REFERENCES

- Abd. Majid, M. Z., & McCaffer, R. (1988). Factors on non-excusable delays that influence contractors' performance. Journal of Management in Engineering, Vol. 14, No.3, 42-49.
- Ahmed SM, Azhae S, Kappagntula P, Gollapudial D (2003). Delays in construction: A brief study of the Florida construction industry. Proceeding of the 39th Annual ASC Conference, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, pp. 257-266.
- Ali, S.A., Rahmat,I.& Hassan,H.(2008).Involvement of key design participants in refurbishment design process, Facilities. Emerald, UK. Vol. 26 No. 9/10 pp 389-400
- Ali, S.A., Rahmat,I. & Noorhashimah N.(2006). Information in the design process of refurbishment projects. 5th MICRA 2006, Kulliyyah of Architecture and Environmental Design, UIAM, 20-21 June 2006, pp 128-400
- Ali, S.A., Rahmat,I. & Noorhashimah, N. (2006).Integrative mechanisms in the design process of refurbishment projects. International Conference of the Built Environment in the 21st Century, Renaissance Hotel Kuala Lumpur, 13-15 June 2006, pp 699-708
- Ali, S.A.& Rahmat,I. (2009). Coordination Methods in Managing the Design Process of Refurbishment Projects. Journal of Building Appraisal Palgrave, UK. pp. 87-98
- Ali. S.A, Syahrul N. K & Salleh, H. (2009) "The characteristics of refurbishment projects in Malaysia", Facilities, Vol. 27 Iss: 1/2, pp.56 – 65
- Al-Momani, A. H. (2000). Construction delay: quantitative analysis. International Journal of Project Management, 18, 51-59.
- Andi & Minato, T. (2003a). Design documents quality in Japanese construction industry. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 21, 537-546.
- Andi & Minato, T. (2003b). Representing causal mechanism of defective designs: a system approach considering human errors. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 21, 297-305.
- Andi, & Minato, T. (2004). Representing causal mechanism of defective designs: Exploration through case studies. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 22, 183-192.

- Arain, F.M. and Low, S.P. (2005), "The potential effects of variation orders on institutional building projects", Facilities. Emerald, UK. Vol. 23 No. 11/12 pp. 496-510.
- Arditi, D., & Gunaydin, H. M. 1977. Total quality management in the construction process. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 14, No.2, 81-87.
- Arditi, D., Koksal, A., & Kale, S. 2000. Business failure in the construction industry. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 7, No. 2, 120-132.
- Ashley, D.B. (1986), " new trends in risk management", paper presented at the internet's 10th International Expert Seminar on New Approaches in Project Management, Zurich, 10-12 March.
- Assaf, S. A., Al-Khalil, M., & Al-Hazmi, M. (1994). Causes of delay in large building construction projects. Journal of Managementin Engineering, Vol.11, No.2, 45-50.
- Atkinson, R. (1999), "Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, it's time to accept other success criteria", International Journal of Project Management, Vol 17 No, 6, pp, 337-42.
- Babbie, E. R. (2003). The practice of social research. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Baccarini, D. (1996). The concept of project complexity- a review. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 14, No. 4, 201-204.
- Baccarini, D.(1999). The logical framework method for defining project success. Project Management Institute, Vol.30, No 4, 25-32.
- Baldwin, A. N., Austin, S. A., Hassan, T. M. & Thorpe (1999). Modelling information flow during the conceptual and schematic stages of building design. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol.17, 155-167.
- Baldwin, J.D., Manthei, J.M., Rothbart, H., & Harris, R.B. (1971). Causes of delay in construction industry. Journal of Construction Division, ASCE, Vol.97, No.C02, 177-187.

- Bassioni, H.A., Price, A.D.F. & Hassan, T.M. (2005). Building a conceptual framework for measuring business performance in construction: an empirical evaluation. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 18, 73-182.
- Beckmann, P. & Bowels, R. (2004). Structural Aspects of Building Conservation. Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd, Oxford.
- Beger, H., Wolf, H.F. & Ullmann, E. 1989. Handbook der Sozialistischen Forschung. Methodologies, Method, Techniques, Berlin: Academy Verlag.
- Bennett, J. & Fine, (1980). Measurement of complexity in construction projects. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol.2, 225-263.
- Bennett, J. (1983). Office Refurbishment: Contracts and Organization. Architects Journal, 178(48), 69-70.
- Bennett, J. (1991). International construction project management general theory and practice. Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd, Oxford.

Bennett, J. (2002). Construction the third way. Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd, Oxford.

- Bloomberg, I. (1992). Careful renovation-obstacle and possibilities, Proceeding innovations in management, maintenance & modernisation of building, 28-30 Oct. 1992 Rotterdam-Holland, Vol. 4 Theme 6, Paper 6.5.
- Building Research Establishment (BRE) (2002) Tall Buildings and Sustainability Report, BRE, London, UK.
- Bouma, G., Atkinson, G. (1995). Social Science Research: a comprehensive and practical guide for students (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, D. & Weaver, O.P. (1994). Improving the management and operation of refurbishment projects, Proceedings of the 10th. ARCOM Annual Conference, 14-16 September, 1994, Loughbrough University of Technology, UK.
- Brandon, P.S. and Powell, J.A. Quality and profit building design E & F N Spon, London. Pp 339-349
- Building And Construction Authority (2010). Contract Administration Public Sector Standard Of Contract For Construction Works.

- Burati, J.L., Farrington, J.J. & Ledbetter, W.B. (1992). Causes of quality deviation in design and construction. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 118, No. 1, 34-49.
- Casley, D.J., and K. Kumar. 1988. The collection, Analysis and Use of Monitoring and Evaluation Data. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press for the World Bank.
- Chalabi, A.F., & Camp, D. (1984). Causes of delays and overruns of construction projects in developing countries. Proceedings of the CIB, W65, Vol 3, 723-734.
- CIDB, (2007). Construction quarterly statistical bulletin- fourth quarter 2006. CIDB, Malaysia.
- Clancy, B. P. (1995). New building from old: some views of refurbishment projects. Journal of The Structural Engineer. Vol. 73, No. 20/17, 341-346.
- Clancy, B.P. (1994). The role of the structural engineer in maintaining the built environment. Journal of The Structural Engineer. Vol. 72, No. 21/1, 365-368.
- Coles, J.E., 1990. Design Management: A study of practice in the building industry. Occasional Paper No. 40. The Chartered Institute of Building, Ascot UK.
- Cooper, R. & Press, M. (1995). The Design Agenda, A guide to successful design management. John Wiley and Sons, Inc, USA.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daoud, (1997). The Architect/Engineer's role in rehabilitation work. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 123, No. 1, 1-5.
- Diekmann, J. E., & Girard, M.J. (1995). Are contract disputes predictable? Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 121, No.4 355-363.
- Diekmann, J. E., & Nelson, M.C. (1985). Construction claims: frequency and severity. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 111, No.1, 74-81.

Dvir, D., Raz, T., & Shenhar, A.J. (2003). An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success. International Journal of Project Management, 21, 89-95.

