extent? How much time?
5. If a cleaner does not turn up for work – is that your problem? Whose? What do you do?
6. The change for internal cleaners employment contract (in line with University General Staff) how much does this affect the colleges fiscal operations? Annually?
Appendix A3 College Property Managers Interviews 20 minutes taped

1. How much do you have to do with the college cleaning staff? A lot? Expand on this or Not much?

Contract Cleaners

1. How much time would you spend on the cleaners? What does this involve?
2. Do you sign off the invoices for payment?
3. Do you sign off the timesheets for payment? How often? How many?
4. Who provides the cleaning products? Who orders them? Where from? Who pays?
5. Any other time you spend on the cleaning staff? How much? Why?
6. Has this always been part of this role or has it emerged?
7. How do you feel about your time being taken up dealing with cleaning staff/issues?
Appendix A4  Cleaning Supervisor Interviews  30 Minutes taped

1. How many people do you supervise?
2. Do you clean as well as supervise?
3. What other duties do you do? E.g. order linen, cleaning products?
4. Where do you purchase your cleaning products from? E.g. Property Services or elsewhere?
5. What hours do you work? Part-time/fulltime? Academic year, summer cleaning?
6. Do you have a good relationship with your ‘College supervisor’? Do you have one? Who is that?

Contract Cleaners

7. How much time do you spend with your Contract Cleaning Supervisor? Do you have regular meetings? On-site/off-site? During work time?
8. Do you have performance reviews? If so, how often? If not, would you like to?
9. Do you performance review the cleaners you supervise? If not, who does? 
10. Are you involved in any administration such as timesheets etc.?
11. What happens if a cleaner does not turn up for work? Is this your problem or someone else’s? Whose problem?
Appendix A5  Internal Cleaning Supervisor

7. Do you feel part of the college management team?

8. How much administration is in your role?

9. Do you sign off/process the cleaner’s timesheets?

10. Do you sign off invoices/purchase orders?

11. Are you involved in the recruitment of the cleaners?

12. Are you involved in the cleaner’s performance management? PDR’s etc.?
Appendix A6  Cleaning Staff Interviews  30 minutes taped if permitted

Objective: *Do contract cleaners feel any different than cleaners employed directly by the college?*

1. How long have you worked for Contract Cleaning Company/College?
2. Do you like your job? How much? What is good about your job? Anything else?
3. Do you enjoy working in the college? How enjoyable?
4. What are the not so good things? E.g. Pay, unpleasant duties?
5. What do you like/dislike? Anything else? Is that it?
6. Do you feel like you work for Contract Cleaning Company or for ***** College?
7. Are the people you work with good? In what way?
8. Overall how do you feel?
9. If contractor – Do you always work here? Or do you get moved around to other places? Is that good or bad?
10. Do you have another job as well as this one?

Objective: *Is the training/induction/support cleaners receive different for contractors/university employed?*

1. When you started cleaning here – did you have a tour of the college buildings?
2. Were you shown facilities such as staff bathroom, tea room etc.?
3. Were you provided with a uniform? By Contract Cleaning Company or College?
4. Were you told what was expected of you? E.g. quality of cleaning, rules about going in to students bedrooms, offices etc.?
5. Have you had any more training since you started? What was this?
6. Did you receive training about cleaning products and chemicals? Who provided this training? Contract Cleaning Company and/or the College?
Appendix A6  Cleaning Staff Interviews

Objective: *Do cleaners feel that they are part of the college staff team?*

1. Do you feel like you are part of the college staff team? In what way?
2. Who is the person you report to? Who is the Head of College here?
3. Do you feel valued and supported by the college head? How does he/she show this?
4. Are you invited to college staff functions? Which ones? How often? Do you go? If so why? If not why not?
5. Do you feel loyalty towards ***** College? Why do you think that is or isn’t?
Appendix B: Findings to emerge from Interviews

Appendix B contains the main findings to emerge from the interviews held with Heads of Colleges, College Administrators, College Property Supervisors, Cleaning Supervisors, and Cleaning Staff.

**Appendix B1  Head of College Interview Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Colleges involved in this research had always had the same method of cleaning employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Heads of College (HOC’s) interviewed had thought of changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HOC’s interviewed said that the management of cleaning played a small part in their role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half of the HOC’s interviewed had their own houses cleaned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HOC’s satisfaction of the cleaning ranged from quite satisfied to entirely satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HOC’s would make any changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were few or no cultural issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were few or no communication issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners were provided with morning tea, some with lunch and full uniforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent cleaner – not the HOC’s problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Colleges had bedrooms cleaned except one college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Administrators Interview Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a lot of time spent on cleaners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners part-time, one college has a night cleaner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only administration involved for colleges with internal cleaners e.g. timesheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment for colleges with internal cleaners and one administrator does the PDR’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent cleaner not administrators problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One college cited some communication issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### College Property Supervisor Interview Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Property Supervisors involved only with contract cleaning staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little time spent on cleaners – just talking or might need to address ‘stuff’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of college relationship with contract cleaning staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also have a relationship with the off-site contract supervisor who visits regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some communication and language issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cleaners Interviews Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners work part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some contract cleaners had additional cleaning jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one internal cleaner had another cleaning job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disliked messy bathrooms and ‘surprises’ in bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who have a number of buildings disliked having to go outside in the cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges without a lift were a ‘pain’ for cleaners carrying vacuum cleaners up stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners felt they were part of the college team but internal cleaners more so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cleaners had loyalty to the college and the contract company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners got on well in their respective teams and helped each other out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cleaners received more training off-site and on-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners liked being invited to college functions even if they did not go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners were happy with their supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cleaners did not get moved to other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners had their own area to clean but helped others out when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners took pride in the area they clean and the respective college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most cleaners felt valued by the HOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cleaners liked working in the student environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Student Survey Questions for Residential Colleges

Appendix C contains the questions used in the residential college student surveys and the consent form for this survey.

Colleges involved in research:

- SI
- SC
- LC1
- LC2
- LI

Results of questions 19, 22, 30 of the main survey were also provided for the purpose of this research:

19. Cleanliness of College

22. Cleanliness of Bathrooms

30. Physical Environment

5 Additional Questions:

1. **How would you rate the cleaning service provided for your bedroom?**

   Excellent    Fair    Poor

   1  2  3  4  5

2. **Overall cleanliness of the common spaces you use?**

   Excellent    Fair    Poor

   1  2  3  4  5
Appendix C

Residential College Survey 2012

3. The cleaning staff respect my personal privacy

   Definitely agree, Neutral Definitely, Disagree 1 2 3 4 5

4. The cleaning staff are friendly and considerate

   Definitely agree, Neutral, Definitely Disagree 1 2 3 4 5

5. The cleaner staff appear to be part of the college team

   Definitely agree, Neutral, Definitely Disagree 1 2 3 4 5

   Any Additional Comments?
Appendix C forms part of a research project being undertaken by a University of Otago Post Graduate student. It relates particularly to the quality and service provided by cleaners in the residential colleges and involves answering five additional questions.

Please complete Appendix C in the same manner as the main college survey. This part of the survey is also treated as anonymous and will be processed in confidence.

**Consent Form for Participants**

I have read the information concerning this project and understand that my participation is entirely voluntary.

------------------------------------------

Signature of Participant  Date

-----------------------------