

Factors Influencing Quantity Surveying Services Performance in Nigeria

Esther Ilori Ebunoluwa and Grace Kehinde Ojo*

*Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Environmental Design and Management,
Obafemi Awolowo
University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.*

**Corresponding author. E-mail: owoyemi_esther@yahoo.com*

Received: 16 Apr 2020

Reviewed: 23 Mei 2020

Accepted: 12 June 2020

ABSTRACT

Quantity surveying profession is faced with great challenges concerning recognition and survival in Nigeria. Usually, this could be overcome by being proactive in dealing with factors that could influence their services performance. Quiet numbers of factors are affecting the performance of quantity surveying firms in Nigeria; which makes their survival to be a matter of concern to the researchers. Therefore, this paper evaluated the extent to which the performance of quantity surveying firms is being influenced by internal and environmental factors with a view to increasing the recognition and survival of the firm in the competitive business environment. Employee quantity surveyors assessed internal factors while employers of quantity surveying firms assessed external factors. One hundred and thirty-one (131) respondents comprising eighty-five (85) employees and forty-six (46) employers of registered quantity surveying firms were sampled randomly. Data were collected through administration of questionnaire on influencing factors; the collected data were subjected to mean analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings showed that lack of recognition of the employees by the management influenced the performance of employees mostly; the employees agreed on the influence of this factor on the overall performance of firm. On external factors, findings revealed that technological changes and tough competition have high level of influence on the performance of quantity surveying firms in the built environment. In addition, the employers have similar view on the influence of these factors @ $p > 0.05$. The study concluded that lack of recognizing the employees by the firm, technological changes and tough competition influenced the performance of quantity surveying services in Nigeria; these factors had affected the recognition of quantity surveying profession in the competitive environment. Therefore, the factors should be given adequate and prompt consideration so as to minimize their adverse effects on the survival of Quantity Surveying Firms in Nigeria.

Keyword: *Employee Quantity Surveyors, Employers, Quantity Surveying Firms, Services Performance, Influencing Factors.*

INTRODUCTION

Factor influencing the performance of Quantity Surveying Firms (QSFs) in terms of quality of services delivered is a critical issue that needs to be examined and evaluated for the survival of the firms in the competitive business environment. Certain factors influencing the performance of an organization could either stem from employees of the firms or the employer. In other words, factors influencing firms' performance could be traced to the elements inside and outside of the firms, which

Dragnic (2013) and Voiculet, Belu, Parpandel and Rizea (2010) described as internal and external factors. Internal factors could be a combination of human resources, culture of the firm, structure of the firm, management style and way of exercising authority over employees. These factors can be controlled by the planning and management of the firm so as to reduce their adverse effects on the performance of the employees and the firm. Diamantidis and Chatzoglou, (2018) establish that lack of supporting and appreciating employees in an organization have negative impact on their performance. Additionally, an industry does not operate in a space, hence, there is need for firm to adjust themselves in relation to environmental factors. The environment in which QSFs operate changes constantly and this change is inevitable (Emeka and Eyuche, 2014). Some of these environmental (external) factors include tough completion, economic conditions, political issue, technological advances and legal problem among others. These factors might not be easy to control by the firm. Recent development in Adagba and Shakpande (2017) showed that firms and businesses have not adequate and direct control on environmental factors. Challenges, problems, successes, opportunities and failures of any firm depend mainly on the ability of the firm to adapt to changing conditions (Wong and Mohd, 2013; Adagba and Shakpande, 2017). Therefore, for any company (QSFs in this case) to perform excellently in the competitive business environment, there is need for them to be proactive in dealing with the factors that could influence their performances.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As earlier stated, quantity surveying profession is faced with great challenges concerning recognition and survival in Nigeria (Oyegoke, 2006; Olaniyi *et al.*, 2011). Several studies have shown that there are number of factors that are preventing construction quantity surveyors from performing excellently, among which are; stringent codes of ethics, lack of marketing know-how, difficulty in measuring marketing performance (Ogbu, 2015); lack of management commitment (Abdul Aziz & Wai, 2008) and incompatibility of marketing with professional ethics (Abdul Aziz & Wai, 2008). Equally are absence of good marketing strategies in quantity surveying firms (Kadiri and Ayodele, 2013), lack of understanding and acceptance of marketing concepts (Abdul Aziz and Wai, 2008), political connection and professional-client relationship (Preece *et al.*, 2007; Ojo, 2011; Ebunoluwa, 2015). However, organisation performances are usually influenced by the behaviour of the employees, which invariably influence the overall performance of the firm. Additionally, environmental factors also influenced the performance of an organisation. Factors influencing the services performance of quantity surveying firms were assessed from employers' perspective (external factors) and employees' perspective (internal factors).

