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Abstract
A procurement system is vital in ensuring the successful implementation of a construction project, precisely executed for all phases of any particular project. Therefore, this paper aims to investigate in a systematic manner the factors that influence the selection of a procurement system in the South African construction industry. An extensive theory and literature review of procurement systems was conducted. The literature reviewed included a sample of 6 case studies of completed Building and Civil Engineering projects within South Africa. Questionnaire surveys were carried out using a 4 round Delphi method approach to conduct the empirical study in order to obtain participants’ opinions about the factors that influence the selection of procurement systems as well as the utility value of various procurement systems on each factor as identified. Finally, data analysis of both qualitative and quantitative techniques was performed using the statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS). After qualitative analysis the findings indicate that the factors that influence the selection of procurement systems are closely linked to the problem areas or cut across all the phases of the project as identified in this paper. Therefore, these factors are categorically classified into internal and external factors. Factors from the internal environment were further classified into client characteristics and project characteristics, with client characteristics comprising of variables such as the client’s level of knowledge and control, political and social consideration, familiarity of procurement systems, competition, funding arrangement, government public/private sector projects and risk allocation whereas project characteristics comprise of factors (variables) such as size and technical complexity of the project, influence of the project life cycle, expedited project delivery, time, quality and price certainty. Factors from the external environment include variables such as market competition, information technology, regulatory environment, natural causes and globalization.

After factor analysis had been performed on variables obtained from the literature review, five (5) newly established factors were identified and are considered to be the most significant factors that influence the selection of procurement systems for the South African construction industry. These 5 factors are: socio-economic consideration; client requirements; capital cost/cash flow; procurement policy; and project characteristics. This study investigates factors that influence the selection of procurement systems in South Africa for the purpose of assisting and guiding construction practitioners in selecting suitable procurement systems for their planned projects.
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1. Introduction

Two studies conducted within the SADC region, one for South Africa and the other for Botswana by Rwelamila and Meyer (1996) have revealed that South Africa had adopted a ready-made construction framework including the hybrids of traditional procurement systems during the years when South Africa was a British colony. Although the South African procurement system is based on the British model, the context and the application of this model were unsystematic for the then apartheid South Africa: this was due to the different set-up and institutional arrangements between South Africa and Britain.

However, the political uncertainties that had taken place during the early 1980s and late 1990s led to some changes within the South African construction industry. This was due to the South African construction industry shifting its focus from a predominantly first-world oriented construction environment to a developing-world construction environment that focuses on the basic needs of the population and its economic circumstances. Among other things, this shift was directed towards the development of new construction policies aimed at promoting stability; fostering economic growth and economic competitiveness; creating new sustainable employment; as well as addressing the historic imbalances as new industry capacity is being generated for development (Department of Public Works, May 1999).

Post-1994, the newly formed South African Government of National Unity and all stakeholders of the construction industry headed by the Department of Public Works, initiated and co-ordinated the development of the Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB) which was mandated among other things to improve a standardised application of best practice in construction procurement within the framework of government procurement policies (Construction Procurement Library, CIDB, 2005). Therefore, this study aims to investigate in a systematic manner the factors that influence the selection of procurement systems within the South African construction industry.

2. Research Methodology

The triangulation approach was deemed appropriate to investigate factors influencing the selection of procurement systems in the South African construction industry. According to Clarke (2005), triangulation is the combination of two or more methodologies to study the same phenomena. However, triangulation can be conducted in two different approaches, namely; simultaneous and sequential triangulation. In conducting this study, the sequential triangulation approach was adopted, which involves linking qualitative and quantitative approaches. The vast body of theory and literature reviews focusing on both national and international literature was used for the qualitative approach in this study. This also included a review of 6 South African case studies of completed construction projects that had been successfully used and implemented universal procurement systems.

