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Abstract

Disputes are common in construction projects because of the complexity of the construction process and the imperfect of the design and moreover, it takes so many individuals and companies to construct a project. Dispute also occur through accidents (Injury), mismanagement, human error, disagreement or lack of communication. Dispute affect the cash flows of the company and also affects relationships between parties. This paper investigated the construction stakeholder’s perception on alternative dispute resolution in the construction industry of Swaziland. The data used in this study were derived from both primary and secondary sources. The secondary data for the study were derived from the review of literature. The primary data were obtained through the use of a structured questionnaire which was distributed to client (government), contractor, subcontractor and consultant representatives (quantity surveyor, civil engineer, architects, project managers and mechanical and electrical engineers); only organizations registered with the ministry of public works and transport in Swaziland and other professional bodies were surveyed. A total of 90 questionnaires were distributed, while only 63 were received back which represent a response rate of 70%, these data formed the basis of this study. Frequency analyze and various statistics procedures were used to analyze the returned questionnaire data.

Findings enacting from the survey revealed that the best mechanism of alternative dispute resolution in the Swaziland construction industry were arbitration, negotiation, mediation and dispute resolution that can be used to resolve construction dispute promptly. Litigation, adjudication and conciliation were not the best mechanism as per the opinion from the respondent. In-terms of effective and efficient dispute mechanism used to resolve dispute in construction project in Swaziland it was arbitration, dispute resolution boards, litigation, mediation and adjudication. The results of this study contribute to the body of knowledge and provides valuable insight to the knowledge the respondent had about the alternative dispute resolution mechanism. The study recommends that every stakeholder in the Swaziland construction industry familiarize themselves with the alternative dispute resolution available to resolve construction dispute promptly and cost efficient
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1. Introduction

The construction industry is one of the most diverse and unstable sector within the economy. It faces fluctuation demand cycles, project specific product demands, uncertain production conditions and it combines a diverse range of specialist skills (Maturana, 2004 & Cakmak & Cakmak, 2013). The construction industry is unique and complex to other industries as it involves many participants in all trends, due to this, conflict and disputes can easily occur for example; through changes in plans, quantities, or details of construction which are inherent in the nature of construction (United State Army Corps, 2004).

The construction industry works involves thing that are hidden beneath the ground and those hidden things may not actually be as had been anticipated. Furthermore, with the best of intention the plans may not work as expected when they are applied to the actual site. Disputes are common in construction projects because of the complexity of the construction process and the imperfect of the design and moreover, it takes so many individuals and companies to construct a project. Dispute also occur through accidents (Injury), mismanagement, human error, disagreement or lack of communication. Dispute affect the cash flows of the company and also affects relationships between parties (Fenn et al. 1997). The occurrence of construction disputes can lead to negative impact towards an organisation. The construction work progress will be slow due to disputes between the contractor and client. Subsequently, the cash flow (Love et al. 2007).

Construction disputes has an effect on all stakeholders which may lead to inequitable mode of project delivery such as reducing the profit margins, increased cost, reduced quality and level of service (Motsa, 2002). Most minor disputes are usually settled quickly, fairly and amicably by the building team through negotiations. However, serious issues that can’t be solved through negotiations then it can be solved through alternative dispute resolution mechanism which are mediation, arbitration and litigation (Hall, 2002). Moreover, consequences of construction disputes will definitely not benefit the stakeholder in the construction project of Swaziland.

There has been a considerable research done to determine Alternative dispute resolution used in the construction industry and consistently the same variables are identified and continue to manifest. However, the has been a gap in investigation of professional opinion within the construction industry of the most preferred ADR used to resolve construction dispute efficiently in Swaziland Construction industry. Disputes have become an endemic feature of the Swaziland construction industry. Hence, this paper aims to evaluate the use of ADR to resolve construction dispute in construction projects in Swaziland.

2. Swaziland construction industry

The construction companies operating in Swaziland range from small local contractors to major companies with the capability to carry out highly specialized projects. The large contractors employ about 20,000 people. The range of work undertaken in the construction industry covers small buildings,
multi-level projects, roads, dams and infrastructure. Therefore, the CI is a key source of work and income in the Kingdom. The overall contribution to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by the construction industry was 5.8% in 2002, but it has dropped down to 2.8% in 2013 (Swaziland Business year book 2002, Central bank of Swaziland).

Government is the major client in the construction industry of Swaziland. The ministry of Public Works and Transport is the Government’s implementing agency on behalf of all ministries with regard to all construction capital projects (Mvubu & Thwala, 2009). The Swaziland Government through the ministry of Public Works and Transport also has a responsibility to educate contractors and subcontractors about government’s expectations of the quality of work; the process of tendering and the information required (Mvubu & Thwala, 2009). The Government of the kingdom of Swaziland, through its 25-year National Development Strategy has identified the construction sector as a priority area to provide the impetus to improve the social and economic development of the country. However, the Agriculture industry is the one that leads by contributing more to the economy of the country.

