

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Arowoja, Victor Adetunji, Akinradewo, Olusola Festus and Adeniyi, Onaopepo (2022) Evaluation of Strategic Knowledge Areas Required in Mechanical and Electrical Services Cost Management. *Journal of Engineering, Project, and Production Management*, 12 (3). ISSN 2221-6529

Published by: De Gruyter Open Ltd.

URL: <https://doi.org/10.32738/JEPPM-2022-0023> <<https://doi.org/10.32738/JEPPM-2022-0023>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/49352/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Evaluation of the strategic knowledge areas required in the cost management of Mechanical and Electrical services

Victor Adetunji Arowooya¹, Olusola Festus Akinradewo² and Onaopepo Adeniyi³

¹ Assistant Lecturer, Department of Quantity Surveying, Federal University of Technology Akure, P.M.B 704 Akure, Nigeria.

² Senior Lecturer, Department of Quantity Surveying, Federal University of Technology Akure, P.M.B 704, Akure, Nigeria (Corresponding Author)

³ Senior Lecturer, Department of Architecture and Built Environment, Northumbria University Newcastle, United Kingdom.

Abstract

Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) services account for 10-70% of the total cost of projects, depending on the project type. Sadly, the complex nature of the design of M&E services among other peculiar attributes has led to an enormous challenge in the cost management of M&E services in the construction industry. This study examined the knowledge areas required to effectively cost-manage M&E services in construction projects. Data for the study were collected by administering copies of a carefully designed questionnaire among experts in M&E services after a pilot study with a team of experts. The variables outlined in the questionnaire were extracted from relevant literature. In selecting the M&E services experts that participated in the survey, purposive and snowballing sampling techniques were used. The professionals involved include Electrical, Mechanical engineers, and Quantity Surveyors. Data analysis was done using Mean Item Score, Gap analysis, Spearman rank correlation, and Kendall coefficient of concordance. Findings revealed that knowledge in Bill of Quantities (BOQ) preparation, valuation, measurement of M&E works, estimating, and quality management were ranked as the most important knowledge areas and a statistically significant agreement among the experts was recorded. Gap analysis revealed that the ability of cost managers/QSs on the knowledge areas is currently below expectation while a moderate relationship was observed between the importance and performance of QSs/cost managers in the knowledge areas. The study concludes that there is a need for cost managers/Quantity Surveyors to enhance their knowledge in the identified knowledge areas and strive hard to close the gap between importance and their performance on the knowledge areas.

Keywords: Cost management, Knowledge, M&E projects, Performance, skills

1. Introduction

Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) services are an intricate element of building which constitute an important component of construction costs (Yusuf and Mohammed, 2015). M&E services can account for up to 10 to 70% of the construction cost of any project (McCaffrey, 2011). Nowadays, the design and construction of the building have been greatly improved due to the quality and improved standard of living of people. Consequently, the design of M&E services in building projects is becoming more complex thereby creating an enormous cost management gap in pricing (Babalola and Adesanya, 2007). According to Yismalet and Patel (2018), Cost management is the process of controlling the expenditure on a construction project from inception to completion stage, within the approved budget and this is an important tool to control and

improve the cost performance of construction projects. These cost management roles are majorly performed by the quantity surveyors in the construction industry.

Quantity Surveyors (QSs) are described as cost accountants in the construction industry and are sometimes referred to as construction economists or cost engineers (Nnadi and Alintah-Abel, 2016). Basically, Quantity Surveyors are trained as construction cost managers, they are professionally responsible for the financial probity of a construction work. According to Ashworth, Hogg, and Higgs (2013), the traditional roles of QS on a typical construction project include single rate approximate estimating; cost planning; procurement advice; measurement and quantification; contract document preparation among others. Recently, quantity surveying evolved roles include whole life

costing, value management, sustainability, and facilities management (Wao and Flood, 2016).

QSs acquire training through workplace and formal university education which enhances their competency level (Perera, Pearson and Ekundayo, 2011). The quantity surveying program at the undergraduate level is to give education and training at degree level with aim of preparing the students to meet the challenges involved in the management of construction projects from the initial to final stages especially in M&E services (Oke and Ogunsemi, 2012). The problem now lies in the level of knowledge acquired by quantity surveyors and how adequate it is to face the challenges out there in the industry. According to Perera et al. (2011), Quantity surveying education has failed to identify and understand the multi-dimensional needs of clients to give satisfaction in the cost management of M&E services. Suhaila (2013) affirmed the barriers that hinder QS to manage the cost of M&E services include the omission of M&E services in the scope of work of QS which leads to the work being passed to the M&E engineers. The study also stated that QS faced difficulty in understanding and interpreting M&E components during the measurement of M&E services. This suggests that some knowledge areas are missing from the capability of QSs.