For the quantitative approach, self-administered questionnaires through the utilization of the Delphi method were used during the empirical survey for collection opinions. The sample comprised a total of 40 areas of expertise, with ten (10) members representing each of the four (4) professional bodies of the built environment, namely the SACQSP, SACCMPM, SACAP and ECSA. The study was limited to only 3 provinces of South Africa, namely Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces. The round 1 questionnaire of the Delphi method comprised of Sections A and B and was sent to participants sequentially, with Section A first and Section B second. Twenty-one (21) participants, equivalent to 52.5%, completed the questionnaires. The purpose of Section A was to obtain the factual biographical data profiles of the targeted respondents, and to ascertain the participant’s level of knowledge about the procurement systems used in South Africa. The purpose of Section B was to determine whether the factors as revealed from the literature review existed within the South African construction industry.

Round 2 of the Delphi survey method comprised a total of 20 variables (factors) collected from Section B of Round 1. Fifteen variables (factors) were found to be from the internal environment and 5 variables
(factors) from the external environment. Questionnaires were distributed through electronic mail to 21 participants in Round 2 and all the 21 participants completed the questionnaires. All the variables (artificial factors) were subjected to factor analysis for the purpose of obtaining the genuine smaller quantity of factors. Round 3 of the Delphi survey method consisted of 5 factors retained after factor analysis of Round 2, whereby experts were requested to rate the utility value score of each of the 5 factors. Twenty (20) questionnaires were returned, which equates to 50%. Round 4 of the Delphi survey method also consisted of the 5 factors retained from factor analysis of Round 2 for re-assessment of Round 3 scores to obtain the mean utility scores on each of the 5 factors. Out of 20 (50%) questionnaires sent, 6 participants which equates to 30% returned their questionnaires and the other 14 which represented about 70% did not return their questionnaire; therefore, their scores for Round 3 were considered for Round 4. All the questionnaires from round 1 to round 4 were distributed to the participants using electronic mail. Data analyses of both qualitative and quantitative techniques were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

2.1 Literature Review on Procurement Systems

‘Procurement system’ is a contemporary term, which is known to the many practitioners and researchers of the construction industry by different terms; these include terms such as project approach, procurement methods, procurement delivery methods or project delivery systems, etc. Below are the three definitions that best define a procurement system:

It is an organizational structure adopted by the client for the implementation and at times eventual operation of a project (Masterman, 2002).

It is a key means through which the clients create the pre-conditions for the successful achievement of project-specific objectives (Rameezdeen and Ratnasabapathy, 2006).

It is the acquisition of project resources for the realisation of a constructed facility (Walker, D. And Rowlinson, S., 2008).

Procurement systems govern the delivery processes of construction projects in more ways than one and are key in determining the success or failure of any particular project. Procurement systems have received well-deserved attention in countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Japan and New Zealand, but this has never been the case locally as well as in many other African countries.

With a plethora of different procurement systems from which to choose to deliver diverse construction projects, an extensive literature review on procurement systems indicates that there is currently no systematic and no realistic approach applied or used to select the appropriate procurement system; in fact, the literature reviewed further highlights that the factors that influence the selection of procurement systems span across all the project phases identified in this study. This is further exacerbated by the poor contractual relationship between the parties in the contract. Procurement Management knowledge includes the techniques to acquire the goods and services from contractors and suppliers, outside of the project organisation (Burke, R., 2010). Procurement is a process that involves two parties with different objectives who interact in a given market segment (Kerzner, H., 2006). Procurement systems are basically classified into traditional and non-traditional systems:

2.1.1 Traditional procurement systems

This method is called ‘traditional’ because it has been in existence for a long time and has been the only choice available for most clients of the construction industry for many years. Using this method, the client enters into an agreement with the design consultant (an architect or engineer) to actually carry out the design work and prepare contract documents. Following the completion of this phase, the contractor is
then appointed based upon the owner’s criteria and the owner enters into a contract with the successful contractor for the assembly of the project elements. In essence, the client is under two contractual obligations; that of the design professional and the contractor. In order for the client to obtain a constructed facility, tenders from this type of procurement system are invited in one of the three following methods:

Open tendering – is a procedure that allows practically, any contractor to submit a tender for the work. This procedure involves either the client or consultant (on behalf) of the client placing a public advertisement giving a brief description of the work. Normally the client will require a cash deposit when contract documents are requested (Pilcher, 1992).

