Afropolitan Journals

ISSN: 2617-3072X www.afropolitanjournals.com

Perceived Contributions of Professionals Towards Cost Overrun in Nigerian Construction Industry; Quantity Surveyors Perspective

Okpan Agara[1], Nnadi Ezekiel Oluwaseun[2] and Chukwuenye Agatha Toochukwu[3]

[1]Department of Quantity Surveying, Akanu Ibam Federal Polytechnic Unwana, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. [2]Department of Quantity Surveying, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria. [3]Department of Building, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria.

Corresponding author: costech0808@gmail.com.uk

Abstract

A project is adjudged successful if it is completed to time, within the budgeted cost and meets client's expectation. However, there is the global issue of construction cost and time overruns, which has contributed to poor project performance. Quantity surveyors have always been seen as the culprit in this regard, whereas, the Quantity surveyor is not solely involved in construction projects, there are other project team members who determine the path of the project success. Although there have been a lot of studies on factors affecting the cost of construction projects, there seems no consensus as what cost factors have direct influence on the cost of construction projects. Most construction projects experience cost overrun and it put massive financial burden on the client or owner. This study therefore aim to bridge the current knowledge gap by examining quantity surveyors' perception of the factor leading to cost overrun in construction projects structure among the already established costing attributes identified based on literature review. Desk study along with questionnaire survey was used to identify the causes of cost overrun used to elicit responses from quantity surveyors working in Nigerian construction industry. A total of 30 filled questionnaires were collected from clients, consultants' quantity surveyors and contractors quantity surveyors. Importance of each cause was calculated on the basis of cumulative effect of occurrence and impact. Spearman rank order correlation analysis was used to evaluate whether consensus of opinions exists between groups of respondents. From the analysis of the results it was found that consensus of opinion exists between respondents on the causes of cost overrun. The results showed that, sole decision making by architect in high cost related designs without involving quantity surveyor, poor schedule cost management, high unit rate of materials, plants and labor inserted on the appendix of bill of quantities, poor knowledge and applications quantity surveyors billing and costing soft wares , poor design/ delay in providing design work to quantity surveyor for bill of quantities preparation, rework due to wrong work not been detected by quantity surveyor during interim valuations and project final account preparation, quantity surveyors accepting to work under pressure while billing, valuations and raising of payments certification, wrong estimation/ estimation method, and long period between design and time of bidding/tendering and collaborations with contractors and architects raising interim valuation orders and payment certificates without corresponding work on site and bill of quantities provisions are the major causes of cost overrun. The major causes as identified by this research were compared with the findings from other countries and there were fairly relevant similarities. Principal component analysis is conducted to extract the factor structure of the cost attributes and the attributes are

grouped into three factor components, namely the contract procurement factor, the project cost management factor and the monetary value factor. Understanding these cost impact factors could be crucial in managing construction projects, since it allows the project stakeholders and quantity surveyors to take precautionary steps to identify the cost management problems and areas for improvement and could even help to avoid cost deviations in construction projects.
Keywords: Construction projects, Cost overrun, perception, quantity surveyors, Nigeria.

Introduction

Cost is a major consideration throughout the project management life cycle and can be regarded as one of the most important parameters of a project and the driving force of project success. It is the universal and most highly visible performance metric for indicating project success. As such, [12] enjoined project managers and project controls professionals to expend their effort and intelligence to properly manage cost. However, cost overrun is a general occurrence in the global construction industry [15][19] .[6] opined that projects completed within budget are rarely found compared with cases of projects with cost overrun. The ripple of this phenomenon is usually friction between clients (especially government clients), project managers and contractors on the issue of project cost variation [38]. Cost overrun is a very frequent phenomenon and is almost associated with nearly all projects in the construction industry. This trend is more severe in developing countries where these overruns sometimes exceed 100% of the anticipated cost of the project [15]. Findings on construction projects in some developing countries revealed that the actual cost of construction do exceed the original contract price by about 30% [6]. It was further observed that both public sector and private sector projects have similar pattern of cost overruns. Asiedu, [14] in a study conducted on 308 public projects and 51 private projects in Nigeria observed that 46.8% and 37.2% of public sector and private sector projects respectively are reported to be completed within the budget. Further result of the study shows that 84.3% of the private sector projects were completed within the 10% cost deviation compared with 76.0% of the public sector projects. This is an indication that both private sector and public sector driven projects are susceptible to cost overruns. Against this backdrop, with the dearth in financial resources available for infrastructure development most especially in developing countries and the susceptibility of construction projects to cost and time overruns, it is necessary to improve construction efficiency by means of cost-effectiveness and timeliness; this would certainly contribute to cost savings. However, the responsibility for project performance is often placed on the contractor, whereas the contractor is not solely and absolutely involved in project execution. The contractor is always at the receiving end of project delays which in most cases leads to cost overruns.

Cost overruns are very common in the construction industry. Hardly few projects get completed within original costs.

Statement of Problem

The basic goal in any industry is to achieve the completion of project within time and stipulated budget. It is the same with construction industry. The construction industry being one of the most complex, fragmented, schedule and resource driven industry, is always facing serious problems like low productivity, low quality, delay, cost overrun etc. [37]. Cost overrun in construction is a worldwide phenomenon, and its effects are normally a source of friction between owners, project managers, and contractors [19].[15] observed that the trend of is more severe in developing countries. As the construction industry continues to grow in size, so do planning and budgeting problems. This is because it is common for projects not to be completed on time and within the initial project budget [12]. It is noted that there were more cases of cost overruns than time overruns. This makes the problem of cost overruns to be of great significance [40]. In fact, it is one of the most important challenges facing the construction industry today. An out of control construction cost adds to investment pressure, increases construction cost, affects investment decision-making and wastes the national finance. Hence, it is important to identify the factors that contribute to cost overrun to avoid and reduce the problems [6]. Identifying the reasons is usually the first step when addressing a problem, and then corrective action can be taken [40].

George [33] notes that there is no single cause for cost and schedule overruns on construction projects. Although some of the factors may seem to be insignificant on one project, they may prove to be significant on another project, as the conditions of project are not always the same. It appears that, there is always be need for debate and further research because of the chronic problem of construction cost overruns [17]. The identification of the cost related risks, underlying drivers and impediments for effective management must be assessed in the contexts of three key stakeholders, namely clients, contractors and consultants [21].