In his findings, Olarenwaju and Anhave (2015) observed that Quantity surveyors are involved in the procurement of M&E services but most of the services performed are at the downstream side of the supply chain not upstream in Malaysia. In another relevant study, Babalola (2009) only examined the core competencies of quantity surveyors in electrical services, this was only on electrical services and the study was conducted over a decade ago and due to time factors, it is necessary to revalidate the areas of competencies. Oke and Ogunsemi (2013)

examined areas of competencies of quantity surveyors and their relevance to value management. The study found that the identified areas of competencies are important and relevant to value management with construction economics and professional practice been very relevant. Basically, it appears that the present education/training of quantity surveyors has not led to adequate qualitative competence of the quantity surveyors due to the evolving nature of the discipline (Dada and Jagboro, 2012) and the emerging complexities of the construction industry. Other studies that work on skills and competencies of QS have been conducted mainly on construction industry generally, value management, procurement management, and civil engineering works (Opawole et al., 2012; Dada and Jagboro, 2012; Oke and Ogunsemi, 2009 and 2013; Oke, Ogunsemi and Adeyelu, 2017). A review of the literature available revealed that limited empirical research has actually been done on the knowledge areas needed by quantity surveyors in the cost management of mechanical and electrical services. Therefore, there is a need to assess the knowledge areas needed in the cost management of M&E services with the view of enhancing the performance level of Quantity surveyors. The objectives are; to examine the importance of the knowledge areas required for the Cost Management of M&E services, examined the performance of quantity surveyors on the respective knowledge areas and presented a gap analysis as well as a relationship between the importance of the knowledge areas and the performance of quantity surveyors on each of the areas. Also, Kendall's coefficients were used to validate the findings by determining the level of agreement among professionals

Research hypothesis

1. Ho1: There is no significant relationship between the importance and performance of QSs in knowledge

- areas for cost management of M&E services
2. Ho1: There is no agreement between the professionals' perceived performance of Quantity surveyors on knowledge areas needed for cost management of M&E services
- 2. Knowledge areas relevant to the cost management of M&E services**

Jack, Simon, and Philp (2006); Design Buildings (2020) explains some knowledge areas required for the cost management of M&E services. These knowledge areas include:

Knowledge in Measurement: This refers to the understanding of design and being able to quantify each component. It is very important to understand measurement, design and construction process which help in costing of M&E services (Design Buildings, 2020)

Knowledge in Alternative design: This refers to the ability of a Cost manager to interpret an alternative design. Knowledge and skills in the area of M&E services component help the cost expert to advise the clients on different options/alternative and cost implications. This will assist the help the client in selecting the best option (Ashworth, Hogg and Higgs, 2013).

Knowledge in Estimating: This refers to the understanding of the estimating procedure and the likely cost to be incurred on acquisition, installation, and associated administrative costs of the M&E project. This simply refers to when appropriate estimating techniques are used to get the cost of the M&E project (Oforeh and Alufohai, 1998).

Knowledge in Feasibility and Viability studies: This when a QS/Cost expert has the knowledge to ascertain whether a project is realistic and economically viable. The outcome of this study helps the client to go ahead or not (Perera, Pearson and Dodds, 2010).

Knowledge of the Installation process: Knowledge in the installation of M&E components is very vital in the costing of M&E services. The installation process applies to both mechanical and electrical equipment designed to fulfil specific purposes. This will help cost experts in accurately costing M&E works especially the labor cost (Oforeh, 2008).

Knowledge in Financial control: This is the ability of a quantity surveyor to know how to monitor and control the financial resources of M&E services. Financial control is the act of adopting control measures that are necessary to ensure that cost is not exceeded (Jack, Simon and Phil, 2006). This can be done by preparing final statements, final account, and cash flows of the M&E project.

Knowledge in Valuation: The knowledge of valuation preparation is crucial in monitoring cash flows. This is prepared so that the accurate value of work done by the contractor is been paid (Ashworth, Hogg, and Higgs, 2013).

Knowledge in Bill of Quantity preparation: Cost expert must know about preparing a detailed bill of quantity for M&E services with the specification. The knowledge of those scheduled items of work to be carried out under the contract with quantities entered against each item. This bill of quantity provides project-specific measured quantities of the items of work identified by the drawings and specifications in the tender documentation (Design Buildings, 2020).

Knowledge in Risk management: QS/Cost expert must understand the possible risks that can affect a M&E project. This is very important for the successful completion of the project at targeted cost, standard quality, and at a fixed time. Risk assessment is used to know the uncertainty concerning costing decisions (Wao and Flood, 2016).

Knowledge in Procurement management: This refers to the knowledge required for procuring M&E components. For a professional to cost manage M&E project, aware of the prices of M&E components is germane to have high bargaining power. It is a process of identifying and obtaining goods, works, and services. It also includes sourcing, purchasing, and covers all activities from identifying potential suppliers through to delivery from supplier to the users or beneficiary. The procurement process is the entire procurement cycle starting from the identification of need, through to the completion of the contract (Sukulpat, 2007).

