

© Emerald Publishing Limited. This AAM is provided for your own personal use only. It may not be used for resale, reprinting, systematic distribution, emailing, or for any other commercial purpose without the permission of the publisher.

The following publication Saka, A.B., Olaore, F.O. and Olawumi, T.O. (2019), "Post-contract material management and waste minimization: An analysis of the roles of quantity surveyors", Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 793-807 is published by Emerald and is available at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEDT-10-2018-0193>



POST-CONTRACT MATERIAL MANAGEMENT AND WASTE MINIMIZATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLES OF QUANTITY SURVEYORS'

Journal:	<i>Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	JEDT-10-2018-0193.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Quantity Surveyors, Material management, Waste minimization, Post-Contract, Construction project management

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Purpose

The paper aims to assess the level of awareness of quantity surveyors in material management and their key roles in waste minimization during the post-contract stage of the project with a view of achieving value for money in their roles.

Methodology

This involves administering a questionnaire survey among registered members of Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS), the only recognized professional body of quantity surveyors in Nigeria, within Lagos state. The empirical questionnaire survey succeeds a literature review that isolates the key strategies used by quantity surveyors in material waste management at the post-contract stage. The validity of the questionnaire was carried out by two experienced construction industry researchers and three experienced professional quantity surveyors to ensure that the questionnaire was not ambiguous and that it consists of the right questions in tandem with the research. The respondents were grouped into consultant QS and contractor's QS.

Findings

Key roles of quantity surveyors during the material management process are proper material storage and material inventory and accounting are the most important material management and waste minimization practices during the Institute stage. It revealed that there is a lack of material waste documentation practices during the construction stage. In addition, no statistical significant difference in the responses of the two groups. This may be because there is no clear compartmentalization between the practices of these groups. Also, these two groups had the same education training, as there is no difference between the educational training of the Consultant QS and Contractor's QS.

Originality/value

This study assessed the quantity surveyors' roles with regards to material waste minimization and management; It would add to the scanty research work in this area. The study has also successfully revealed the strategies that are to be adopted by the quantity surveyors to achieve value for money.

Keywords: Quantity Surveyors, Material management, Waste minimization, Post-Contract, Construction Project management.

1.0 Introduction

Cost of construction materials accounts for a huge portion of the construction project cost. It may account for 50% - 80% of the total cost (Gulghane and Khandve, 2015; Patil et al., 2013), it may vary around 20% - 70% (Bossink and Brouwers, 1996; Kini, 1991) or 30% - 80% (Skoyles, 2000; Patel et al., 2011; Muelhausen, 1991). Evidently, it most times accounts for over 50% of the construction (Akinkurolere and Franklin, 2005; Ilesanmi, 1986).

Since material cost accounts for a bigger portion of the construction cost, thus, material wastage poses a great danger to the construction industry at large. However, complete package construction contracts transfer the risk of material wastage expended during the construction to the contractor. Consequently, any cost overrun caused by poor material management is being borne solemnly by the contractor. Wahab and Lawal (2011) confirmed that material waste at the project and corporate levels imply a loss of profit and competitiveness for the contractor. Akinradewo and Arijeloye (2016) corroborated that it poses a serious problem to contractors in realizing a reasonable profit margin. Therefore, for contracting organizations to maximize their profit margin, material management is an important tool for project success; the responsibility which quantity surveyors in such contracting organizations should shoulder.

Formoso et al. (1991) viewed waste as an ineffective over or underuse of resources than the proportion deemed necessary during construction (Nazeah et al., 2008). Abdulrahman and Allitresyi (1994) viewed it as unnecessary cost generated that is of no value to the end product in the perspective of the client. Lee et al. (1999) opined that there is a dearth of research on waste because of unavailable appraising tools for it. Material waste on site is on the rise as a result of an increase in standard of living, the natural increase in population and complexity of design

59 which are harbingers of increase in construction projects. This increase is alarming, and if not
60 controlled, it can jeopardize the future of the construction industry (Dey, 2001). Ineffective
61 management of materials will tell on the core project success metrics; time, cost, and quality
62 (Putra et al., 1999). The estimators/quantity surveyors do add 5 – 7 per cent for waste during
63 tendering, but over the years this has been found to be insufficient (Obiegbu, 2002; Wahab and
64 Lawal, 2001). However, Quantity surveyors in the contracting organization have a role to play in
65 ensuring that such insufficiency is dealt with and properly managed so as not to erode the profit
66 margin.

67 Previous studies had laid much emphasis on the responsibilities of professionals in the built
68 environment in controlling material wastage at various stages of projects. Others have researched
69 into the impact of construction material wastage on contractors (Gulghane and Khandve, 2015;
70 Albert, 2014; Aiyetan, 2013). However, owing to the significant portion that the cost of materials
71 engulfs in the contract value, quantity surveyors in contracting organizations have a lot of
72 responsibilities to shoulder - in material wastage control, if they want to achieve the desired
73 profit margin for their respective organizations (Bello and Saka, 2017; Alabi *et al.*, 2018). This
74 study assesses the level of awareness of quantity surveyors in material management and waste
75 minimization, and identifies the key strategies involved and ranked these strategies in order of
76 importance. Avoidance of material waste is pertinent in having projects completed within cost,
77 time budget and to desired quality (Ayegba, 2013; Kasim, Anumba and Dainty, 2005; Ogunlana
78 et al., 1996).