Aim and Objectives of the Research

The aim of the research is to assess the professional quantity surveyors contributions leading to cost overruns on construction projects in Nigeria.

Research Objectives are:

- To discover the Quantity surveyors professional activities that lead to cost overrun and to evaluate their relative importance.
- To get opinion on these causes from other design team in the construction industry namely Architects, structural engineers and service engineers.
- To rank the quantity surveyors activities of cost overrun on the basis of importance.
- To assess how severe the impact of these causes will be on the total cost of the project and to proffer solution as a quantity surveyor how to reduce project costs overrun to barest minimum level.

Literature Review

Project cost is generally referred as construction cost. It can be viewed differently at different timelines for a construction project. From the perspective of cost consultants or quantity surveyors, project cost is administered in two stages, the pre-contract stage and the post contract stage. At tendering stage, construction project cost is seen to be divided into pre-tendering and post-tendering stage. This division is offered because it is critical to the client to confirm the budget for the construction works and to the contractor to confirm business [34]. As the usual client for construction projects is the government, a pre-tender estimate has to be established and approved before tendering and contracted out. This is generally known to quantity surveyors as the pre-contract stage. Once a contract is awarded, the cost monitoring function is based on the contract price and this is known as the post contract stage, including finalizing the cost at project completion at a later date [34]. It is not uncommon to find cost deviations at the pre-contract stage and cost overrun at the post-contract stage, while many studies relate to project cost have been conducted on cost impact factors aiming at identifying factors and/or attributes affecting/determining the magnitude of project cost [2] [14] [45]. Generally, the attributes that affect project cost can be grouped into several factors, including project issue, estimator-attribute, and construction, contract, economic, environmental and political factors. Ahiaga and Smith [2] distinguish the factors affecting project cost into three dimensions, namely cost estimate, final cost and contract specific dimensions. The cost estimate dimension includes the estimator-attribute factors, and design and project specific factors which have high cost impact on project cost estimate. The items that include in the two factors include the estimator's biases, vagueness in scope, design complexity, project size and such like. Regarding the final cost dimension, Ahiaga and Smith [2] distinguish the factors that affect the final cost and have classified them into two major groups: construction specific factors as well as economic and political environment-specific factors. The construction specific factors refer to unknown geological conditions, weather conditions and client- and sub-contractor generated risk attributes. The economic and political environment-specific factors are about the economic and political risks such as the price fluctuation, high inflation rate, change in exchange rate, political instability and taxation changes etc. The contract specific dimension refers to the type of contract adopted in the project and the contract clauses included in the contract. The use of different types of contract would affect the allocation of risk between the owner and the contractor. Moreover, it is considered that the contract clauses may also result in ambiguity and disputes between project parties, which will lead to decrease in cost effectiveness in the project [2]. However, there is no explanation as to how the above factors are generated, nor any validation of the significance of those factors/items included in the dimension. The validity of the proposed factors is thus questionable.

Trost and Oberlender [43] establish a predictive model to determine project cost. Factor analysis is conducted to group 45 variables into 11 orthogonal factors. Ordinary least square regression analysis is then performed on the 11 factors and their factor scores are used to predict the project cost and assess its accuracy. Of the 11 factors, 5 are found to be significant in determining project cost: process design, team experience and project information, time allowed to prepare the estimate, site requirements and bidding and labor estimate. Subsequently, Chan and Park [17] argue that the application of the ordinary regression analysis approach in the study tends to produce coefficient estimator that will perform poorly in the presence of multi-collinearity and surface due to high correlation among a group of variables. In addition, the variance of the ordinary least squares estimator becomes inflated, which results in the low possibility of the estimator being close to the true value of the regression coefficient [17].

The study of Chan and Park [17] points out that the construction project cost is affected by a number of factors as the industry is multi-disciplinary and its work is done by a lot of parties. In the study, a total of 57 variables/determinants are classified into 3 broad categories, pertaining to (1) project design, complexity and time, (2) professional level of the project team; and (3) contractor's competency for extracting components that contribute to project cost. The factor analysis result shows that the factors affecting construction project cost are project-specific factors and those reflecting the characteristics of the project team, including technological and project design requirements preset by the client and the consultants, contractor's expertise and management ability; and the client's desired level of construction sophistication. However, there is a lack of description and explanation about how the factors are generated whereas the questionnaire respondents are identified from building projects.

Warsame [45] have enhanced researchers' understanding of the cost impact factors by systematizing the attributes that influence project costs into four factors, namely project-specific factor, client and contractor related factor, competition and market condition, and macroeconomic and political factors. The project-specific factor contains attributes that are related to the project issues such as the size, quality and complexity of the project. The items that include in the client and contractor-related factor are about the procurement method selected, contractor-client relationship etc. The competition and market condition comprise attributes that are difficult to control by the client and the contractor but can have a high impact on the costs and mark-up, such as the level of competition and market condition [45]. Macroeconomic and political factor includes items about the economic situation and political issues such as inflation, interest rate fluctuation and government regulations. On the other hand, there is not any explanation as to how the above factors are generated, nor any validation of the significance of those factors/items included in the dimension. The validity of the proposed factors is thus questionable. Similar variables and factors have also been found as affecting project related cost in other studies. For instance, Olawale et al. [40] applies the factor analysis, and extract "factors" or "components" out of the original variables that influence project construction cost: environment, cost data and inflation. Asiedu [14] presents 24 variables that affect project cost estimation and has found that most of them also have impact on the final project cost. The variables are grouped under seven factors, namely project complexity, technological requirements, project information, project team requirement, contract requirement, project duration and market requirement. Williams [46] findings show that the quality and constructability of the project design, contractor management techniques, project location and macroeconomic conditions have influence on the price of the project during construction. In Iyer and Jha [32] study about factors affecting cost performance of Indian construction projects, it is found that a number of variables, including the conflicts between project participants, poor project specific attributes, holistic socio-economic relations and climate conditions, aggressive contractor competition and short bid preparation time would have impact on the project cost. Elhag et al. [22] in their analysis of factors affecting tendering cost state that the client priority on construction time, contractor's planning capability, procurement methods, market conditions as well as the level of construction activity would have impact on the project tendering cost. The research results of Elhag et al. [22] indicate that the technological and project design, the contractor's expertise and management ability, and the client's desired level of construction sophistication all play a role in determining the cost of the project. Recently, Chan [17] examines factors that influence construction project overhead expenses. Using the factor analysis approach, the 27 variables identified from the Delphi method are extracted into 8 factors: contractor's design requirement, regional economic condition, financial and insurance charges, project complexity, procurement arrangement, site layout, stakeholders' interest and project duration.

