Assessing the readiness of facilities management organizations in implementing knowledge management systems

Syahrul Nizam Kamaruzzaman
Department of Building Surveying, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Emma Marinie Ahmad Zawawi
Centre of Research and Graduate Studies, University Technology MARA, Shah Alam, Malaysia

Muhaimin Ooyub Shafie and Siti Nur Aishah Mohd Noor
Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying, University Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Malaysia

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to assess the readiness of Malaysian facilities management (FM) organizations in implementing knowledge management (KM) systems.

Design/methodology/approach – The questionnaire survey was used to retrieve information on the readiness of FM organizations in Malaysia.

Findings – The findings reveal that, although many FM organizations were capable and ready in terms of information technology, lack of human behaviour and organizational policy is still seen. Technology, policy and human behaviour are the factors that have a strong influence on the successful outcome of KM.

Originality/value – This paper fulfils an identified need to study in implementing KM systems.
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Introduction

Knowledge is important in managing organisations, and must be recognised as such. It exists as the final product of a continuum. Figure 1 shows the relationships along this continuum and the amount of understanding required or given.

Figure 1 shows that knowledge involves the understanding of patterns (creation of models, exemplars or archetypes). Data alone have no context. When it is put into context, it becomes information. When the connections are made between different...
pieces of information, forming patterns, knowledge is obtained. When the underlying principles are understood, knowledge becomes wisdom. Another characteristic of knowledge is that it alone has no power; it requires human decision and action to acquire power.

Knowledge management (KM) is generally defined as the acquisition, storage, retrieval, application, generation and review of the knowledge assets of an organisation in a controlled way (Brelade and Harman, 2003; Pathirage et al., 2008; Tucker, 2008; Kebede, 2010; Ajmal et al., 2011), although the precise definition depends greatly on the context and relevance of the particular business sector in which it is applied.

It can be seen that KM emphasises the changing relevance of information according to context and need. The essence of KM is the relationship between two dimensions, people and information, mediated by systems and processes. This is generally seen as a comprehensive approach which recognises the interdependence of members towards the organisational effectiveness of people, technology and the systems within which knowledge is used, for example, facilities management (FM).

The British Institute of Facilities Management (BIFM, 2014) defines the discipline as:

Facilities management is the integration of processes within an organisation to maintain and develop the agreed services which support and improve the effectiveness of its primary activities.

“Facilities”, here, is defined as being the sum of physical operational functions like building and technical functions, and service-related functions (Jensen, 2008).

“Management” is defined as the coordination of the activities of other professions (Bell, 1992). Here, the emphasis is on coordination, control and planning at a strategic level.

Knowledge management in facilities management

FM in Malaysia

The growth of FM in Malaysia has been slow (Moore and Finch, 2004) and still at the development stage, in comparison with FM in other countries (Myeda and Pitt, 2014). Although FM is considered to be a new discipline in Malaysia, it can be a valuable tool in the country’s quest to achieve its vision for 2020 (Kamaruzzaman et al., 2010). Myeda and Pitt (2014) recommended that further study and analysis are essential to focus on
the FM profession in Malaysia, creating a research impetus. To date, very little research has been conducted on the concept of KM in FM in Malaysia, especially in assessing the readiness of KM in FM organisations, and awareness of KM in Malaysian FM organisations is relatively low (Yasin and Egbu, 2015). Hence, the aim of this paper is to assess the readiness of Malaysian FM organisations in implementing KM systems. Existing studies of critical success factors (CSFs) in KM were identified and then used to assess the readiness in Malaysian FM organisations.

Benefits of KM in FM
The knowledge and experience of facilities managers are required in deciding how facilities are best governed with the available resources; the client’s facilities must be managed according to the (often limited) resources provided.

Most employees no longer expect to work for the same organisation for their entire lives. The concept of the “company man” is a diminishing and already outdated notion. Phenomena such as re-engineering, downsizing, rightsizing and outsourcing have all created a more dynamic employment market. Employees now move between projects and companies. As a result, organisations have discovered that they are losing valuable skills and experience, and becoming aware that how they used to do things was a key asset that, like other valuable assets, needs to be carefully managed.