Selective tendering – it consists of the client drawing up a short-list of contractors that are known to have the appropriate qualifications to carry out the work satisfactorily. Those contractors who seek to be listed are then asked for further details concerning their technical competence, financial standing, resources at their disposal and relevant experience. Pre-qualifying contractors who are on the list are invited to tender (Pilcher, 1992). The selection of designers (that is architects and engineers) is usually based on a combination of track record, fees, conceptual design, and previous working relations (Tan, W., 2007).

Negotiated tendering – This method is applied in several different contexts, but the essence is that tenders are obtained by the client inviting a single contractor of his/her choice to submit a tender for a particular project.

2.1.2 Non-traditional procurement systems

Non-traditional is a generic term which is used to refer to all emerging or contemporary procurement systems of the construction industry other than the traditional procurement system. Over the past number of years, the construction industry has undergone changes in a manner never seen before. The increased size and complexity of the construction projects, financial challenges, political and social consideration, and information technology are just some of the changes that have been taking place. These changes had led to the development of alternative procurement systems other than the famous traditional one.

Although the development of non-traditional procurement systems seemed to be the favourite to most clients in the construction industry, it must however be emphasised that there is not yet a specific method used to select the most appropriate procurement system. Masterman (2002) defines a non-traditional procurement system as a diversified contemporary procurement system(s) that not only considers design and construction, but also considers financing, operating and facility management. Listed below are the three different types of non-traditional procurement systems:

Integrated procurement system – Where one organization, usually but not exclusively the contractor, takes responsibility for the design and construction of the project, in theory at least. The client deals only with one organization.

Management-Oriented procurement system – under a management-oriented procurement system, the management of the project is carried out by an organization working with the designer and other consultants to produce the designs and manage the physical operations which are carried out by contractors. When using systems within this category, the client will need to have a greater involvement with the project than when employing any of the other methods described in the other two categories.

Collaborative/discretionary procurement system – Under a collaborative system the client lays down a framework for the overall administration of the project within which he/she has the discretion to use the most appropriate of all the procurement systems contained within the other three categories. In a collaborative procurement system Quantity Surveyors play an integral role by providing a wide range of
services, which include contractual issues; it also offers Quantity Surveyors an opportunity to act as independent advisors within the system (Cartlidge, 2002).

3. South African Perspectives

Although the forerunner of procurement systems in South Africa is based on the British model, post-1994, the South African government and all other stakeholders of the construction industry through the Department of Public Works initiated and co-ordinated the development of a comprehensive CIDB as part of their contribution to national projects for the Reconstruction, Growth and Development typified in the white paper “Creating an Enabling Environment for Reconstruction, Growth and Development in the Construction Industry” (DPW, 1999).

3.1 Construction procurement policy in South Africa

Procurement is defined as the process which creates, manages and fulfils construction contracts, and it is further described as a succession of logically related actions occurring or performed in a definite manner and which is culminated by methods (i.e. documented systematically), and procedures which are performed and shaped by the policy of an organization (Draft International Standard ISO/DIS 10845-1, 2008). Within the South African government context, policy is often translated into rules and regulations; policy also relates to choices made in the use of generic procedures, methods and circumstances under which a certain procedure should be used (SANS 294). Therefore it can be deduced from the two above-mentioned definitions that the combination results in a processes referred to as a procurement policy, which is defined as a process which creates, and manages contracts based on the choices made in the use of generic procedures, methods and circumstances adopted in terms of 76(4) (c) of the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA).