Drawing on the ongoing discussion, it is undeniably factual that, a project cost depends not only on a single factor but a group of attributes/items that are related to the characteristics of the project and to the construction team as well as the market conditions. Despite these enormous contributions, it is not clear in the literature about the specific cost attributes that affect project cost in construction projects. On the other hand, taking lead from previous studies by related scholars such as Ahiaga and Smith [2]; Asiedu [14]; Iyer and Jha [32] and Warsame [45] etc. and from preliminary interviews with experienced professionals, a list of 12 cost attributes that affecting project cost besides external influencing factors are firstly identified, namely "inflation rate", "exchange rate", "the profit margin", "the tender negotiation process", "tender pricing or contractor's pricing", "valuation of variation", "assessment of claims", "the negotiation process taken at the post-contract stage", "re-measurement of provisional quantities", "revaluation of provisional sums and prime cost sums", "the negotiation process taken at the final account stage", and "the overall settlement of the final account", which are generally focused on the calculation of the project cost at different timelines. The views on external influencing factor are varied and are later verified and expanded into 7 items. They are "site location", "programme", "procurement strategy", "contract management", "market conditions", "contractor's workload" and "technology". Though the list of attributes identified may not be exhaustive due to the vast magnitude and fragmented nature of the construction industry, the list covered attributes pertaining to influence the magnitude of project cost in a large variety of construction projects shown in the literature [2, 14, 45, 23]. The list of cost attributes forms the backbone of the survey instrument in the following section.

Cost

Cost is the budgeted expenditure, which the client has agreed to commit for creating/acquiring the desired construction facility [14]. Cost overrun is defined as the difference between the actual and estimated costs as a percentage of the estimated cost, with all costs calculated in constant prices. Actual costs are defined as the accounted costs actually spent, as determined at the time of project completion. Estimated costs are defined as the budgeted or forecasted costs at the time of project approval, which are typically similar to costs presented in the business case for a project [35].

Classification of Construction Costs

The cost of a work unit is comprised of many cost elements. These cost elements include labor costs, material costs, plant and machinery costs, administration costs and other expenses. In order to identify costs associated with an activity, construction costs are categorized into „Direct costs" and „Indirect costs" or „Overhead costs". Direct Costs: Direct costs are costs that can be correlated to a specific activity or a work item, which is being done or produced. Direct cost of permanent work item = Direct material cost + Direct labor cost other direct expenses Direct material costs cover all costs connected with materials, which are incorporated into permanent works of the project. Direct labor costs cover net expenses far procurement, maintenance, and wages of all categories of workers employed at the work site for the execution of an item of project. Other direct expenses include all other expenses on account of services rendered, which can be directly attributed to and clearly identified with the execution of an activity or work item. Indirect Costs: Indirect costs include all costs, which are attributable to a given project but cannot be identified with the performance of a specific activity or a work package. In other words, all costs other than direct costs are covered under indirect costs[20].

Causes of Cost Overrun

According to [13], the main controllable causes of the projects" cost overruns include but are not limited to the following:

- Inadequate project formulation: Poor field investigation, inadequate project information, bad cost estimates, lack of experience, inadequate project formulation and feasibility analysis, poor project appraisal leading to incorrect investment decisions.
- Poor planning for implementation: Inadequate time plan, inadequate resource plan, inadequate equipment supply plan, inter-linking not anticipated, poor organisation poor cost planning.

- Lack of proper contract planning and management: Improper pre-contract actions, poor post-award contract management.
- Lack of project management during execution: Insufficient and ineffective working, delays, changes in scope of work and location, law and order.

The Quantity Surveyor

Quantity surveyors are called by so many names all over the world such as cost engineers, building economists, cost managers, construction accountants, construction cost consultants, commercial managers among other names which have been adapted by many researchers [43][40][39].

Quantity surveyor according to Wikipedia [38] is "a professional trained, qualified, and experienced in handling construction cost, construction management and construction communication on behalf of the client". He manages all costs relating to building and civil engineering projects from the initial calculations to the final figure seeking to minimize the cost of the project and enhance value for money while still retaining the quality and required standards specified by statutory building regulations.

Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors[39] defined a quantity surveyor as the expert professionally trained and experienced in dealing with construction cost, construction management and construction communication; which is exhibited in various types of projects including building construction, civil and structural engineering, mechanical building and engineering services, petrochemicals, mineral extraction, cost and production engineering, environmental economics, planning and urban development, landscaping, interior design and all other relevant areas.

Quantity Surveyors role in Construction project cost overrun

Project cost is generally referred as construction cost. It can be viewed differently at different timelines for an engineering project. From the perspective of cost consultants or quantity surveyors, project cost is administered in two stages, the pre-contract stage and the post contract stage. At tendering stage, construction project cost is seen to be divided into pre-tendering and post-tendering stage. This division is offered because it is critical to the client to confirm the budget for the construction works and to the contractor to confirm business [34]. As the usual client for engineering projects is the government, a pre-tender estimate has to be established and approved before tendering and contracted out. This is generally known to quantity surveyors as the pre-contract stage. Once a contract is awarded, the cost monitoring function is based on the contract price and this is known as the post contract stage, including finalizing the cost at project completion at a later date [34]. It is not uncommon to find cost deviations at the pre-contract stage and cost overrun at the post-contract stage, while many studies relate to project cost have been conducted on cost impact factors aiming at identifying factors and/or attributes affecting/determining the magnitude of project cost [2] [14] [45]. Generally, the attributes that affect project cost can be grouped into several factors, including project issue, estimator-attribute, and construction, contract, economic, environmental and political factors.

Ahiaga and Smith [2] distinguish the factors affecting project cost into three dimensions, namely cost estimate, final cost and contract specific dimensions. The cost estimate dimension includes the estimator-attribute factors, and design and project specific factors which have high cost impact on project cost estimate. The items that include in the two factors include the estimator's biases, vagueness in scope, design complexity, project size and such like. Regarding the final cost dimension, Ahiaga and Smith [2] distinguish the factors that affect the final cost and have classified them into two major groups: construction specific factors as well as economic and political environment-specific factors. The construction specific factors refer to unknown geological conditions, weather conditions and client- and sub-contractor generated risk attributes. The economic and political environment-specific factors are about the economic and political risks such as the price fluctuation, high inflation rate, change in exchange rate, political instability and taxation changes etc. The contract specific dimension refers to the type of contract adopted in the project and the contract clauses included in the contract. The use of different types of contract would affect the allocation of risk between the owner and the contractor. Moreover, it is considered that the contract clauses may also result in ambiguity and disputes between project parties, which will lead to decrease in cost effectiveness in the project [2]. However, there is no explanation as to how the above factors are generated, nor any validation of the significance of those factors/items included in the dimension. The validity of the proposed factors is thus questionable.

Drawing on the ongoing discussion, it is undeniably factual that, a project cost depends not only on a single factor but a group of attributes/items that are related to the characteristics of the project and to the construction team as well as the market conditions. Despite these enormous contributions, it is not clear in the literature about the specific cost attributes that affect project cost in civil engineering projects. On the other hand, taking lead from previous studies by related scholars such as Ahiaga and Smith [2]; Asiedu [14]; Iyer and Jha [32] and Warsame [45] etc. and from preliminary interviews with experienced professionals, a list of 12 cost attributes that affecting project cost besides external influencing factors are firstly identified, namely "inflation rate", "exchange rate", "the profit margin", "the tender negotiation process", "tender pricing or contractor's pricing", "valuation of variation", "assessment of claims", "the negotiation process taken at the post-contract stage", "re-measurement of provisional quantities", "revaluation of provisional sums and prime cost sums", "the negotiation process taken at the final account stage", and "the overall settlement of the final account", which are generally focused on the calculation of the project cost at different timelines. The views on external influencing factor are varied and are later verifiedand expanded into 7 items. They are "site location", "programme", "procurement strategy", "contract management", "market conditions", "contractor's workload" and "technology". Though the list of attributes identified may not be exhaustive due to the vast magnitude and fragmented nature of the construction industry, the list covered attributes pertaining to influence the magnitude of project cost in a large variety of construction projects shown in the literature [2, 14, 45, 23]. The list of cost attributes forms the backbone of the survey instrument in the following section.

Research Methodology

Quantitative approach with questionnaire survey was then adopted to collect the primary data from a large number of quantity surveyors. The questionnaire survey is considered as an appropriate tool for this study as it is the most popular and cost effective means to collect information about attitudes, opinions and behaviors [29] and is widely used by researchers in the construction management discipline. Quantity surveyors were selected as the target respondents as they are responsible for cost management functions in construction projects. The questionnaire survey under internet-link was sent to the targeted respondents (i.e. quantity surveyors) by e-mail through relevant professional in Nigeria. The respondents were filled in the questionnaire directly by click in the internet-link.

Although justification has been made for looking at the variables as the underlying factors that affect project cost, it was not clear which of the variables would measure the same underlying effect. In the questionnaire survey, the sequence of the cost attributes was randomly oriented. The respondents (quantity surveyors) were asked to respectively indicate whether they agree the cost factors that have high impact on project cost in construction projects on a 5-point likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Before the main survey was conducted, the questionnaire was pre-tested for comprehensibility by consulting a few experienced quantity surveyors and those in the academics. The analytical tool selected was aimed to explore the perceived contributions of quantity surveyors professionals towards cost overrun in construction industry in Nigeria were identified using rank order. The causes of construction projects cost overrun were established from the data through questionnaire. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 was used to compute the (MRS) used to decide the ranks and to collect data in line with the study objective.

Discussion of Findings

Following the questionnaire survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten experienced practitioners who had wide knowledge of project cost management as to supplement the quantitative results obtained from the questionnaire survey. The main method for identifying interviewees was through the contact obtained from the questionnaire survey respondents. All the interviewees were experienced quantity surveyors and have more than 20 years working experience in the construction industry. It was believed that the semi structured interviews could also help to provide a better understanding about the latent properties of the factors identified in the quantitative findings. The profiles of the interviewees are listed in the following table.

TABLE 1

Profile of Interviewees

Interviewees	Place level	Company Nature
1	QS Director	Quantity Surveying Consultant
2	Assistant QS Director	Quantity Surveying Consultant
3	Professor	Tertiary institution
4	QS Director	Engineering Consultant
5	QS Director	Engineering Consultant
6	Quantity Surveyor	Quantity surveying consultant
7	Senior contracts administration manager	Engineering consultant
8	Senior resident quantity surveyor	Contractor
9	Quantity surveyor	Engineering consultant
10	Quantity surveyor	Client/development office

When the survey is closed, a total of 165 responses were collected. The data collected are analyzed Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. The following is the research results obtained from the questionnaire responses.

1) **Demographic Information of Survey Respondents**

A preliminary descriptive analysis is provided for the understanding of the background of the survey respondents. Table 2 presents the characteristics of survey respondents with respect to their demographic information.

TABLE 2

Demographic Information of Survey Respondents

Items	Label	Frequency	Percentage
Working	QS consultant	38	23.0 %
Field	Civil Engineering consultant	17	10.3 %
	Contractor	56	33.9 %
	Client	34	20.7 %
	Others	17	10.3 %
	Not Answered	3	1.8 %
Nature of works	Building	64	38.8 %
	Building and civil engineering	49	29.7 %
	Not answered 8	4.8%	

Working position level	Policy making (planning) level	14	8.5%
	Project management (group of projects level)	63	38.2%
	Project (single project) level	81	49.1%
	Not answered	7	4.2%
Company attribute	Public	16	9.7%
	Semi-public	6	3.6%
	Private	53	32.2%
	Not answered	90	54.5%
Working experience in the profession (years)	1-3 years	7	4.2%
	3-5 years	1	0.6%
	5-7 years	2	1.2%
Working experience in the profession (years)	1-3 years	7	4.2%
	3-5 years	1	0.6%
	5-7 years	2	1.2%
	7-10 years	4	2.4%
	More than 10 years	63	38.2%
	Not answered	88	53.4%

Source: Field survey 2022

A number of characteristics are identified from the demographic information of the survey respondents. Except for those respondents who do not answer the questions, a high portion of the respondents (more than 38%) have more than 10 years working experience in the profession. More than 32% of the respondents are working in the private sector. However, nearly 50% of the respondents are working with a single project only. In addition, a high portion of the respondents (around 40%) involves in building projects, rather than civil engineering projects in the last three years. The number/percentage of respondents working with contractors and consultants are nearly the same; whilst more than 20% of the respondents are working for the client.

