

**FRONTIERS IN CIVIL ENGINEERING  
AND CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS**

**ISSN: ( 3065- 4181 )**



✉ editor.fcecm@gmail.com

🌐 <https://multisciajournals.com/journals/index.php/fcecm>

## Quantitative Views on the Delphi Method's Use in Construction Engineering and Management Studies

, Yi HU<sup>b</sup>, Ming SHAN<sup>b</sup>  
Department of Civil

### Article Info

*Received: 27-01-2026    Revised:22-03-2026    Accepted:09-04-2026    Published:12-04-2026*

---

#### Abstract.

Over the last 20 years, an increasing number of researchers in the area of Construction Engineering and Management (CEM) have relied on the Delphi method as their primary research tool. There are a lot of studies on Delphi, but not many have looked at how it may work with other statistical methods. This is certain to change in the future of Delphi studies. The purpose of this research is to conduct a systematic literature review of 88 works that pertain to the topic of coupled Delphi and other quantitative approaches in the CEM sector. From 1990 to 2012, 88 publications were meticulously selected from 10 prestigious peer-reviewed CEM journals. We take a look at the 88 Delphi publications and assess their statistical methods, topic breadth, and application needs. We also take a look at how the Delphi approach may be used with three additional modeling techniques: Analytical Hierarchy Process, Analytical Network Process, and Fuzzy sets. For researchers interested in implementing the Delphi technique in CEM research, these review findings give practical references.

**Keywords:** Delphi method, construction engineering and management research, quantitative perspective, review.

#### Introduction

When faced with a complicated topic, a group of specialists might use the Delphi method, which is an organized approach to communication and consensus formation (Chan et al. 2001). Iteratively gathering expert opinion and judgment on a certain topic is a common way to establish agreement using this approach (Hallowell, Gambatese 2010b). For situations where objective data are unavailable, empirical evidence is lacking, or experimental research is unrealistic or unethical, the Delphi method can be a valuable alternative. However, there are instances where the reliability of the findings from a Delphi study is called into question due to improper design and execution, such as problems with the survey instrument, experts chosen poorly, weak bias control, inaccurate analyses, and limited feedback during the study (Gupta, Clarke 1996; Keeney et al. 2001). Here, the Delphi method shines (Hallowell, Gambatese 2010b).

Civil engineering management (CEM) is a practice-driven profession with deep roots in the construction industry. The effects of people, groups, and the larger community on construction management tasks are an important focus of many open research issues in the area. on tasks related to making decisions, planning, and forecasts (Fellows, Liu 2009). The best way to address these issues is to pool the expertise of a few chosen individuals in the field. While other approaches, including interviews, may be used to solve similar issues with considerable uncertainty, Delphi offers a more reliable and efficient option (Chan et al. 2001). Therefore, a growing number of researchers have adopted Delphi method in CEM research since the early 1990s (Hallowell, Gambatese 2010b). Although many researchers regard Delphi as a qualitative method (Hasson et al. 2000), a trend that conduct Delphi in a more quantitative manner by combining quantitative methods has

been emerged in the past two decades. This tendency was also confirmed in a recent review article by Hallowell and Gambatese (2010b). Unfortunately, there is a lack of comprehensive summaries for these quantitative Delphi investigations. Compared with traditional Delphi studies, quantitative Delphi studies require careful research design and consequently a number of statistical data analysis approaches. Therefore, this study aims to begin to fill this gap by conducting a systematic review of relevant Delphi papers in CEM research. Specific objectives of this research are fourfold: first, to classify the areas of study that have made use of Delphi; second, to outline the essential criteria for using Delphi; third, to look into the statistical methods used to analyze Delphi data; and fourth, to analyze how well Delphi works in conjunction with advanced modeling techniques.