In the field of procurement systems, South Africa like many other developing countries uses the generic procedures and standard set of processes and methods for procurement systems that are fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective when pursuing implementation of construction projects within the construction industry and which is regulated in all spheres of government including state-owned enterprises through various pieces of legislation.

3.2 Procurement systems used in South Africa

South Africa, being one of the developing countries, therefore follows and is guided by the framework for developing effective procurement systems in developing countries (The round table process, December 2000). Based on this declaration an agreement was reached for developing countries to utilize common strategies, approaches and tools in order to strengthen the procurement systems’ capacities in developing countries and move towards greater reliance on national systems. With reference to SANS 294 as highlighted in the construction procurement processes, procedures and methods of the best practice guidelines # A1 (CIDB, September 2005), it provides guidance classified into three categories as shown below in table 1:

Table 1: Standard Procurement procedures in South Africa - Source: Draft International Standard ISO/DIS 10845 – 1 (2008)

| Category       | Procurement procedure | Actions                                      |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Negotiated Procedure | Negotiated Procedure  | A tender offer is solicited from a single tenderer |
Competitive Selection Procedure

| Procedure                              | Description                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nomination Procedure                   | Tenders that satisfy prescribed criteria are entered into an electronic database. Tenderers are invited to submit tender offers based on search criteria and if their position is relevant on database. Tenderers are repositioned on the database upon appointment or upon submission of tender offer. |
| Open procedure                         | Tenderers may submit tender offers in response to an advertisement.                                                                            |
| Proposal Procedure (Two envelope system) | Tenderers submit technical and financial proposals in two envelopes; financial proposal is only opened and considered if it attains minimum threshold score. |
| Proposal Procedure (Two stage system)   | Tender offers are invited from those that submitted acceptable proposals based on revised procurement documents. Alternatively, a contract is negotiated with the tenderer scoring the highest number of points. |
| Qualified Procedure                     | A call for expressions of interest is advertised, and thereafter only those who have expressed interest, satisfy objective criteria and who are selected to submit tender offers, are invited to do so. |
| Quotation Procedure                     | Tender offers are solicited from not less than three tenderers in any manner the organization chooses, subject to the procedures being fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective. |
| Shopping Procedure                      | Obtain three written or verbal quotes and confirm the lowest offer.                                                                           |

Competitive Negotiation Procedure

| Procedure                              | Description                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Restricted Competitive Negotiations     | Tenderers who have expressed interest, satisfy objective criteria and who are selected to submit tender offers, are invited and the client evaluates offers and determines who may enter into competitive negotiations. |
| Open Competitive Negotiations           | The employer evaluates the offers and determines who may enter into competitive negotiations.                                                  |

4. Case Studies of Construction Projects Successfully Implemented in South Africa Using Different Categorizations of Non-Traditional Procurement Systems

Despite South Africa being a developing country, construction wise, South Africa has the potential to undertake both public and private sector construction projects using the categorization of universal procurement systems. This is evidenced by the empirical survey conducted by Grobler and Pretorius (1999). Their study has established that about 30% of the respondents agreed that the traditional procurement system has been the most used and favoured form of procurement system for housing delivery projects in South Africa. The pair further indicated in their report that 62% of both Building and Civil Engineering projects were delivered using the integrated type of procurement systems (Design and Build) and 8% of both Building and Civil Engineering projects were implemented using other forms of non-traditional procurement systems, with Construction Management using procurement systems the least.

Another empirical survey conducted by Mbanjwa and Basson (2003) indicates on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating no knowledge and 5 indicating excellent knowledge, that the traditional procurement system was rated the most favoured form of procurement systems, followed by construction management, management contracting ranked third, fourth being design and build (turnkey) and design and manage including (Build, Operate and Transfer) ranked fifth. However, the survey findings of Grobler and Pretorius (1999), Chege (April, 2001) and Mbanjwa and Basson (2003) indicate that some of the construction projects delivered locally used different categorization and innovative procurement systems.
5. Findings

The theory and literature review conducted during this study revealed that factors that influence the selection of procurement systems in South Africa are classified as either internal or external factors. Factors from the internal environment were further grouped into client characteristics and project characteristics. Client characteristic factors were found to consist of artificial factors (variables) such as the client’s level of knowledge, political and social consideration, familiarity with procurement systems, competition, funding arrangements, government (public)/private sector project, and risk allocation. Project characteristics were found to be artificial factors (variables) such as the size and technical complexity of the project, influences on the life cycle of the project, expedited project delivery, time, quality, and price certainty. Factors from the external environment comprised the following variables: market competition, information technology, regulatory environment, natural causes and globalisation.