3. Literature review

3.1 Dispute

Dispute is defined as an assertion of opposing views or claims or disagreement as to rights (Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of law, 1996). Dispute can be caused by negligence in understanding the terms in the contract, for example disputes on misunderstanding and also payment (Thomas, 1992 & 1994). Reid and Ellis (2007), in a paper titled ‘Common sense applied to the definition of a dispute’ make the argument that there is no definitive meaning of dispute and a dispute according to Reid and Ellis doesn’t not exist until a claim has been submitted and rejected, a claim being a request for compensation for damages incurred by any party to the contract. The definition of Dispute is a problem or disagreement between the parties that cannot be resolved by on jobsite or on-site project managers. Moreover, the definition carries the emphasis on jobsite or on-site disputes are firstly seen as occurring on site then escalating upwards through the organizational hierarchy (Love, et al 2007).

3.2. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

There is an extensive range of dispute resolution techniques and processes available to a disputing party. Most of the time, parties will identify at the beginning of the contract the process of resolving the dispute if it occurs. There are different procedures which the parties are exposed and can choose from and range from traditional court processes to alternative dispute resolution (Fenn, et al, 1998). Dispute resolution process can fall into two main categories non-binding and binding and literature suggest that these types of process produce successful outcomes (Madden, 2001). Non-binding process are beneficially for the disputing participant and the industry because they produce acceptable result in a cost efficient and timely manner (Finlay, 1998). Disputes should be quickly addressed and resolved for the well-being of the project and to minimize disruption of the design and building process. If the dispute
cannot be resolved by the parties, various methods of resolution are offered that include settlement, mediation, arbitration, and litigation (Frederick at el., 2001). Following is a discussion of the different dispute resolution used in the construction industry to resolve dispute:

3.2.1 Settlement of disputes

Disputes between two parties should be addressed quickly and, if at all possible, a settlement should be rendered and recorded. Settlement can be in the form of monetary adjustment or payments, free services on behalf of the architect to remedy or correct an error or such other agreement between the two parties. It is recommended that this method of dispute resolution be used whenever possible to avoid time, cost and anguish, which can occur as a result ADR (Frederick at el., 2001:17). An advantageous dispute resolution process will ideally seek to settle a dispute with an acceptable outcome within the least amount of time, as cost effective as possible, with the least amount of resources and hopefully the preservation of the working relationship between both parties (Maden 2001).

3.2.2 Negotiation

Negotiation is one of the most common form of alternative dispute resolution and most cost effective and most reliable form of dispute resolution. Many authors agree that it is the most preferred dispute resolution systems used in the construction industry. Negotiation can be defined as a basic means of getting what you want from others, or a consensual process requiring a willingness of both parties to understand the other stand point (Love et al. 2007:30). Negotiation is defined as a private, voluntary and consensual process whereby parties attempt to resolve their differences personally by agreement (Havenga, 2010:286). One of the benefits of this process is that both the discussion and the outcome can remain confidential, unless negotiations are in the public interest (for example labour or trade negotiations). In negotiations, the parties attempt to reach an acceptable resolution of their dispute without outside intervention. This is a distinction between negotiation and mediation or arbitration, in both the latter instance, a third party is involved (Havenga, 2010:286).

3.2.3 Mediation

Mediation, conciliation are terms used to describe dispute resolution process, that involves assistant negotiation through the use of third party who is neutral (Love et al., 2007:32). However, these processes are usually employed once the dispute has passed through the administrative procedures and negotiations have proved unsuccessfully. Moreover, any unsettled dispute can be escalated to more formally binding process including litigation (Love et al., 2007:32).

Mediation is the process by which the participants, together with the assistance of a neutral person or persons, systematically isolate disputed issues in order to develop options, consider alternatives, and reach a consensual settlement that will accommodate their needs (Love et al, 2007, Holtham et al.,2009 & Havenga, 2010)). Mediator is a circuit breaker, because they intervene and suppress should the situation become aggressive and they are commonly trained in communications and negotiation skills,
can commonly come from law or social working industries. The resolution process is more to provide evidence in separate meeting with the mediator (Havenga, 2010).