## 1. Overview of the Delphi method

The Delphi concept originated from the American defence industry. The classical Delphi procedures usually comprise at least three rounds of survey (Keeney *et al.* 2011). Round 1 is to solicit opinions on a certain issue in an open-ended way from the expert panel. Round 2 is to ask panelists to rate the statements in a questionnaire according to their opinions on the subject. Round 3 is to ask panelists to reassess the ratings in the light of the consolidated results from Round 2. Rounds of the survey may continue until a consensus among panelists can fulfil the requirement on some or all of the items. Sometimes Round 1 survey can be skipped when the Round 2 survey questionnaire can be developed through literature review and interviews (Ke *et al.* 2011; Hon *et al.* 2012).

## 2. Research methodology

This study conducted a comprehensive review of papers that employed Delphi as the primary or secondary research method and were published in the first-tier CEM journals between 1990 and 2012. The review scope included relevant papers published in the ten selected journals: (1) *Construction Management and Economics (CME)*, (2) *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management (JConstr.EM)*, (3) *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management (ECAM)*, (4) *Journal of Management in Engineering (JME)*, (5) *International Journal of Project Management (IJPM)*, (6) *Automation in Construction (AC)*, (7) *Building Research and Information (BRI)*, (8) *Building and Environment (BE)*, (9) *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management (JCiv. EM)*, and (10) *Journal of Facilities Management (JFM)*. The first seven journals are among the top journals in the ranking of Chau (1997). The remaining three journals are also widely regarded as the most important sources to obtain high-quality CEM papers (Chan *et al.* 2009). The common keyword “Delphi” was searched in the ten journals through search engines of Taylor and Francis, ASCE Library, Emerald, and Web of Science (WoS). The total number of relevant papers identified by the initial search was 282. However, not all the initial identified papers used Delphi method as its primary or secondary research method. Some just happened to have the word “Delphi” in their contexts and references. Thus, the initial collection was trimmed via a further visual examination. Only those studies that have clearly specified necessary details of undertaking the Delphi study and satisfied the Delphi requirements are regarded as valid. After the visual examination, 88 papers were finally identified as valid, including CME (16), JConstr.EM (30), ECAM (9),

JME (6), IJPM (16), AC (3), BRI (2), BE (4), JCiv.EM (2), and JFM (2). Figure 1 shows the distribution of the identified Delphi papers in the study period, which has indicated the increasing application trend of the Delphi method in the past two decades. The literature search work was conducted between March and April in 2013.




Fig. 1. Identified Delphi papers published between 1990 and 2012

### 3. Topic coverage of the Delphi papers

Considering the good reputation and widespread acceptance of the *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management (JConstr.EM)* (Chau 1997), its categorization framework of topic coverage was adopted to categorize the topics of the identified Delphi papers (ASCE 2013). Despite the simplicity of this categorization framework, the framework remains familiar and easily understandable to CEM researchers. Within the 88 identified papers, in addition to the three review papers of Chan *et al.* (2009), Hollowell and Gambatese (2010b), and Lucko and Rojas (2010), research topics of the remaining 85 Delphi papers could be grouped under seven categories as shown in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. Distribution of research interests in the identified Delphi papers

Project planning and design ranked first with 29 papers involved. Majority of these papers employed Delphi as a forecasting instrument to identify and evaluate certain risks for managing a specific type of projects, such as financial risks (Thomas *et al.* 2006; Lyer, Sagheer 2010; Xu *et al.* 2010a, 2010b; Ke *et al.* 2010, 2011), technical risks (Seo, Choi 2008), execution risks (Aritua *et al.* 2011; del Caño, de la Cruz 2002; de la Cruz *et al.* 2006), as well as contractual and cost risks (Tummala, Burchett 1999; Adams 2006, 2008). Aside from these studies on risk management, the Delphi method could be also used to investigate factors regarding engineering design and pre-project planning. For instance, Pan (2008) applied the Delphi method to explore the factors affecting the decision making on the selection of bridge construction methods. Wu *et al.* (2007) used this method to identify the evaluation criteria for selecting on the optimal project location.