The artificial factors obtained from the theory and literature review mentioned above were further subjected to an empirical survey consisting of 4 rounds of the Delphi method, which was used to obtain the participant’s level of comprehension with regard to various procurement systems as utilised within the South African construction industry. Because of the large number of variables collected from Round 1, a multivariate method known as factor analysis was used in Round 2. This method analyses and correlates the difficult-to-interpret variables into fewer conceptual, meaningful and relatively independent variables.

5.1 Analysis of Round 2

A 5-point Likert scale was used to obtain the participant’s opinions in Round 2, and the results of Round 2 were then descriptively and inferentially analysed. Descriptively, the means and standard deviation scores were computed in order to determine the variability of the spread of data as shown in table 2.

Table 2: The descriptive statistics of all the factors collected from Round 1.

| No | Variables                                      | Obs. | Min   | Max   | Mean | Std Deviation |
|----|------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|---------------|
| 1  | Client’s level of knowledge                    | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 4.105| 1.449         |
| 2  | Influence of the life cycle of the project     | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 2.895| 1.696         |
| 3  | Government/Private sector project              | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.579| 1.427         |
| 4  | Political consideration                        | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.368| 1.707         |
| 5  | Expedited project delivery/time constraints    | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 2.895| 1.883         |
| 6  | Corruption/self enrichment                     | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 4.053| 1.433         |
| 7  | Size and technical complexity of the project   | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 4.368| 0.955         |
| 8  | Funding arrangements                           | 19   | 4.000 | 5.000 | 4.158| 0.375         |
| 9  | Familiarity of procurement system              | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.947| 1.129         |
| 10 | Affirmative action/government policies         | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.158| 1.740         |
| 11 | Competition                                    | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.579| 1.644         |
| 12 | Risk allocation/reduction                      | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 4.105| 1.979         |
| 13 | Client’s specific requirements                 | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.579| 1.427         |
| 14 | Client’s budget/cash flow                     | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 4.053| 1.177         |
| 15 | Lack of resources                              | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.211| 1.960         |
| 16 | Markets/economic conditions                    | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.316| 1.336         |
| 17 | Political influences/interferences             | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.579| 1.427         |
| 18 | Unemployment/lack of skilled labours          | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.737| 1.327         |
| 19 | Emerging technology                            | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.368| 1.707         |
| 20 | Globalization                                  | 19   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 3.158| 1.425         |
Inferential statistics were also computed in order to determine whether all the participants had been drawn from the same population. Two tests, namely Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and Standardised Cronbach’s Alpha (α) for the entire input data set were computed producing satisfactory results.

After the lengthy steps of principal factor analysis for Round 2 had been performed, it was established that within a set of 20 variables, only 12 variables could be extracted for further consideration. The determination of the number of factors to be retained for further consideration was based on the Kaiser criterion (Kaiser, 1960) supplemented by Cattell’s scree test plot (Cattell, 1966) which suggests that only factors with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.00 are retained for further interpretation, and later suggests to dropping all factors immediately after the break or elbow as they are considered to contain debris information as shown in table 3 and figure 1.