Economic Review Committee Sub-committee on Domestic Enterprises, 2011

- Egan, J. (1998) Rethinking construction. Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Egbu, C.O. (1994). Management education and training for refurbishment work within the construction industry, PhD thesis Department of Civil Engineering, University of Salford, UK.
- Egbu, C.O. (1995). Perceived degree of difficulty of management tasks in construction refurbishment work. Building research and information Vol. 23, No. 6, 340-344.
- Egbu, C.O. (1997) Refurbishment management: challenges and opportunities. Building research and information Vol. 25, No. 6, 338-347.
- Egbu, C.O. (1999) Skills, knowledge and competencies for managing construction refurbishment works. Journal of Construction Management and Economics 17, 29-43.
- Egbu, C.O., Young, B.A. & Torrance, V.B. (1996). Refurbishment management practices in shipping and construction industries- lesson to be learned. Building Research and Information Vol. 24, No. 6, 329-338.
- Egbu, C.O., Young, B.A. and Torrance, V.B. (1998). Planning and control processes and techniques for refurbishment management. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 16, 315-325.
- Elinwa, A. U., & Joshua, M. 2001. Time overruns factors in Nigerian construction industry. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 127, No. 5, 419-425.
- Erling S. Andersen, David Birchall, Svein Arne Jessen, Arthur H. Money, (2006) "Exploring project success", Baltic Journal of Management, Vol. 1 Iss: 2, pp.127 - 147
- Friedman, D. & Oppenheimer, N. (1998). The design of renovations. W. W. Norton & Company New York, London.

- Frimpong, Y., Oluwoye, J., & Crawford, L. (2003). Causes of delay and cost overruns in construction of groundwater projects in a developing countries: Ghana as a case study. International Journal of Project Management, 21, 321-326.
- Gardiner, P.D., & Simmons, J.E.L. 1992. Analysis of conflict and change in construction projects. Construction Management and Economics, 10, 459-478.
- Georgy, M.E., Chang, L.M. & Zhang, L. (2005). Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 131, No. 5, 548-557.
- Global Construction 2020. (2009). Global Construction Perspectives and Oxford Economics.
- Griffith, A. F., Gibson Jr., E. G., Hamilton, M. R., Tortora, A. L., & Wilson, C.T.(1999). Project success index for capital facility construction projects. Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, Vol. 13, No.1, 39-45.
- Harris, C.M. (2006). Interior fit out of commercial office space. CPD Talk of The Chartered Institute of Building, November, Malaysia.
- Hashim, S., Kadir, M. R.A., Lew, Y.L., & Sim, Y.C. (2003). Estimation of minimum working capital for construction projects in Malaysia. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 129, No.4. 369-374.
- Hong, T.J. (2005). Statistical techniques in business research a practical approach. Pearson Prentice Hall, Malaysia.
- John, J.A., Whitaker, D. & Johnson, D.G. (2001). Statistical thinking for managers. Chapman and Hall/CRC, United States.
- Kagioglou, M., Cooper, R, and Aouad, G, 2001, "Performance management in construction: a conceptual framework:, Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 85-95.
- Kaming, P. F., Olomolaiye, P.O., Holt, G. D., & Harris, F, 1997. Factors influencing construction time and cost overruns on high-rise projects in Indonesia. Construction Management and Economics, 15, 83-94.

- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan D.W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 30, 607-610.
- Krippendrof, F. (1980). Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology. Saga, London.
- Koontz, H. and O'Donnel, C. (1972). Principles of management: an analysis of managerial functions, 5th edition, McGraw-Hill, Tokyo. Pp 199-227
- Kometa, S.T. Olomolaiye, P.O. & Frank, C.H. (1994). Attributes of UK clients influencing project consultant's performance. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 12, 433-443.
- Kumaraswamy, M. M. (1997). Conflicts, claims and disputes in construction. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 4, No. 2 95-111.
- Kumaraswamy, M. M., & Chan, D. W. M. (1998). Contributors to construction delays. Construction Management and Economics, 16,17 -29.

Latham, M. (1994). Constructing the Team. H.M.S.O.

- Laufer, A., Shapira, A. and Cohenca-Zall, D. (1993). Pre-bid and pre-construction planning process. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 119, No. 3, 426-443.
- Laufer, A., Tucker, R.L., Shapira, A., and Shenhar, A.J. (1994). The multiplicity concept in construction project planning, Construction Management and Economics, 11, 53-65.
- Lee, A., Cooper, R. and Aouad, G. (2000)," A methodology for designing performance measures for UK construction industry", paper presented at Bizarre Fruit Postgraduate Research Conference on the Built and Human Environment, Salford.
- Lee, B., Bouchlaghem, D. & Austin, S. (2003). Design management in practice: testing a training initiative to deliver tools ad learning. Construction Innovation, Vol. 3, 217-229.
- Lee, Jae-Seob. 2007. Delay analysis using linear schedule in construction.AACE International Transactions.

- Lee, J.H. (1996). Statistical deterioration models for condition assessment of older buildings, PhD thesis. Wayne State University, Nebr.
- Liaw, S.H. & Goh, K.L. (2002). Statistik asas: konsep & amalan. McGraw-Hill (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd, Kuala Lumpur.
- Lind, D.A., Marchal, W.G. and Wathen, S.A. (2003). Basic Statistics For Business and Economics. McGraw Hill, United States.
- Lin, G. and Shen, Q., (2007). Measuring the performance of value management studies in construction critical review. Journal of Management in Engineering, ASCE, 23(1), 2-9.
- Liu, A.M.M., & Walker, A.(1998). Evaluation of project outcomes. Construction Management and Economics, 16, 209-219.
- Long, N.D., Ogunlana, So.O., & Lan, D.T.X. (2004a). A study on project success factors in large construction projects in Vietnam. Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural, 11. 404-413.
- Love, P.E.D. & Edwards, D.F. (2004). Determinants of rework in building construction projects. Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 11, No. 4, 259-274.
- Love, P.E.D. & Wyatt, A.D. (1997). Communication and rework: Case studies of construction projects, CSIRO. DBCE DOC 97/38 (B), Australia.
- Love, P.E.D., Holt, G.D. & Li, H. (2002). Triangulation in construction management research. Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 9, NO. 4, 294-303.
- Love, P.E.D., Mandal, & Li, H. (1999), Determine the causal structure of rework influences in construction. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 17, 505-517.
- Love, P.E.D., Mandal, P. Smith, J. & Li, H. (2000). Modelling the dynamics of design error induced rework in construction. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 18, 567-574.