2.0 Material management

Beyond reasonable doubts, an effective material waste management system can realize benefits for a contractor (Aiyetan and Smallwood, 2013). Wahab and Lawal (2011) regard material management as a reflection of site management. It is common on construction sites to see materials procured which are not eventually incorporated into the building; the common ones are the coarse and fine aggregates, reinforcement bars, timbers etc. This reflects the inefficiency of the material/site management practice of such project teams. Eduardo (2002) described material management as “the system of planning and controlling all the efforts necessary to ensure that the correct quality and quantity of materials are properly specified in a timely manner, and obtained at a reasonable cost, and most importantly, are available at the point of use when required.” Ayegba (2013) and Albert (2014) viewed it as “the process that coordinates planning, assessing the requirement sourcing, purchasing, transporting, storing and controlling of materials, minimizing the wastage and optimizing the profitability by reducing the cost of material.” From a quantity surveyor’s perspective, the in-exhaustible description of material management in the literature revolves around the theme of planning to minimize wastage and maximize profit.

Material management practices is thus divided between the field and the office (Baldva, 1997), Johnston (2001) corroborated this by noting that the selection, pricing, order preparation of schedules and payment accounts are dealt with at the head office, while learning the receipt storage, protection and use of materials, management are dealt with on construction site. In essence, the planning, procurement and logistics surrounding materials are the main focus of the head office, while handling, stock and waste control are being carried out on site. In the same

103 vein, Gulghane and Khandve (2015) opined that material management consists of activities that
104 are field, and office related; this was supported by Zeb *et al.*, (2015).

105 Material management practices come at a cost. Such cost might include the cost of setting up a
106 monitoring team in the office which will be receiving information from another team on-site /
107 field. Although the cost of putting such monitoring team in to place has to be compared with its'
108 benefit(s), it can be concluded that investment in these practices **is** of immense benefits (Aiyetan,
109 2013).

110 It has been established that the material management process is divided between head office and
111 site (Zeb *et al.*, 2015; Baldva, 1997). Gulghane and Khandve (2015) posit that material
112 management involves planning, purchasing and transportation, handling and waste control.
113 Albert (2014) and Kasim (2008) viewed it to involve planning, procurement, logistics, handling,
114 stock and waste control, which would be adopted by this study:

115 *2.1 Planning:*

116 The material planning aspect lays the foundation for other material management processes. It is
117 thus very important as other subsequent processes depend on it for support. Material planning
118 includes quantifying, ordering and scheduling (Gulghane and Khandve, 2015). This stage
119 consists of creating and updating of inventory (Payne *et al.*, 1996).

120 *2.2 Purchasing/Procurement:*

121 This consists of procuring of necessary resources that are required for **a** smooth construction
122 project (Barrie and Paulson, 1992). Kasim (2008) viewed it as procurement and sourcing of
123 physical and human resources outside the firms to aid services rendered by the organization.

124 Akinradewo and Arijeloye (2016) submitted that the motive of this stage is to make specify
125 materials available as at when deemed necessary and within the budget limit.

126 *2.3 Transportation/ Logistics:*

127 This comprises of all activities involved in getting the materials to form the source to the point of
128 usage (Agapiou et al., 1998). Albert (2014) corroborated this and regards it as the stage that
129 involves all activities dealing with moving the materials in its raw form to the finished product to
130 meet customers' requirements.

131 *2.4 Handling:*

132 Tompkins and White (1984) define effective material handling as “using the right method in
133 providing the right amount of the right material, at the right place, time, sequence, position,
134 condition, and cost”. It is a very critical stage, as ineffective handling during construction will
135 have effects on the project (Ogunlana et al., 1996) and also influence project cost and time (Putra
136 et al., 1999). Thus, it can make or mar projects (Chan, 2002). Kasim (2008) viewed it as an all-
137 encompassing stage in the movement of materials from source to its destination.

138 *2.5 Stock and waste control:*

139 This involves the availability of materials at the right place and appropriate time of need, and in
140 the necessary quantity. It can include raw materials, processed materials, and components for
141 assembly, consumable stores, general stores, maintenance materials and spares, work in progress
142 and finished products.

143 Material waste has increased in the last two decades (Katz and Baum, 2011), construction
144 material waste accounts up to 30%-40% in China, 39.27 million tons in Spain, and more than

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

145 50% in the UK. (Wang and Li, 2011). Thus, waste minimization and reuse should be of
146 importance (Albert, 2014)

147

148 **2.6 Importance of material management**

149 Material management and waste minimization is of immense benefits as it set out to as (Albert,
150 2014; Gulghane and Khandve, 2015): (1) Efficient material planning, (2) Quality assurance, (3)
151 Good supplier and customer relationship, (4) Improved departmental efficiency, (5) Reducing
152 the overall costs of materials and in duplicated orders, (6) Better handling of materials, (7)
153 Materials will be on site when needed and in the quantities required, (8) Improvements in labor
154 productivity and project schedule, (9) Better field material control and better relations with
155 supplier, (10) Reduce of materials surplus and storage of materials on site, (11) Labor and
156 purchase savings, and (12) Better cash flow management.