Another aspect of KM in FM organisations is increasing social inclusiveness and facilitating the involvement of users (clients) in service development; no longer is FM solely about effective and efficient delivery, but it leads to improved customer satisfaction and client relationships with FM organisations.

Barriers to KM
If organisations do not use all their available knowledge, there must be some barriers to their knowledge use and transfer that prevent the learning process. Barriers can be the result of psychological and social systems or of political or cultural restrictions.

The biggest problems in introducing a knowledge system (Ruggles, 2006; Mittelmann et al., 1999) are:

- changes in personal behaviour, 56%;
- measuring the importance and efficient use of the actual knowledge, 43%;
- justification for the use of meagre resources in introducing KM, 34%;
- recording the organisation’s existing knowledge, 28%; and
- finding a suitable scale for the knowledge initiative, 24%.

The biggest barriers or hindrances (Ruggles, 2006; Mittelmann et al., 1999) are:

- culture, 54%;
- top management are unable to clarify the purpose of KM, 32%;
- absence of a common view about the organisation’s strategy, 30%;
- organisational structure, 28%;
- inadequate responsibility for the problem, 28%;
- no standardised processes, 27%;
- restrictions imposed by information and communication technology, 22%;
Ruggles (2006) and Mittelmann et al. (1999) conclude that soft rather than the technical factors are the main problem, and that organisations need an initial balance of 50:25:25 regarding human:process:technology.

Factors in influencing successful KM

Technology factor
Strategic information systems have been critical to organisations since the 1980s. As a result, organisations have been investing heavily in information technology (IT) and IT strategies (Davenport et al., 1998; Hafizi and Zawiyah, 2004; Pathirage et al., 2008; Tucker, 2008; Kuah and Wong, 2012; Wong et al., 2014). The focus of early strategies was on:

- regulating user behaviour;
- ensuring common standards and compatibility between different applications and different technologies;
- facilitating corporate databases; and
- with the advent of email, establishing corporate communication systems.

However, investment in new technologies did not necessarily mean that the organisation’s performance improved. According to Strassman (1997), increasing advances in technology in the above contexts have resulted in the following advantages:

- solutions to storage of information and codified knowledge;
- providing efficient search and retrieval facilities; and
- effective communication, removing barriers to collaborative work created by geographic location.

The intranet and the Internet. Intranets can be navigated in the same way as the Internet, through browsers. The development of Web-based technology in recent years has created an opportunity for different approaches to collaborative working and the sharing of knowledge and expertise (knowledge creation and diffusion).

Through an intranet, organisations are able to create a platform for interactive working, as well as a knowledge repository accessible from anywhere in the world, at a relatively low cost. The intranet can be extended to the Internet by developing secure areas, accessible only to members of virtual teams. This provides structured and low-cost workspaces remotely accessible over the Internet, extending the functionality of geographically distant team members.

Human factor
The human factors are explained in the form of challenges that KM imposes on how organisations approach people management, recruitment, rewards and managing and developing knowledge and knowledge workers.
Human Resources (HR) or the personnel department is responsible for emphasising knowledge, skills and creativity and on the capturing and sharing of information. The HR department’s key role is to help bridge the gap between what people know (the information and expertise they have available to them) and what they do (King 1999; Egbu et al., 2001; Jeffrey et al., 2001).

**Recruitment, retention and succession planning in a knowledge environment**

**Recruitment.** Organisations involved in KM are becoming increasingly flexible towards recruitment. It is more important to recruit any good people encountered than to wait for vacancies to arise. The traditional perspective of a detailed job description and vacancy to which a person is recruited does not lend itself to effective KM or to the development of the individual. Use of sophisticated selection procedures designed to obtain a cultural fit can easily exclude more creative and innovative individuals and discourage diversity, inhibiting KM. More important than cultural fit is the ability of candidates to be effective in different cultures, especially if the current culture.

**Retention.** Organisations also need to adjust to changes in the reward system to retain knowledge. They should consider the expectations and perceptions of self-worth and economic worth of knowledge workers and how people are managed, treated and involved in daily operations. General principles applied in the retention of knowledge workers are:

- Making explicit the terms of psychological contract (unwritten agreements) by investigating mutual expectations.
- Building trust and evaluating management decisions.
- Involving people in managing their own work priorities and in the organisation’s priorities.
- Designing corporate personnel policies around lifestyle choices and personal aspirations of knowledge workers (e.g. flexible working hours, time off).
- Avoid reliance on regulating the employment relationship through purely contractual means.