Internal Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

Like other employees in other sectors of the economy, employees of quantity surveying firms also face challenges in their day to day activities, which in turn affect the performance of the firms. The review of literature shows that the major problems faced by employees of many companies, including quantity surveying firms, are lack of recognition by management, inadequate logistics to work with, poor working conditions and environment, difficult targets to achieve and poor remuneration among others (Agyapong *et al.*, 2014). The study of Harris (2002) reveals that work constraints are the skin tone of work environment that negatively affect job performance. Tarmidi and Arsjah (2019) argue that the performance of employee in any organisation has significant influence on the overall performance of the organisation either positively or negatively. Several studies such as Khan, Ahmed, Paul and Kazmi (2018), Rusu, and Avasilcai (2014) and Harris (2002) outline numerous factors that could affect the productivity and performance of employees in an organisation. Among are insufficient information from the firm, inappropriate tools and equipment, inadequate, training, missing materials or supplies, limited budget, insufficient support from others, insufficient task preparation, limited time, poor physical condition, and poor scheduling. The occurrence of these

factors may affect the overall objective of the organisation (Yankah, 2015). Table 1 highlighted these factors.

Table 1. Internal Factors Influencing the Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

Internal factors	Author(s)							
	Abdul-Aziz & Wai, 2008	Agyapong <i>et al</i> , n.d	Ebunoluwa 2015	Harri s 2000	Kadiri & Ayodele 2013	Ogbu 2015	Thom e 2017	Yankah 2015
Lack of recognition by the management		✓						
Inadequate logistics to work with		✓						
Poor working conditions and environment		✓		✓				
poor remuneration		✓						
Insufficient information from the firm				✓				
Inappropriate tools and equipment				✓				
Missing materials and supplies				✓				
Limited budget				✓				
Insufficient support from others				✓				
Insufficient task preparation				✓				
Limited time				✓				
Poor scheduling				✓				
Lack of marketing know-how						✓		✓
Lack of management commitment	✓							
absence of good marketing strategies								
Lack of accepting marketing concepts	✓				✓			
Political connection and contact (Preece <i>et al.</i> , 2007)								
Lack of in-house marketing expertise						✓		✓
Professional limitation								✓
Disdain of commercialism			✓					✓
Resource constraint							✓	✓
Lack of the required skills of the employees								✓
Inadequate budget for marketing activities								✓

Source: Author's Synthesis of Literature Review, 2019

External Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

Adagba and Shakpande (2017), Team (2013) and Anaele (2012) describe external challenges facing QSFs as the uncontrollable factors outside the organisation, which the firm has no control over, which affect its overall objectives. Jessee (n.d) establishes that politics, competitors, customers as well as weather are uncontrollable factors that can influence an organization’s performance. Despite the fact that firms do not have adequate control over the factors, they can still respond and adapt to the associated threats, using the firm’s controllable mix strategies from internal environment (Ulen, 2010). Furthermore, George (2017) suggests that it is necessary to plan for factors over which the firm has no control for an enhanced productivity. Uncontrollable factors that influence an organization may include a combination of competition, Government actions, natural forces, social and cultural forces, demographic factors, and technological changes among others (Janković, Mihajlović and Cvetković, 2016; Anaele, 2012). Additionally, Heiko, Anders and Lars (2011) link external factors affecting firms’ activities to munificence which has to do with scarce resources that should support the growth of the firm, the complexity of customers’ needs that face the organisation and lastly, the dynamism factor, which is concerned with the rate of change and instability of the environment. These factors impede the growth of firms significantly. In addition, Team (2013) describes external factors as factors that do not favour the achievement of organizational objectives; among them are competitors, price reduction, demographic alterations, new technology, government regulations, economic slumps and recession. Kowo, Olalekan and Popoola, (2018) suggest that firms should understand external factors and their implications on the performance of the firm in the competitive environment. In addition, Kuznetsova *et al.*(2017) submit that the use of strategic analysis methods for the assessment of external factors usually allow an organization to timely extract information about the business environment, hence, develop programs for the development of the organization. This will help the organisation in dealing with the factors. Table 2 summarized the external factors influencing the performance of quantity surveying services.

Table 2. External Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

External factors	Author(s)							
	Anael e 2012	Ebubolu wa 2015	Goerg e 2017	Heiko <i>et al.</i> 2011	Ogbu 2015	Olanrewa uju <i>et al.</i> 2013	Team 2013	Yanka h 2015
Competition	✓		✓				✓	
Government actions	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
Natural forces								
Stringent codes of ethics								
Professional limitation								✓
Social and cultural forces	✓		✓				✓	
Demographic factors	✓		✓				✓	
Technological changes	✓		✓				✓	
Scarce resources				✓				
Complexity of customers’ needs				✓				
Dynamism factors				✓				
Client sophisticated needs						✓		

Equating marketing with selling	✓
Disdain of commercialism	✓
Economic slumps and recession	✓