Knowledge in Quality management: The quantity surveyor must know about the quality management of M&E services. This refers to the possession of the skills required to oversee activities and ensure that they are done to the specific standard stated in the bill of quantity or specification. Cost expert should ensure that quality policies and objectives are achieved (RICS, 2006)

Knowledge in Value management: A quantity surveyor should have knowledge of value management. Value management can be defined as a systematic process of technical appraisal of a developing project, product, or process to eliminate unnecessary costs and add value while maintaining or enhancing quality, scope, and performance (Jack, Simon and Phil, 2006). It is a process of identifying components that have the best function at a minimal cost. Quantity surveyor must be versatile about different components that can be used for M&E projects and advice the best component to be used

Knowledge in Whole life cycle costing: This includes the initial cost, installation cost, operation and maintenance, and disposal cost. To know the viability of the M&E project, it is, therefore, necessary to understand the life cycle cost (CIPFA, 2011).

Knowledge in Cost-benefit analysis: The knowledge of cost-benefit analysis is required to compare the cost with the benefit derived from a purported investment. Cost experts must be able to advise on which M&E components to procure by examining the cost to benefits derived. Potential cost and revenue or intangible benefits are being examined which can be enjoyed from the product (WillKenton, 2019).

Knowledge in understanding, interpreting M&E components and specification: The knowledge and understanding of M&E components are important. The symbol which each M&E component represent in the drawing is essential for an expert to know so that the costing of those components can be easily done. The specification of those M&E components is very important in pricing for those components (Oforeh, 2008)

3. Research Methodology

The study commenced with a literature review targeted at identifying the knowledge areas relevant to the management of Mechanical and Electrical Services. This was followed with a pilot study conducted with five (5) carefully selected experts. These experts include one (1) mechanical engineer, two (2) Quantity surveyors, and two (2) electrical engineers. The pilot study was conducted to ensure that all relevant variables are included in the research instrument, ambiguous words are not expressed, and appropriate technical terms were used. Pretesting a research instrument helps to check whether the raised questions are appropriate or they are in rhetorics (Dada, 2012). In this study, snowballing and purposive sampling techniques were used in selecting professionals experts. The snowballing techniques were used because the sampling frame is difficult to establish. The sampling techniques are premised on the fact that unknown respondents can be known through known respondents. Atkinson and Flint (2001) noted that Snowballing is an

answer to hidden/concealed respondents. After the pilot survey, the known specialized professionals nominated the unknown professionals, the professionals work in M&E engineering firms, and some consultancy firms in the study area.

Each identified professional identifies another professional (snow-balling) and other respondents were selected based on researchers' knowledge of the area of practice of the professionals. Eventually, 168 professionals were identified, and given questionnaires, 144 copies of the questionnaire were retrieved but 122 questionnaires were suitable for analysis. This connotes a response rate of 73 percent which makes more than the normal response rate of 20-30 percent for questionnaire surveys. The respondents were 68 quantity surveyors, 24 Mechanical Engineers, and 30 Electrical engineers. Mechanical and Electrical engineers were included because they work together with Quantity surveyors in those M&E firms and also to prevent biased view of QSs performance. Most of the un-retrieved questionnaires fall among the mechanical and electrical engineers. The questionnaire administered was designed with different sections, respondents' demographic information such as years of experience, profession, the number of projects engaged, academic qualification and number of M&E projects handled was retrieved in the first section. The other part is about the knowledge areas needed in the cost management of M&E services. Five-point Likert Scale was used as the basis for ranking the level of significance and the level of

performance on the knowledge areas, 5 represents Very high, 4 indicates High, 3 indicates Average, 2 connotes Low and 1 represents Very low. The data collection was conducted within three months via self-administration to respondents and electronic channels. Mean Item Score, Bar chart, Standard deviation, Gap analysis, Spearman correlation, and Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance were used in analyzing the retrieved data. The Background information of professionals was presented with a Bar chart, an average of the responses of professionals were analyzed by Mean Item Score (MIS). Variability or disparity in the responses of professionals was revealed by the standard deviation. A gap analysis was used to compare the current or actual state and the expected or desired state. Spearman correlation test was used to examine the relationship between the importance and performance of these knowledge areas while Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to examine the level of agreement between the professionals.

4. Findings and Discussion of Result

Figure 1 shows that 32 respondents work in a consulting firm which represents 26.2% while 90 respondents discharge their duties in an M&E contracting firm which connotes 73.8 percent. The quantity surveyors were 68 respondents' that represent more than half of the population while mechanical engineers represent 19.7% of the population and electrical engineers represent 24.6% of the respondents. Ninety-two (92) respondents i.e., 75.4% of the population were male while the rest were females.