Table 3: Eigenvalues, variability and cumulative variability before Varimax rotation

| Factors | Eigenvalues | Variability (%) | Cumulative (%) |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| F1      | 4.989       | 24.947          | 24.947         |
| F2      | 4.602       | 23.010          | 47.952         |
| F3      | 2.475       | 12.375          | 60.332         |
| F4      | 1.232       | 6.159           | 66.491         |
| F5      | 1.124       | 5.620           | 72.111         |
| F6      | 0.898       | 4.488           | 76.598         |
| F7      | 0.760       | 3.801           | 80.400         |
| F8      | 0.416       | 2.082           | 82.482         |
| F9      | 0.226       | 1.130           | 83.611         |
| F10     | 0.155       | 0.776           | 84.388         |
| F11     | 0.045       | 0.223           | 84.610         |
| F12     | 0.004       | 0.019           | 84.629         |

Figure 1: A scree plot from principal factor analysis
5.2 Factor Rotation

Factor rotation is the process of holding the point constants and mainly rotating the axes. The purpose of this operation is to provide a more meaningful interpretation of the factor solution (http://www.qualtrics.co.za). In this study a Varimax rotation was employed, which is an orthogonal rotation which produces uncorrelated factors on the factor axis in order to maximize the variance of the squared loadings. After Varimax rotation, meaningful artificial factor loadings or variables that cross-loaded on more than one factor were scratched out because they were considered to be deceitful measures of any one construct. Variables dropped out include V4, V6, V11, V12, V15 and V18 as shown in table 4.

Table 4: Factor pattern (loadings) obtained after Varimax rotation that cross-loaded on more than one factor

| Code | Variable description                                      | D1    | D2    | D3    | D4    | D5    |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| V1   | Client’s level of knowledge                             | -0.339| 0.791 | 0.107 | 0.173 | 0.277 |
| V2   | Influence of the life cycle of the project              | 0.214 | 0.178 | -0.166| -0.068| 0.848 |
| V3   | Government/Private sector project                       | 0.814 | 0.095 | -0.066| -0.208| 0.112 |
| V4   | Political consideration                                 | 0.944 | -0.137| -0.082| 0.267 | -0.068|
| V5   | Expedited project delivery/time constraints             | 0.768 | -0.441| -0.038| -0.027| 0.031 |
| V6   | Corruption/self enrichment                              | 0.743 | 0.327 | 0.014 | -0.394| -0.405|
| V7   | Size & technical complexity of the project              | -0.116| 0.039 | -0.387| -0.165| 0.407 |
| V8   | Funding arrangements                                    | 0.092 | -0.179| 0.073 | -0.459| 0.076 |
| V9   | Familiarity of procurement system                       | 0.123 | -0.124| 0.130 | 0.271 | 0.073 |
| V10  | Affirmative action/government policies                  | 0.378 | 0.222 | -0.037| -0.548| 0.183 |
| V11  | Competition                                             | -0.202| 0.692 | 0.401 | 0.394 | -0.116|
| V12  | Risk allocation/reduction                               | 0.173 | 0.497 | -0.039| 0.580 | -0.482|
| V13  | Client’s specific requirements                          | -0.047| 0.950 | -0.121| -0.088| 0.026 |
| V14  | Client’s budget/cash flow                               | -0.130| 0.269 | 0.624 | 0.042 | -0.121|
| V15  | Lack of resources                                       | 0.462 | 0.270 | 0.313 | 0.602 | -0.037|
| V16  | Markets/economic conditions                             | 0.695 | 0.062 | 0.173 | -0.112| 0.264 |
| V17  | Political influences/interferences                       | -0.047| 0.950 | -0.121| -0.088| 0.026 |
| V18  | Unemployment/lack of skilled labours                    | -0.023| 0.453 | -0.749| 0.030 | 0.060 |
| V19  | Emerging technology                                     | 0.944 | -0.137| -0.082| 0.267 | -0.068|
| V20  | Globalization                                           | 0.356 | 0.816 | 0.066 | 0.091 | 0.023 |