3.0 Research Methodology

The study employed a quantitative research method. This involved administering a questionnaire survey among registered members of Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS), the only recognized professional body of quantity surveyors in Nigeria, within Lagos state. The choice of Lagos was informed by the continuous increase in the number of ongoing construction projects in the state and its status as Nigeria's "most important economic state". Ajanlekoko (2001) eluded that Lagos accounts for 60% of prospective clients that patronize the construction industry in Nigeria. The population of the study is the registered quantity surveyors in Lagos State, Nigeria. An internet-based survey was employed in order to save time, cost and to reach a much larger sample (McDonald and Adam, 2003). Snowballing sampling technique was adopted with reference to the list of registered firms in order to reach a larger number of quantity surveyors in Lagos, state. There are 66 registered quantity surveying firms in Lagos, the emails of these firms were extracted, and the questionnaire link was sent to them. However, some of the email addresses are either incorrect or invalid (thus, the email sent was bounced back) and a low response rate was recorded. The web-link to the questionnaire was then sent to some of the identified respondents on various professional platforms (e.g. LinkedIn, Facebook group pages etc.), also some questionnaire were hand delivered to some of the professionals involved. The respondents were also asked to suggest eligible respondents for the survey. A total of 74 entries submission and questionnaires administered were recorded, out of which 52 entries were complete and valid for data analysis (70% valid response rate).

The empirical questionnaire survey succeeds a literature review that isolates the key strategies used by quantity surveyors in material waste management at the post-contract stage (Table 1). The survey was carried out to achieve the first two objectives namely: to assess the level of

180 awareness of quantity surveyors in material management and waste minimization; to assess the
181 effectiveness /adoption level of various quantity surveyors' strategies in material waste
182 management at the post-contract stage.

183 The questionnaire consists of three sections. The first section solicits demographics of the
184 respondents, the second section assessed the level of awareness quantity surveyors in material
185 management while the third category comprises of key strategies used by quantity surveyors in
186 managing material wastes which were extracted from extant literature. The extracted key
187 strategies were then subjected to ranking on the Likert scale by the quantity surveyors and
188 analyzed by using relative importance index. The relative importance index is one of the widely
189 used statistical tools in construction management to evaluate the importance of a set of variables
190 (Chan and Kumaraswamy, 1997), thus it was adopted for the analysis. A pilot survey was carried
191 out prior to the administration of the full survey. Internal validity of the questionnaire was
192 carried out by two experienced construction industry researchers and three experienced
193 professional quantity surveyors to ensure that the questionnaire was not ambiguous and that it is
194 consists of the right questions in tandem with the research.

195 Table 1: Key strategies used by quantity surveyors in material waste management at the post-
196 contract stage

197 **3.1 Method of Data Analysis**

198 The respondents' Job procedure, educational qualification, professional qualification, years of
199 experience and the number of projects undertaken were also analyzed in percentage and
200 frequency

3.1.1 Cronbach's alpha reliability test

Cronbach's alpha value is useful in assessing a research instrument and to check the internal consistency of the totality of the research instrument (Olatunji, Olawumi and Aje, 2017). Cronbach's alpha value ranges from 0 to 1, and a value of 0.7 is acceptable to further analysis of any research. The alpha (α) value of the is 0.961, which is above 0.7. This implies that further analysis can be carried out on the study and that the scale is reliable.

3.1.2 Relative Importance Index (RII)

The relative importance index method (RII) was used to determine the respondent's perception of material management and waste minimization during the post-contract stage in the construction industry. This calculation puts the factors in rank order and indicates how much the top ranked is more important than the next. The perception of the consultant quantity surveyors and the contractor's quantity surveyors were also ranked separately.

The RII was computed as:

$$\text{Relative importance index (RII)} = \sum w / (A \times N) \dots, (0 \leq \text{index} \leq 1)$$

Where: w = weighting given to each factor by the respondents and ranges from 1 to 5 where 1 is not significant and 5 is extremely significant, A = highest weight (i.e. 5 in this case), and N = a total number of respondents (i.e. in this case 52).

3.1.3 Mann Whitney U test

The Mann Whitney U test is used because the parametric assumptions were not met. It is a nonparametric test to detect whether there is a statistically significant difference exist in the median value of the same factor under study between two respondent groups (SPSS, 2007; Chan *et al.*, 2010).

224 Rule: If the probability value (p) is not less than or equal to 0.05, therefore the result is not
225 significant. There is no statistically significant divergence in the responses between the two
226 groups (Consultant quantity surveyor and Contractor's quantity surveyor).

227 4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

228 The respondents were asked to rate their perception of the level of effectiveness of material
229 management and waste minimization measures during the post-contract stage. Similarly, they
230 were asked to rate their level of adoption/usage of the key strategies identified on a five-point
231 liker-type scale (1=Very low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4=High, 5= Very high).

233 4.1 Presentation of Analysis Results

234 4.1.1 Respondents' demographics

235 From the survey conducted on the background information of respondents, it was evident that
236 48.1 per cent are contractor's quantity surveyors and 51.9 per cent are consultant quantity
237 surveyors. 23.1 per cent of the respondents had Higher National Diploma (HND)/ Postgraduate
238 Diploma (PGD), 50 per cent had Bachelor Degree (BSc/ B.Tech) as their highest academic
239 qualification while 26.9 per cent had Masters of Science or Technology (M.Sc./M.Tech).
240 Professionally, 96.1 per cent of the respondents are members of the Nigerian Institute of
241 Quantity Surveyors (MNIQS), with 2(two) fellows (FNIQS) of the Institute representing 3.9 per
242 cent of the respondents. It was also evident that respondents with years of experience within 5 to
243 10 years represent the major with 40.4 per cent, followed by those with 11 to 15 years with 26.9
244 per cent, 19.2 per cent and 13.5 per cent for respondents with less than 5years and more than
245 15years experience respectively. A larger percentage of the respondent has been involved in
246 between 5 to 10 projects representing 30.8 per cent of the respondents, followed by 28.8 per cent,

21.2 per cent and 19.2 per cent for those that have been involved in less than 5 projects, between 11 to 15 projects and more than 15 projects respectively. Evidently, the respondents have sufficient professional experience and educational background to give opinions on the subject matter of the study.