Source: Author's Synthesis of literature review, 2019

METHODOLOGY

The methods employed for this study included review of literature, questionnaire and a statistical analysis of the survey data. The questionnaires were design such that firm assessed external factors while employees (2 per firm) assessed internal factors. Two sets of questionnaires were designed for the two categories of respondents (employers and employees). The employers were to rate the extent to which environmental factors influenced their services performance; while employees assessed the extent to which internal factors influenced their performance which in turn affect the overall performance of the firm. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. Section 1 focused on the profile of the respondents while section 2 addressed the subject matter i.e. factors influencing the services performance of QSFs. Fifty-six (56) registered quantity surveying firms and one hundred and twelve (112) employees were randomly sampled in southwestern Nigeria. Three states in Southwest i.e. Lagos, Oyo and Ondo were focused as the study area. One hundred and sixty-eight (168) respondents were considered for this study. In all, one hundred and thirty-one (131) respondents comprising 46 employers and 85 employees responded in filling the administered questionnaire; this gives a response rate of 76.19%, which is adequate for this study (Moser and Kalton, 1979). The employees assessed Twenty-two (22) internal factors while employers assessed fifteen (15) external factors. Data collected on profiles of the respondents were subjected to descriptive analysis while data on subject matter were analysed using Mean Analysis and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This study requires knowing the extent to which internal and external factors influences the performance of QSFs in terms of service delivered. The particulars of the respondents i.e. the employers and employees were adequately assessed to ascertain their suitability in providing relevant, adequate and reliable data needed for this study. The general particulars of the respondents (employers and employees) were presented in Table 3.

Background Information of the Respondents.

The background information of the surveyed respondents (employers and employees) were obtained for their capability in providing adequate and reliable data needed for the study. Data collected on respondents' background include location of the firm, years of existence of the firm, highest academic and professional qualifications of the respondents, years of professional experience, position in the firm and income of the employees. These data were analysed using frequency distributions; the results of these were presented in Table 3.

Table 3 shows the result obtained on the background information of the respondents' employers and employees. Starting with employers' profiles; the result revealed that, thirty-two (32) QSFs emanated from Lagos state, twelve (12) from Oyo state and two (2) from Ondo state. This trend could be described moderate because the focus of this study was on Lagos (38), Oyo (14) and Ondo (4). Likewise, 91.3% of the firms had been in existence for more than 10 years with 37% of them existing between 11-20 years; 32% of the firms existing between 21 and 30 years while 21% had been

established for over 30 years. Average year of existence of the surveyed firms was 21 years. It can be inferred from the result that, most of the firms surveyed were matured organization with expected experience on influencing factors. Similarly, the results obtained on academic qualification showed that the employers of the surveyed QSFs had required qualifications with 84.8% of them had minimum of B.Sc, 69.6% had additional higher degree comprising 15.2% PGD, 45.7% M.Sc and 8.7% PhD. The respondents are adequately qualified in providing necessary information related to the research focus. Hence, their information and contribution are well reliable. Moreover, majority of the respondent firms were Members and Fellows of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (MNIQS= 54.3% and FNIQS = 45.7%). The result also revealed that 58.7% of them had more than 20 years of experience with 30.5% having 10-20 years of experience, only 10.8% had less than 10 years working experience. This portrays a good image of QSFs where information on environmental issue is expected. Furthermore, 67.4% of the surveyed firms were principal partner (PP) while 32.6% were Managing Director (MD) of the firm. In summary, the result obtained on profile of employers showed that they are competent, experienced, and well qualified in providing reliable information for this study.

Similarly, result on employees' profiles showed that the employees surveyed had required academic qualification with 71.8% of them had minimum of B.Sc and 40% had additional higher degree comprising 9.4% PGD, 27.1% M.Sc and 3.5% PhD. This signifies that they are adequately qualified in providing information needed for this study. Equally, 75.3% of them were Members of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (MNIQS) while 2.4% were Fellows of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (FNIQS). This is an indication that the employees were professionally qualified. Nevertheless, 22.4% were probationer members of the Institute. The result further revealed that 5.9% of the employees had more than 20 years of professional experience with 31.8% having between 11 and 20 years of experience. This depicted a good image of employee QS; hence, they are suitable in providing information needed for the study. Conversely, 21.2% had less than 5 years working experience, which might be as a result of number of the probationer members in the earlier mentioned.