**Succession planning.** Succession planning is intended to preserve organisations by planning for anticipated future knowledge requirements (not simply replacing particular people or filling particular jobs). This means planning for the retirement of people and technology, and identifying replacements where needed.

**Policies (organisation)**

It is suggested that the world of knowledge-based business involves continuous redefining of an organisation’s way of doing things, that is, its culture, including a continuous redefinition of organisational aims and objectives (Brian, 1994; Sveiby, 1997).

This need for change is evident in organisations affected by KM and the knowledge economy. Policies influencing KM can be further categorised into the following sub-topics.
Organisational structures

For organisations, KM is about collaborative and integrated working, pooling of knowledge and information within the organisation. Achieving this integrated and collaborative method is not just about technology; it requires doing things differently and removing barriers to integrated working. A common barrier is the hierarchical and departmental structure of traditional organisations, which are divided around functions and tasks (Wong et al., 2014).

Ryan (1995) outlined the linking organisational knowledge in decision-making:

Organisational structures draw boundaries around the activities of individuals and groups and help to specify and develop relationships between them. It can also be suggested that they regulate what expertise is available, in which areas and how much influence on decision outcomes.

KM requires the reduction or removal of boundaries and opening up the possibility of new relationships between different professions. It requires different viewpoints and multi-disciplinary collaboration, sharing ideas and experiences to solve problems and issues. Organisations need to recognise and facilitate the flow of information to achieve effective sharing of knowledge and experiences through a process of redesigning their structure around the principles of flexibility, increasing the use of multi-disciplinary project groups to deliver the corporate agenda and redefining the management role into one of trainer or coach.

Culture

Interaction between technology and people results in effective KM; the context in which these two factors interact is called the organisational structure. Without a culture that is conducive to KM, the potential to effectively harness an organisation’s knowledge resources will not be realised (Wong et al., 2014).

One of most distinctive features of organisations which have implemented successful KM is the willingness of people to share information (often inhibited by internal competitiveness and “political” relationships). If the members of an organisation are not happy to share information, this would suggest a cultural issue rather than a problem with the individuals. A common starting point for KM is a knowledge audit; an appropriate approach is analysis of the current culture, identifying aspects that will promote KM and those that will hinder it. Identifying an effective culture can put as a simple question: What makes an individual good at acquiring, using and sharing information and knowledge? Typical answers include:

- Is a good listener and equally willing to contribute to discussions and share ideas.
- Is able to build constructive relationships with others.
- Is not always seeking credit, and never tries to take it from others.
- Knows how to find out information and knowledge from a range of sources.
- Is able to separate out relevant from irrelevant information.
- Can make connections between different, apparently unrelated, pieces of information.
- Is able to organise information and ideas into a logical format.
• Can produce new and creative ideas and look at things from different perspectives.
• Is committed to continuous learning and personal development and always looks for learning opportunities in new experiences.

These answers can then be used to establish the type of culture in which the following attributes will be valued, nurtured and supported:
• individuals and individual viewpoints (including those that are contradictory);
• collaborative working and sharing of ideas and information;
• building of relationships, internally and externally (networking);
• trust;
• sound underlying systems and procedures;
• creativity and innovation; and
• training and development.

Through a clearly defined definition of the above, a culture can be evaluated as to whether it is conducive to KM. Organisations can survey their staff by ascertaining whether they feel that:
• as individuals they have a high level of autonomy in their work;
• team working and collaboration are encouraged by the organisation;
• the organisation is committed to their training and development;
• they are able to fully use their skills and abilities;
• they are valued;
• there is sufficient variety in their work; and
• they are adequately informed about and involved in making decisions.

Answers from staff to these questions give a good indication of how successful the introduction of KM might be.

Methodology
Interviews were conducted among key FM staff at the Imperia Institute of Technology to determine the existence of factors influencing success in KM. It was imperative to identify whether these factors were viewed as relevant and critical for FM organisations. The interviews were based on the knowledge management critical success factors (KMCSF) derived from a comparison and combination of the studies of David (2007) and Jennex et al. (2007) by Artinawati and Surendro (2009). This questionnaire was used as a basis for interviews with key FM personnel in the organisations selected for study.

The questionnaire comprises ten KMCSF. There are four to ten items for each KMCSF, each given a value from 0 to 5 with the following criteria:
• 0 – Not true or do not know.
• 1 – True (performed).
• 2 – True (managed) and there are rules, documentation or a standard operating procedure (SOP).
• 3 – True (defined) and there is a control and evaluation for the statement.
• 4 – True (quantitatively managed) and there is a measurement or assessment for the statement.
• 5 – True (optimised) and there is optimisation and continuous improvement for the statement.

The ten KMCSF and their attributes were approved by key FM staff of organisations practising them in Malaysia. The confirmed factors were included in the questionnaire survey; 125 FM organisations are registered with the Malaysian Association of Facility Management; and a total of 60 questionnaires were distributed to a sample determined by calling all the 125 organisations. The respondents include:

• *FM as their core business*: Organisations that perform FM for other organisations as part of outsourcing processes or methods.
• *FM as a supporting business*: Large organisations with established FM departments as part of in-house processes or methods.

The KMCSF readiness level for each factor was calculated by the following equation:

$$KMCSF \text{ Level} = \frac{\text{Sum of value given by the KMCSF}}{\text{number of statement}}$$

**Results and analysis**

Of the 60 questionnaires distributed among FM organisations in the Klang Valley, only 31 were returned. This study adopted a non-parametric analysis, and a reliability test was performed to analyse the consistency of the variables. The result revealed that the coefficient value ($\alpha = 0.782$) is considered good, indicating that the scale and the data obtained are reliable. The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

**FM organisations’ age and size**

*Organisation age.* Table I shows that the age of the FM organisation (length of time in the business of FM) that influences the level of readiness to implement KM systems. Young organisations tend to be more accommodating to organisational change, as they continually search for optimised work processes. Older organisations, on the other hand, tend to have either comprehensive or established procedures or processes which have been in implementation for many years. This decreases their flexibility towards change and acceptance of new concepts such as KM. Overall, the organisations are well distributed, with a majority having been in business for 6-10 years, that is, they have established themselves in the market and have sufficient experience in the field to realise the importance of KM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration range</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I.**
Organisation size

Table II shows the number of employees in the FM organisations, with the majority of organisations having more than 50 employees. Knowledge-sharing activities are more common among organisations with a smaller number of personnel because of their relatively narrower areas of expertise (e.g. provision of FM services specialising in electrical and mechanical engineering) as well as the presence of closer interpersonal relationships between employees. Larger organisations tend to have more difficulty streamlining their knowledge processes, as they encompass a larger and wider variety of knowledge, as well as increasing opportunities for interpersonal barriers. However, some of the organisations with a large number of employees are engaged in providing menial services such as landscaping and cleaning. This indicates that the survey has succeeded in addressing the various sizes and sub-types of FM organisations in Malaysia.

KM critical success factors

The results of the questionnaire obtained from the 31 respondents are summarised in the radar chart in Figure 2.

The details of the results on which the radar chart is based are given in Table III.

Weaknesses

Out of the ten KMCSF, there are only two which Malaysian FM organisations are not prepared for or are borderline passes on the standard score of readiness of 2 (Artinawati and Surendro, 2009): leadership and measurement.

Leadership. FM organisations in Malaysia score low on the leadership factor, at 1.84. This is interpreted as their having no specific or detailed strategy for storing and managing knowledge. However, these organisations are aware that KM and its contribution to the organisation are important. This is further reflected in the absence of clear responsibilities for knowledge strategy and activities such as those performed through a Chief Knowledge Officer. This result suggests that it is difficult for leaders or management teams to influence other employees to imitate them and to participate in KM. In essence, leaders establish a critical role for effective KM, as their support and guidance should be transformed into concerted efforts contributing to the success of KM their organisation.