Table 2: Perception of Material waste management

4.1.2 Perception of Material waste management

From Table 2, it was observed that all the respondents perceived ‘proper storage of materials on site’ and ‘checking materials quantities supplied for right quantities and volumes’ as the most important material management and waste minimization practices during the post-contract stage; as it was accorded a relative importance index value of 0.838. This was also in tandem with the responses of the Consultant quantity surveyors and Contractor’s surveyors analyzed separately. Quantification of material waste was deemed as the least important with general RII of 0.654, Consultant QS RII of 0.667 and Contractor QS RII of 0.640.

Table 3: Mann Whitney U test between the consultant QS and the contractor’s QS on material management and waste minimization.

Furthermore, the perception of the consultant quantity surveyors and contractor’s quantity surveyors was compared to reveal if there is any statistically significant difference between the responses these two groups (Table 3). When the actual calculated p-value is below the prescribed significance level of 0.05, it means there is statistically significant divergence. None of the p-values is less than the significance level of 0.05 as shown in Table 4, meaning that the consultants and contractor’s quantity surveyors are in agreement in their responses as to what

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

material management and waste minimization connotes. This may be because there is no clear compartmentalization between the practices of these groups, as a Consultant QS might have worked as a Contractor’s QS before and vice versa. Also, these two groups had the same education training, as there is no difference between the educational training of the Consultant QS and Contractor’s QS.

Table 4: Adoption/Usage of Key Strategies by Quantity Surveyors

4.1.3 Adoption/Usage of Key Strategies by Quantity Surveyors

From Table 4, ‘supply management’ and ‘confirmation of actual quantities required on-site prior to ordering’ with RII of 0.815 are the most adopted strategies by the Quantity surveyors during the post-contract stage for effective material management and waste minimization. The consultant and contractor’s quantity surveyors are in agreement and ranked the aforementioned strategies as the second most important strategies. ‘deduction of cost implication of material wasted by the victim’ with and ‘preparation of cost implication of wasted materials for management decision’ are the least adopted measures/ strategies.

Table 5: Mann Whitney U test between the consultant QS and the contractor’s QS on adopted strategies for material management and waste minimization.

From Table 5, the perception of the consultant quantity surveyors and contractor’s quantity surveyors was compared to reveal if there is any statistically significant difference between the responses these two groups (Table 5). When the actual calculated p-value is below the prescribed significance level of 0.05, it means there is statistically significant divergence. None of the p-

value is less than the significance level of 0.05 except that of “Overseeing storekeeper / store operational officer activities” with p-value of 0.049 as shown in Table 5, meaning that the consultants and contractor’s quantity surveyors are in agreement in their responses as to what strategies are being adopted in material management and waste minimization. The significant divergence as regards “Overseeing storekeeper/store operational officer activities” may be as a result of the difference in the practice of these groups which influences their perception; the Contractor’s quantity surveyors are mostly on the construction sites and they do work with the storekeepers as compared to the Consultant quantity surveyors who have little or no relationship with the storekeeper.

Table 6: Material management process and measures

4.1.4 Material management process and measures

The measures of material management and waste minimization strategies are grouped into different phases of material management and ranked according to the responses of quantity surveyors (Table 6). In the planning/scheduling process, ‘confirmation of actual quantities required on-site prior to ordering’, with RII of 0.815 is the most adopted measure, while ‘ordering according to contract bill specifications’ with RII of 0.758 is the least adopted. For the purchasing/procurement stage of material management, ‘supply Management to ensure materials are delivered as at when needed’ with RII of 0.815 is considered the most adopted measure while ‘Ordering according to budgeted quantities’ with RII of 0.769 is the least adopted measure in this stage. ‘Monitoring by following up on all activities on site from the office’ with RII of 0.808 is the most adopted in handling/usage stage and it is not surprising that the consultant QS who

315 spent much time in the office ranked it as the most important in this stage. 'Overseeing
316 storekeeper/store operational officer activities' with RII of 0.770 is the most adopted measure in
317 stock control and it is in agreement with the response of the contractor's quantity surveyors who
318 are mostly on site. The two groups (consultant and contractor's quantity surveyors) are in
319 agreement as regards stock control stage.

320 **5.0 Discussion of findings**

321 The study was able to isolate key strategies/measures that are being adopted by the quantity
322 surveyors during the post-contract stage for material management and waste minimization. These
323 measures include ordering of right quantities, ordering the right quality of materials, prior survey
324 of available materials, efficient overseeing in the flow of materials, adequate support and follow
325 up by office function during the material management stages. These are in agreement with
326 Agyekum et al. (2012), Aiyetan (2013), and Eduardo (2002).