- Love, P.E.D., Skitmore, M. & Earl, G. (1998). Selecting a suitable procurement method for a building project. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 16, 221-233.
- Mahr, W. 1995. Politishe struktur der sozialforschung. Leipzig:Selbstverlag.
- Manavazhi, M.R. & Xunzhi, Z. (2001). Productivity oriented analysis of design revisions. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 19, 379-391.
- Manavazhi, M.R. (2004). Assessment of propensity for revisions in design projects through the dichotomous characterization of designer effort. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 22, 47-54.
- Mao, Z., Goh, B.H., Shou, Q.W. & Ofori, G. (2003). Total factor productivity growth accounting in the construction industry of Singapore, Construction Management and Economics, 21:7, 707-718.
- Markus, T.A. (2003). Lesson from the design quality indicator. Building Research and Information, Vol. 31, No. 5, 399-405.
- Marsh, P. (1983). The refurbishment of commercial and industrial buildings. Construction Press, London.
- Marsh, P. (1983). The refurbishment of commercial and industrial buildings. Construction Press, London.
- Mbugua, L. A. Harris, P., Holt, G.D., & Olomalaiye, P.P.(1999, September 15-17). A framework for Determining Critical Success Factors Influencing Construction Business Performance. Paper presented at ARCOM fifteenth Annual Conference, Liverpool, UK.
- McKim, R., Hegazy, T., & Attala, M. (2000). Project Performance control in reconstruction projects. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol, 126, No. 2, 137-141.
- Meng, Y.C. (1994). Time & cost performance of building contracts in Australia and Malaysia. Unpublished Msc Dissertation, University of South Australia.
- Meng. Y.C. (1994). Time & Cost performance of building contracts in Australia and Malaysia. Unpublished MSc Dissertation, University of South Australia.

- Mezher, T., & Tawil. W. (1998). Causes of delays in the construction industry in Lebanon. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 5, No. 3, 252-260.
- Ministry of Trade and Industry Singapore. (2010). Economic Survey of Singapore, Second Quarter 2010.
- Mintzberg, H. (1981). Research notes and communications, what is planning anyway? Strategic Management Journal, 2, 319-24.
- Moselhi, O. and Nicholas, M.J. 1990. Hybrid expert system for construction planning and scheduling, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, 116(2), 221-38.
- Munns, A.K and Bjeirmi, B.F, (1996), "The role of project management in achieving success", International Journal of Project Management, Vol, 14 No2, pp, 81-7.
- Munns, A.K., & Bjeirmi, B.F. (1996). The role of project management in achieving project success. International journal of Project Management, Vol. 16, No.1, 1-8.
- Mustapha, F. H., & Naoum, S. 1988. Factors influencing the effectiveness of construction site managers. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 16, No.1, 1-8.
- National Environment Agency. (2011) Guide to Singapore's weather. Meteorological Services.
- Neely, A., Adams, C, and Kenerley, M. 2002, "The performance prism; the scorecard for measuring and managing business success", Financial Times, Prentice-Hall, London.
- Nachmias, C., & Naclumias, D. (1991). Research Methods in the Social Sciences(2nd ed.). London: St Martin Press Inc.
- Naoum, S.G. (1998). Dissertation research and writing for construction students. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Nkado, R. N. (1995). Construction time-influencing factors: the contractor's perspective. Construction Management and Economics, 13, 81-89.

- Odeh, A.M. & Battaineh, H.T. (2002). Causes of construction delay: traditional contracts. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 20, 67-73.
- Ogunlana, S.O., Promkuntong, K., & Jearjiran, V. 1996. Construction delays in a fast growing economy: Comparing Thailand with other economies. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 14, No:1, 37-45.
- Ofori, G. (2001). Indicators for measuring construction industry development in developing countries. Building research and information, Vol. 29, No. 1, 40-50.
- Ofori, G. (1991). Programmes for improving the performance of contracting firms in developing countries: A review of approaches and appropriate options. Construction Management and Economics, 9, 19-38.
- Okoroh, M.I. & Torrance, V.B. (1999). A model for subcontractor selection in refurbishment projects. Journal of Construction Management and Economics. Vol. 7, Ofori. G., Evelyn, T. & Tjandra, I (2011). A decade of change and improvement in Singapore Construction Industry: Review of Construction 21. Retrieved 2011 from http://www.misbe2011.nl/uploads/File/MISBE%20Keynote_Ofori_1.pdf 141-153.
- Ofori, G.(2005). Productivity of the Construction Industry: Research Brief. Singapore Contractors Association Ltd.
- Okoroh, M.C. 1992. Knowledge-based decision support system for the selection and appointment of subcontractors for building refurbishment contracts, Ph.D thesis, Loughbourough University.
- Okpala, D. C., & Aniekwu, A.N. 1988. Causes of high costs of construction in Nigeria. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 114, No.2, 233-244
- Othman, A. A., (2006). Factors influencing the construction time of public sector civil engineering projects in Malaysia, PhD thesis, University Technology Mara, Malaysia.
- Othman,A.A., Johan, V.T., Hamid, A.M, (2006) "Factors influencing the construction time of civil engineering projects in Malaysia", Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 13 Iss: 5, pp.481 – 501.
- Oyedele, L.O. & Tham, K.W. (2005). Examining architects' performance in Nigerian private and public sectors building projects. Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 12, No. 1, 52-68.

Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS survival manual. Open University Press, USA.

- Pickavance, K. (2005). Delay and disruption in construction contracts, 3rd ED., (London: LLP)
- Pillai, A.S., Joshi, A. and Rao, K.S. (2002), "Performance measurement of R&D projects in a multi-project, concurrent engineering environment", International Journal of Project Management.
- Pinto, J.K. and Slevin, D.P (1998). "Project success; definitions and measurement techniques", Project Management Journal, Vol. 19 No 1, pp. 67-71.
- Pinto, J.K. and Slevin, D.P. (1987), "Critical factors in successful project implementation," IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, Vol 34 No1, pp. 22-33.
- Pocock, J.B., Liu, L.Y. & Kim, M.K. (1997). Impact of management approach on project interaction and performance. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 123, No. 4, 411-418.
- Quah, L. K., (1988). An Evaluation of the risks in estimating and tendering for refurbishment work, PhD thesis, Herriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK.
- Quah, L. K. & Damen, T. (1998). Protocol and information system for IQA assurance in building refurbishment in Proceeding of international symposium on management, maintenance and modernization of building facilities, 18-20 Nov. 1998 Singapore, CIB 213-218.
- Quah, L. K. (1992a). Comparative variability in tender bids for refurbishment and new build work. Journal of Construction Management and Economics Vol.10, 263-269.
- Quah, L. K. (1992b). The risk in refurbishment works in Proceeding innovations in management, maintenance & modernisation of building, 28-30 Oct. 1992 Rotterdam-Holland, Vol. 4 Theme 6, Paper 6.7.
- Rahmat, I. (1997). The planning and control process of refurbishment projects, PhD thesis, University College London, UK.