The contracting issue received the second ranking with 18 papers involved. Some researchers identified the selection criteria for project procurement methods by using the Delphi method (Chan *et al.* 2001; Lee, Kim 2001). Delphi was also commonly employed to resolve procurement-related evaluations in different types of projects, such as Design-Build projects and Public-Private Partnership projects (Brown *et al.* 2001; Yeung *et al.* 2007, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Kumaraswamy, Anvuur

2008; Xia *et al.* 2009, 2011; Xia, Chan 2010, 2012b).

Labour and personnel issues ranked third with 12 papers involved. Most of these studies focused on safety management. Many researchers utilized Delphi to evaluate the effectiveness of safety programs or systems (Hallowell, Gambatese 2009a, 2010a; Rajendran, Gambatese 2009; Hallowell, Calhoun 2011; Hallowell *et al.* 2011; Hon *et al.* 2012; Shapira, Lyachin 2009). Delphi was also used to identify and evaluate personal issues, such as irregular behaviour (Tabish, Jha 2011), professional attributes (Hackett, Hicks 2007), and engineer competences (Yik *et al.* 2012).

Organizational issues also received the third ranking with 12 papers involved. These studies mainly used Delphi to develop certain solutions for construction organizations, such as internationalization, corporate financing, corporate competences, and business (Gunhan, Arditi 2005a, 2005b; Chen, Hsu 2008; Hsu *et al.* 2008; Dikmen *et al.* 2010; Lu 2010; Cha, O'Connor 2005). Additionally, Delphi was used to explore a reasonable organization design and the influence of organization culture (Gajendran, Brewer 2007; Elbarkouky, Fayek 2011; Lin 2011).

The number of papers on information technologies ranked fifth. Six papers were devoted to this area. These studies mainly employed Delphi to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of innovative technologies and systems (Karlsson *et al.* 2008; Cooke *et al.* 2008; Dawood, Sikka 2009; Dawood 2010; Lin *et al.* 2011).

Four papers on cost and schedule were identified (Chau 1995; Shaheen *et al.* 2007; Pivo 2008; Chan 2012). These studies mainly used Delphi as forecasting and evaluation tools.

Construction Materials and Methods also have four papers involved. Among these studies, Delphi was mainly used to evaluate the effectiveness of various construction methods and technologies (Arditi, Gunaydin 1999; Sarkar, Dutta 2010; Hallowell, Gambatese 2009b; Yasamis-Speroni *et al.* 2012).

#### **4. Key requirements for the Delphi method**

##### **4.1. Selection of Delphi panelists**

The success of Delphi studies mainly depends on the careful and objective selection of expert panelists (Chan *et al.* 2001). Those experts involved in a Delphi study refers to professionals or researchers having special knowledge/experience, which are evident by several specific requirements such as working appointments, professional qualifications, working experience, and relevant publications (Hallowell 2008). The majority of the identified Delphi papers (64 out of 88) indicated the requirements for the selection of experts. Two sets of the qualification of expert panelists were adopted: (1) specific requirements, and (2) a flexible point system. Some researchers adopted clear criteria to qualify experts. For example, Chan *et al.* (2001) and Manoliadis *et al.* (2006) adopted the working experience and the involvement in a certain kind of projects as key criteria to qualify experts. Meanwhile, Hallowell and Gambatese (2010b) and Hallowell *et al.* (2011) recommended that an identified expert scores a minimum of 12 total points in an expert evaluation system to qualify for participation in a study.

##### **4.2. Number of expert panelists**

Extant CEM literature is inconclusive on the optimal size of a Delphi panel. Some researchers believe that the bigger panel size can yield more reliable results (Murphy *et al.* 1998). Others have argued that there is no significant correlation between the size of a Delphi panel and accuracy and effectiveness of the Delphi method (Boje, Murnighan 1982). However, the variation in numbers of Delphi panelists results from several factors, including: the scope or nature of the problem under investigation, number of available experts, and available resources in terms of time and money (Hallowell, Calhoun 2011; Manoliadis *et al.* 2006; Chan *et al.* 2001; Hasson *et al.* 2000). In all 88 identified papers, 67 papers specified the sizes of the expert panel employed. The size of the expert panel involved in these studies ranged from 3 to 93. Table 1 has indicated that majority of researchers are inclined to employ a panel size between 8 and 20 in their CEM researches.