Figure 1: Model for Mediation Process (Source: Love et al, 2007:32)

The mediation process

- Nomination of the mediator
- Confirmation of appointment & possible preliminary conference
- Full meeting with the mediator & all other parties
- Use private meetings (caucus)
- Full meeting for the parties to put formal proposal to each other
- Final full meeting to agree on the resolution or to decide that there can be no resolution

- This may be done by mutual agreement of the parties or through a nominating body
- The party will present their position and the matters to be mediated they see them
- In the caucus meeting, the mediator can hear information and discuss possible solutions in private
- The process may be repeated several times

3.2.4 Expert determination

Expert determination is a process in which the parties to dispute present arguments and evidence to neutral third party chosen on the basis of their specialist qualification or experience on the subject matter of the dispute (Love et al, 2007 & Fenn et al 1998). The task of the expert is to provide an objective independent and impartial assessment of the dispute through the investigation of facts or issues presented by the disputing parties. However, the judgement provided is a decision based on fact and not the personal opinion of the expert (Love et al, 2007:33). However, the process by which the expert structures the investigation is primarily governed by the expert and usually conditionally on the type of dispute in question (Jones, 1998). The expert may meet privately with each party, together with both parties or determine the merits of the dispute purely through assessment of facts and statements (Fenn, 1998). This process is advantageous where the dispute is technical in nature, contractual, valuation of the work or specialist area of work (Love, et al, 2007:34). The processes beneficial where the communication
between the disputing parties has determinate and direct negotiation impractical (Jones, 1998). Expect
determination has certain advantages over mediation in that it satisfies the participants needs for an
impartial assessment consequently giving the process a more equitable appeal (Love et al, 2007:34).

3.2.5 Dispute Resolution boards

Dispute resolution boards must be established at the project onset. Potential candidates for the
board must be identified and appointed. Client and contractors tend not to focus on disputes at start of
the project and when a dispute does arise they tend to take considerable time reaching agreement on the
members and establishment of the board (Gould, 2006). The Board members must be impartial and have
wide ranging expertise with excellent communication and management skills. It is also imperative that
board members are available for the duration of the project to deal with matters promptly (Jones, 1996)).
Dispute resolution board is a panel of three standing neutral advisors chosen by both the owner and the
contractor prior to initiation of construction (Peck and Dalland, 2007). Usually, the panel conducts
routine site visits to monitor construction progress, as well as assist the owner and the contractor to
resolve any outstanding issues and avoid their escalation to a disputes that night have adverse effects on
the project schedule budget and quality. However, the Board should meet at least 3 times a year, and the
function of the board should be to nip in the bud problems before they develop into disputes (Gaistskell,
2005).

3.2.6. Arbitration

Arbitration is the ADR technique most similar to litigation, however, instead of presenting the
case to a judge or Jury, summary presentations are made by both side to one or a panel of neutral
arbitrators (Havenga, 2010). Many of the same procedures used in litigation, such as discovery and
preliminary motions, are used in arbitration. However, arbitrators have the power to direct those
processes (Hinds,1998). Arbitration decisions are considering binding, unless previously agreed upon to
be non-binding (Eilenberg, 2003). However, the outcomes of arbitration provide a satisfactory outcome,
this is outweighed by the excessive cost, adversarial process and long waiting periods for hearings (Love
et al, 2007:37). There are defined advantageous of using arbitration such advantages over court action
such as confidentiality as the hearings are a private determinative process and the findings are not
published, flexibility and convenience. The process is also final and binding and is heard by single or
panel of expert in the relevant field (Havenga, 2010).

3.2.7 Mini Trials

Concept of the mini-trials is that by presenting the facts of both sides of the case to top executives
from both sides and educating them on the strength and weakness of the case, they will ultimately resolve
the matter. This method provides them, probable for the first time, with the necessary information to
make a complete assessment of the risks and cost of going to trial. In the Mini-Trial lawyers make the
abbreviated presentation which are usually also heard by neutral advisor, usually a retired judge or an
authority on the technical issues in the case (Havenga, 2010). However, a mini trial is not a trial at all but a structured nonbinding settlement procedure which effectively incorporates many of the adversarial aspects of arbitration and the negotiation aspect of mediation. The main difference, however, is that the mini-trial focuses on allowing executive level management to resolve the disputes. This concept strives to reduce the dispute to a business decision rather than a complex legal question (Havenga, 2010).

4. Research Methodology

The data used in this paper were derived from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data was obtained through the survey method, while the secondary data was derived from the review of literature and archival records. The primary data was obtained through the use of a structured questionnaire survey. This was distributed to a total of 90 construction professionals that included; client (government), contractors, consultants’ representative’s quantity surveyors, civil engineers, architect, etc who are currently involved in construction of public projects in Swaziland. Out of the 90 questionnaires sent out, 63 were received back representing 70% response rate. This was considered adequate for the analysis based on the affirmation of Mcneill & Chapman, (2005) since the result of a survey could be considered as biased and of little value if the return rate was lower than 30 to 40%. The data presentation and analysis made use of frequency distributions and percentages of all the respondents. The research was conducted between the months of June to August, 2014.