- Rahmat, I., Rashid, A.R. & Ahmad, N. (2005). Client's attribute during briefing process, UiTM Research Centre, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.
- Rahmat, I., Torrance, V. B. & Young, B. A. (1998). Decision making in planning and control of refurbishment projects in Proceeding of international symposium on management, maintenance and modernization of building facilities, 18-20 Nov. 1998 Singapore, CIB 229-236.
- Rahmat, I., Torrance, V.B. & Ezanee, A. H., (2003). Refurbishment cycles and the management of refurbishment projects, UiTM Research Centre, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.
- Real Estate Developers' Association of Singapore. (2011). Contract Administration Guide To REDAS (Design and Build Conditions :3rd Edition)
- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (1982) Refurbishment and alteration work, Quantity surveying Documentation, R.I.C.S.,October, UK.
- Rubin, R.A., Guy, S. D., Maevis, A. C., and Fairweather, V. (1983). ConstructionClaims, Analysis, Presentation and Defense, Van Nostrand Reinhold, NY.
- R.V.Krejcie and D.W. Morgan (1970), 'Determining sample size for research activities', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, pp.607-10.
- Ruyon, R.P. (1977). Non-parametric statistics: A Contemporary Approach. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc., United States.
- Salter, A. & Torbett, R. (2003). Innovation and performance in engineering design. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 21, 573-580.
- Sandivo, V., Grobler, F, Parfitt, K., Guvenis M. and Coyle M. (1992)," Critical success factors for construction projects" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol, 118 No1, pp 94-111.
- Sanvido, V.E. & Norton K.J. (1992). Integrated Design Process Model. Journal of Management in Engineering, Vol. 10, 55-62.

Sarantakos, S. 1988. Social Research. New York: Palgrave, New York.

Sekaran, U. 2003. Research Methods for Business. (4th ed). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Sekaran, U. (2004), Research methods for business, a skill building approach, 4th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shen, L., & Song, W. 1998. Competitive tendering practice in Chinese construction, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 124, No. 2, 155-161.
- Slaughter, E.S. (2001). Design strategies to increase building flexibility. Building research and information Vol. 29, No. 3, 208-217.
- Singapore Construction Prospects (2011), Building and Construction Authority. Singapore Construction Prospects 2011, Singapore Review Of Local Construction Demand In 2010 :Lo Yen Lee.
- Singapore Institute of Architect. (2010).Contract Administration Guide To Singapore Institute Of Architects (Condition of Building Contract :9th Edition). Singapore.
- Takim, R and Akintoye, A. (2002), "A conceptual model for successful construction project performance", paper presented at the Second International Postgraduate Research Conference in Built and Human Environment, University of Salford, Salford, 11-12 April.
- Tarek, H. & Attalla, M. (2007). Project Performance Control in Reconstruction Project. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 126, No. 2, 137-141.
- The Chartered Institute of Building (1987) Refurbishment and modernisation supplement no 1 the Code of Estimating Practice, CIOB, Englemere.pp28
- Toufic M.M., Wissam.T. (1998). Causes of delays in the construction industry in Lebanon. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol. 5 Iss:3, pp.252-260.
- Walker, A. (1984). Project management in construction. Collins, Glasgow.
- Walker, D.H.T. (1994). An investigation into the factor that determine building construction time performance, PhD thesis, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Australia.
- Walker, D.H.T. (1995). An investigation into construction time performance. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 13, 263-274.

- Walker, D.H.T. (1997). Choosing as appropriate research methodology. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, Vol. 15, No. 2, 525-531.
- Walker, D.H.T. (1998). The contribution of the client representative to the creation and maintenance of good project inter-team relationships. Journal of Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, Vol.5, No.1, 51-57.
- Wang, X. and Huang, J. (2006), "The relationship between key stakeholder' project performance and project success: performance of Chinese construction supervising engineers", International Journal of Project Management, Vol, 24, No.3, pp. 253-60.
- Wateridge, J. (1998), "How can IS/IT projects be measured for success?,", International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 16 No 1, pp, 59-63.
- Ward, S. C., Curtis, B., & Chapman, C. B. (1991). Objectives and performance in construction projects. Construction Management and Economics, 9, 343-353.
- Westerveld, E. (2003): The Project Excellence Model: linking success criteria and critical success factors. International Journal of Project Management, 21, 411-418.
- Wildavsky, A. (1973). If planning is everything, maybe it's nothing, Policy Sciences, 4, 127-53.
- Winch, G. (1989) The construction firm and construction project: a transaction cost approach, Construction Management and Economics, 7,pp 335-345.
- Yang. H, F.Y.John, P.C. Albert, Chiang Y.H & W.M. Chan Daniel (2010). A critical review of performance measurement in construction, Hong Kong Polytehnic University.
- Young, B. A. and Egbu, C. O. (1993), "The Characteristics and Difficulties Associated with Refurbishment and the Need for Education and Training from a Management Perspective", Proceedings of 9th Annual Conference of the Association of Researchers in Construction Management (ARCOM), 14 - 16 Sept., Oxford University, U.K., pp. 338 - 350.
- Young, B.A. Torrance, V.B. & Egbu, C.O. (1996). Management in refurbishment works in the construction and shipping industry, Project reference CMR 236. The Bartlett Faculty of Built Environment, University College London, UK.

- Yogeswaran, K., Kumaraswamy, M. M. and Miller, R. A. (1998). Claims for extension of time in civil engineering projects. Construction Management and Economics, 16, 283-293.
- Zaneldin, E., Hegazy, T. & Grierson, D. (2001a). Improving design coordination for building projects I: Information model. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 127, No. 4, 322 – 329.
- Zaneldin, E., Hegazy, T. & Grierson, D. (2001b). Improving design coordination for building projects II: A collaborative system. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management Vol. 127, No. 4, 330 – 336.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

7 AUGUST 2010

RESEARCH INTO REFURBISHMENT TIME PERFORMANCE

This is simply a brief introductory letter to inform you that Ms. Chew Lee Fuan is conducting research into the time performance of construction refurbishment Singapore. She is working under my supervision at the University of Malaya, Malaysia.

Ms Chew Lee Fuan is a postgraduate student, who is taking Master of Science (Building). I am aware of the considerable pressure on your time, but shall be most grateful if you will complete the questionnaire attached to Ms Chew Lee Fuan's letter enclosed and return it to her at your earliest convenient opportunity.

With much appreciation.

Yours faithfully,

Associate Professor Dr. Sr Azlan Shah Ali PhD, MSc, B(Hons), FRISM, FCIOB, MRICS Deputy Dean (Higher Degree) Faculty of Built Environment University of Malaya Tel:+603-79676880 Fax: +603-79675713 Dear Sir/Madam,

Semi Structured Interview on Construction Time Performance of Refurbishment Projects In Singapore

I am writing to ask if you would be kind enough to provide me with some information about your company and your general views on the construction time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

I am a postgraduate student from University of Malaya in Malaysia, doing my master studies, supervised by Associate Professor Dr Sr Azlan Shah Ali. My research started in February this year and is now entering the preliminary data collection stage.

I am sending this letter to you and to other construction companies operating in Singapore. You will appreciate that I am anxious to get a reply from each person I write to in order to get as many points of view as possible, so I do hope that you will be willing to cooperate.

The semi structured interview will take about half an hour. I would be obliged if you would ask a senior member of your company who participate actively in the construction of refurbishment projects to complete it.

I hope that your company will be able to benefit directly from this research, when fully completed, as the results obtained will be sent to you free of charge upon request. It is generally agreed that time performance is the most difficult tasks faced by management level. I anticipate that the final results obtained will contribute to improving this situation.

Please be assured that both your identity, that of your company and information provided will remain strictly confidential. I would be very grateful if you could return the completed questionnaire to me as soon as possible.

I hope you will agree to assist me in my research.