Figure 1. Types of Organization

Also, figure 2 shows that Higher National Diploma (HND) holders were 21.3% i.e. 26 respondents, 70 professionals hold Bachelor of Science/Technology degree (B.Sc/B.Tech) i.e. 57.4% of the population while the remaining respondents hold a Master of Science/Technology (M.Sc/M.Tech) degree in their respective professions. For the year of experience, those with a range of 1-5 years were 46 respondents which denote 37.7% of the population, 54.1% represent 6-10 years which was 66 respondents, 4 respondents fall in the range of 11-15 years which represent 6.6% and those above 20 represent 1.6%. Furthermore, 44 people are a member of their various affiliation which represent 72.1%, 12 respondents belong to a corporate member

which represent 19.7 percent and 5 professionals belong to associate member which represent 8.2%. The last part concerns the number of M&E projects handled by each profession; 13 respondents noted that they have handled 1-5 number of M&E projects which connotes 21.3%. 27.9% have handled 6-10 M&E projects which were 17 respondents, 6.6% of the population belongs to 11-15 numbers of executed projects, 3 respondents have handled 16-20 projects while those projects handled above 20 are 24 respondents which represent 39.3%. Based on the findings above this can be affirmed that the data provided by the respondents are reliable




Figure 2. Academic qualifications

Table 1 shows the ranking of the importance of the knowledge areas for cost management of M&E services. The table shows the fifteen variables are important to the cost management of M&E services because their overall mean values are all above 4.00. This ranking revealed the mean item score and the standard deviation of each variable. The largest ranked importance was knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services of 4.82 to mean value with SD of 0.388 followed by Knowledge in Valuation of

M&E works of 4.77 mean value with SD of 0.424. The third-ranked importance was knowledge in the measurement of M&E services and the next is Knowledge in Estimating techniques. The fifth and sixth-ranked have the same mean with different standard deviation. According to Field (2005), the lowest SD was ranked first which makes Quality management to be ranked fifth. The least ranked variable was Knowledge in the installation of M&E services having a mean value of 4.03 and SD of 0.856

Table 1. Importance of the Knowledge Areas for Cost Management of M&E

| Knowledge areas | QS Mean | Elect. Mean | Mech. Mean | O/R Mean | Std. Deviation | Rank |
|--|------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|------|
| Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services | 4.85 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 0.388 | 1 |
| Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works | 4.85 | 4.60 | 4.75 | 4.77 | 0.424 | 2 |
| Knowledge in Measurement of M & E Services Engineering works | 4.76 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.52 | 0.648 | 3 |

| Knowledge areas | QS | Elect. | Mech. | O/R | Std. | Rank |
|--|------|--------|-------|------|-----------|------|
| | Mean | | | | Deviation | |
| Knowledge in Estimating techniques | 4.50 | 4.53 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 0.595 | 4 |
| Quality Management/Assurance knowledge | 4.32 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 0.578 | 5 |
| Knowledge in Financial Control | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 0.633 | 6 |
| Knowledge in Cost for alternative designs of M&E services | 4.59 | 3.93 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 0.574 | 7 |
| Knowledge in Value Management/analysis of M&E works | 4.53 | 3.93 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 0.558 | 8 |
| Procurement Management Studies knowledge | 4.12 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 0.656 | 9 |
| Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services | 4.35 | 3.93 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 0.864 | 10 |
| Understanding and interpreting of M&E components and specification | 4.29 | 3.80 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 0.734 | 11 |
| Knowledge in Cost benefit analysis of M&E components | 4.09 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.13 | 0.741 | 12 |
| Whole life cycle costing of M&E services knowledge | 4.21 | 4.07 | 3.83 | 4.10 | 0.746 | 13 |
| Risk Management strategies knowledge | 3.97 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 0.834 | 14 |
| Knowledge in the installation of M&E services | 4.44 | 3.67 | 3.33 | 4.03 | 0.856 | 15 |

Table 2 shows the ranking of the performance of QS in knowledge areas for the cost management of mechanical and electrical services. This ranking reveals the mean item score and the standard deviation of each variable. The largest ranked performance of QS was knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services of 3.90 mean value with SD of 0.851 followed by Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works of 3.90 mean value with SD of 0.978. The third-ranked performance of QS was knowledge in financial control having a mean value 3.82 and SD of 0.719 the next was Knowledge in Feasibility study/viability studies of M&E services with 3.72 and 0.777 standard deviations. The least ranked variable is Knowledge in the installation of M&E services having a mean value of 3.18 and SD of 1.057. The least ranked has a standard

deviation above 1.0 because there is a high disparity between the professionals' opinions. The performance means was fixed at 3.5 and the performance level was set at 95 percent following the conventional risk levels. On this basis, the factors are said to be considered when QSs is performing at 3.5 and above (Ahadzie et al., 2008). Performing areas are knowledge in preparing BOQ, valuation, financial control, feasibility/viability study, measurement, estimating techniques, understanding and interpreting M&E services, risk management strategies, and value management. Non-performing areas are procurement management, Cost for alternative designs, Cost-benefit analysis, Whole life cycle costing, quality management, installation of M&E services.