2) **Factor Analysis (Principal Component Analysis) (PCA)** in this study, the PCA technique is used to examine the factor structure among the cost attributes and determine the grouping of the related attributes in the analysis. It is because the technique is useful for finding the underlying structure of related variables and ideal for reducing a large number of variables into a more easily understood framework [43, 25, 45, 30]. The tool is widely used by researchers of different disciplines to identify and interpret non-correlated clusters of

variables [43, 24, 35]. To ensure the validity of the factors, some pertinent issues such as the reliability of the survey instrument (cost attributes), the adequacy of sample size and the suitability of the items are addressed before the analysis is conducted. The reliability of the cost attributes is related to the internal consistency of the attributes included in the measurement, which is obtained through the Cronbach's reliability test. The Cronbach's alpha is a value commonly used to depict the degree to which the attributes in the measurement scale to "indicate" the construct [30]. Typically, the scale with a threshold value of 0.70 is regarded as having acceptable internal consistency [41, 45].

Following the reliability analysis, the data is subjected to the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinand Barrtlett's Test which measures the sampling adequacy - in factor analysis [23]. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test measures whether the distribution of values is adequate for conducting factor analysis [23]. It is expressed as an index range from "0" to "1". Scholars [30, 42] suggest that the threshold Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value should be greater than 0.70 if the sample size is adequate for factor analysis. The sample that has a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value between 0.50 and 0.70 is marginal while lower than 0.50 is considered to be unsuitable for factor analysis [42]. The Barrlett's Test of Sphericity is a Chi-square test, which measures the multivariate normality of the variables. The test examines the probability that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix [30, 28]. Result with a significant level of less than 0.05 is considered suitable for carrying out the factor analysis. The results of the reliability of cost attributes, sample size adequacy and population matrix are provided as follows:

TABLE 3

Reliability Statistics of the Cost Attributes

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on standardized item	N of items
940	**.941**	**19**

The alpha value of 0.940 in Table 3 indicates that the cost attributes achieve a high level of reliability for factor analysis.

TABLE 4

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinand Barrlet's Test the Cost Attributes

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy		814
Barter's test of sphericity	Approx. chi-square	726.928
	Df	171
	Sig.	.000

Table 4 shows that the test result of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is 0.814, indicating that the sample size is more than adequate for factor analysis. The Barrlett's test of Sphercity is also significant, suggesting that the population is not an identity matrix, of which the research instrument is suitable for factor analysis. After satisfying all the necessary requirements, factor analysis is conducted for the cost attributes by using PCA with varimax rotation. This rotation method is used as it seeks to maximize the variance of the factor loadings by making high loadings higher and low loadings lower on each factor [30]. The eigenvalue is a measure of how a standard variable contributes to the principal components [46][33][37]. As a general rule applied in most factor analysis results, the extracted components having the eigenvalues of 1.0 are considered as significant contributing factors and those having less than 1.0 can therefore be ignored [25, 42, 46]. Regarding the factor structure issue, a clear component structure is present when a variable has significant factor loading (loading > 0.50) on one component only [45]. Dogbegah et al. [20] recommended checking for two strange situations, namely complex structures among variables and components that have one variable loading on them. Complex variables refer to that having significant factor loading on more than one component, which also make interpretation of the output difficult. When a complex structure exists, the variable that has significant loading on more than one component has to be eliminated and the remaining variable has to rotate again for the factor result loading. The loading specified is used to express the influence of each variable to the particular component. In addition to examining whether complex structure exists among the variables, the researcher also has to examine the factor loading as to check for components that have more than one variable loading on them, otherwise the component is eliminated for further analysis. The rotated component matrix of the cost attributes are provided in Table 5 as follows:

TABLE 5 (Rotated Component Matrix)

Cost Attributes	Component		
	1	2	3
11 The negotiation process taken at final account stage	0.862	0.302	0.074
12 The overall settlement of the final account	0.831	0.267	0.126
7 Assessment of claims	0.798	0.309	0.190
6 Valuation of variation	0.797	0.347	0.224
8 The negotiation process taken at post-contract stage	0.754	0.252	0.260
9 Re-measurement of provisional quantities,	0.751	0.036	0.329
10 Re-valuation of provisional sums and prime cost sums	0.703	0.042	0.409
1 Inflation rate	0.205	0.808	-0.024
14 Programme	0.140	0.743	0.168
19 Bill software	0.118	0.695	0.369
2 Exchange rate	0.260	0.690	- 0.014
17 Market conditions	0.101	0.621	0.416

16 Contract management	0.505	0.531	0.338
4 The tender negotiation process	0.523	- 0.058	0.714
15 Procurement strategy	0.204	0.392	0.693
18 Contractor's workload	0.192	0.452	0.681
5 Tender pricing or contractor's pricing (whatever method)	0.529	- 0.019	0.666
3 The profit margin	0.517	0.413	0.539
13 Site location			

Source: Field survey 2022

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; a. Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

TABLE 6

Revised Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Barrlett's Test for the Cost Attributes

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.782
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	545.208
	Df	105
	Sig.	0.000

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of 0.782 in Table 6 indicates that the sample size is adequate for factor analysis for the remaining cost attributes. The Barrlett's test of Sphercity is also significant, suggesting that the population is not an identity matrix and is suitable for factor analysis.

TABLE 7

Total Variance Explained of the Cost Attributes

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.363	49.084	49.084	7.363	49.084	49.084	4.897	32.650	32.650
2	2.022	13.481	62.565	2.022	13.481	62.565	3.205	21.370	54.020
3	1.103	7.356	69.921	1.103	7.356	69.921	2.385	15.901	69.921
4	0.913	6.084	76.005						
5	0.762	5.083	81.088						
6	0.634	4.224	85.312						

7	0.511	3.404	88.716						
8	0.426	2.837	91.553						
9	0.364	2.426	93.979						
10	0,255	1.701	95.680						
11	0.236	1.572	97.252						
12	0.139	0.924	98.175						
13	0.123	0.820	98.995						
14	0.086	0.571	99.566						
15	0.065	0.434	100.000						

Source: Field survey 2022

Table 7 shows that when the rule of an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 is applied, 3 components are extracted in the factor analysis. The cumulative of total variance explained has been accounted for 69.921% of the variation in the data set, which fulfills the criterion of factors explaining at least 50% of the variation. The variance explained by Component 1, 2 and 3 are 32.650%, 21.37% and 15.901% respectively.