Yours faithfully,

Chew Lee Fuan

APPENDIX B

Interview Sheet

Reference No:
Name of Interviewee:
Role in the project:
Tel:
Date:
Time: Start: End:
<u>Verify:</u>
Experience in construction industry: years

No of refurbishment work/project involved: ______ numbers

- Based on reading, delays are evidently frequent problems in the construction refurbishment of many developed and developing countries like Singapore. What is opinion on above statement?
- 2. It is difficult to control and manage the time performance of construction refurbishment due to its uncertainty and complexity such as incomplete design before refurbishment works started on site. **Does this problem occur in Singapore**?
- 3. What are the major problems in controlling time performance of refurbishment projects? How the problems are normally handled?
- 4. How do you decide the construction duration for a refurbishment project?
 - i. As tendered by the contractor

- ii. Based on previous similar project
- iii. Used documented procedure for estimation of construction duration
- iv. Others: _____

5. <u>How do you rate degree of importance for the following factors that affect time</u> performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

Scale: very least important 1 2 3 4 5 very important

a)Contractor's finance related

- i. Improper management of funds by contractor.
- ii. Inability for contractor to keep materials due to cash flow problem.
- iii. Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractor or suppliers.
- iv. Lack of working capital.
- v. Non-payment of salary to workers causing slow down.
- vi. Low design fee for consultant causing error in design thus delaying the project.

b)Contractor related factors

- i. Lack of experience in the nature of work.
- ii. Poor planning and management.
- iii. Mistakes during construction.

c)Designers related factors

- i. Slow decision making or frequent change of decision which affect the progress of work
- ii. The state of completeness of design before the refurbishment project commenced on site.
- iii. Lesser experience of designer on refurbishment projects

d)Client attributes

e)Contractual relationship related factors

- i. Poor coordination between different parties who are involved in the projects
- ii. Conflicts / disputes between contractor and superintending officer
- iii. Lack of communication between superintending officer and contractor
- iv. Lack of teamwork among the different parties working on project
- v. Occupancy in a refurbished building

f)Skilled labor related factors

g)Material related factors

h)Project or site related factors

- i. Uncertainty and complexity of the project
- ii. Difficulty to gain access to site and existing building
- iii. The structural work of existing work
- iv. Variation or additional works

i)Unpredictable weather condition

6. Any additional factors that not in the list but you think is important towards contributing to delay for refurbishment projects in Singapore.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY ON THE FACTORS INFLUENCING TIME PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION REFURBISHMENT PROJECTS IN SINGAPORE.

SURVEY ON THE FACTORS INFLUENCING TIME PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION REFURBISHMENT PROJECTS IN SINGAPORE.



NOTE ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

Before you answer all the following questions, please select the completed refurbishment project that designed by you. the selected project must satisfy the following criteria.

- Contract value of the project more than \$250,000 (Two hundred fifty dollars)
- The procurement system was either traditional or design and build

You answer should be based on the refurbishment project that you have chosen. If you have involved in two refurbishment projects, please fill in twice for this questionnaire. You can fill in as many projects as you involve.

Your identity and that of your firm will remain strictly confidential to us.

Definitions:

Refurbishment refers to upgrade, major repairs work, renovations, rehabilitation, alterations, conversions, extensions and modernization of existing building, but exclude routine maintenance and cleaning work.

Your Personal Particulars	
Name of the refurbishment project	ct

Name

*

Contact number

* Email address

1.0 What is your job title?

- **Managing Director**
- 🗖 General Manager
- Contract Manager
- Coperational Manager
- Construction Manager
- **Project Manager**
- **Engineer**
- Cuantity Surveyor
- **Site Executive**

Others, please specify it.

*

1.1 How long have you worked in construction industry?

- **Less than 5 years**
- **6-10** years
- **11-15 years**
- **16-20** years
- More than 20 years

1.2 How long have you been involved in construction refurbishment projects?

- **Less than 5 years**
- **6-10** years

*

- **11-15 years**
- **16-20 years**
- More than 20 years

* 2.0 Project Characteristics:

2.1 Please indicate the type of building of the refurbishment project selected.

- **Residential**
- **School**, College
- □ Office
- 🔲 Industrial
- 🔲 Hospital
- 🗖 Hotel

Others, please specify.

- * 2.2 Please indicate the size of the project
- Less than \$250,000
- **\$250,000 to \$1 million**
- **\$1** million to \$10 million
- More than \$10 million

2.3 Project duration (Excluding extension of time) Weeks

2.4 Project duration (Including extension of time, if any)

Weeks

3.0 Factors Affecting Construction Time Performance For Refurbishment Projects

Construction time is elapsed period from possesion of site to practical completion of project. Hypothesized factors that can influence construction time performance are listed under the the following headings.

Please indicate the significance of each factor by ticking the appropriate scale from 1 to 5, 1 is being not significant and the scale increases in level of significance where 5 is extremely significance. Please relate answer to the project that you have experience with.

0

* 3.1 Finance related factors

To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work					
Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work					
Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down					

*

3.2 Contractor related factors

To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Lack of experience in the nature of work.						
Poor site planning and management.						

* 3.3 Designers related factors

To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.



*

3,4 Client attributes

To what extent the client attributes, through your experience, can affect the time performance of construction refurbishment in Singapore.

Client Attributes		1	2	3	4	5
	Client Attributes					

* 3.5 Contractual relationship related factors

To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

	1	2	3	4	5
Poor in coordination between different parties involved in projects.					
Conflict/disputes between Contractor and Superintending officer.					
Occupancy in a refurbished building.					
Lack of teamwork among different parties working on project.					

*

3.6 Skilled labour related factors

To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.

	1	2	3	4	5
Shortage of qualified/skilled labours.					

* 3.7 Material related factors To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect time performance of refurbishment projects in Singpaore.										
	1		2	3	4	5				
Shortage of construction materials.										
* 3.8 Project or Site related factors To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore.										
		1	2	3	4	5				
Uncertainty and complexity of the project.		\Box								
Difficulty to gain access to site and existing building.	J									
Necessary variation or additional works.										
* 3.9 External factors (Sources from Building contract-Singapore Institute of Architect) To what extent the following factors, through your experience, can affect the time performance of refurbishment projects in Singapore. 1 2 3 4 5 Unpredictable weather condition. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1										
✓ III Recommendations										
Please provide recommendations that you thi performance of refubishment projects in Sing	ink ca apore	n imp	orove	constru	ction tim	ie				

Þ

Thank you very much for taking part in this questionnaire survey. Your cooperation and time spent in filling up this questionnaire is greatly appreciated.

If you have any comment concerning the questionnaire or the research topic, please write to chewleefuan@siswa.um.edu.my

Faculty of Built Environment University of Malaya 50603 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia.