5.3 Interpretation and Naming of Surviving Variables

A 0.40 factor loading was used as a cut-off point (Stevens, 1986), therefore the surviving variables with factor loadings of 0.40 or higher (Stevens, 1986) were considered further for interpretation and naming. The interpretation and naming of factors implied that the remaining or surviving variables with high factor loadings and common conceptual meanings were grouped together to form a genuine independent factor. Table 5 provides a summary of rotated factor patterns. After the grouping, naming and interpretation, 5 newly established factors were identified and are considered to be significant factors that influence the selection of procurement systems in the South African construction industry.
Table 5: Significant factors obtained from the surviving variables after factor analysis

| Factor Code | Variable Code | Variable description                        | Factor loadings | Factor scores |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| D1          | V3            | Political considerations                    | 0.94            | 4             | 3.269         |
|             | V4            | Public/Private sector projects              | 0.81            | 4             |               |
|             | V16           | Market/Economic conditions                  | 0.76            | 8             |               |
|             | V19           | Emerging technology                         | 0.74            | 3             |               |
| D2          | V13           | Client’s specific requirements              | 0.95            | 0             | 3.501         |
|             | V17           | Political interferences                     | 0.95            | 0             |               |
|             | V20           | Globalization                               | 0.81            | 6             |               |
|             | V1            | Client’s level of knowledge                 | 0.79            | 1             |               |
| D3          | V14           | Client’s budget/Cash flow                   | 0.62            | 4             | 0.624         |
| D4          | V8            | Affirmative Action/Government policies      |                | -0.548        |               |
|             | V10           | Funding arrangements                        |                | -0.459        | -1.007        |
| D5          | V2            | Influence of the life cycle of the project  |                | 0.848         | 1.255         |
|             | V7            | Size and technical complexity of project    |                | 0.407         |               |

5.3.1 Factor 1(D1): Socio-economic consideration

Factor 1(D1) is derived from four variables, namely political considerations (0.944), government (public) or private sector project (0.814), market or economic conditions (0.768) and emerging technology (0.743). Three (3) variables have the highest loading of this factor relating to political and economic issues, therefore this factor can be referred to as ‘socio-economic conditions’. This factor is assessed as reliable and valid at Chronbach’s-Coefficient Alpha ($\alpha$) = 0.910 with a 2nd highest factor score of 3.269.

5.3.2 Factor 2(D2): Client requirements

Factor 2 (D2) for client requirements account for 23.27% of total variance, and variables loading on this factor include: client’s specific requirements (0.950), political interferences (influences) (0.950), globalization (0.816) and the client’s level of knowledge (0.791). Three variables that have the highest factor loadings seem to have common conceptual meaning which clients of the construction industry deem to be the prerequisites prior to making any procurement decision. Therefore, this factor can be referred to as ‘client requirements’. This factor is also assessed as reliable and valid at Chronbach’s-Coefficient Alpha ($\alpha$) = 0.916 with a highest factor score of 3.501.
5.3.3 Factor 3(D3): Capital cost

Factor 3 (D3) accounts for 7.5% of the total variance with a factor loading of 0.624; however, it is difficult to interpret this factor, since only one variable loads on it. One thing clear about this factor is that it is a client- and cost-related factor. If this factor measures capital cost, it would be related to variables of Factor 2. More variables would need to be loaded on this factor to interpret it in a conclusive manner. It will, however, be referred to as ‘capital cost’. Since questions were invalidly answered, they had to be omitted as being unreliable; Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) = -0.759. Factor 3 (D3) is the 2nd lowest ranked with a factor score of 0.624. It must, however, be borne in mind that a high or low degree of internal consistency of the Cronbach’s Alpha (α) does not directly address the major concerns about the data except that judges were not consistent when rating this factor.