Measurement. The majority of organisations lack appropriate managed and controlled assessment of knowledge processes or activities. There is also poor assessment of the contribution of existing knowledge to the organisation. This is because they have no absolute method, standard or guideline for measuring KM,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of employees in the organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-149</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-250</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 250</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Total number of employees in the organisation
hindering the organisation from tracking, evaluating, comparing, controlling and improving the progress and performance of KM. However, there is a marginally managed map of knowledge assets in the organisations. An overall score of 1.98 indicates that FM organisations in Malaysia generally recognise processes and activities informally, although they are not managed formally.

**Strengths**

Of the ten KMCSFs, eight pass the standard score of readiness of 2 (Artinawati and Surendro, 2009). These eight factors are discussed below.

**Explicit knowledge.** The overall score for the explicit knowledge KMSCF is 2.06, just above the minimum score of readiness of 2. Organisations only informally review or perform regular monitoring of available knowledge to ensure relevance and accuracy. This includes the absence of appropriate documentation methods of knowledge in terms of source and the name of the person responsible for particular knowledge. Other reasons for the lower score are informal continuous development of explicit knowledge and storage for unused ideas. However, it was observed that explicit knowledge is used for decision-making, and the management of organisational databases is formally managed.

**Knowledge hub.** The overall score for the knowledge hub KMSCF is 2.18. The organisations are already aware of the importance of knowledge hubs, implementing standard operating procedures to list knowledge users, resources, knowledge processes and storing and retrieving knowledge. The hub involves the integration of softcopy and hardcopy information, cataloguing of knowledge for more effective access and a knowledge centre that enables individuals to exchange information. This is reflected in the increasing use of technical libraries in FM organisations, where technical personnel refer to stored information for facilities they are handling. However, half of the FM organisations do not have or do not manage their knowledge maps.
### Leadership
1. Strategy of how to store and manage knowledge, and the relationship between knowledge and KMS 1.84
2. Knowledge management vision and its contribution to organisation process or business process 1.50
3. There are clear responsibilities for knowledge strategy and activities, such as through a Chief Knowledge Officer 1.63
4. Senior executives becomes a role model for employees in knowledge management practice 1.79
5. Senior executives encourage employees to participate on knowledge process 1.92
6. Regular meeting to discuss and review the organisational knowledge 1.92

### Culture/structure
7. Organisation's culture and environment encourages knowledge development and sharing 2.47
8. Organisation motivating and managing knowledge workers, so that they are innovative and readily share their knowledge 2.23
9. Award (reward) to the knowledge processes that occur 2.23
10. Organisation’s structure encourages knowledge development and sharing 2.39
11. Facilities and support for continuous learning 2.61
12. There are activities involving people with different expertise and experience 2.65
13. There is information distribution procedure 2.87
14. There are knowledge-sharing activities 2.65

### Processes
15. There is knowledge transfer process, both tacit and explicit knowledge 2.45
16. List of jobs description and organisational activities 2.58
17. List of knowledge and information needed for each job and organisational activities (knowledge map or knowledge taxonomy) 2.45
18. Knowledge process effectiveness reviewed regularly 2.19
19. Knowledge process naturally integrated into the flow of work (business process) 2.52

### Explicit knowledge
20. Collect, classify and monitor external knowledge 2.06
21. There’s a documentation for available knowledge, its source and name of person who’s responsible for particular knowledge 2.03
22. Review explicit knowledge regularly to ensure relevancy and accuracy 1.94
23. Continue to develop explicit knowledge 1.94
24. Explicit knowledge is used for decision making 2.10
25. Management of organisation’s database 2.29
26. Storage for unused ideas 1.97

### Tacit knowledge
27. Convert tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge 2.28
28. There’s a list of experts with his/her expertise 1.94
29. The exchange of knowledge between employees may occur when required and held on a regular basis 2.48
30. There’s documentation of every meetings or discussions 2.55

### Knowledge hubs and centres
31. Organisation’s knowledge structure (knowledge map) is managed 2.18
32. There’s a list of knowledge users, knowledge resources and knowledge process 2.29
33. Standard procedure to store and retrieve knowledge 2.35
34. Catalogue or index of each type of knowledge for more effective access 2.23
35. Integration of online/softcopy and hardcopy information 2.10
36. Knowledge centre that facilitate individuals to exchange information with one another 2.13

(continued)
Tacit knowledge. Although the tacit knowledge KMSCF score is 2.28 overall, many organisations scored low on the aspect of converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. This is a reflection of the absence of dedicated personnel or procedures for translating tacit knowledge for the benefit of other employees. Technical staff learns by experience alone (tacit knowledge). Otherwise, this factor received a high score because of procedures for listing experts and their areas of expertise (evident in FM organisations where certain technical areas require specialised licences), exchange of knowledge between employees (in meetings) as well as documentation of every meeting or discussion.