APPENDIX D

Frequencies

Statistics

		Time Performance Index	Finance-Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work	Finance-Delay ed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work	Finance-Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down	Contractor-La ck of experience in the nature of work.
Ν	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.0942	3.76	3.15	3.00	3.52
Std. Deviation		.15321	.830	.755	.829	.834

Statistics

		Contractor-Po or site planning and management.	Designers-SI ow in decision making or frequent change in decision which affect the progress of work.	Designers-Th e state of completeness of design before the refurbishment projects commenced on site.	Client attributes	Contractual- Poor in coordination between different parties involved in projects.
Ν	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.45	4.42	4.33	4.21	4.15
Std. Deviation		.905	.751	.736	.696	.566

Statistics

		Contractual-Co nflict/disputes between contractor and superintending officer.	Contractual-Oc cupancy in a refurbished building.	Contractual -Lack of teamwork among different parties working on project.	Skilled labour-Shorta ge of qualified/skille d labours.	Material-Sho rtage of construction materials.
Ν	Valid	33	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.52	3.91	3.79	4.52	4.36
Std. Deviation		.834	.631	.600	.667	.603

Statistics

		SIte-Uncertai nty and complexity of the project.	Site-Difficulty to gain access to site and exsiting building.	Site-Necessa ry variation or additional works.	External-Un predictable weather condition.
Ν	Valid	33	33	33	33
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.85	4.55	4.85	1.70
Std. Deviation		.364	.506	.364	.847

Frequency Table

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.86	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	.89	1	3.0	3.0	6.1
	.90	1	3.0	3.0	9.1
	.95	1	3.0	3.0	12.1
	1.00	10	30.3	30.3	42.4
	1.06	2	6.1	6.1	48.5
	1.07	1	3.0	3.0	51.5
	1.08	3	9.1	9.1	60.6
	1.08	1	3.0	3.0	63.6
	1.10	1	3.0	3.0	66.7
	1.11	2	6.1	6.1	72.7
	1.17	3	9.1	9.1	81.8
	1.27	1	3.0	3.0	84.8
	1.33	4	12.1	12.1	97.0
	1.57	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Time Performance Index

Finance-Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Fair	10	30.3	30.3	36.4
	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	81.8
	Extremely significant	6	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Finance-Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Fair	20	60.6	60.6	75.8
	Significant	6	18.2	18.2	93.9
	Extremely significant	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Finance-Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	9	27.3	27.3	27.3
	Fair	17	51.5	51.5	78.8
	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	93.9
	Extremely significant	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractor-Lack of experience in the nature of work.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Fair	14	42.4	42.4	51.5
	Significant	12	36.4	36.4	87.9
	Extremely significant	4	12.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractor-Poor site planning and management.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Fair	18	54.5	54.5	63.6
	Significant	6	18.2	18.2	81.8
	Extremely significant	6	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Designers-Slow in decision making or frequent change in decision which affect the progress of work.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	9.1
	Significant	12	36.4	36.4	45.5
	Extremely significant	18	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Designers-The state of completeness of design before the refurbishment projects commenced on site.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	9.1
	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	54.5
	Extremely significant	15	45.5	45.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Client attributes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	9.1
	Significant	19	57.6	57.6	66.7
	Extremely significant	11	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Poor in coordination between different parties involved in projects.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Significant	22	66.7	66.7	75.8
	Extremely significant	8	24.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Conflict/disputes between contractor and superintending officer.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	4	12.1	12.1	12.1
	Fair	11	33.3	33.3	45.5
	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	90.9
	Extremely significant	3	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Occupancy in a refurbished building.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	8	24.2	24.2	24.2
	Significant	20	60.6	60.6	84.8
	Extremely significant	5	15.2	15.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Lack of teamwork among different parties working on project.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	10	30.3	30.3	30.3
	Significant	20	60.6	60.6	90.9
	Extremely significant	3	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Skilled labour-Shortage of qualified/skilled labours.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Significant	10	30.3	30.3	39.4
	Extremely significant	20	60.6	60.6	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Material-Shortage of construction materials.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Significant	17	51.5	51.5	57.6
	Extremely significant	14	42.4	42.4	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Slte-Uncertainty and complexity of the project.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Extremely significant	28	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Site-Difficulty to gain access to site and exsiting building.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Extremely significant	18	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Site-Necessary variation or additional works.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Extremely significant	28	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

External-Unpredictable weather condition.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very least significant	17	51.5	51.5	51.5
	Least significant	10	30.3	30.3	81.8
	Fair	5	15.2	15.2	97.0
	Significant	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX E

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Finance-Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work	33	2	5	3.76	.830
Finance-Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work	33	2	5	3.15	.755
Finance-Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down	33	2	5	3.00	.829
Contractor-Lack of experience in the nature of work.	33	2	5	3.52	.834
Contractor-Poor site planning and management.	33	2	5	3.45	.905
Designers-Slow in decision making or frequent change in decision which affect the progress of work.	33	2	5	4.42	.751
Designers-The state of completeness of design before the refurbishment projects commenced on site.	33	2	5	4.33	.736
Client attributes	33	2	5	4.21	.696
Contractual-Poor in coordination between different parties involved in projects.	33	3	5	4.15	.566
Contractual-Conflict/disput es between contractor and superintending officer.	33	2	5	3.52	.834
Contractual-Occupancy in a refurbished building.	33	3	5	3.91	.631
Contractual-Lack of teamwork among different parties working on project.	33	3	5	3.79	.600
Skilled labour-Shortage of qualified/skilled labours.	33	3	5	4.52	.667
Material-Shortage of construction materials.	33	3	5	4.36	.603
Slte-Uncertainty and complexity of the project.	33	4	5	4.85	.364
Site-Difficulty to gain access to site and exsiting building.	33	4	5	4.55	.506
Site-Necessary variation or additional works.	33	4	5	4.85	.364
External-Unpredictable weather condition.	33	1	4	1.70	.847
Valid N (listwise)	33				

APPENDIX F

Frequency Table

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Fair	10	30.3	30.3	36.4
	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	81.8
	Extremely significant	6	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Finance-Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work

Finance-Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Fair	20	60.6	60.6	75.8
	Significant	6	18.2	18.2	93.9
	Extremely significant	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Finance-Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	9	27.3	27.3	27.3
	Fair	17	51.5	51.5	78.8
	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	93.9
	Extremely significant	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractor-Lack of experience in the nature of work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Fair	14	42.4	42.4	51.5
	Significant	12	36.4	36.4	87.9
	Extremely significant	4	12.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractor-Poor site planning and management.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Fair	18	54.5	54.5	63.6
	Significant	6	18.2	18.2	81.8
	Extremely significant	6	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Designers-Slow in decision making or frequent change in decision which affect the progress of work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	9.1
	Significant Extremely significant	12	36.4	36.4	45.5
		18	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Designers-The state of completeness of design before the refurbishment projects commenced on site.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	9.1
Signific Extrem signific	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	54.5
	Extremely significant	15	45.5	45.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Poor in coordination between different parties involved in projects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Significant	22	66.7	66.7	75.8
	Extremely significant	8	24.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Least significant	4	12.1	12.1	12.1
	Fair	11	33.3	33.3	45.5
	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	90.9
	Extremely significant	3	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Conflict/disputes between contractor and superintending officer