4.1 Analysis

In this study, The quantitative data collected was analysed with Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) a computer programme which is used for analysing data concerned with social phenomena. The software was used to generate various statistical, including descriptive statistic, which provides a basic summary of all variables in the data (Henn et al., 2006). The benefits of using SPSS is that it allows for scoring and analysing quantitative data at speed and it can also be used to perform multivariate analysis. SPSS also helps to present the data in a logical format (Babbie, 2004:398) thereby reducing time spent on calculating scores. However, accuracy in results is highly dependent on inputs, hence the need to accurately capture data from the questionnaire.

Furthermore, a 5-point Likert type scale was also used to evaluate the effects of construction dispute and the use of ADR in the Swaziland construction industry with regard to the identified factors from the reviewed literature. The adopted scale read as follows, 1= Never, 2= rarely, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often and 5= Always. The five-point scale was transformed to mean item score (MIS) for each of the factors as assessed by the respondents. The indices were then used to determine the rank each item. Following the mathematical computations, the criteria are then ranked in descending order of their relative importance index (from the highest to the lowest). The Mean Item Score (MIS) was derived from the following formula (Lim and Alum, 1995).

\[
MIS = \frac{1n1 + 2n2 + 3n3 + 4n4 + 5n5}{\Sigma N}
\]

Where;

\( n_i \quad = \quad \text{number of respondents for strongly disagree} \)
5. Findings and Discussion

Findings from the 63 respondent revealed that 63% were males and 37% were female. Further findings revealed that 32% of the respondents were civil engineers, 28% of the responded were quantity surveyors, 25% were construction managers, and 12% were project manager and construction project manager, 3% were electrical engineers, site managers and health and safety. Most of the respondent had a working experience of more than 5 years, 60% of the respondent had 5 or more years, 32% had 4 years experience, 13% had 3 years’ experience, 3% had 2 years and lastly 2% had 1-year experience. Respondent who were involved in civil and building projects were 44.6%, 27.7% of the respondent were involved in buildings, 10.8% were involved in civil work only, 9.2% were involved in electrical work, 6.2% were in Mechanical work and lastly 1.5% were involved in other projects. Respondent on the value of work executed were 37% who had executed 100-200million, 200 million were 24%, 21% had executed 10-20 million, 18% of the respondent had executed 20-100 million and 2% had executed 2-5 million. 59% Respondent had 5 or more construction dispute, 19% had encounter 3 dispute, 10% had encountered 2 & 4 dispute, and 3% had encounter one dispute

5.1 Preferred ADR mechanism for resolving construction disputes

Respondent were asked based on their opinion which was the best mechanism that can be used to resolve construction dispute. Most respondent, about 58.7% believed that arbitration is the most preferred mechanism that can resolve construction dispute promptly in Swaziland construction industry; 14.3% of the respondent felt that negotiation can also be used; followed by mediation and dispute resolution at 12.7%. Lastly respondent felt that litigation at 7.9%; Adjudication at 6.3% and conciliation at 4.8% were not the best mechanism to resolve construction disputes in Swaziland construction projects (Figure 2)
Respondent were asked to rank the effective and efficient dispute mechanism used to resolve dispute in construction project in Swaziland. Most respondent, ranked Arbitration the highest with a mean of 3.29 and standard deviation (SD)= 0.982; dispute resolution boards ranked second with a mean score of 2.95 and SD= 0.931; Litigation was ranked third with a mean score of 2.61 and SD= 1.030; Mediation was ranked fourth with a mean score of 2.56 and SD= 0.969. However, Adjudication was ranked fifth with a mean score of 2.49 and SD= 0.887; dispute resolution was ranked sixth with a mean score of 2.48 and SD= 0.893 and Negotiation was ranked last with a mean score of 2.27 and SD= 1.162 (Table 1)

**Table 1: Effective and efficient mechanism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma X$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute resolution boards</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute resolution</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\sigma X$ = Standard deviation; $\bar{x}$ = Mean item score; R = Rank
6. Conclusion and Recommendation

6.1 Conclusion

From the study we have seen that arbitration was the preferred mechanism that can solve construction dispute, followed by negotiation and mediation were the most preferred mechanism in Swaziland construction industry. The findings on the effective and efficient dispute resolution mechanism the respondent ranked arbitration, dispute resolution boards, followed by litigation. However, mediation, negotiation and adjudication were ranked the list, the respondent felt that it was not an efficient and effective method to resolve construction dispute.

6.2 Recommendation

The study has revealed research gap which might be fruitfully pursued, such as the use of ADR to resolve construction dispute. Most of the stake holders require to be taught about the benefit of ADR.

6.3 Strategies to avoid disputes

From the discussion above, it is recommended that the use of Alternative dispute resolution should be emphasis by the government as the major client for public project, by way of having workshops annually with an emphasis on to dispute avoidance and the mechanism to use for resolving construction dispute, especial negotiation and mediation since they are cost effective and fast if the parties involve can cooperate
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