A check on Table 5 shows that the three components obtained from the varimax rotation has more than one variable loading on them, thus all the 3 components can be kept in the analysis. However, when looking into details of the 3 components, it is found that 4 items (Item 3, 4, 5 and 12) have significant loading on more than one component. The significant loading of 4 items on 2 components expresses the influence of each original variable within the two components. Thus, the 4 items are excluded from the cost attributes and the remaining research instruments (i.e. remaining cost attributes) have to be rotated again for the factor analysis result.

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

TABLE 8 Rotated Component Matrix

Cost Attributes	Component		
	1	2	3
11 The negotiation process taken at final account stage	0.861	0.111	0.282
12 The overall settlement of the final account	0.824	0.089	0.304
7 Assessment of claims	0.811	0.292	0.166
6 Valuation of variation	0.802	0.279	0.258
8 The negotiation process taken at post-contract stage	0.774	0.282	0.163
9 Re-measurement of provisional quantities,	0.794	0.195	- 0.007

10 Re-valuation of provisional sums and prime cost sums 1 Inflation rate	0.764 0.166	0.268 0.266	- 0.016 0.769
14 Programme	0.139	0.668	0.401
19 Bill software	0.167	0.666	0.405
2 Exchange rate	0.196	0.140	0.825
17 Market conditions	0.152	0.707	0.318
16 Contract management	0.505	0.531	0.338
4 The tender negotiation process	0.523	- 0.058	0.714
15 Procurement strategy	0.309	0.738	0.081
18 Contractor's workload	0.290	0.830	0.097
3 The profit margin	0.517	0.413	0.539
13 Site location	0.217	0.636	0.303

Source: Field survey 2022

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
The remaining is about the interpretation of the 3 principal components extracted. It is instructive to note that the 15 retained cost attributes are summarized into 3 new uncorrelated factors that explain 69.921% of the total variance in the variables included in the components. However, as this paper adopts only exploratory approach involving a large number of cost attributes, the interpretation of the principal components has become a considerable challenge in this study. Another challenge posed by the Principal Component Analysis is that the combination of the variables that load high on a component is difficult to interpret and to explain their pattern, as the analysis indicates only the relationship between individual component and the variable. As such, the interpretation of factors involves a certain amount of inventiveness and imagination [44, 3]. In the next section, the assessment and naming of each component is based on the understanding of the content and relationship among the variables.

Discussion of Factor Analysis Results

Based on the critical examination of the variables in each factor/component, an appropriate collective label is given to each extracted factor/component so as to reflect the correlation of all the variables within. Factor 1 is named as contract management factor; factor 2 is named as project management factor and factor 3 is named as monetary value factor. Referring to the findings obtained in preceding studies and opinions collected from the semi structured interviewees, the meaning of the three extracted factors are interpreted as follows according to the descending order of variance explained by each factor.

1. Contract Management Factor The first principal component (factor) in Table 6 reports high factor loadings for a group of variables (cost attributes), namely "The negotiation process taken at final account stage", "The overall settlement of the final account", "Assessment of claims", "Valuation of variation", "Re-measurement of provisional quantities", "The negotiation process taken at post-contract stage" and "Re-valuation of provisional sums and prime cost sums". These variables account for 32.65% of the variance explained as shown in Table 5. Subsequently, examining critically the latent characteristics of the variables, the factor is named as "contract management factor". This factor is easy to interpret, in the sense that with the complex, dynamic and challenging nature of construction projects, contract management is exceptionally important in this type of project and its performance would affect project productivity, quality and budget significantly. For instance, Ahsan [4] point out that the ambiguity and disputes between project parties in a number of contract clauses (including workmanship variation, work variation order and cost reporting and control etc.) affects project performance, cost, schedule and quality. Similarly, in the study of 204 construction contracts in Italy, Trost[43] points out that the contract clauses define how a project is measured (e.g. variation work and works under provisional and prime cost sum) and how risks are allocated between the parties involved. Hence, it is essential that the contract specific issues would determine the magnitude of the total cost of the project. The interview results also confirm the questionnaire findings of which most of the respondents have pointed out that a number of matters of contract administration are cost significant, including payment, valuation, variations and claims, loss and expenses issue and final account settlement etc. Since the contract issues of a project determines the condition under which the project will be let and the amount of work to be valuated, it is not surprising that the contract management factor has been found as a cost impact factor in civil engineering projects.

2. Project Management Factor Factor 2 accounts for 21.37% of the total variance (see Table 5). As demonstrated in Table 6, the factor consists of "contractor's workload", "procurement strategy", "market conditions", "site location" and "programme" and "technology". It is noteworthy that these variables are loaded on the same factor, which is related to the construction project subject matter. Without difficulty, the factor is labeled as "project management factor", and the interpretation that follows. Contractor's workload and market conditions are found to have high impact on project cost in a number of studies. For instance, Asiedu [14] study findings show that that the contractor's workload and trends in market condition have implications on the resource cost and mark-up determination for the project and consequently, the whole project costing. Moreover, Elhag et al. [22] also point out in his study that market conditions have a clear effect on tender prices, and particularly on mark-up and profit margins of a particular construction project. In the analysis of construction cost in Sweden, Warsame [45] found that the contractor's workload is a function of the number of contractors in the market, which inherently influences the costs of inputs and the level of final construction cost. Warsame [45] also points out that the market condition would have high impact on final project cost as it determines how a project initial cost get estimated and the level of final construction costs derived, usually long after the estimated date.

Considering the procurement strategy, although it is argued by some researchers [4, 30] that the attribute itself has little relationship with the construction cost of the project, it is expected that this attribute has some implication on the contractual arrangement, which affects the risk allocation and thus the final project cost. Site location also has implication on project cost as site located in remote area may encounter more problems such as the unforeseen geological condition, delivery of resources and restriction of access to site [23] [27] [35]. In addition, the work programme is also considered as important in project cost as this information is essential to plan the construction activities and resource requirements accurately at the project construction stage. Inaccurate estimation of the materials and manpower would subsequently affects project performance, cost and schedule. Some of the interview respondents also mentioned that problems or negative effects (such as time overrun) may arise when less attention has been paid to monitor the work programme, which will in turn affects the final project cost. The bill software is of particular importance in project cost estimates as it determines the success of construction projects. Some interview respondents also support that the "bill software" used in construction is important in construction project cost because of the project complexity usually found in many of constructing works.

3. Monetary Value Factor Factor 3 consists of two cost variables: exchange rate and inflation rate, which accounts 15.901% of the total variance (see Table 5). This factor is named as "monetary value" and the interpretation follows. Both exchange rate and inflation rate affect the financial performance of a construction project as the two variables will contribute for the unprecedented price strikes in vital construction labour and materials such as steel, copper and cement etc., which have an enormous impact on the overall cost of the project. For example, inflation causes price escalation in concrete will obviously lead to an increase in the total concrete cost of a project. Whilst the economic and financial factor plays a role in project cost, its significance varies with the country in which construction is taken place and with the project duration [2]. This factor is especially important when the project takes place in countries where there is economic instability or with project of long duration. For instance, in the study of North Sea platform projects, Hetland [31] has found that the projects normally take 3 to 5 years for completion and inflation alone already represents about 27% of the total project cost, which is also one of the major reasons for project cost overrun. Similarly, Olawale et al. [40] also state that there is cost overrun on high-rise projects in Indonesia because of the unpredicted inflation in the past few years of which the price of the cement itself has already increased by more than 70%.

Conclusion

Project cost is an important concern in any construction project. The significant cost deviations in construction projects, nowadays has placed emphasis on the need for construction professionals to understand the magnitude of the factors on influencing the project cost. Taking lead from previous studies and discussions with experienced construction professionals, nineteen cost attributes that affect construction project cost are identified. Principal Component Analysis is adopted to extract the factor structure of these attributes. The analysis results show that the cost attributes can be distinguished into three factors, namely contract management factor, project management factor and monetary value factor. This also forms the basis for improving the cost management of construction projects in Nigeria. The originality and value of the paper is manifested in the use of the principal component analysis to provide an understanding into the grouping of the various cost overrun attributes and expound three cost impact factors in construction projects.
The contribution of this paper is twofold:

- First, it represents the idea of context-driven research that identifies the cost overrun impact factors in the provision of construction projects to address the dynamic nature of the industry.
- Second, the findings draw an implication of focus in assisting the project stakeholders and quantity surveyors to perform cost management functions better in construction projects.

This is achieved through the grouping of the factor components. The recognition of these factor component groupings, representing the important cost attributes in construction works, implies that the three factors should be considered carefully in managing construction project cost. It is believed that an improved understanding portrayed in this study would enable the development of strategies, methods and tools for managing those costing items in construction projects. In addition, categorization of the cost attributes under different principal factors allows practitioners to assess the associated risks with reference to the project characteristics and environment and to make necessary adjustments, thereby performing better cost management functions.

Recommendation

The following recommendations are made as deriving from the outcome of the analysis of the findings. Contributions of professionals towards cost overrun in Nigerian construction industry; quantity surveyors perspective was conducted to ascertain the contributions of quantity surveyors professional activities that leads to project cost overrun were investigated.

- The sole decision making by architect in high cost related designs should be discouraged, rather quantity surveyors should be involved early enough to handle, poor schedule cost management, high unit rate of materials, materials, plants and labor schedules.

- Quantity surveyors should be trained on the use and applications quantity surveyors billing and costing soft wares.
- Poor designs/ delay in providing designs drawings to quantity surveyor for bill of quantities preparation should be discouraged.
- Rework due to wrong work been detected by quantity surveyor during interim valuations and project final account preparation should be reduced to a minimum level through good project supervision.
- Quantity surveyors should not accept to work under pressure while billing, valuations and raising of payments certification.
- Quantity surveyors should avoid wrong estimation/ estimation method, and long period between design and time of bidding/tendering and collaborations with contractors and architects raising interim valuation orders and payment certificates without corresponding work on site and bill of quantities provisions which are the major causes of cost overrun. These confines also provide the basis for future research recommendations. Future research to explore the right probes of how those cost factors in construction projects can be worked out would be important for improving the predictability of project cost and enhancing the project cost accuracy.

Understanding these cost impact factors could be crucial in managing construction projects, since it allows the project stakeholders and quantity surveyors to take precautionary steps to identify the cost management problems and areas for improvement and could even help to avoid cost deviations in construction projects.

References

[1] Adaku, Amoatey, Nornyibey, Famiyeh, and Asante-Darko (2018), "Delays in new product introduction: Experiences of a food processing company in a developing economy", Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp.811828.

[2]Ahiaga-Dagbui, and Smith (2014), "Rethinking construction cost overruns: cognition, learning and estimation", Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction, Vol. 19, No.1, pp.38-54.

[3]Ahiaga-Dagbui, Love, Smith, and Ackermann (2017), "Toward a Systemic View to Cost Overrun Causation in Infrastructure Projects: A Review and Implications for Research", Project Management Journal, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 88–98.

[4]Ahsan, and Gunawan, (2010), "Analysis of cost and schedule performance of international development projects", International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 68-78.

[5]Aje, (2012), "The impact of contractors' prequalification on construction project delivery in Nigeria", Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 159-172.

[6]Ali and Kamaruzzaman (2010), "Cost Performance for Building Construction Projects in Klang Valley", Journal of Building Performance, Vol. 1, No. 1, 110-110.

[7]Alsuliman, Bowles,and Chen (2012). Current practice of variation order management in the Saudi construction industry In: Smith, S.D (Ed) Procs 28th Annual ARCOM Conference, 3-5 September 2012, Edinburgh, UK, Association of Researchers in Construction Management, 1003-1012.

[8]Ameyaw, and OtengSeifah (2010), “Construction Project Delivery in Ghana – The performance of Traditional Procurement Method”, West African Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference, University of Reading, 2010.

[9]Ameyaw, Mensah and Osei-Tutu (2012), “Public procurement in Ghana: The implementation challenges to the public procurement law 2003 (Act 663)”. International Journal of Construction Supply Chain Management, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 55-65.

[10]Amoah, Ahadzie, and Dansoh (2011), “The factors affecting construction performance in Ghana: the perspective of small-scale building contractors”, The Ghana Surveyor, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 48.

[11]Amoatey, Ameyaw, Adaku and Famiyeh (2015), "Analysing delay causes and effects in Ghanaian state housing construction projects", International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp.198-214

[12]Apolot, Ruth.,Alinaitwe, Henry,Tindiwensi, and Dan (2012) , “An Investigation into the Causes of Delay and Cost Overrun in Uganda’s Public Sector Construction Projects”, Second International Conference on Advances in Engineering and Technology.

[13]Asiedu and Alfen (2015), “Understanding the underlying reasons behind time overruns of government building projects in Ghana,” KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp. 2103–2111.

[14]Asiedu and Alfen(2014). “Factors engendering cost misrepresentation of public sector projects in Ghana.” International Journal of Sustainable Construction Engineering and Technology, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 13-24 .

[15]Azlan, S.A., Smith, A., Pitt, M. & Chan, H.C. (2010), “Contractors perception of factors contributing to project delay: case studies of commercial projects in Klang Valley, Malaysia”, Journal of Design & Built Environment, Vol. 6 (2), No.7, 43-57.

[16]Baloyi, Lucius,Bekker,and Michiel. (2011), “Causes of construction cost and time overruns: The 2010 FIFA World Cup stadia in South Africa”, ActaStructilia Journal, Vol.No. 1, 51-67.

[17] Chan(2012), "The principal factors affecting construction project overhead expenses: an exploratory factor analysis approach," Construction Management and Economics, vol. 30, pp. 903-914.

[18]Chitkara(2011), “Construction Project Management - Planning, Scheduling and Controlling”, 2nd Edition, Tata McGraw Hills.

[19]Creedy, Garry D., Skitmore, Martin. & Wong, Johnny K. W. (2010), “Evaluation of Risk Factors Leading to Cost Overrun in Delivery of Highway Construction Projects”, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 136, No. 5, 528-537.

[20]Dogbegah, Owusu-Manu and Omoteso(2011) "A principal component analysis of project management competencies for the Ghanaian Construction Industry," Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 26-40.

[21] Doloi andHemanta. (2012), “Cost overruns and failure in project management - understanding the roles of key stakeholders in construction projects”, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, oi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943- 7862.0000621. [12]. Ejaz, Naeem.,Ali, Imran., &Tahir, Muhammad Fiaz. (2008), “Assessment

[22]Elhag, Boussabinaine andBallal(2005), "Critical determinants of construction tendering costs: Quantity surveyor's standpoint 538-545.

[23]Enshassi, Al-Najjar and Kumaraswamy(2009), "Delays and cost overruns in the construction projects in the Gaza Strip," Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 126-151.

[24]Fang, Xie, Huang and Li(2004) "Factor analysis-based studies on construction workplace safety management in China," International Journal of Project Management, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 458-467.

[25]Field(2013) "Factor analysis using SPSS: theory and application," [Online]. Available: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/users/andyf/factor.pdf. [Accessed 21 August, 2022].

[26]Flyvbjerg, Holm and Buhl(2003), "Underestimating costs in public works projects, error or lie," Journal of the American Planning Association, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 279-292.

[27]Frimpong, Oluwoye and Crawford(2003), "Causes of delay and cost overruns in construction of groundwater projects in a developing countries; Ghana as a case study," International Long, Lee and Lee(2008), "Delay and Cost Overruns in Vietnam Large Construction Journal of Project Management, vol. 21, pp. 321-326.

[28]George andMallery(1999), "Factor analysis," in SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide for Reference, Boston, Allyn& Bacon, 1999, pp. 231-246.

[29]Gravetter and Forzano(2012) Research Methods for Behavioral Science, 4th ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

[30] Hair, Anderson and Tatham(1998), Multivariate data analysis, 4th ed., Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

[31]Hetland(1994), "Toward ultimate control of megaprojects in the North Sea," in Global project management handbook, D. Cleland and R. Gareis, Eds., New York, McGraw-Hill.

[32] Iyer andJha(2005), "Factors affecting cost performance: evidence from Indian construction projects," International Journal of Project Management, vol. 23, pp. 283-295.

[33]Jergeas, George F. &Ruwanpura, Janaka. (2010), "Why Cost and Schedule Overruns on Mega Oil Sands Projects?", Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, Vol. No. 1, 40-43.

[34]Lau (2011) "A review of cost planning methodology adopted in engineering projects," in 15th PAQS Congress, Sri Lanka.

[35] Lee and Lee(2011), "Application of factor analysis for service R&D classification: a case study on the Korean ICT industry," Expert Systems with Applications, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 2119-2124.

[36]Mahamid andBruland (2012), "Cost deviation in road construction projects: the case of Palestine," Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 58-71.

[37] Memon, AftabHameed., Rahman, Ismail Abdul. &Azis, Ade Asmi Abdu. (2011), "Preliminary Study on Causative Factors Leading to Construction Cost Overrun", Journal of Sustainable Construction Engineering & Technology, Vol. 2, Issue. 1, 57-71.

[38]New Enyclopaedia Britannica (2001): Macropedia. EncyclopaediaOxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2001) Oxford, Oxford University Press.

[39]Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (2015a).Measurement and Cost Management of Engineering Projects.Abuja, Nigeria, Author.Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (2015b).Building and Engineering Standard of Measurement (4thed.).Abuja, Nigeria, Author.

[40]Olawale, Y.A. & Sun, Ming. (2010), "Cost and Time Control of Construction Projects: Inhibiting Factors and Mitigating Measures in Practice", Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 20, Issue 5, 509526.

[41]Projects: A Comparison with Other Selected Countries," KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 367-377.

[42]Stern(2010), A visual approach to SPSS for Windows: a guide to SPSS 17.0, 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2010.

[43]Trost and Oberlender(2003), "Predicting accuracy of early cost estimates using factor analysis and multivariate regression," Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, vol. 129, no. 2, pp. 198-204.

[44]Wai, Yousf, Ismail and Ng(2013), "Exploring Success Factors of Social Infrastructure Projects in Malaysia," International Journal of Engineering Business Management, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1-9.

[45] Warsame(2006) "Construction Costs: Central Concepts, Categories and Determining Factors," Royal Institute of Technology.

[46] Williams (2003), "Predicting final cost for competitively bid construction projects using regression models," International Journal of Project Management, vol. 21, pp. 593-599.