Table 2. Performance of QSs in Knowledge Areas for Cost Management of M&E

| Knowledge areas | QS | Elect. | Mech. | O/R | Std. | Rank |
|--|------|--------|-------|------|-----------|------|
| | Mean | | | | Deviation | |
| Knowledge in Estimating techniques | 4.50 | 4.53 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 0.595 | 4 |
| Quality Management/Assurance knowledge | 4.32 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 0.578 | 5 |
| Knowledge in Financial Control | 4.38 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 0.633 | 6 |
| Knowledge in Cost for alternative designs of M&E services | 4.59 | 3.93 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 0.574 | 7 |
| Knowledge in Value Management/analysis of M&E works | 4.53 | 3.93 | 4.08 | 4.30 | 0.558 | 8 |
| Procurement Management Studies knowledge | 4.12 | 4.53 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 0.656 | 9 |
| Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services | 4.35 | 3.93 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 0.864 | 10 |
| Understanding and interpreting of M&E components and specification | 4.29 | 3.80 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 0.734 | 11 |
| Knowledge in Cost benefit analysis of M&E components | 4.09 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.13 | 0.741 | 12 |
| Whole life cycle costing of M&E services knowledge | 4.21 | 4.07 | 3.83 | 4.10 | 0.746 | 13 |
| Risk Management strategies knowledge | 3.97 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 0.834 | 14 |
| Knowledge in the installation of M&E services | 4.44 | 3.67 | 3.33 | 4.03 | 0.856 | 15 |

| Knowledge areas | Importance Mean | Performance Mean | Gap Mean | Rank |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------|-------|
| Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services | 4.29 | 3.47 | 3.33 | 3.90 |
| Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works | 4.38 | 3.27 | 3.33 | 3.90 |
| Knowledge in Financial Control | 4.24 | 3.40 | 3.17 | 3.82 |
| Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services | 4.03 | 3.40 | 3.25 | 3.72 |
| Knowledge in Measurement of M & E Services Engineering works | 4.05 | 3.60 | 2.83 | 3.70 |
| Knowledge in Estimating techniques | 4.06 | 3.20 | 3.33 | 3.70 |
| Understanding and interpreting of M&E components and specification | 4.03 | 3.40 | 3.08 | 3.69 |
| Risk Management strategies knowledge | 3.88 | 3.07 | 3.17 | 3.54 |
| Knowledge in Value Management/analysis of M&E works | 4.09 | 3.13 | 2.33 | 3.51 |
| Procurement Management Studies knowledge | 3.76 | 3.00 | 3.33 | 3.49 |
| Knowledge in Cost for alternative designs of M&E services | 3.91 | 2.87 | 2.83 | 3.44 |
| Knowledge in Cost benefit analysis of M&E components | 3.85 | 2.87 | 2.75 | 3.39 |
| Whole life cycle costing of M&E services knowledge | 3.85 | 2.93 | 2.58 | 3.38 |
| Quality Management/Assurance knowledge | 3.79 | 2.73 | 2.75 | 3.33 |
| Knowledge in the installation of M&E services | 3.76 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 3.18 |
| | | | | 1.057 |
| | | | | 15 |

Table 3 shows the gap between importance and the performance of QS in the knowledge areas required for the cost management of mechanical and electrical services. Ideally, the performance of a QS/cost manager on a knowledge area should match or surpass the importance of the knowledge area. This will imply that the professional can effectively meet up with the knowledge demands of cost management. However, the findings of this study revealed that in terms of the gap between importance and performance, quality management/assurance knowledge ranked first having a gap value of 1.03, this is followed by knowledge in preparing the bill of quantity of M&E services with a gap value

of 0.92. The third-ranked gap value is knowledge in cost for alternative designs of M&E services of 0.90 next to knowledge in valuation of M&E services having a gap value of 0.87. The fifth-ranked variable was knowledge in the installation of M&E services. The least ranked is understanding and interpreting M&E components with a gap value of 0.47 which means QSs are not performing to expectation in the knowledge area for cost management of M&E services. There is a need for QSs to improve themselves in the knowledge areas to meet up or bridge the gap between the possessed and expected level.

Table 3. Comparison of Means on Knowledge Areas Needed by QSs

| Knowledge areas | Importance Mean | Performance Mean | Gap Mean | Rank |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------|------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|----|
| Quality Management/Assurance knowledge | 4.36 | 3.33 | 1.03 | 1 |
| Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services | 4.82 | 3.90 | 0.92 | 2 |
| Knowledge in Cost for alternative designs of M&E services | 4.34 | 3.44 | 0.90 | 3 |
| Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works | 4.77 | 3.90 | 0.87 | 4 |
| Knowledge in the installation of M&E services | 4.03 | 3.18 | 0.85 | 5 |
| Knowledge in Measurement of M & E Services Engineering works | 4.52 | 3.70 | 0.82 | 6 |
| Knowledge in Estimating techniques | 4.49 | 3.70 | 0.79 | 7 |
| Knowledge in Value Management/analysis of M&E works | 4.30 | 3.51 | 0.79 | 7 |
| Procurement Management Studies knowledge | 4.26 | 3.49 | 0.77 | 9 |
| Knowledge in Cost-benefit analysis of M&E components | 4.13 | 3.39 | 0.74 | 10 |
| Whole life cycle costing of M&E services knowledge | 4.10 | 3.38 | 0.72 | 11 |
| Knowledge in Financial Control | 4.36 | 3.82 | 0.54 | 12 |
| Risk Management strategies knowledge | 4.07 | 3.54 | 0.53 | 13 |
| Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services | 4.23 | 3.72 | 0.51 | 14 |
| Understanding and interpreting of M&E components and specification | 4.16 | 3.69 | 0.47 | 15 |