327 Storing of materials in a conducive environment on site, adequate monitoring of supplies and
328 strong communication link between the store and construction personnel to avoid waste are
329 considered the most significant in reducing material waste, while reuse of waste materials and
330 proper documentation of waste are given less consideration. It was also evident that no
331 deduction of cost implication of material waste by the victim(s) is being carried out and that
332 there is no availability of the cost implication of wasted materials for management decision. This
333 is partly due to the relational mode of project governance adopted by Nigerian contracting
334 organizations as opposed to the more contractual mode adopted in developed countries.
335 However, it is of enormous importance for quantity surveyors who are saddled with the cost
336 related to construction to prepare cost implication of material waste during the post-contract

stage as this will be of great benefit to contracting organizations when making managerial decisions. As affirmed by Ogunlana et al (1996), deducting the cost of materials improperly handled from the victim(s) salaries/wages will deter others from handling the materials improperly thereby leading to efficient waste minimization.

Also, since the material waste minimization and management are divided between the office and site; the quantity surveyors were grouped into consultants (who mostly work from office) and contractor's quantity surveyors (who are mostly time on site) and their responses were analyzed and compared. The Mann Whitney U test also shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of these two groups.

6.0 Conclusion

This study assessed the roles of quantity surveyors as regards material waste minimization and management; It would add to the scanty research work in this area. The study has also successfully revealed the strategies that are to be adopted by the quantity surveyors to achieve value for money.

The findings of this study have practical implication for stakeholders in the construction industry. The firms should consider reuse of waste materials on site which would help to reduce their construction cost and quantification of material waste during construction projects should be properly documented as this would be beneficial for key management decisions as regards material management and waste minimization.

The scope of this research to quantity surveyors in Lagos state, Nigeria (a developing country) constitutes a limitation to this study. Nevertheless, the findings can be extrapolated to other states

358 and developing countries since the roles and responsibilities of the quantity surveyors are
359 similar; and challenges facing the construction industries of these states/countries are similar.

360 Further research in this area could adopt a case study approach to assess the material
361 management and waste minimization practices and with focus on reuse of waste materials. Also,
362 material waste quantification on construction sites could be carried out.

363 References

364 Abdul-Rahman, H. and Alidrisyi, M.N., 1994. A perspective of material management practices
365 in a fast developing economy: the case of Malaysia. *Construction Management and*
366 *Economics*, 12(5), pp.413-422.

367 Agapiou, A., Clausen, L.E., Flanagan, R., Norman, G. and Notman, D., 1998. The role of
368 logistics in the materials flow control process. *Construction management & economics*,
369 16(2), pp.131-137.

370 Agyekum, K., Ayarkwa, J. and Adinyira, E., 2012. Consultants' perspectives on materials waste
371 reduction in Ghana. *Engineering Management Research*, 1(1), p.138.

372 Ajanlekoko, J.S., 2001, October. Sustainable housing development in Nigeria-The financial and
373 infrastructural implication. In *international conference on spatial information for*
374 *sustainable development in Nairobi, Kenya* (pp. 2-5).

375 Akinkurolere, O.O. and Franklin, S.O., 2005. Investigation into waste management on
376 construction sites in South Western Nigeria. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(5),
377 pp.980-984.

- 378 Aiyetan, O. and Smallwood, J., 2013. Materials Management and Waste Minimisation on
379 Construction Sites in Lagos State, Nigeria. In *Proceedings of the 4th International*
380 *Conference on Engineering, Project, and Production Management (EPPM)* (pp. 1161-
381 1172).
- 382 Aiyetan, A.O., 2013. Causes of rework on building construction projects in Nigeria. *Interim:*
383 *Interdisciplinary Journal*, 12(3), pp.1-15.
- 384 Alabi, T.M., Ijigah, E.A., & Saka, A.B. (2018). Appraisal of project scheduling in Nigeria
385 construction industry: A case study of Ibadan, Nigeria. *International Journal of*
386 *Research*, 19 (05), 851-860.
- 387 Arijeloye, B.T. and Akinradewo, F.O., 2016. Assessment of materials management on building
388 projects in Ondo State, Nigeria. *World Scientific News*, 55, pp.168-185.
- 389 ALBERT, I., 2014. *ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL'S PERCEPTION ON MATERIALS*
390 *MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON CONSTRUCTION SITES IN SELECTED STATES IN*
391 *NIGERIA* (Doctoral dissertation).
- 392 Ayegba, C., 2013. An Assessment of Material Management on Building Construction Sites. *Civil*
393 *and Environmental Research* [www. iiste. org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN, pp.2224-5790.
- 394 BaldvaSurbhi. (1997): Thesis, Material management in construction industry, CEPT
- 395 Barrie, D. S., & Paulson, B. C. (1992). *Professional construction management: including CM,*
396 *design-construct, and general contracting*. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math.
- 397 Bossink, B.A.G. and Brouwers, H.J.H., 1996. Construction waste: quantification and source
398 evaluation. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 122(1), pp.55-60.