##### **4.3. Number of rounds**

The number of rounds is an essential aspect in design a Delphi study, which aims at reaching consensus among panelists through controlled and anonymous feedback and iterative process (Hallowell, Gambatese 2010b).

Table 1. Panel sizes in identified Delphi papers

Panel size	3-7	8-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 or above	Total
Frequency	7	41	9	5	4	1	67

However, there is no specific guidance on the optimal number of rounds in Delphi studies in previous literature and therefore researchers tend to settle on different number of rounds given their desired level of consensus. Among the identified 88 papers, the number of rounds ranges from two to six. It is worth noting that the 40 of the identified 88 papers have reached desired consensus after two and three rounds. This is in line with the observation of Dalkey *et al.* (1970) that Delphi results are more accurate after two iterations. Nevertheless, in the case of more than three iterations involved, the researcher should consider issues of participant fatigue, attrition rates, time, and cost (Hasson *et al.* 2000). For example, in the three identified papers by Chan *et al.* (2001), Rajendran and Gambatese (2009), and Xia *et al.* (2011), the number of experts involved started dropping out of the studies after Round 2.

#### 4.4. Anonymous feedback process

Linstone and Turoff (1975) stated that, in Delphi studies, providing anonymous feedback facilitates indirect communication among respondents to reach a high level of consensus. Hallowell and Gambatese (2010b) also emphasized that the process is not a Delphi without the iterative and feedback processes. Based on reviewing the 88 identified papers, the common simple statistical feedback between the rounds is mean or median (32 out of 88 papers).

### 5. Statistical analysis tests for the Delphi data

A growing number of Delphi papers which used advanced statistical techniques in data analysis have been identified in the past two decades as shown in Figure 3. Statistical analysis techniques were adopted in data analysis of Delphi survey mainly for three different purposes: consensus measurement, inter-group comparison and correlation analysis. Table 2 summarizes statistical tests used for each purpose of the identified Delphi papers. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software is the most frequently used software for conducting statistical analysis on Delphi data.




Fig. 3. Number of Delphi papers using statistical analysis techniques between 1990 and 2012

Table 2. Statistical analysis techniques used in identified Delphi studies

Purpose	Techniques	Frequency
Consensus measurement	Deviation	16
	Kendall's coefficient of concordance ( <i>W</i> )	15
	Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ )	3
Inter-group comparison	Spearman rank correlation test	4
	Wilcoxon signed rank test	1
	Kruskal-Wallis test	1
Correlation analysis	Pearson correlation matrix	12

#### 5.1. Attitude scales

Nearly half of the identified Delphi papers (41 out of 88 papers) adopted a Likert scale to quantify the opinions of experts on a specific subject. As shown in Table 3, the attitude scales adopted in the identified Delphi papers were in the range between 3 and 12. The five-point Likert scale was used mostly with the frequency of 22. The increasing use of ten-point Likert scale was also observed. It should be noted that the attitude scale employed in Delphi questionnaires should be in a range of over five points to sustain measurement accuracy because most Delphi sample sizes are small (Hsu, Sandford 2007).

Table 3. Attitude scales in identified Delphi studies

Attitude scale	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	12	Total
Frequency	4	2	22	1	2	2	7	1	41

Apart from the Likert scale, a centesimal system was also used in a few Delphi studies to collect panelists' opinions (Chan *et al.* 2001; del Caño, de la Cruz 2002; Adams 2008). For example, in Chan's *et al.* (2001) study that investigated criteria for the selection of procurement systems for construction projects, panelists were requested to provide ratings of the utility attribute of each selection criterion against each selected procurement system based on a centesimal system.

### 5.2. Consensus measurement

In order to get a unanimous decision, the Delphi technique is used (Chan *et al.* 2001). The interpretation of Delphi survey data relies heavily on consensus measurement. The level of consensus is determined differently for each CEM region due to the uniqueness of the Delphi data. So, it's hard to say how much agreement is ideal for Delphi investigations in various CEM domains. According to the analysis of the 88 publications in the Delphi review, the three main methods for gauging the panel experts' agreement are Deviation, Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W), and Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ). According to Table 2, out of all the metrics used to assess the level of consensus throughout the several Delphi survey rounds (16 articles), deviation garnered the greatest attention. The two most common metrics used were absolute deviation and standard deviation of absolute deviation. Some researchers (Hallowell, Gambatese 2009a, 2009b, 2010a; Hallowell *et al.* 2011; Hallowell, Calhoun 2011) preferred to use absolute deviation as a measure of the dispersion around a data set's mean value, and they established a cutoff of 5% or 10% for absolute variance in their studies. In CEM domains like organization issues, contracting, project planning and design, and information technologies, standard deviation has been extensively utilized for consensus measurement (Arditi, Gu-naydin 1999; del Caño, de la Cruz 2002; Gunhan, Ardit 2005a, 2005b; Chinowsky *et al.* 2007; Dawood, Sikka 2009; Dawood 2010; Vidal *et al.* 2011; Yu, Kwon 2011; Yasamis-Speroni *et al.* 2012). The consensus from the Delphi poll cannot be accepted, however, unless a minimum value of standard deviation is agreed upon. Despite the fact that this ratio suggests a significant disparity among the data, some studies have accepted it as a 30% standard deviation vs mean ratio (Chinowsky *et al.*, 2007; Vidal *et al.*, 2011; Yasamis-Speroni *et al.*, 2012).

Another popular method for testing the amount of unanimity among the expert panelists is Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) (Xia *et al.*, 2009; Hon *et al.*, 2012; Hallowell *et al.*, 2011). Fifteen of the recognized Delphi publications used this method in our investigation. The W value indicates the degree of agreement between the panel members by taking into account the variations between the rankings of mean of different variables (Hon *et al.* 2012). If the concordance coefficient is 1, then there is complete agreement. One possible interpretation is that the W value, in conjunction with subsequent Delphi survey rounds, should be raised. According to Hon *et al.* (2012) and Pivo (2008), the W value varied between 0.234 and 0.600 in the recognized Delphi papers.

Chi-square should be recommended to be adopted when the number of variables to be evaluated is larger than seven (Siegel, Castellan 1988). Views of the Delphi panelists reach a consensus

when the computed Chi-square value is larger than the critical Chi-square value (Ke et al. 2010, 2011; Hon et al. 2012).

### 5.3. Inter-group comparison

It is widely accepted that setting the boundary within the expert panel can improve the validity of the Delphi studies. Thus, inter-group analysis should be conducted to test whether there is any substantially similar agreement among the respondents from different subgroups before combining the data from various subgroups (Hon *et al.* 2012). Since Likert data were usually treated as ordinal data in the identified Delphi papers, three non-parametric statistical techniques, namely, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, Wilcoxon signed rank test, and Kruskal-Wallis test were found to be used for the inter-group comparison.

Four identified Delphi papers use Spearman's rank correlation coefficient to test the inter-group comparison (Arditi, Gunaydin 1999; Hackett, Hicks 2007; Ke *et al.* 2010, 2011). If the computed Spearman's rank correlation coefficient exceeds the critical value at a significance level (of say 0.05), it can be construed that there is consistency between the different respondent groups (Ke *et al.* 2011).

Two identified Delphi papers employed Wilcoxon Signed Rank test to examine the inter-group comparison (Hallowell, Calhoun 2011; Yasamis-Speroni *et al.* 2012). If the computed test statistics is less than the critical value at a significance level (of say 0.10), there is no significant difference among the views of experts those belong to different subgroups (Yasamis-Speroni *et al.* 2012).

In addition, Hon *et al.* (2012) conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test on experts' evaluation of difficulties of implementing safety practices in the repair and maintenance sector within three expert subgroups, namely, client subgroup, contractor subgroup, and occupational health and safety consultants/regulatory subgroup. Hon *et al.* (2012) mentioned that if the computed Kruskal-Wallis test value is less than the critical value at a significance level (of say 0.05), this indicates that consensus among different subgroups are achieved.

### 5.4. Correlation analysis

In some cases, Delphi method is used to examine independent variables regarding a particular construct which are identified from literature reviews, interviews, or a combination of these two methods (Xia *et al.* 2009). Thus correlation analysis of variables in a Delphi survey should be performed. Pearson Correlation Matrix is a primary form of correlation analysis used in the identified Delphi studies (Yeung *et al.* 2007, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Xia *et al.* 2009, 2011; Xu *et al.* 2010a, 2010b; Xia, Chan 2010, 2012a, 2012b).

As indicated earlier in Section 5.3, Likert data collected in the identified Delphi papers were usually treated as ordinal data. A controversy exists in the analysis of ordinal data that, Pearson Correlation Matrix, a parametric statistical technique can better handle interval data rather than ordinal data. However, much documentation has confirmed that parametric statistical technique could also be used for the ordinal data when the different response categories are equal (Kim 1975; Allan 1976; Weisberg *et al.* 1996; Norman 2010; Hwang *et al.* 2013, 2014; Zhao *et al.* 2013). Thus, the use of Pearson Correlation Matrix to check the correlations of different variables in the identified Delphi papers is acceptable. Its high exposure rate in the identified Delphi papers also reveals a great application potential (Yeung *et al.* 2007, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Xu *et al.* 2010a, 2010b; Xia, Chan 2010, 2012a, 2012b; Xia *et al.* 2009, 2011).

## 6. Combination of Delphi and other advanced modeling methods

To yield stronger and more reliable findings, some researchers have attempted to combine Delphi with other advanced modeling methods in their CEM studies. Based on the 88 identified Delphi papers, Fuzzy Sets, Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), and Analytical Network Process (ANP) were the most common modeling methods employed in previous Delphi studies. Figure 4 shows the development of the trend of combining Delphi with the three modelling methods in the past two decade.




Fig. 4. Number of Delphi papers having combined fuzzy sets, AHP, and ANP

### 6.1. Combination with Fuzzy sets

Many research questions associated with the construction industry are complex, uncertain, and sensitive to the environment (Chan *et al.* 2009). Under such circumstances, Fuzzy Theory is regarded as a proper option to deal these problems (Nasirzadeh *et al.* 2008; Manoliadis *et al.* 2009). Fuzzy Theory is a branch of modern mathematics that has been first formulated by Zadeh (1965), which includes two fundamental concepts, fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic. Compared with fuzzy logic, Fuzzy sets are the more popular methods employed in the CEM field (Chan *et al.* 2009). Among the 88 papers identified, twelve papers adopted Fuzzy Sets in Delphi studies. These papers could be categorized into two groups: Fuzzy Delphi and Fuzzy Set Analysis.

Fuzzy Delphi is a modified Delphi method in terms of Fuzzy sets developed by Murray *et al.* (1985). Compared with classic Delphi, this method used a fuzzy-membership response system instead of the single-choice response system, which allows experts involved to express the vagueness in answering survey questions. Six papers identified in this study have utilized the Fuzzy Delphi method (Dzeng, Wen 2005; Thomas *et al.* 2006; Shaheen *et al.* 2007; Nasirzadeh *et al.* 2008; Manoliadis *et al.* 2009; Lin *et al.* 2011). The other stretch of research attempts to combine Delphi and Fuzzy sets is to analyze Delphi data through Fuzzy set analysis. Under such circumstance, the Delphi method and Fuzzy set analysis are adopted sequentially in the research design. Six identified Delphi papers adopted this combined research approach (Pan 2008; Xu *et al.* 2010a; Elbarkouky, Fayek Particularly, of the 12 papers combining Delphi and Fuzzy sets, four papers were identified on project risk management (Thomas *et al.* 2006; Nasirzadeh *et al.* 2008; Xu *et al.* 2010a; Khazaeni *et al.* 2012), three papers on procurement (Dzeng, Wen 2005; Manoliadis *et al.* 2009; Xia *et al.* 2011). This indicates that a mixed use of Delphi and Fuzzy sets are more appropriate for research topics related to the two areas.

### 6.2. Combination with AHP

The AHP method was first developed by Saaty (1980) and assisted in developing a useful multiple criteria decision making tool dealing with economic, technical, and social issues. One major advantage of AHP is that it can convert a particular subject that is intangible and difficult to quantify into quantified and tangible values by using a systematic approach (Hyun *et al.* 2008). To assist in the decision making on these complicated issues, the AHP considers the trade-offs and evaluates the level of relative importance among various factors related to the issues using pairwise comparison (Khasnabis *et al.* 2002; Shapira, Goldenberg 2005). Some researchers affirmed this merit of AHP and used this technique to quantify Delphi survey results. In this study, twelve papers that used a combination of Delphi and AHP were identified (Shields *et al.* 1988; Brown *et al.* 2001; Khasnabis *et al.* 2002; Shapira, Goldenberg 2005; Bertolini *et al.* 2006; Wu *et al.* 2007; Hsu *et al.* 2008; Hyun *et al.* 2008; Lu 2010; Lin 2011; Vidal *et al.* 2011; Khazaeni *et al.* 2012). Topics of these identified papers refer to various CEM areas, such as organizational issues, contracting, project planning and design, labour and personnel issues, and information technologies (ASCE 2013). This suggests a wide application of the combined approach of Delphi and AHP method.

### 6.3. Combination with ANP

ANP is a useful method used to deal with a number multiple decision making problems in the construction domain (Chen *et al.* 2008). It is regarded as a generalized form of the AHP method (Saaty 1996). Since the AHP does not allow interdependencies between the components of a problem, the ANP can be used as an effective tool in those cases (Dikmen *et al.* 2010). Therefore, the advantage of ANP is that it provides more reliable decision-making support by quantitatively measuring all possible interrelations among indicators based on reuse of the experts' knowledge. In this study, three papers combining ANP with Delphi were identified (Lee, Kim 2001; Chen *et al.* 2008; Dikmen *et al.* 2010).

## Conclusions

This comprehensive literature review reveals that Delphi is a robust tool for identifying, evaluating, and forecasting purpose in areas of project planning and design, contracting, labour and personnel issues, and organizational issues in CEM research. Application of Delphi in the 88 identified papers shows that researchers are more inclined to adopt this method within an expert panel of 8–20 members specialized selected in two or three rounds of solicitation, by using mean or median as the most common feedback process. An evident increasing trend of using statistical techniques to analyse data collected in Delphi surveys has been detected. Various statistical analysis techniques utilized to measure the consensus, inter-group comparison, and correlation of the data provided by the Delphi panel are scrutinized in details. This review paper also reveals the combined use of the Delphi method with three advanced modeling techniques, namely, Fuzzy sets, Analytical Hierarchy Process, and Analytical Network Process. By combining these advanced techniques, Delphi will have a greater application potential for addressing the ambiguous and imprecise events in CEM area.

## References

- building Management and Economics, Volume 24, Issue 1, Pages 81–96, Adams, F. K. 2006. An inquiry of expert elicitation and Bayesian analysis of hazards associated with building contracts. Adams, using the DOI code 10.1080/01446190500310254 as the DOI entry, In 2008, F. K. published an article in the International Journal of Project Management titled "Risk perception and Bayesian analysis of international construction contract risks: the case of payment delays in a developing economy." The article can be found on pages 138–148. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2007.05.007
- G. J. B. Allan 1975. The American Journal of Sociology, volume 81, issue 6, pages 1498–1500, comments on Hawkes's work on ordinal-scaled variables and multivariate analysis. Presented by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2013. Purpose and extent [retrieved from the internet on December 12, 2013]. According to Arditi and Gunaydin (1999), the article may be accessed online at this URL: <http://ascelibrary.org/page/jcemd4/editorialboard?curLocale=4>. Building project managers' impressions on process quality, Journal of Management in Engineering, 15(2), 43–53. The reference is [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(1999\)15:2\(43\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(1999)15:2(43)).
- Bower, D.; Smith, N. J.; Aritua, B. 2011. Evidence from public sector infrastructure projects in the United Kingdom: what hazards are common or magnified in programs? (International Journal of Project Management, 29(3), 303–312). Bertolini, M., Braglia, M., and Carmignani, G. (2006) published their work at this doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.04.004. Public work contract proposal using the AHP approach, International Journal of Project Management, 24(5), 422–430. Management Science 28(1): 1187–1196 (Boje, D. M.; Murnighan, J. K. 1982). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2006.01.005>. [Brown, D. C.; Ashleigh, M. J.; Riley, M. J.; Shaw, R. D. 2001] is the DOI for the article. [Journal of Management in Engineering, 2017: 17(4), 192–201] New project procurement method. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(2001\)17:4\(192\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2001)17:4(192))
- Cha, H. S.; O'Connor, J. T. 2005. Optimizing implementation of value management processes for capital projects, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management 131(2): 239–251. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2005\)131:2\(239\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2005)131:2(239))
- Chan, A. P. C.; Chan, D. W. M.; Yeung, J. F. Y. 2009. Overview of the application of “fuzzy techniques” in construction management research, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management 135(11): 1241–1252. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000099](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000099)
- Chan, A. P. C.; Yung, E. H. K.; Lam, P. T. I.; Tam, C. M.; Cheung, S. O. 2001. Application of Delphi method in selection of procurement systems for construction projects, Construction Management and Economics 19(7): 699–718. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01446190110066128>
- Chan, C. T. W. 2012. The principal factors affecting construction project overhead expenses: an exploratory factor analysis approach, Construction Management and Economics 30(10): 903–914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2012.717706>
- Chau, K. W. 1995. The validity of the triangular distribution assumption in Monte Carlo simulation of construction costs: empirical evidence from Hong Kong, Construction Management and Economics 13(1): 15–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01446199500000003>
- Chau, K. W. 1997. The ranking of construction management journals, Construction Management and Economics 15(4): 387–398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/014461997372953>
- Chen, J. H.; Hsu, S. C. 2008. Quantifying impact factors of corporate financing: engineering consulting firms, Journal of Management in Engineering 24(2): 96–104. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(2008\)24:2\(96\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2008)24:2(96))
- Chen, Z.; Li, H.; Ross, A.; Khalfan, M. M. A.; Kong, S. C. W. 2008. Knowledge-driven ANP approach to vendors evaluation for sustainable construction, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management 134(12): 928–941. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2008\)134:12\(928\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2008)134:12(928))
- Chinowsky, P. S.; Molenaar, K.; Bastias, A. 2007. Measuring achievement of learning organizations in construction, Engineering, Construction and Architecture Management 14(3): 215–227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09699980710744872>
- Cooke, T.; Lingard, H.; Blismas, N.; Stranieri, A. 2008. ToolSheDTM: the development and evaluation of a decision support tool for health and safety in construction design, Engineering, Construction and Architecture Management 15(4): 336–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09699980810886847>
- Dalkey, N.; Brown, B.; Cochran, S. 1970. Use of self-ratings to improve group estimates, Technological Forecasting 1(3): 283–291. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0099-3964\(70\)90029-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0099-3964(70)90029-3)

- Dawood, N. 2010. Development of 4D-based performance indicators in construction industry, *Engineering, Construction and Architecture Management* 17(2): 210–230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09699981011024704>
- Dawood, N.; Sikka, S. 2009. Development of 4D based performance indicators in construction industry, *Engineering, Construction and Architecture Management* 16(5): 438–458. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09699980910988357>
- de la Cruz, M. P.; del Caño, A.; de la Cruz, E. 2006. Downside risks in construction projects developed by the civil service: the case of Spain, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* 132(8): 844–852. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9364\(2006\)132:8\(844\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2006)132:8(844))