Moreover, the table showed that 20% of the respondents' employees were chief QS of their firms, 62.4% of them were quantity surveyors while 17.6% were assistant QS. Result on employees' monthly income revealed that 71.8% of them earned more than ₦60, 000.00. Also, 17.7% earned between ₦20,000 and ₦40,000 while 10.6% earned between ₦50,000 and ₦60,000. A well-paid employee will be motivated to do more than the firms' expectation in terms of services delivered while those that were less paid may perform below expectations. Hence, quantity surveying firms in Southwestern Nigeria should try to motivate their employees by paying them well as they are the one who do the major works within the firm. Similarly, information obtained on nature of the job of the employee revealed that, most of the respondents were a full-time (94.1%) employee, which is very adequate. Very few of them were part-time (5.9%); this might be as a result of good previous performance of such employees. The result obtained on nature of job is an indication that QSFs contributes to some extent to the development of Nigerian economy when it comes to employment issues. In summary, the result obtained on the profile of employees showed that they are capable, competent and knowledgeable in providing dependable information required for this study.

Evaluation of Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

Factor influencing the services of QSFs is a vital issue that needs to be put into consideration in the competitive business environment. Moreover, such factor could have influence on the performance of firms either from employees or from environmental factors. In other words, factors influencing firms' performance could be traced to the elements inside and outside of the firm known as internal and external factors. Therefore, this assessed influencing factors from two angles i.e. internal and external factors.

Table 3. Background Information of Employers and Employees of QSFs

S/N	Profile of Respondents	EMPLOYERS		EMPLOYEES	
		F	P	F	P
1	Location of the Firm				
	Lagos	32	69.6		
	Oyo	12	26.1		
	Ondo	2	4.3		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.00</i>		
2	Years of existence of the firm				
	<10	4	8.7		
	11-20	17	37.0		
	21-30	15	32.6		
	>30	10	21.7		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.0</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>		<i>21years</i>		
3	Highest Academic Qualification of the Respondents				
	HND	7	15.2	24	28.2
	B.Sc.	7	15.2	27	31.8
	PGD	7	15.2	8	9.4
	M.Sc.	21	45.7	23	27.1
	PhD	4	8.7	3	3.5
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>
4	Professional qualification of the respondents				
	Probationer			19	22.4
	MNIQS	25	54.3	64	75.3
	FNIQS	21	45.7	2	2.4
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>
5	Years of professional experience				
	1-5	2	4.3	18	21.2
	6-10	3	6.5	35	41.2
	11-15	5	10.9	22	25.9
	16-20	9	19.6	5	5.9
	above 20	27	58.7	5	5.9
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	<i>Mean</i>		<i>18 years</i>		<i>10 years</i>
6	Position in the firm				
	Principal Partner (PP)	31	67.4		
	Managing Director (MD not owner)	15	32.6		
	Chief QS			17	20.0
	QS			53	62.4
	Asst. QS			15	17.6
	<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Monthly income received by the employees				
	No response			1	1.2
	>N20,000			2	2.4
	N21,000-N30,000			5	5.9
	N31,000-N40,000			7	8.2
	N41,000-N50,000			2	2.4
	N51,000-N60,000			7	8.2
	above N60,000			61	71.8
	<i>Total</i>			<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Nature of the job				
	Full-time			80	94.1
	Part-time			5	5.9
	<i>Total</i>			<i>85</i>	<i>100.0</i>

F = Frequency; P = Percentage (%)

Internal Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

Internal factors could be regarded as human resources, culture of the firm, the structure of the firm as well as management style. Internal factors to some extent can be controlled through the planning and management of the firm. In most cases, internal factors are directly related to management issues that affect employees of the firm; which invariably influenced their performance and finally have influence on the overall performance of the firm. Data were collected on internal factors that influenced the performance of employees within the firm. The collected data were subjected to mean analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA); the results obtained are as presented in Table 4.

Considering the extent to which internal factors influence the performance of employees; mean weighted average (MWA) was established as a reference point. The result of the analysis reveals that twelve (12) out of the twenty-one (21) internal factors have influence on the performance of employees in QSFs; these factors had mean value of more than 3.11MWA. This is an indication that these factors have a high level of influence on the overall objective of the firm. The five (5) top influencing factors among the twelve factors include: lack of recognizing employees by the management (mean value=3.36), inadequate logistics to work with (mean value=3.33), resource constraint (mean value=3.32), poor remuneration (mean value=3.26) and poor working conditions (mean value=3.25). It could be interpreted that employee are not accorded proper recognition by QSFs as expected; this may affect the performance of the employees and can lead to abortion of firm's goals. From the submission of scholars (Đuričić, 2013; Janković, Mihajlović and Cvetković, 2016), the most powerful resources of any organization are the employees. Therefore, QSFs should recognize the input of their employees; this will enhance service delivery to their clients.

In addition, it has been established in previous studies that employees affect the growth of an organization. For instance, researchers (Chandrasekar, 2011; Chaudhary and Sharma, 2012; Guo, Liao, Liao and Zhang, 2014) have ascertained a strong relationship between working conditions and job performance. Moreover, Mohapatra, and Srivastava (2003) suggest that a physically and psychosocially sound working environment will enhance the performance of an employee in terms of service delivery and lead to survival of the organisation. The absence of this could affect firm-employee relationship i.e. internal marketing (Guzzoni, 2005) and client-employee relationship i.e. interactive marketing (Dushyenthan, 2012). Building a healthy work environment usually influences employees' behavior, which eventually influence the performance of the firm positively. Khan, Azhar, Parveen, Naeem and Sohail (2011) establish that incentives at a place of work have a positive impact on employee's performance.