5.3.4 Factor 4 (D4): Procurement policy

Factor 4(D4) accounts for 9.409% of the total variance and is derived from two negative variables, namely affirmative action/government policy (-0.548) and funding arrangements (-0.459). Both of the two (2) variables relate to the Preferential Procurement Framework Act (Act 5 of 2000) and the Broad-Based Economic Empowerment Act (Act 53 of 2003). The former focuses on the participation of targeted enterprises and labour in the performance contract and the latter focuses on promoting social and economic goals, including developing criteria or strategies for entering into partnerships with the private sector. Therefore this factor can be referred to as ‘procurement policy’. This factor had a Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) = -0.088. Factor 4 (D4) has the lowest ranked factor score of -1.007.

5.3.5 Factor 5 (D5): Project characteristics

Factor 5(D5) is derived from two variables that constitute 7.655% of the total variance, namely influences on the life cycle of the project (0.848) and size and technical complexity of the project (0.407). The two (2) variables loading onto this factor are those that are project related, therefore this factor can be referred to as ‘project characteristics’. This factor is moderately reliable at Chronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) = 0.608 with a factor score of 1.255.

5.4 Analysis of Round 3

The utility value scores based on table 10 of various procurement systems are compared to the 5 factors using a scale of 1 to 11, with 1 representing the least significant and 11 representing the most significant. The results indicate that:

Procurement policy (D4) with a utility value of 76.30 being the most significant factor,
Project characteristics (D5) with a utility value of 74.55 is ranked 2nd most significant factor,
Socio-economic consideration (D1) with a utility value of 73.45 is ranked 3rd,
Capital cost/cash flow (D3) with a utility value of 70.86 is ranked 4th,
Client requirements (D2) is ranked 5th with a utility value of 67.26.

Further, to the significance level of each factor, Kendall’s Coefficient of Concordance (W) was computed in order to assess the level of agreement among experts (judges). According to Legendre (2005), variables or experts are in total agreement when H0≤W≤H1, where one (1) indicates perfect agreement and zero (0) no agreement. The test results of Kendall’s Coefficient of Concordance (W) = 0.657 for this study were computed, and suggest a moderate level of consistency among the respondents.
5.5 Analysis of Round 4

Round 4 was basically a refinement of Round 3, except that the same utility value scores were re-sent to all the participants of Round 3 to re-evaluate their utility value scores. If a utility value score(s) different from those registered in Round 3 is observed, a mean utility value score different from the one in Round 3 was to be computed. However, all the participants in Round 4 committed to their initial scores.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

It is evident from this study that the South African construction industry has done exceptionally well in implementing world-class projects successfully while utilising various procurement systems. Based on the findings of the literature review and empirical survey findings, it was established after factor analysis that 5 factors significantly influence the selection of procurement systems. The 5 factors in the order of importance in terms of their utility value scores are: procurement policy, project characteristics, socio-economic considerations, project characteristics, capital cost, and client requirements.

The study further revealed that, although the procurement choice or the utility value (level of satisfaction) by different procurement decision makers is not in total agreement with each other, the utility value of any particular procurement type does not have a significant influence on the choice of procurement system. Based on the above, the following implementation measures are recommended:

Construction planners, managers and all other stakeholders involved in procurement decision-making should formulate a systematic selection approach, as this will assist in the elimination of unnecessary project demands.

Clear contractual arrangements should be set out right from the start as this will consequently assist with the determination of responsibilities of all the project participants.

All clients of the construction industry, whether from the public or the private sector, should familiarise themselves with various procurement systems as this will assist them in making well-informed procurement decisions.

Client’s actual needs, requirements, objectives and project goals must be accurately conveyed to the project team in order to enable the project team to develop a sound procurement strategy.

The procurement selection criteria should contain contingency measures in order to counteract any unforeseen circumstances, should these factors present themselves to the project.

A clear ‘general strategy’ should be established at a very early (planning) stage of the project which will determine broadly what has to be done, how it must be done, by whom it must be done, where it must be done and when it must be done.

However, it must be borne in mind that the main focus of this study was not on investigating the most appropriate procurement selection criteria, but rather on investigating the factors that influence the selection of procurement systems. Therefore, further research that will focus on selection criteria of procurement systems in South Africa should be considered.
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