- 399 Chan, D. W., & Kumaraswamy, M. M. (1997). A comparative study of causes of time overruns
400 in Hong Kong construction projects. *International Journal of project management*, 15(1),
401 55-63.
- 402 Chan, D. W., Chan, A. P., & Choi, T. N. (2010). An empirical survey of the benefits of
403 implementing pay for safety scheme (PFSS) in the Hong Kong construction
404 industry. *Journal of safety research*, 41(5), 433-443.
- 405 Chan, F.T.S., 2002. Design of material handling equipment selection system: an integration of
406 expert system with analytic hierarchy process approach. *Integrated Manufacturing*
407 *Systems*, 13(1), pp.58-68.
- 408 Dey, P.K., 2001. Re-engineering materials management: A case study on an Indian refinery.
409 *Business Process Management Journal*, 7(5), pp.394-408.
- 410 Formoso, C.T., Soibelman, L., De Cesare, C. and Isatto, E.L., 2002. Material waste in building
411 industry: main causes and prevention. *Journal of construction engineering and*
412 *management*, 128(4), pp.316-325.
- 413 Formoso, C.T., Isatto, E.L. and Hirota, E.H., 1999, July. Method for waste control in the building
414 industry. In *Proceedings IGLC* (Vol. 7, p. 325).
- 415 Eduardo L., 2002. Material waste in building industry: Main causes and prevention. *Journal of*
416 *Construction Engineering and management*, 12(4),
- 417 Formoso, C.T., Isatto, E.L. and Hirota, E.H., 1999, July. Method for waste control in the building
418 industry. In *Proceedings IGLC* (Vol. 7, p. 325).

- 419 Gulghane, A.A. and Khandve, P.V., 2015. Management for Construction Materials and Control
420 of Construction Waste in Construction Industry: A Review. *Int. Journal of Engineering
421 Research and Applications*, 5(4), pp.59-64.
- 422 Ilesanmi, O., 1986. Materials Management as a Tool for Enhancing Productivity on Selected
423 Building Construction Sites in South-Western Part of Nigeria. *An Unpublished B. Sc
424 Building Dissertation, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria*.
- 425 Kasim, N.B., 2008. *Improving materials management on construction projects* (Doctoral
426 dissertation, © Narimah Binti Kasim).
- 427 Johnston, J. E., 2001, Site Control and Material Handling Storage and Protection, First Edition,
428 Butter Worth Limited, London.
- 429 Kasim, N.B., Anumba, C.J. and Dainty, A.R.J., 2005, September. Improving materials
430 management practices on fast-track construction projects. In *21st Annual ARCOM
431 Conference, SOAS, University of London* (Vol. 2, pp. 793-802).
- 432 Katz, A. and Baum, H., 2011. A novel methodology to estimate the evolution of construction
433 waste in construction sites. *Waste management*, 31(2), pp.353-358.
- 434 Kini, D.U., 1999. Materials management: The key to successful project management. *Journal of
435 management in engineering*, 15(1), pp.30-34.
- 436 Lan C., 2008, Materials Management on Building site, 1st Edition, London, The construction
437 Press Lancaster.

- 438 Lee, S.H., Diekmann, J.E., Songer, A.D. and Brown, H., 1999, July. Identifying waste:
439 applications of construction process analysis. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual*
440 *Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction* (pp. 63-72).
- 441 McDonald, H. and Adam, S., 2003. A comparison of online and postal data collection methods
442 in marketing research. *Marketing intelligence & planning*, 21(2), pp.85-95.
- 443 Muehlhausen, F.B., 1991. Construction site utilization: impact of material movement and storage
444 on productivity and cost. *AACE International Transactions*, pp.L2-1.
- 445 Nazeck, E.M., Zaldi, D. and Trigunarsyah, B., 2008. Identification of construction waste in road
446 and highway construction projects.
- 447 Obiegbu, L.Y., 2002. Materials Management on Sites. B.Sc. Thesis submitted to the Department
448 of Surveying, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- 449 Ogunlana, S.O., Promkuntong, K. and Jearkjirm, V., 1996. Construction delays in a fast-growing
450 economy: comparing Thailand with other economies. *International journal of project*
451 *Management*, 14(1), pp.37-45.
- 452 Olatunji, S. O., Olawumi, T. O., & Aje, I. O. (2017). Rethinking Partnering Among Quantity-
453 Surveying Firms In Nigeria, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*,
454 143(11), 1- 12. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001394](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001394)
- 455 Patel, K.V. and Vyas, C.M., 2011, May. Construction materials management on project sites. In
456 *National Conference on Recent Trends in Engineering & Technology* (pp. 1-5).

- Patil, A.R. and Pataskar, S.V., 2013. Analyzing Material Management Techniques on Construction Project. *International Journal of Engineering and Innovative Technology*, 3(4), pp.96-100.
- Payne, A. C., Chelsom, J. V., & Reavill, L. R. (1996). *Management for engineers*. John Wiley & Son Ltd.
- Putra, C. C. W., Ahmad, A., Majid, M. A., and Kasim, N., 1999. Improving material scheduling for construction industry in Malaysia. In *Malaysian Science & Technology Congress 99*, pp.6-8.
- Shen, L.Y. and Tam, V.W., 2002. Implementation of environmental management in the Hong Kong construction industry. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20(7), pp.535-543.
- Skoyles, E.R., 2000. Material control to avoid waste. *Building Research Establishment Digest London, UK*, 3(259), pp.1-8.
- Tompkins, J A and White, J A. 1984. *Facilities Planning*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wahab, A.B. and Lawal, A.F., 2011. An evaluation of waste control measures in construction industry in Nigeria. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, 5(3), pp.246-254.
- Wang, R. and Li, S., 2011, March. Talking about the production and disposing of construction waste from the view of sustainable development. In *Power and Energy Engineering Conference (APPEEC), 2011 Asia-Pacific* (pp. 1-4). IEEE.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

477 Zeb, A., Malik, S., Nauman, S., Hanif, H. and Amin, O.S., 2015, June. Factors Affecting
478 Material Procurement, Supply and Management in Building Projects of Pakistan: A
479 Contractor's Perspective. In *International Conference on Innovations in Civil and*
480 *Structural Engineering held in Istanbul, Turkey. Retrieved from [http://urst.](http://urst.org/siteadmin/upload/2209U0615309.pdf)*
481 *org/siteadmin/upload/2209U0615309.pdf.*

482

Table 1: Key strategies used by quantity surveyors in material waste management at the post-contract stage

S/N	Material Management Process	Material Management measures related to Quantity Surveyors	Quantity Surveyors' role
A	Planning Scheduling	/ Tight Estimating (Sawant, Hedao and Kumthkar, 2016)	Ordering according to budgeted quantities
		Accurate & good specifications of materials to avoid wrong ordering (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Ordering according to contract bill
		Access to the latest information about types of materials on the market (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Material Survey
		Purchasing raw materials that are just sufficient (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Ordering according to budgeted quantities Confirmation of actual quantities required on site prior to ordering.
B	Purchasing Procurement	/ Checking material quantities supplied for right quantities and volumes (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Monitoring and receiving deliveries
		Supplier Coordination / Just in time delivery (Sawant, Hedao, and Kumthkar, 2016) and (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Supply Management
		Purchasing raw materials that are just sufficient (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Ordering according to budgeted quantities Confirmation of actual quantities required on site prior to ordering.
C	Handling Usage	/ Determine daily allocation of materials to different operations on site (Aiyetan and Smallwood, 2013)	Resource / material allocation on site based on expected usage

		Good coordination between store and construction personnel to avoid over ordering (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Resource / material allocation on site based on expected usage
		Weekly materials return to be submitted by the head of operation on site. (Aiyetan and Smallwood, 2013)	Data Base monitoring by office function
		Employing competent & trustworthy hands (Aiyetan and Smallwood, 2013)	Subcontract management
		Weekly monitoring of material usage (Formoso, Isatto and Hirato, 1999)	Monitoring of budgeted and actual material usage
		Quantification of variability of waste rate (Formoso, Isatto and Hirato, 1999)	Preparation of Cost Implication of wasted materials for management decision
		Accurate measurement of materials during batching	
		Weekly programming of works (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Site Planning Monitoring of activities on site
		Careful handling of tools and equipment on site (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	
		Encourage re-use of waste materials in projects (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Deduction of cost implication of material wasted by the victim
D	Stock Control	Taking Inventory of material before use (Aiyetan and Smallwood, 2013)	Overseeing storekeeper / store operational officer activities
		Monitoring of Physical quantity of inventories weekly (Formoso, Isatto and Hirato, 1999)	Data Base Monitoring by Office function Overseeing storekeeper/store operational officer activities

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Proper storage of materials on site (Agyekum, Ayarkwa, and Adinyira, 2012)	Overseeing storekeeper/store operational officer activities
--	---

Table 2: Perception of Material waste management

Material management and Waste Minimization	ALL		Consultant QS		Contractor's QS	
	RII	Rank	RII	Rank	RII	Rank
Proper storage of materials on site	0.838	1	0.837	1	0.84	1
Checking material quantities supplied for right quantities and volumes	0.838	1	0.837	1	0.84	1
Good coordination between store and construction personnel to avoid over ordering.	0.8	3	0.793	5	0.808	3
Taking Inventory of material before use	0.788	4	0.807	4	0.768	6
Accurate & good specifications of materials to avoid wrong	0.781	5	0.822	3	0.736	9
Determine daily allocation of materials to different operations on site	0.777	6	0.77	6	0.784	4
Supplier coordination	0.758	7	0.756	8	0.76	7
Access to latest information about types of materials on the	0.746	8	0.719	11	0.776	5
Monitoring of physical quantity of inventories weekly	0.746	8	0.756	8	0.736	9
Precise Estimating	0.731	10	0.748	10	0.712	13
Accurate measurement of materials during batching	0.727	11	0.763	7	0.688	15
Weekly programming of works	0.719	12	0.696	12	0.744	8
Careful handling of tools and equipment on site	0.715	13	0.696	12	0.736	9

Purchasing raw materials that are just sufficient.	0.712	14	0.689	15	0.736	9
Encourage re-use of waste materials in projects	0.692	15	0.696	12	0.688	15
Weekly materials return to be submitted by the head of operation on site.	0.692	15	0.674	16	0.712	8
Quantification of material waste	0.654	17	0.667	17	0.64	17

Table 3: Mann Whitney U test between the consultant QS and the contractor's QS on material management and waste minimization.

Material Minimization and Waste Management	Mean Rank		Z	P value
	Contractor's QS	Consultant QS		
Precise Estimating	24.340	28.500	-1.027	0.304
Accurate & good specifications of materials to avoid wrong	24.240	28.590	-1.088	0.277
Access to latest information about types of materials on the	28.680	24.480	-1.043	0.297
Purchasing raw materials that are just sufficient.	28.040	25.070	-0.741	0.458
Checking material quantities supplied for right quantities and volumes	26.040	26.930	-0.229	0.819
Supplier coordination	27.200	25.850	-0.348	0.728
Determine daily allocation of materials to different operations on site	26.220	26.760	-0.134	0.893
Good coordination between store and construction personnel to avoid over ordering.	27.140	25.910	-0.313	0.754
Weekly materials return to be submitted by the head of operation on site	27.780	25.310	-0.605	0.545
Quantification of material waste	25.520	27.410	-0.467	0.640
Accurate measurement of materials during batching	23.980	28.830	-1.196	0.232
Weekly programming of works	27.500	25.570	-0.472	0.637
Careful handling of tools and equipment on site	27.440	25.630	-0.449	0.653

Encourage re-use of waste materials in projects	26.400	26.590	-0.480	0.962
Taking Inventory of material before use	25.280	27.630	-0.588	0.557
Monitoring of physical quantity of inventories weekly	25.580	27.350	-0.437	0.662
Proper storage of materials on site	25.820	27.130	-0.334	0.738

Table 4: Adoption/Usage of Key Strategies by Quantity Surveyors

Strategies	ALL		Consultant QS		Contractor's QS	
	RII	Rank	RII	Rank	RII	Rank
Supply Management to ensure materials are delivered as at when needed	0.815	1	0.8	2	0.832	2
Confirmation of actual quantities required on site prior to ordering.	0.815	1	0.8	2	0.832	2
Monitoring by following up on all activities on site from the office	0.808	3	0.83	1	0.784	9
Monitoring and receiving deliveries	0.8	4	0.756	9	0.848	1
Subcontract management to ensure competent hands are engaged	0.796	5	0.785	5	0.808	5
Material allocation on site based on expected usage	0.788	6	0.785	5	0.792	8
Site Planning to ensure materials needed for all tasks are well known ahead	0.785	7	0.793	4	0.776	10
Overseeing storekeeper / store operational officer activities	0.777	8	0.726	12	0.832	2
Ordering according to budgeted quantities	0.769	9	0.763	11	0.808	5
Material Survey prior to ordering	0.765	10	0.756	9	0.776	10
Data Base monitoring of budgeted and actual material usage in the office	0.762	11	0.77	7	0.752	12
Data Base periodic monitoring of materials in store	0.762	11	0.719	13	0.808	5
Ordering according to contract bill specifications	0.758	13	0.733	8	0.808	5
Deduction of cost implication of material wasted by the victim	0.692	14	0.644	15	0.744	14
Preparation of Cost Implication of wasted materials for management decision	0.677	15	0.68	14	0.672	15

Table 5: Mann Whitney U test between the consultant QS and the contractor's QS on adopted strategies for material management and waste minimization.

Strategies	Mean Rank		Z	P value
	Site	Consultant		
Ordering according to contract bill specifications	25.780	27.170	0.346	0.730
Material Survey prior to ordering	26.720	26.300	0.105	0.916
Confirmation of actual quantities required on site prior to ordering.	26.880	26.150	0.187	0.852
Monitoring and receiving deliveries	29.540	23.690	1.472	0.141
Supply Management to ensure materials are delivered as at when needed.	27.680	25.410	0.579	0.562
Ordering according to budgeted quantities	29.100	24.090	1.262	0.207
Material allocation on site based on expected usage	26.280	26.700	0.106	0.916
Subcontract management to ensure competent hands are engaged.	27.000	26.040	0.244	0.807
Data Base monitoring of budgeted and actual material usage in the office	25.140	27.760	0.654	0.513
Preparation of cost implication of wasted materials for management decision	25.680	27.260	0.391	0.696
Site Planning to ensure materials needed for all tasks are well known ahead	25.580	27.350	0.443	0.658
Monitoring by following up on all activities on site from the office	24.820	28.060	0.817	0.414
Deduction of cost implication of material wasted by the victim	29.600	23.630	1.476	0.140
Overseeing storekeeper / store operational officer activities	30.520	22.780	1.969	0.049
Data Base periodic monitoring of materials in store	29.260	23.940	1.387	0.165

Table 6: Material management process and measures

Material management process		ALL		Contractor's QS		Consultant QS	
	Planning / Scheduling Process	RII	Rank	RII	Rank	RII	Rank
A	Confirmation of actual quantities required on site prior to ordering.	0.815	1	0.832	1	0.800	1
	Material Survey prior to ordering	0.765	2	0.776	3	0.756	2
	Ordering according to contract bill specifications	0.758	3	0.808	2	0.733	3
	Purchasing/ Procurement	RII	Rank				
B	Supply Management to ensure materials are delivered as at when needed	0.815	1	0.832	2	0.800	1
	Monitoring and receiving deliveries	0.800	2	0.840	1	0.756	3
	Ordering according to budgeted quantities	0.769	3	0.808	3	0.763	2
	Handling/ Usage	RII	Rank				
C	Monitoring by following up on all activities on site from the office	0.808	1	0.784	4	0.830	1
	Subcontract management to ensure competent hands are engaged.	0.796	2	0.808	1	0.785	3
	Material allocation on site based on expected usage	0.788	3	0.792	3	0.785	3
	Site Planning to ensure materials needed for all tasks are well known ahead	0.785	4	0.776	5	0.793	2
	Data Base monitoring of budgeted and actual material usage in the office	0.762	5	0.808	1	0.770	5
	Deduction of cost implication of material wasted by the victim	0.692	6	0.744	6	0.644	7
	Preparation of Cost Implication of wasted materials for management decision	0.677	7	0.672	7	0.680	6
	Stock Control	RII	Rank				
D	Overseeing storekeeper / store operational officer activities	0.777	1	0.832	1	0.726	1
	Data Base periodic monitoring of materials in store	0.762	2	0.800	2	0.719	2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology