## Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI) Volume 12, Issue 8, July 2021: 472-481

## Research Findings on Impacts of Material Wastage of Building Construction Project

# Kidist Mengesha<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Subash Thanappan<sup>2\*</sup>, Woyesa Ararsa<sup>3</sup>, Geleta Chala<sup>4</sup>, Jifara Chimdi<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Ambo University, Ethiopia

\*Corresponding Author Email: thanappansubash@gmail.com

Abstract: All over the world, the development of construction related industries depend on the natural and artificial resources. The generation of wastes from the construction industries and its management is a big task for the proponents and stake holders of the industry. The quantity of waste generation from the construction industryis highly related to the construction methods, improper management, the onsite sorting and recycling abilities for construction waste, the levels of education and trainingsgiven to workers and the design concepts. The current research focuses to identify the contributory factors that influences the generation of construction material wastage. In addition, the study aims to deeply analyze the impact of construction material waste on cost at building construction project and recommends the strategies to minimize the construction material wastage. Data collection was done through questionnaire survey and interviews among the different stake holders in building construction (Clients, Consultants, Contractors and other Professionals) in Addis Ababa. Stratified Sampling technique was considered as a tool to opt for the Sites with regards to all the civil engineering professionals, stakeholders like contractors, consultants, and clients. The current study focuses in identifying and analyzing the major impacts of the construction material wastage at building construction site in Kolfe Keranio sub city, Addis Ababa. The outcome of the result would bring strong information to clients. consultants and contractors and other stakeholders in minimizing the overall cost due to material wastage.

*Keywords:*Contributory factors, Questionnaire survey, Spearman'srankcorrelation coefficients, Validity and Reliability test.

#### 1. Introduction

The growth of construction industry, especially in Addis) is mainly due to the growth of Ethiopian economy and population Ababa (Mahilet Reta et.al., 2020. More complex type of buildings arises and the numbers are gradually increasing, now-a-days. The demand for the construction materials are increasing dramatically day by day. The demand for the material resources is increasing day by day due to the growth of construction industries (Subash Thanappan et.al., 2021), [7,8]. On contrary, there are various reasons for the wastage of a fairlymajorfraction of the construction material at building sites (Getachew Araya Kassa, November, 2009).

Although the construction industry rely on both natural and artificial resources and responsible for large quantities of construction wastes, it takes a major role for the economical

growth of any country and thus promoting the comfortable enjoyment of livingwith the promoted infrastructure of highways, health centers, educational institutions, and other fundamental facilities.

In spite of losing large amounts of money, time and other resource, there is a lack of the current construction management. Waste generation on construction sites might mostly be related to selection of construction methods, selection of construction materials, the accessibility of onsite sorting and recycling facilities of construction wastes, the levels of education and training given to workers, design concepts, and others. The pioneer research found that material wastes from construction industries signify a comparatively largerfraction of production cost.

#### 2. Material and Methods

The main expansion area of Addis Ababa is considered as the study area,located within the diverse economic activities taking place, and a place for different kinds of reales tate projects under

construction. The total population lived in this subcity is estimated about 546, 219 from this 220, 859 are male and the rest (235, 360) are females.

In the current study, a wide range of construction parties are involved in construction of projects were targeted in order to evaluate and assess the current situation of wastage of construction materials on selected building projects.

Both the primary and secondary data collection methods are done and the selected samples include contracting and consulting companies of all gradecategory's that have a valid registration by Ministry of UrbanDevelopment and Construction in Addis Ababa. Both open and close ended format questions are designed to obtain information on of Construction material was tage of building.



Figure 1: Study Area

The collected data (waste volume) was used to find the contribution of material wastes to the produced quantity of cost overruns.

#### 2.1. DataProcessingandAnalysis

Through the site investigation and the collection of data from office records, the collection of primary data was accomplished, and those primary data were helped to identify on material waste and cost overruns in building construction industries. In the current study, bothdescriptivedata and inferential data were used. With the help of measuring instruments (on-site measurement), the total quantity of material wastes on-sitewere noted to correlate it to estimate the amount of cost overruns.

#### 2.2.SoftwarecumInstrument

As discussed before data is collected through different methods like interview, site visit andquestionerssurveythereforeneedtousedifferentinstrumentse.g.Instrumentslikecamera(duringsite visit) ,paper, Copy machine,Printer, Computer etc.(during QuestionnairesSurvey). Collected data are extracted and analyzed using different software like excel, MS Word etc. Allgathered data are feed in excel and give out put in the form of graphs and tables. MS Word is alsousedthroughout theresearch for Typing and drawing purposes.

#### 2.3. ValidityandReliabilityTests

The foremost data collection mechanisms to be engaged in this research are questionnaire and interview that are verified for validity and reliability by testing the questionnaire initially with particular sample respondents and lateral tering the questionnaire and interview questions based on the feedbacks.

| No | Stakeholder | Dispersed<br>numbers |       | Outcome<br>numbers |       | Botched<br>numbers |      | Analyzed<br>numbers |       |
|----|-------------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|------|---------------------|-------|
|    |             | No.                  | %     | No.                | %     | No.                | %    | No                  | %     |
| 1  | Supervisor  | 27                   | 28.42 | 20                 | 21.05 | 3                  | 3.16 | 17                  | 17.89 |
| 2  | Contractor  | 52                   | 54.74 | 48                 | 50.53 | 4                  | 4.21 | 44                  | 46.32 |
| 3  | Client      | 16                   | 16.84 | 13                 | 13.68 | 1                  | 1,05 | 12                  | 12.63 |

Table 1: Questionnaire survey and its Response rate

It found that the perception among the contractors and consultants about its effect are similar. The level of client material supplyby twogroups of respondents is shown in Figure 2. It has been observed that 83.72% of contracting companies and 75% of the consultantshas agreed to supply the client materials, and in turn, increase the quantity of wastage.



Figure 2:Impact on the supply of client materials

| Table 2. Neason for the material wastage |                     |         |             |             |  |  |  |  |
|--|---------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | Rankand Percentiles |         |             |             |  |  |  |  |
| Reasonsformaterialwastage                | Rank                | Clients | Consultants | Contractors |  |  |  |  |
| Nopropercontrol                          | 1                   | 86.21   | 74.31       | 43.16       |  |  |  |  |
| Clientdoesn'tdeliverygoodquality         | 2                   | 12.78   | 17.01       | 49.25       |  |  |  |  |
| material                                 |                     |         |             |             |  |  |  |  |
| Clientsuppliesmaterialinunplanned        | 3                   | 1.01    | 8.68        | 7.59        |  |  |  |  |
| way                                      |                     |         |             |             |  |  |  |  |

**Table 2:**Reason for the material wastage

Spearmanrankcorrelationcoefficients were employed to check if there anydisparity in ranking amid two groups of respondents.

| Items              | Rho=1-(6( $\Sigma$ di <sup>2</sup> )) (N(N <sup>2</sup> -1)) | Critical r value |  |  |
|--------------------|--|------------------|--|--|
| Concrete waste     | 0.20   | 0.410            |  |  |
| Mortar waste       | 0.85   | 0.410            |  |  |
| Reinforcementwaste | 0.65   | 0.410            |  |  |
| HC block waste     | 0.89   | 0.410            |  |  |

**Table 3:**Spearman'srankcorrelation coefficients for causes of waste

Forbothgroupofrespondents,therelativetherelativerespondentstherelativetherelativetherelativetherelativethere lativethere lativetablethere lative</

| Items                        | Contractor |                  | Consultant |                  | Clients |                  |  |
|------------------------------|------------|------------------|------------|------------------|---------|------------------|--|
| items                        | R.W        | Assigned<br>Rank | R.W        | Assigned<br>Rank | R.W     | Assigned<br>Rank |  |
| Designcategory               | 4.0        | 1                | 3.20       | 4                | 3.12    | 5                |  |
| Procurement category         | 2.90       | 6                | 3.10       | 5                | 2.87    | 6                |  |
| Handlingand storage category | 3.40       | 5                | 3.80       | 3                | 3.92    | 2                |  |
| Operation category           | 3.50       | 4                | 4.31       | 1                | 4.08    | 1                |  |
| Management category          | 3.62       | 3                | 3.90       | 2                | 3.41    | 4                |  |
| Supervision category         | 3.83       | 2                | 2.86       | 6                | 3.66    | 3                |  |

Table 4: Relativeweight andrankingof concrete waste

The finding shows that discordantopinionsonthecategoryofconcrete waste among three different groups of respondents.

#### 2.4.Levelof contribution of the waste causes for the generation of waste

Themeanandrankofeachcauseoftheconcretewasteconferringtothecontractors, consultant's and clie nt'sperceptionare displayed in the Tables5 and 6 respectively.

Cause RW Rank Changesandrevision on design 4.36 1 Damagetoworkdone 4.11 2 Rework 4.04 3 Delayinperforminginspectionandtesting 3.86 4 Mistakes on drawingsand specification 3.84 5 Clutteredconstructionsite 3.82 6 Overloadingoftransportequipment 7 3.59 Poorcoordinationandcommunication 8 3.45 Poor qualification of employees 4.14 9 Slow response 3.36 10 Lack of attention 3.34 11 Poor qualification of subcontractor's 3.16 11

Table 5:Relative weightandranking of concrete wastecauses -views of contractors

# Kidist Mengesha, Dr. Subash Thanappan, Woyesa Ararsa, Geleta Chala, Jifara Chimdi

| Using excessive quantity of materials than required | 3.04 | 11 |
|---|------|----|
| Double handling of materials                        | 2.98 | 13 |
| Mistakes in quantity surveys                        | 2.93 | 16 |
| Improper handling of materials                      | 2.76 | 15 |
| Poor workmanship                                    | 2.68 | 16 |
| Scarcity of Equipment                               | 2.45 | 17 |

| Cause   | R.W  | Assigned Rank |
|---|------|---------------|
| Damagetoworkdonebyothertrade                  | 4.35 | 3             |
| Overloadingoftransportequipment               | 4.40 | 2             |
| Poorworkmanship                               | 4.53 | 1             |
| Poorhandling of materials                     | 4.18 | 6             |
| Rework  | 4.35 | 4             |
| Use of excessive quantity of materials        | 4.29 | 5             |
| LackofEquipments                              | 4.10 | 7             |
| Changesandrevision on design                  | 3.93 | 8             |
| Errorsinquantity survey                       | 3.82 | 9             |
| Double handling of materials                  | 3.53 | 11            |
| Untidy construction site                      | 3.71 | 10            |
| Low qualification of subcontractors           | 3.41 | 13            |
| Use of wrong material                         | 3.47 | 12            |
| Theft   | 3.18 | 14            |
| Lack of response from the consultant engineer | 3.06 | 15            |

## Table 6:Concrete waste causes

# Research Findings on Impacts of Material Wastage of Building Construction Project

| to contractor inquires                                      |      |    |
|---|------|----|
| Poor quality of materials                                   | 2.88 | 16 |
| Delay in performing inspection                              | 2.13 | 18 |
| Mistakes, and inconsistencies on drawings and specification | 2.18 | 17 |

| Cause  | R.W  | Assigned Rank |
|--|------|---------------|
| Poorworkmanship  | 4.50 | 1             |
| Damagetoworkdone   | 3.75 | 9             |
| Rework   | 4.33 | 2             |
| Mistakesinquantitysurvey   | 4.25 | 3             |
| Overloadingoftransportequipment                                      | 4.00 | 6             |
| Improperhandling ofmaterials   | 4.16 | 4             |
| Delay in performing inspection                                       | 3.25 | 14            |
| Multiplehandling ofmaterials   | 3.92 | 7             |
| Changesandrevision on design   | 3.84 | 8             |
| Cluttered site   | 3.67 | 10            |
| Poor qualification of subcontractor's                                | 3.50 | 11            |
| Use of wrong material  | 3.42 | 12            |
| Lack of Equipment  | 3.33 | 13            |
| Mistakes, and inconsistencies in drawings and specification          | 3.08 | 15            |
| Lack of response from the consultant engineer to contractor inquires | 2.58 | 16            |

 Table 7:Relativeweight andrankingof concretewastecauses-viewofclients

#### Kidist Mengesha, Dr. Subash Thanappan, Woyesa Ararsa, Geleta Chala, Jifara Chimdi

| Useexcessivequantityofmaterialsthan required | 4.08 | 5  |
|--|------|----|
| Poor quality of materials                    | 2.55 | 17 |
| Theft  | 2.42 | 18 |



Figure3:Budgebeam



Figure4: Budgeshearwall

During the revision on design, the strategies implemented by respondents are shown in Figure 5.Alloftherespondentsundergoatleastcorrectingdetailingproblemsonthedesigndrawingduringade signrevisionperiod.Nevertheless,theoutcomeindicatesthe lack of practice by the firm on the dimensional coordination, standardization and material selection to reduce the generation of wastages.



Figure 5:Strategiesemployedduringdesignrevisionbyconsultants

### **3.** Conclusions

Thesurvey reveals that the levelofmaterialswasteinconstruction projects is legitimately high. It also displays that the cost effect extent upto 10 % of the project cost. The supply of poor quality material hasaugmented thegeneration of material wastage. The rework and damage to the work done by othertrade are amongst the top five major causes of concrete wastage in the sites is another major cause for wastages. Similarly, the use of excessive quantities of materials, multiple handling, rework, poor workmanship, damageto work done are the majorportentous causes of mortar waste in the study area. The waste generation on site is directly related to the design process. The majorcauses for the wastage of hollowconcreteblock aremainly due to the lowqualitymaterials, improper storageof materials, poor workmanship, improper handling of materials and lack of attention.On contrary, the the poorperformanceoftheconstructionsupervisorsinstandardizationandmodularization of design during a design revision period is consequently increasing the generation of wastages in excess.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors express their profound sense of gratitude and to Department of Construction Engineering and Technology, School of Civil and EnvironmentalEngineering, Ambo University, Ambo, Ethiopia for providing all facilities and for their intellectual and affectionate guidance, constant encouragement which paved the way for the genesis of this successful work.

## References

- [1] Shimizu, Y.,and Cardoso, F. "Sub-Contracting and Cooperation Network in BuildingConstruction". Gramado, Brazil, 2002.
- [2] Getachew Araya Kassa. "Master of Science of Civil Engineering, ConstructionTechnologyandManagement". AAUSchoolofGraduateStudies, 2009.
- [3] Ameh, J.O. & Itodo, E.D. Professional sviews of material wastage on construction sites, 2013.
- [4] Gutherie, P., Woolveridge, A., & Patel. "*Waste Minimization in Construction London*:", ConstructionIndustry ResearchandInformationAssociation, 1999.

- [5] Jain, M. "Economic Aspects of Construction Waste Materials in terms of cost savings Acase of Indian construction Industry" International Journal of Scientific and ResearchPublications, Volume 2, Issue 10, 2250-3152, 2012.
- [6] Love, P., Edwards, D. & Irani, Z. "Moving beyond optimism bias and strategicmisrepresentation: An explanation for social infrastructure project cost overruns". IEEETransactionon Engineering Management, 560-571, 2011.
- [7] Dr. Subash Thanappan, Gammachis Merga, Kidist Dinsa, Jifara Dirirsa, Lami Terefe, Segni Teesisa, "Solid Waste Management: Plan of Action for Healthy Environment", International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAME), 2(12), pp.707-711, 2021.
- [8] Dr. Subash Thanappan, Kasahun Girma Lemessa, Genet Muktar Urago, Tigist Aregawi, Azeb Balcha Turi, Betelihem Zebene Damte, Biniyam Zewdu, Chaluma Feyera Telila, Derartu Tariku, Eden Tedla, Emawayish Worku Beza, Frehiwet Leake Hadgu, Hundatu Teke Mosisa, Iyasu Gebre, Kassahun Jima, Misker Hagos Habtemicheal, Mubarek Y. K, Selmawit D, Tadesse Dabio Urga, Tigist Bekele, Yemariyam Kibret, Zekarias Gebre, "Construction Materials: Modern Techniques for Green Home", International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM), 3(1), pp: 150-156, 2021.
- [9] Mahilet Reta, Dr.Subash Thanappan, Sathya Prabha, Eyob Mekonnen, "Survey of Chief factors influencing the growth of Construction Activities – A Proven Map", Int. J. of Adv. Research in Engineering and Technology (IJARET), 11(10), 67-69, 2020.