Likewise from Table 4, the result of ANOVA, which shows a significant difference in the perception of respondents' employees on internal factors influencing their performance, was presented.

Hypothesis 1

- H₀: There is no statistically significant difference in the respondents' employees' perceptions on internal factors influencing service performance of QSFs, based, on the respondents' location.
- H₁: There is a statistically significant difference in the respondents' employees' perception on internal factors influencing service performance of QSFs, based on the respondents' location.

Table 4. Internal Factors Influencing Services Performance of QSFs

Internal factors Influencing Services Performance of QSFs	ALL		LAGOS		OYO		ONDO		ANOVA	
	M	R	MS	R	MS	R	MS	R	F-Value	P-value
Lack of recognition by the management	3.36	1	3.31	1	3.55	20	3.20	6	0.322	0.726
Inadequate logistics to work with	3.33	2	3.21	2	3.73	14	3.00	14	2.010	*0.141
Resource constraint	3.32	3	3.16	3	3.82	7	3.00	14	1.900	0.156
poor remuneration	3.26	4	3.05	4	3.86	4	3.00	14	3.553	*0.033
Poor working conditions and environment	3.25	5	2.95	6	4.05	1	3.20	6	5.603	*0.005
Lack of marketing know-how	3.20	6	3.03	5	3.64	18	3.20	6	1.977	0.145
Inappropriate tools and equipment	3.18	7	2.90	10	3.91	3	3.20	6	5.497	*0.006
Lack of in-house marketing expertise	3.18	7	2.93	8	3.82	7	3.20	6	3.736	*0.028
Disdain of commercialism	3.18	7	2.95	6	3.82	7	3.00	14	3.298	*0.042
Absence of good marketing strategies	3.16	10	2.93	8	3.68	16	3.60	1	2.813	0.066
Limited time	3.12	11	2.84	11	3.82	7	3.20	6	4.511	*0.014
Poor scheduling	3.12	11	2.79	15	3.86	4	3.60	1	5.662	*0.005
Insufficient task preparation	3.09	13	2.84	11	3.77	11	3.00	14	4.051	*0.021
professional limitation	3.08	14	2.84	11	3.77	11	2.80	20	3.968	*0.023
Lack of management commitment	3.07	15	2.78	16	3.73	14	3.60	1	4.142	*0.019
Lack of accepting marketing concepts	3.07	15	2.81	14	3.68	16	3.40	4	3.045	0.053
Political connection and contact	3.06	17	2.76	17	3.77	11	3.40	4	3.972	*0.023
Insufficient information	3.01	18	2.62	18	4.00	2	3.20	6	8.433	*0.000
Limited budget	2.86	19	2.62	18	3.50	21	2.80	20	3.127	*0.049
Insufficient support from others	2.82	20	2.4	20	3.86	4	3.20	6	9.636	*0.000
Missing materials	2.64	21	2.24	21	3.59	19	3.00	14	8.359	*0.000
MWA	3.11		2.86		3.77		3.18			

*M = Mean; R = Rank; * = Sig. @p < 0.05*

From Table 4, it can be seen that the F value is 0.322 for lack of recognition by the management, F= 1.900 for resource constraint, F= 1.977 for lack of marketing know-how, F= 2.813 for absence of good marketing strategies and F= 3.045 for not accepting marketing concepts all at p>0.05. Hence, Ho is accepted, meaning, there is no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the surveyed respondents on these five (5) internal factors influencing the performance of QSFs through employees. This implies that the surveyed employees of QSFs in the three states viewed the significance of these factors the same way; hence, quantity surveying firms should take cognizance of these factors so as to minimize its adverse effect on the overall objective of the firm. In other words, it could mean that location has no significant effect on these internal factors. Therefore, the respondents' employees are in agreement on the influence of these five (5) factors on their performance. However, there exists a significant difference in the perception of the respondents on the

remaining sixteen (16) influencing internal factors. This indicates that location has significant effect on these other 16 internal factors influencing the service performance of QSFs in the study area. It could as well be interpreted that the employees perceived the influence of these factors on their performance differently. The significant factors internal factors include: inadequate logistics to work with (F=2.010), poor remuneration (F=3.553), poor working conditions and environment (F=5.603), inappropriate tools and equipment (F=5.497), lack of in-house marketing expertise (F=3.736), disdain of commercialism (F=3.298), limited time for work that needs more concentration (F=4.511), poor scheduling (F=5.662), insufficient task preparation (F=4.051), lack of professional limitation (F=3.968), lack of management commitment (F=4.142), political connection and contact (F=3.972), insufficient information (F=8.433), limited budget (F=3.127), insufficient support from others (F=9.636) and missing materials and supplies (F=8.359) all at $p < 0.05$. This is an indication of the differing views of respondents on the influence of these sixteen (16) factors on the services performance of QSFs

External Factors Influencing Services Performance of Quantity Surveying Firms

An industry does not operate in a space, likewise quantity surveying firm. It has to act and react to what happens outside the company, known as external factors. The environment in which quantity surveying firms operate changes constantly, and this change is inevitable (Emeka and Eyuche, 2014). Challenges, problems, successes, opportunities and failures depend largely on an organizations' ability to adapt to changing conditions (Wong and Mohd, 2013). Therefore, to foresee and adapt to changes, a firm needs to review and analyze certain external forces (factors) that might influence their performance (Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2017). Based on this, data were collected on external factors influencing the services performance of QSFs to be assessed by employer. The collected data were analysed using mean analysis and ANOVA; the results obtained are as shown in Table 5.

The results presented in Table 5 (mean analysis result) show that five (5) out of the twelve (12) external factors had high mean values above 3.52 MWA. This signifies their high significance in the performance of QSFs in the competitive environment. The table shows the five (5) top external factors to include: technological changes (mean value= 3.89), tough competition (mean value= 3.89), scarce resources (mean value=3.87), government policies (mean value=3.83) and clients' behavioural factors (mean value=3.67). Technological changes and tough competition were ranked as the 1st external factors influencing the service performance of QSFs. This is not impossible because high competition may be as a result of changes in technology. Tuckwell (2014) submits that high competition affects the activities of an organization the most. Likewise, Kuznetsova *et al.*(2017) identify this as one of the factors that mostly influencing an organisation, as such; a competitive environment is an issue for QSFs. Additionally, researchers (Emeka and Eyuche, 2014; Isiac, 2014) have shown that external factors such as customers, competitors, government policies, and technology affects business operations. Hence, it can be concluded that the external factors identified by this study are very significant factors influencing the overall performance of QSFs, which invariably could have adverse effects, not only on the services but also on the profession.

Similarly, ANOVA investigation was carried out on the external factors influencing performance of QSFs; this was to examine the significant differences in the views of respondents' employers on the influencing external factors. The result can as well be seen in Table 5.

Hypothesis 2

- H₀: There is no statistically significant difference in the views of respondents' employers on external factors influencing the performance of QSFs based on the respondents' location.
- H₁: There is a statistically significant difference in the views of respondents' employers on external factors influencing the performance of QSFs based on the respondents' location.

Table 5: External Factors Influencing Services Performance of QSFs

External Factors Influencing Services Performance of QSFs	ALL		LAGOS		OYO		ONDO		ANOVA	
	M	R	MS	R	MS	R	MS	R	F value	P value
Technological changes	3.89	1	3.84	4	3.92	1	4.50	1	0.558	0.576
Tough competition	3.89	1	4.00	2	3.67	2	3.50	5	0.485	0.619
Scarce resources	3.87	3	4.03	1	3.67	2	2.50	12	2.722	0.077
Government actions	3.83	4	3.94	3	3.50	8	4.00	4	1.011	0.372
Behavioural factors e.g client's attitude, knowledge about QS services etc	3.67	5	3.81	5	3.33	12	3.50	5	1.305	0.282
Client sophisticated needs	3.41	6	3.34	6	3.42	9	4.50	1	1.212	0.307
Geographical factors e.g client using state to judge personality	3.39	7	3.31	7	3.42	9	4.50	1	1.355	0.269
Natural forces	3.28	8	3.16	9	3.67	2	3.00	10	0.809	0.452
Stringent professional codes of ethics	3.28	8	3.25	8	3.33	11	3.50	5	0.054	0.947
Social and cultural forces	3.26	10	3.13	10	3.67	2	3.00	10	1.607	0.212
Complexity of customers' needs	3.26	10	3.13	10	3.58	7	3.50	5	1.276	0.290
Demographic factors e.g age, sex, income, education, religion etc	3.20	12	2.91	12	3.92	1	3.50	5	4.243	0.021*
MWA	3.52									

*M = Mean; R = Rank; * = sig. at $p < 0.05$*

As further shown in Table 5, there exists a significant difference in the perception of the employers surveyed in 1 out of the 12 external factors that influence the performance of quantity surveying services, based on their location. This is revealed by the f- value at $p < 0.050$. The significant factor is demographic factor e.g. age, sex, income, education, religion etc (f value=4.243; p value=0.021). This implies that the respondents' employers exhibited different views on the significance of this external factor, meaning they do not agree on the influence of this factors on their performance in the competitive business environment. In other words, location has a statistically significant effect on employers' perception of the significance of demographic factor. The respondents in the three states viewed the influence of this one (1) factor differently. However, there is no significant difference in the views of the surveyed respondents on the remaining eleven (11) external factors that influence the services performance of QSFs as revealed by their f-values at $p > 0.05$. These external factors include; technological changes (f value=0.558; p value=0.576), tough competition (f value=0.485; p value=0.619), scarce resources (f value=1.011; p value=0.372) and government actions (f value=0.485; p value=0.619) among others. The employers of QSFs in the study area were in agreement on the influence of these factors on their performance. This means that the respondents perceived the significance of these external factors the same way. It can be interpreted that location has no significant effect on the views of the firms, concerning the significance of the external factors that influence marketing performance of quantity surveying firms in Southwestern Nigeria.

Summary of Findings

The study focused on factors influencing services performance of quantity surveying firms in Nigeria; selecting three states as the study area. The results on profile of the respondents reveal that the two categories of respondents (employers and employees) surveyed had the required academic qualifications, professional qualifications and adequate years of professional experience to be proactive in dealing with factors that influenced their services performance; this will help the profession to stand out in the competitive business environment where they operate. Furthermore, factors influencing services performance of quantity surveying firms were evaluated from two points of views i.e. internal factors and external factors. Employee quantity surveyors working within the firm assessed internal factors, while employers of firms assessed external factors. The result reveals the five (5) top internal factors influencing performance of firm to comprise lack of recognizing the employees by the management, inadequate logistics to work with, resource constraint, poor remuneration and poor working conditions. The result further shows significant difference in the views of employees on some of the influencing internal factors, such as, inadequate logistics, poor remuneration and poor working conditions among others. On external factors, the five (5) top influencing factors include technological changes, tough competition, scarce resources, government actions and client's attitude towards quantity surveying services. The views of firms' employers were the same on these five influencing external factors in relation to the performance of quantity surveying services in Southwestern Nigeria.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the summary of findings of this study, lack of recognizing the employees by the management influenced the performance of employee quantity surveyors, which invariably influence the performance of firm where they operate. Moreover, technological changes and tough competition influenced the overall performance of quantity surveying firms. The study recommended that quantity surveying firms should be proactive in dealing with these influencing factors so as to minimize their unpleasant effects on the survival of the firm.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The efforts of the employee quantity surveyors and the employers of registered quantity surveying firms who responded in providing adequate and valid data for this study are well appreciated.

REFERENCES

- Adagba, D.T. and Shakpande, C. (2017). Effect of environmental factors on business performance. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(1), 17-23.
- Agyapong, K., Dankwa, D. D. and Acheampong, A. (2014). Internal Marketing Motivation and Employees' Challenges: A Study of Selected Rural Banks in Ghana. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(9), 1-10.
- an Emerging Market.
- Anaele, B. (2012). The External Environmental Forces That Can Influence Your Business. Retrieved from: <http://mymarketingnotebook.blogspot.com.ng/2012/11/the-six-6-external-environmental-forces.html#!/2012/11/the-six-6-external-environmental-forces.html> on 18th October, 2017.
- Chandrasekar, K., 2011. Workplace Environment and its Impact on Organizational Performance in Public Sector Organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business System*, 7(1), 1-20.
- Chaudhary, N. and B. Sharma, 2012. Impact of Employee Motivation on Performance (Productivity) In Private Organization. *International Journal of Business Trends and Technology*, 2(4).

- Diamantidis, A. D. and Chatzoglou, P. D. (2018). Factors affecting employee performance: an empirical approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(1).
- Dragnic, D. (2014). Impact of Internal and External Factors on the Performance of Fast-Growing Small and Medium Businesses. *Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*.
- Duričić, M. (2013). Management. Belgrade: Faculty for Business and Industrial Management.
- Dushyenthan, T. (2012). Interactive Marketing and its Impact on Customer Satisfaction- The Study of Mobile Communication Service Providers in Jaffna Srilanka. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*. 12(14), 57-66.
- Ebunoluwa, E.I. (2015). Risk Impact on Marketing of Construction Professional Services in Lagos State. *Published M.Sc. Thesis*. Department of Quantity Surveying. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.
- Emeka, N. and Eyuche, A. H. (2014) Environmental Factors and Organizational Performance in Nigeria (A Study of Juhel Company) *World Engineering & Applied Sciences Journal* 5 (3), 75-84, 2014 ISSN 2079-2204
Firms, *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 6(16), 30-43.
- George, N. R. (2017). Uncontrollable External Factors of Marketing. Retrieved from: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/uncontrollable-external-factors-marketing-20762.html> on 20th September 2017.
- Guo, Y., Liao, J. S. and Zhang, Y. (2014). The Mediating role of Intrinsic Motivation on the Relationship, between Developmental Feedback and Employee Job Performance. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 42(5).
- Guzzoni, M. L. (2005). Models of Service Marketing. A Study on the Marketing Functions of Project Workers in Knowledge-Intensive Companies. *Institution of Business Administration*, Spring.
- Harris, M. (2002). Human Resource Management: A Practical Approach, (2nd ed.). Orlando: Harcourt Int.
- Heiko, G., Anders, G. and Lars, W. (2011). Competitive Advantage Through Service Differentiation by Manufacturing Companies, 2011, *Journal of Business Research*, (64), 12, 1270-1280.
- Janković, M., Mihajlović, M. and Cvetković, T. (2016): Influence of External Factors on Business of Companies in Serbia *Original Scientific Article*. Retrieved from: <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0350-137X/2016/0350-137X1604031J.pdf> on 11th June, 2020. 62(4), 31-38
- Jessee, T. (n.d). How To Identify External Factors That May Affect Your Strategic Plan. Retrieved from: <https://www.clearpointstrategy.com/external-factors-that-affect-a-business/> on 12th June, 2020.
- Kadiri, D.S and Ayodele, E.M (2013). Constraints to Quantity Surveying Awareness in Nigeria. *Civil and Environmental Research*, 3(11), 17-21.
- Khan, A., Ahmed, S., Paul, S. and Kazmi, S. H. A. (2018). Factors Affecting Employee Motivation Towards Employee Performance: A Study on Banking Industry of Pakistan. *International Conference on Management Science and Engineering Management*.
- Khan, R.A. (2008). Role of Construction Sector in Economic Growth: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan Economy. *First International Conference on Construction In Developing Countries. Advancing and Integrating Construction Education, Research and Practice*, 279-290.
- Kowo, S. A., Olalekan, S.O. and Popoola, M.A. (2018). Impact of external business environment on organizational performance 4(3), 498-505.
- Kuznetsova, N.V., , Rahimova, N.M., Gafurova, V.M., Simakov, D.B., Zinovyeva, E.G. and Ivanova, L.A. (2017). External Environment as a Factor of Ensuring the Competitiveness of Organizations in the Regional Market of Medical Services. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20 (4A), 308-322. London.
- Mohapatra, B.K. and A.K. Srivastava, 2003. A Study of the Relationship of Perceived Work Environment with Job Attitude, *Performance and Health*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University.
- Moser, C.A. and Kalton, G. (1979). *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*, Heinemann, Nigeria. (A Case Study of Quantity Surveying Profession). *Environmental*
- Ogbu, C.P. (2015). Application of Marketing Strategies in Nigerian Quantity Surveying

- Ojo, G.K. (2011). Effective Marketing Strategies and the Nigerian Construction
- Olaniyi, J. O., Sanni, M. and Garba, A. (2011). Marketing of Professional Services in
- Olanrewaju .A., Anavhe. P., and Abdul-Aziz .A. (2013). The Nigerian Quantity Surveyors in
- Oyegoke, A.S. (2006) Managing Clients Expectations in Project Delivery. *A Paper Presented at the 22nd Biennial Conference of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors.*
<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://kubanni.abu.edu.ng:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/6109/1/DEVELOPING%2520A%2520FRAMEWORK%2520FOR%2520THE%2520MARKETING%2520OF%2520QUANTITY%2520SURVEYING%2520SERVICES.pdf>.
Accessed on 28th December, 2017.
- Preece, C.N., Roziha, C. H., Handzalah, A. and Mohammed, S. N (2007). The Challenges and Opportunities in Marketing the QS Practice in Malaysia. *Commissions: Transformation through Construction*, 1-14.
Professionals. *African Journal of Marketing Management* 3(12), 303-311.
- Rusu, G. and Avasilcai, S. (2014). Factors Influencing Employees' Motivation for Knowledge Communication *Advanced Materials Research*, 837. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271504123_Factors_Influencing_Employees'_Motivation_for_Knowledge_Communication, on 11th June, 2020.
- Tarmidi, D. and Arsjah, R. (2019). Employee and Organizational Performance: Impact of Employee Internal and External Factors, Moderated by Online *Application Journal of resources development and management*, 57, 30-37.
Technology CES Kaduna Polytechnic Journal, 1(2), 35-42.
- Ulen, T. (2010). Responding to change: internal and external factors in organizational success. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 6(01):133-137.
- Voiculet, A., Belu, N., Parpandel, D.E. and Rizea, I.C. (2010). The Impact of External Environment on Organizational Development Strategy.
- Wong, W. P., & Mohd, A. (2013). The Impact of External Environmental on Business Process Management and Organizational Performance. Verlag Berlin Heidelberg
- Yankah J.E. (2015b). Principal Barriers to Marketing Performance of Quantity Surveying Consultancy Firms. *African Journal of Applied Research*, 2(2), 126-139.