The level of relationship between the importance of knowledge areas and the performance of QSSs in those knowledge areas for cost management of M&E services was determined by carrying out a correlation test. From the result below, it can be observed the correlation coefficient (Rs) was 0.654. This means there is a moderate positive relationship between the importance of knowledge areas and the performance of QSSs. The positive values mean that the increase of one brings an increase of others in a moderate degree (Laerd Statistics, 2017). Although, based on the result of gap analysis

(Table 3), performances are not matching up with the importance of the knowledge areas. The *p-value* was 0.008 at a significance level of 0.01 which revealed the *p-value* is lesser than the significance level. This means there is a significant relationship between the importance of knowledge areas and the performance of QSSs. Therefore, we accept H1 and reject Ho.

H01: There is no significant relationship between the importance and performance of QSSs in knowledge areas for cost management of M&E services

Table 4. Test on Relationship between Means on Knowledge Areas Needed by QSSs

| Spearman's rho | Importance Mean | Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) | Importance Mean | Performance Mean |
|----------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| | | | 1.000 | .654** .008 |
| | | N | 15 | 15 |
| | | Correlation Coefficient | .654** | 1.000 |

| | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------|---|
| Performance Mean | Sig. (2-tailed) N | .008 15 | . |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------|---|

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was computed to further determine the degree of agreement between the professionals on the knowledge areas needed in the cost management of M&E services. Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) takes note of the variation between the ranks that constitute the mean score of each factor. Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) of the components was based on the rating of professionals' experts which was 0.153. The Kendall's coefficient is statistically significant at 0.000 significant level. It is therefore concluded that there is statistically significant agreement among the professional's expert. To further buttress the statistical output of Kendall's coefficient, a chi-square (χ^2) test was conducted. The chi-

square value (χ^2) of the knowledge area for cost management of M&E services was 130.344. The χ^2 critical value from the chi-square table revealed 23.685 (for $p=0.05$) and 29.141 ($p=0.01$) at the degree of freedom (df) of 14. The computed chi-square values (χ^2) were higher than the critical values obtained from the statistical table at a significant level of 0.000 which implied a robust consensus among professionals. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the research hypothesis (H_a)

H₀₁: There is no agreement between the professionals' perceived performance of Quantity surveyors on knowledge areas needed for cost management of M&E services

Table 5. Test on Performance of QSs in Knowledge Areas Needed

| Knowledge areas | Mean | Std. Deviation | Rank |
|--|------------|----------------|------|
| Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services | 3.90 | 0.851 | 1 |
| Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works | 3.90 | 0.978 | 2 |
| Knowledge in Financial Control | 3.82 | 0.719 | 3 |
| Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services | 3.72 | 0.777 | 4 |
| Knowledge in Measurement of M & E Services Engineering works | 3.70 | 0.955 | 5 |
| Knowledge in Estimating techniques | 3.70 | 0.955 | 5 |
| Understanding and interpreting of M&E components and specification | 3.69 | 0.886 | 7 |
| Risk Management strategies knowledge | 3.54 | 0.828 | 8 |
| Knowledge in Value Management/analysis of M&E works | 3.51 | 0.960 | 9 |
| Procurement Management Studies knowledge | 3.49 | 0.674 | 10 |
| Knowledge in Cost for alternative designs of M&E services | 3.44 | 0.992 | 11 |
| Knowledge in Cost benefit analysis of M&E components | 3.39 | 0.988 | 12 |
| Whole life cycle costing of M&E services knowledge | 3.38 | 0.756 | 13 |
| Quality Management/Assurance knowledge | 3.33 | 0.944 | 14 |
| Knowledge in the installation of M&E services | 3.18 | 1.057 | 15 |
| Number of respondents | 122 | | |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Kendall's coefficient of concordance | 0.153 |
| Chi square | 130.344 |
| Degree of freedom (Df) | 14 |
| Sig. | 0.000 |

The findings revealed the importance of the knowledge areas to cost management of M&E services. It was revealed that knowledge of preparation of bill of quantities (BOQ), knowledge of valuation, knowledge of measurement of M&E services, knowledge of estimating techniques, Quality analysis and management knowledge and knowledge in financial control were rated high. This reason is that for quantity surveyors to manage M&E services these knowledge areas are very important. For effective management, there is a need to have versed and experienced knowledge in preparing the bill of quantity, valuation, and controlling finances so that resources will be monitored and ensure it cost is not exceeded. This is in line with Mohd Shafiei and Said (2008) who stated that quantification/measurement is one of the most important knowledge areas in the construction for quantity surveyors. The findings also partly corroborate Yogeshwaran et. al (2018) where cost estimation was rated the most important area of knowledge area for quantity surveyors while delivering construction industry related services. This implies that estimating knowledge is a vital area in getting the cost of executing M&E services

In terms of performance, it is evident that other professionals rated the performance of quantity surveyors low compared to QSs themselves in the cost management of M&E services. There were none of the knowledge areas where the possessed level of quantity surveyors is up to the expected level or more. This was shown in the gap analysis results in table 3; this finding does not agree with Yogeshwaran et. al (2018) where it was revealed that quantity surveyors perform

more than the expected level in risk management, value management, and life cost analysis. This implies that academia need to improve and equip upcoming professionals with the right knowledge to meet up with the industry demands and standards. This means there is a gap to bridge in the level of knowledge possessed to the level expected by the industry. Furthermore, Wao and Flood (2016) noted that professionals should go beyond the conventional duties and acquire knowledge in value management, whole life cycle costing, sustainability and facilities management. This statement is in support of my findings where Quantity surveyors was ranked among the least in whole life costing and averagely in value management of M&E services. Perera (2010); Dada and Jagboro (2012) opined that the knowledge of building construction is critical in knowledge of measurement for building components. This means that knowledge of building construction includes practical aspects of site exposure and how construction processes are done. This is also applicable to M&E services but against my findings where knowledge of installation of M&E services has the least performance for Quantity surveyors. It implies that quantity surveyors are not well exposed to construction and installation process of M&E works which allows cost overrun in most projects. It was also affirmed by Unit (2015) who stated that new strategies must be developed to influence the students with intellectual performance and capacity to manage projects

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The industry practitioners and the educational institutions have important roles in passing knowledge to upcoming professionals and graduate. The industry should ensure additional knowledge is given to graduate that is beyond the confine of the curriculum in their degree programme. The study revealed Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services, Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works, Knowledge in Measurement of M & E Services Engineering works, Knowledge in Estimating techniques, Quality Management/Assurance knowledge and Knowledge in Financial Control as the most important knowledge areas of Quantity Surveyors in cost management of mechanical and electrical services. Even though Quantity Surveyor performs better in Knowledge in Preparing Bill of Quantity for M&E services, Knowledge in Valuation of M&E works, Knowledge in Financial Control, Knowledge in Feasibility Study/Viability Studies of M&E services. There are still large gap values between the actual and the expected performance in preparation of BOQ and valuation of M&E services. The quantity surveyors are expected to increase their level of knowledge by updating themselves to the current practices. The least performed areas are Quality Management/Assurance knowledge and Knowledge in the installation of M&E services. Those skills and knowledge areas that QSs performed least require urgent attention so that it would be improved in the curriculum used in training of QSs.

Quantity surveying education must be able to equip them with knowledge needed for the upcoming professionals to face the challenges and threat in M&E industry. The spearman correlation conducted revealed that there is a moderate relationship between the importance and performance mean. Kendall's Coefficient of concordance was used to show that there is significant agreement among the professionals/expert which means robust consensus among professionals' opinion. It is recommended that there is a need for Quantity Surveyors to develop themselves personally especially in the areas of the installation process, Quality management, and preparing the bill of quantity for M&E services. These require immediate attention because they were rated high in terms of importance but rated low in terms of performance by Nigerian Quantity Surveyors. The curriculum of educational system for quantity surveying should be reviewed to meet the industry expectations. This can be done by meeting industry practitioners and academia in reviewing the curriculum regularly. Low performance of Quantity surveyors in those areas listed above can be improved by visiting the site where M&E projects are being executed to give them exposure and experience, attending the symposium, workshops, seminars, etc. conducted by the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors or relevant professional institutions. Further research can be conducted in other developing countries to ascertain this study for general acceptability.

References

- Akintoye, A. (2000). Analysis of factors influencing project cost estimating practice. *Journal of Construction Management and Economics*, 18 (1), 77-89.

- Ahadzie, D.K., Proverbs, D.G. and Olomolaiye, P.O. (2008). Critical success criteria for mass house building projects in developing countries. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(6), 675-687

- Ashworth, A., Hogg, K., and Higgs, C., (2013). *Willis's Practice and Procedure for the Quantity Surveyor*. 13th ed. Chichester: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Babalola, O. (2009). A study of the core competencies of quantity surveyors in managing electrical and engineering services sub-contract. *Journal of Environmental Design and Management*, 2 (1), 55-64
- Babalola, O., and Adesanya, D. A. (2007). An evaluation of the level of accuracy of electrical services cost estimates in Nigeria. *Association of Researchers in Construction Management*, 1(1), 75–83. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26650324>
- CIPFA (2011). *Whole Life Costing*. <https://www.cipfa.org/policy-and-guidance/publications/w/whole-life-costing>
- Dada, J.O., and Jagboro, G.O. (2012). Core skills requirements and competencies expected of quantity surveyors: perspectives from quantity surveyors, allied professionals, and clients in Nigeria. *Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building*, 12 (4), 78-90.
- Design Buildings (2020). *Designing Buildings Wiki Share your construction industry knowledge*. Retrieved January 19th, 2020, from <https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Measurement>
- Design Buildings (2020). *Designing Buildings Wiki Share your construction industry knowledge*. Retrieved January 27th, 2020, from https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Specification_for_construction
- Design Buildings (2020). *Designing Buildings Wiki Share your construction industry knowledge*.
- construction industry knowledge. Retrieved March 01, 2020, from https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Bill_of_quantities_BOQ
- Gayathri Yogeshwaran, B.A.K.S Perera, M.R. Mahendrini Fernando
- Ariyachandra, (2018). Competencies expected of graduate quantity surveyors working in developing countries. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMP-06-2017-0019>
- Jack R., Simon B., and Phil G., (2006). *Contract Practice for Surveyors*, 4th edition. Elsevier Linacre House, Jordan Hill. pg. 344
- Laerd Statistics. (2017). *Spearman's rank-order correlation*. Retrieved October 24, 2017, from <https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/spearmans-rank-order-correlation-statistical-guide.php>
- McCaffrey, J., (2011). What is an M&E QS? *Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors Students Construction Journal*, 22 - 23.
- Mohd Shafiee M.W. and Said I. (2008). The Competency Requirements for Quantity Surveyors: Enhancing Continuous Professional Development. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(1), 17-27
- Nnadi and Alintah-Abel (2016). Utilization of quantity surveyors' skills in the construction industry in southeastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Latest Research in Engineering and Technology*, 2(2), 42-51
- Oforeh, E. (2008) *Installation and Electrical Works in Buildings*. Second Edition ed. Lagos: Cosines.
- Oforeh, E., and Alufohai, A. (1998) *Management Estimating and*