Exploitation. The overall score for the exploitation KMSCF factor is 2.55. FM organisations rely heavily on employees’ knowledge to gain market leverage over their competitors, due to the nature of their business, the provision of services. This is also reflected in the majority of organisations’ high scores for utilising customers’ knowledge. Again, this is due to the close nature of FM organisations’ relying heavily on customer feedback to provide a better and more accurate service. It was observed that some large FM organisations also exploit their knowledge by providing training programmes (as a non-core business activity). Some were also observed to exploit knowledge to compete with each other by providing a more comprehensive and wider range of services with different modes of contract.

People/skills. The overall score for the people and skills KMSCF is 2.55. People are the organisation’s soft infrastructure, important assets for an organisation and also the sole
originators of knowledge. The organisations understand this and know that their success depends on the knowledge and skills of their employees, and manage their training and development of knowledge. Listings employees’ skills, expertise and competence are managed and, to some extent, quantitatively managed by some organisations. The skills and competences of employees need to be continuously developed by providing appropriate professional development activities.

Culture/structure. The high score for the culture/structure KMSCF of 2.47 is due to the encouraging environment and culture of sharing knowledge between employees. FM organisations have procedures in place to reward innovation (provision of solutions) and knowledge-sharing processes (internal training) as means of motivating their employees. Although the FM organisations actively reward their employees for knowledge-sharing activities, proper measurement of its effectiveness is yet to be achieved, as discussed under the measurement KMSCF above. Other supportive statements are the presence of managed facilities for continuous learning (training, conference/meeting/lounge rooms) and information distribution procedures (e.g. facility status updates and new procedures). These enable staff knowledge sharing and transfer, offering a platform for them to come together to interact and exchange ideas. This can build trust and close relationships which facilitate a more proactive knowledge-sharing process.

Processes. The overall combined result of the processes KMSCF is 2.45. There is a managed knowledge transfer process in the organisations, reflected in on-the-job training and periodic internal and external training, which also relates to the natural integration of knowledge transfer into the flow of FM business processes. The organisations also have well-managed descriptions of organisational activities (breakdown reporting, maintenance procedures, fore-planning), usually compiled in the form of standard operating procedures. This trait is enforced by the nature of the business, as when offering services, processes must be defined carefully in contracts.

Technology infrastructure. The technology infrastructure KMSCF overall score of 2.43 reflects the presence of managed intranet (content and security) and Internet connections. The technology used to link employees (telecommunications equipment, email) is also formally managed. This can be related to the currently common and natural distribution of IT in many organisations today, as a result of lower costs and increasing availability over recent years. Technology enables the rapid search, access and retrieval of information which supports an organisation’s KM processes. However, it is noted that for the technology infrastructure to play its role in KM, factors such as, user friendliness, suitability to the user’s needs and standardisation must be considered.

Conclusion
Although some of the KMSCF do not meet the defined ideal state of the standard of readiness value of 2 (Jennex et al., 2007), it can be concluded that FM organisations in Malaysia are well on the way to an acceptable level of readiness to implement KM systems. This is shown by the majority of KMSCF achieving the score of 2, with the exception of leadership (1.84) and measurement (1.98). This means that majority of KMSCF are managed with rules, documentation or standard operating procedures; at the very least, these factors are informally performed. FM organisations in Malaysia, therefore, collectively realise the importance of knowledge in their business processes,
although their management might not be aware of the existence of established KM systems which can further increase the efficiency of their current practices.

It is hoped that the contents of this report define the readiness status of FM organisations in Malaysia in implementing KM systems. Subsequently, this report will also help introduce FM organisations to the importance of knowledge and its use as leverage in the new knowledge-based economy.
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