Contractual-Occupancy in a refurbished building.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	8	24.2	24.2	24.2
	Significant	20	60.6	60.6	84.8
Extrer signifi	Extremely significant	5	15.2	15.2	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Contractual-Lack of teamwork among different parties working on project.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	10	30.3	30.3	30.3
	Significant	20	60.6	60.6	90.9
Extr	Extremely significant	3	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Skilled labour-Shortage of qualified/skilled labours.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Significant	10	30.3	30.3	39.4
	Extremely significant	20	60.6	60.6	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Material-Shortage of construction materials.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fair	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
	Significant	17	51.5	51.5	57.6
	Extremely significant Total	14	42.4	42.4	100.0
		33	100.0	100.0	

Slte-Uncertainty and complexity of the project.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Extremely	28	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Site-Difficulty to gain access to site and exsiting building.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	15	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Extremely significant	18	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Site-Necessary variation or additional works.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significant	5	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Extremely significant	28	84.8	84.8	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

External-Unpredictable weather condition.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very least significant	17	51.5	51.5	51.5
	Least significant	10	30.3	30.3	81.8
	Fair	5	15.2	15.2	97.0
	Significant	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Finance-Lack of working capital on part of contractor to start work	33	2	5	3.76	.830
Finance-Delayed payment by main contractor to subcontractors and supplier which interrupt the progress of work	33	2	5	3.15	.755
Finance-Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down	33	2	5	3.00	.829
Contractor-Lack of experience in the nature of work.	33	2	5	3.52	.834
Contractor-Poor site planning and management.	33	2	5	3.45	.905
Designers-Slow in decision making or frequent change in decision which affect the progress of work.	33	2	5	4.42	.751
Designers-The state of completeness of design before the refurbishment projects commenced on site.	33	2	5	4.33	.736
Client attributes Contractual-Poor in coordination between	33	2	5	4.21	.696
different parties involved in projects.	33	3	5	4.15	.566
Contractual-Conflict/disputes between contractor and superintending officer.	33	2	5	3.52	.834
Contractual-Occupancy in a refurbished building.	33	3	5	3.91	.631
different parties working on project.	33	3	5	3.79	.600
Skilled labour-Shortage of qualified/skilled labours.	33	3	5	4.52	.667
Material-Shortage of construction materials.	33	3	5	4.36	.603
Site-Uncertainty and complexity of the project.	33	4	5	4.85	.364
Site-Difficulty to gain access to site and exsiting building.	33	4	5	4.55	.506
Site-Necessary variation or additional works.	33	4	5	4.85	.364
External-Unpredictable weather condition.	33	1	4	1.70	.847
Valid N (listwise)	33				

APPENDIX G

Reliability

***** Method 1 (space saver) will be used for this analysis *****

RΕ	LIABI	LITY	ANALYS	IS – S	CALE (AI	LPHA)
			Mean	Std Dev	Cases	
1.	F1		3.7576	.8303	33.0	
2.	FЗ		3.1515	.7550	33.0	
3.	F4		3.0000	.8292	33.0	
4.	C1		3.5152	.8337	33.0	
5.	C 4		3.4545	.9045	33.0	
6.	D1		4.4242	.7513	33.0	
7.	D3		4.3333	.7360	33.0	
8.	D4		4.2121	.6963	33.0	
9.	C01		4.1515	.5658	33.0	
10.	CO2		3.5152	.8337	33.0	
11.	C05		3.9091	.6307	33.0	
12.	C06		3.7879	.5999	33.0	
13.	S1		4.5152	.6671	33.0	
14.	M1		4.3636	.6030	33.0	
15.	P1		4.8485	.3641	33.0	
16.	P2		4.5455	.5056	33.0	
17.	P5		4.8485	.3641	33.0	
18.	E2		1.6970	.8472	33.0	
					N of	
Statis	tics for SCALE	Mean 70.0303	Variance 34.0928	Std Dev V 5.8389	ariables 18	

Item-total Statistics

	Scale	Scale	Corrected	
	Mean	Variance	Item-	Alpha
	if Item	if Item	Total	if Item
	Deleted	Deleted	Correlation	Deleted
F1	66.2727	30.7045	.2933	.7794
F3	66.8788	28.6723	.5999	.7549
F4	67.0303	29.0928	.4821	.7636
C1	66.5152	28.6326	.5341	.7591
C4	66.5758	27.6894	.5867	.7535
D1	65.6061	29.4962	.4941	.7633
D3	65.6970	30.0303	.4365	.7678
D4	65.8182	29.9659	.4777	.7651
CO1	65.8788	30.9848	.4426	.7693
CO2	66.5152	29.0076	.4889	.7630
CO5	66.1212	32.6098	.1507	.7864
C06	66.2424	30.7519	.4481	.7684
S1	65.5152	33.4451	.0263	.7948
M1	65.6667	32.1042	.2378	.7809
P1	65.1818	33.3409	.1473	.7840
P2	65.4848	33.8201	.0029	.7918
P5	65.1818	33.8409	.0282	.7881
E2	68.3333	30.1667	.3447	.7753

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 33.0

N of Items = 18

Alpha = .7833

Page 3

APPENDIX H

Correlations

Correlations

			Time Performanc e index	Finance- Lack of working capital on part of contracto r to start work	Finance-D elayed payment by main contractor to support which interrupt the progress of work	Finance- Non payment of salary to workers causing slow down	Contra ctor-La ck of expert ence In the nature of work.	Contract or-Poor site planning and manage ment.	Designers -Slow In decision making or frequent charge In decision which affect the progress of work.	Designers- The state of completen ess of design before the refutblishm ent projects commence d on site.	Client attribut es	Contract ual-Poor h coordin at bn between different parties involved h projects.	Contractu al-Conflict /disputes between contractor and superinte nding officer.	Contrac tual-Oc cupanc y h a refutbls hed buildin g	Contract uaHack of teamwo fk among different parties working on project.	Skilled a bour-S hortage of qualfied/ skilled labours.	Materi al-Sho rtage of constr uction materi als.	Ste-Unc etainty and complex ity of the project.	Site-Dim cuty to gan access toste and exsting building	Site-Nece ssary variation or addtional works.	Externa Hun pre dictable weather conditio n.
	Time Performance	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.244	.299	.391*	. 169	.204	.185	.091	.098	.274	.375*	.130	.359*	- 140	- 031	.352*	.006	.212	.272
	INCEX	N	33	.172	.091	.025	.348	.255	.302	.614	.589	.123	.031	.469	.040	.435	.866	.045	.971	.237 33	.126
	Finance-Lack of working	Correlation Coefficient	.244	1.000	.537**	.600**	.404*	.345*	174	095	- 113	014	.034	.027	.167	- 207	- 244	.214	.174	.214	.014
	of contractor to start work	Sig. (2-talled)	.172		.001	.000	. 020	.049	.333	.598	.533	.938	.850	.879	.354	.248	.172	.232	.332	.232	.939
		N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
	Finan ce-Delaye d payment by	Correlation Coefficient	.299	.537**	1.000	.672**	.271	.513**	.009	.045	.012	.180	.212	.051	.221	- 175	.043	.197	.248	061	.532~
	main contractor to	Sig. (2-talled) N	.091	.001	-	.000	. 126	.002	.962	.805	.948	.317	.236	.778	.216	.329	.811	.271	.164	.737	.001
subcontractors and suppler which interrupt the progress of work		33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	
	Finance-Non payment of	Correlation Coefficient	.391*	.600**	.672**	1.000	.355*	.379*	109	.172	045	019	.201	.065	.169	-,417*	037	.097	.028	.097	.350*
	salary to workers	Sig. (2-talled) N	.025 33	.000 33	.000 33	33	.043 33	.030 33	.548 33	.338 33	.802 33	.918 33	.262 33	.721 33	.347 33	.016 33	.839 33	.592 33	.878 33	.592 33	.046 33
	Contractor-Lac k of experience	Correlation Coefficient	.169	.404*	.271	.355*	1.000	.257	.347*	.472**	.277	.300	.442*	- 064	.326	.068	.079	062	120	- 062	.029
	In the nature of work.	Sig. (2-talled) N	.348	.020	.126	.043	33	.148	.048	.006	.118	.090	.010	.723	.064	.705	.661	.733	.507	.733	.874
	ContractorPoo riste planning	Correlation Coefficient	.204	.345*	.513**	.379*	.257	1.000	.137	.225	.241	.223	.421*	.333	.234	- 101	. 108	.220	042	073	.170
	and management.	Sig. (2-talled)	.255	.049	.002	.030	.148		.447	.208	.177	.213	.015	.058	.191	.576	.548	.219	.816	.685	.345
	Designers-Sio wild decision	Correlation	.185	-174	.009	- 109	.347*	.137	1.000	.498***	.453**	.192	.466**	.134	.357*	.272	.246	-075	270	.075	.158
	making or frequent	Sig. (2-talled)	.302	.333	.962	.548	.048	.447		.003	.008	.283	.006	.457	.042	. 126	. 168	.679	.129	.679	.381
	Designers-The	Correlation	.091	-095	.045	.172	.472**	.225	.498***	1.000	.456**	.153	.374*	.039	.329	.063	- 123	-295	425*	295	.105
	completeness of design	Sig. (2-talled)	.614	.598	.805	.338	.006	.208	.003		.008	.395	.032	.831	.062	.728	.495	.095	.014	.095	.557
	Client att ributes	Correlation	.098	-113	.012	045	.277	.241	.453**	.456***	1.000	.330	.358*	.204	.298	.495**	.238	-252	109	- 252	-140
		Sig. (2-talled)	.589	.533	.948	.802	.118	.177	.008	.008		.061	.041	.255	.092	.003	. 183	.156	.546	.156	.437
		N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33

		Time Performanc e index	Finance- Lack of working capital on part of contracto r to start work	Finance-D elayed payment by main contractor to subcontrac tors and suppler which htempt the progress of work	Fhan ce- Non payment of salary to workers caushg slow down	Contra ctor-La ck of experi ence in the nature of work.	Contract or-Poor site planning and manage ment.	Designers -Slow in decision making or frequent charge in decision which affect the progress of work.	Designers- The state of completen ess of design before the refublishm ent projects commence d on site.	Client attrbut es	Contract ual-Poor h coordinat bn between different parties involved h projects.	Contractu al-Conflict /disputes between contractor and superinte nding officer.	Contrac tu aFOc cupanc y fra refutbls hed buildin g.	Contract ual-Lack of teamwo fk among different parties working on project.	Skilled a bour-S hortage of qualfied/ skilled labours.	Materi al-Sho of constr uction materi als.	Ste-Unc etainty and complex ity of the project.	Site-Diffi cuty to gan access toste and exsting building	Site-Nece ssary variation or ad dt ional works.	Externa Huh pre dictable weather conditio n.
Contractual-Po or In	Correlation Coefficient	.274	-014	.180	- 019	.300	.223	.192	.153	.330	1.000	.431*	042	.364*	.444**	.146	.267	077	027	.141
between	Sig. (2-talled) N	.123	.938	.317	.918	.090	.213 33	.283 33	.395 33	.061	33	.012	.818 33	.037 33	.010 33	.418 33	.133	.670 33	.883 33	.435
Contractual-Co nflict/disputes	Correlation Coefficient	.375*	.034	.212	.201	.442*	.421*	.466**	.374*	.358*	.431*	1.000	004	.287	.011	.126	.353*	.189	.071	.105
between contractor and	Sig. (2-talled) N	.031	.850	.236	.262	.010	.015	.006	.032	.041	.012		.984	.105	.950	.485	.044	.293	.693	.559
Contractual-Oc	Correlation	.130	.027	.051	.065	064	.333	.134	.039	.204	042	004	1.000	.153	- 149	022	046	132	.209	.099
refutblished	Sig. (2-talled)	.469	.879	.778	.721	.723	.058	.457	.831	.255	.818	.984		.396	. 409	.904	.800	.464	.244	.583
Contractual-La	Correlation	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
ck of teamwork among different	Coefficient Sh. (2-tailed)	.359*	.16/	.221	.169	.326	.234	.357-	.329	.296	.364*	.287	.153	1.000	.1//	.035	-179	225	- 1/9	.254
partiesworking	N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
Skilled labour-Shortag	Correlation Coefficient	140	-207	175	417*	.068	-101	.272	.063	. 495**	.444**	.011	- 149	.177	1.000	.380*	-026	.041	- 179	-329
e of qualified/skilled	Sig. (2-talled) N	.435	.248	.329	.016	.705	.576	.126	.728	.003 33	.010	.950 33	.409	.325	33	.029	.887 33	.822 33	.318	.062
Material-Shorta	Correlation	031	-244	.043	037	.079	.108	.245	-123	.238	.145	.126	022	.036	.380*	1.000	010	.270	010	.090
construction	Sig. (2-talled)	.866	. 172	.811	.839	.661	.548	.168	.495	. 183	.418	.485	.904	.840	.029		.956	.128	.956	.619
Site-Uncertaint	Correlation	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
y and complexity of	Coefficient Site (2-tailed)	.352	.214	.197	.097	062	.220	0/5	-295	252	.207	.353"	046	-1/9	026	010	1.000	.465	.529	-005
the project.	N	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
Site-Difficulty to gain access to	Correlation Coefficient	.006	.174	.248	.028	- 120	042	270	-425*	- 109	077	.189	- 132	-225	.041	.270	.463**	1.000	.293	021
site and exsitting	Sig. (2-talled)	.971	.332	.164	.878	.507	.816	.129	.014	.546	.670	.293	.464	.208	.822	.128	.007		.098	.908
Site-Necessary	Correlation	.212	.214	061	.097	062	073	.075	-295	- 252	027	.071	.209	-179	- 179	010	.529**	.293	1.000	.126
additional	Sig. (2-talled)	.237	.232	.737	.592	.733	.685	.679	.095	. 156	.883	.693	.244	.318	.318	.956	.002	.098		.483
Extenal-Unop	N Correlation	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
dictable	Coefficient	.272	.014	.532**	.350*	.029	.170	.158	.105	- 140	.141	.105	.099	.254	329	.090	-005	021	. 126	1.000
condition.	N	.126	.909	33	.046	.0/4	.345	.361	.557	.437	.435	.509	.563	.154	.062	.619	.979	.908	.403	33

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

---, Correlation is sign flic ant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).