- Budgeting for Electricals Installations.* First Edition éd. Lagos: Cosines (Nig) Ltd.
- Oke, A.E., and Ogunsemi, D.R. (2009). Competencies of quantity surveyors as value managers in developing economy In *Proceedings, RICS COBRA Research Conference*, 10-11th September, University of Cape Town, 494 – 508.
- Oke A.E, Ogunsemi, D.R., and Adeyelu, M.F (2017). Quantity surveyors and skills required for procurement management, International Journal of Construction Management, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2017.1354497>
- Olanrewaju, A., and Anahve, P. J. (2015). Duties and Responsibilities of Quantity Surveyors in the Procurement of Building Services Engineering. *Procedia Engineering*, 123, 352–360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2015.046>
- Opawole, A., Awodele, O.A., Babatunde, S.O., and Awodele, O.O. (2010). Review of Correlation of Quantity Surveyors' Education in Nigeria to Skill Requirements for Administration of Civil Engineering Projects. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(16), 109-117
- Perera, S., Pearson, J., and Dodds, L. (2010). Alignment of Professional, Academic, and Industrial Development Needs for Quantity Surveyors. COBRA 2010. London, United Kingdom: RICS.
- Perera, S., Pearson, J., Robson, S., and Ekundayo, D. (2011). Alignment of academic and industrial development needs for quantity surveyors: the views of industry and academia. Proceedings of the RICS COBRA Research Conference, 676-686, available at: www.academia.edu/901056/Alignment_of_academic_and_industrial_development_needs_for_quantity_surveyors_the_views_of_industry_and_academia (accessed 10 July 2014).
- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (2006). *Requirements and Competencies*. www.rics.org.
- Sukulpat, K. (2007). Risks in the construction project procurement process and the mitigation methods. *Journal of Architectural/Planning Research and Studies*, 5, 135-145.
- Unit, E. P. (2015). Eleventh Malaysia plan, 2016-2020: Anchoring growth on people. *Putrajaya, Pencetakan Nasional Malaysia Berhad*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>. Accessed on 25 May 2017.
- Wao, J.O., and Flood, I. (2016). The role of quantity surveyors in the international construction arena. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 16 (2), 126-137, DOI:10.1080/15623599.2016.1142251
- Will Kenton (2019). Cost-benefit analysis. Retrieved June 23rd, 2019, from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/cost-benefitanalysis.asp>
- Yismalet, A. G., and Patel, D. (2018). A critical literature review on improving project cost management practice and profitability of domestic contractors. *International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research*, 5(1), 51-58. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1164074
- Yusuf, G. A., and Mohamed, S. F. (2015). Essential features of a building services standard method of

measurement in Malaysia. *Journal of Engineering, Construction and*



Victor A. Arowojoya is an Assistant lecturer in the Department of Quantity Surveying, School of Environmental Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

He is also a Master graduate student from the same institution. Victor is a probationer member of the Nigeria Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS). He is budding researcher that is passionate in novel researches. His research interest includes Cost Management, Green building, Digital technologies and sustainable construction.

Dr. Olusola F. Akinradewo is



a Senior lecturer in the Department of Quantity Surveying, School of Environmental Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

Olusola does research in Quantitative

Architectural Management, 22 (6), 1-31

and Qualitative Social Research. He lectures Pre and Post Contract Administration, Building and Civil Engineering Measurement, Law of Contract and Arbitration



Dr. Onaopepo Adeniyi holds a Ph.D. in Built Environment with commendable research outputs and university teaching experience in the United Kingdom and Nigeria. His research interest includes quantity surveying practice/education, procurement, disaster/climate resilience, construction project management, and infrastructure development economics. He is highly interested in discussing research collaborations, engagements and other forms of opportunities in his research area. Onaopepo is a member of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS), the Quantity Surveyors Registration Board of Nigeria (QSRBN) and a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA).