

**BUILDING MATERIAL SELECTION FRAMEWORK FOR
TROPICAL CLIMATIC CONDITIONS: AN ECO-DESIGN
BASED APPROACH**

Sharon Vanmathy Gurupatham

218074E

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

December 2022

**BUILDING MATERIAL SELECTION FRAMEWORK FOR
TROPICAL CLIMATIC CONDITIONS: AN ECO-DESIGN
BASED APPROACH**

Sharon Vanmathy Gurupatham

218074E

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of
Science in Civil Engineering

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

December 2022

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books)

Signature: *UOM Verified Signature*

Date: 05.02.2023

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters under my supervision

Name of the supervisor: Prof. (Mrs.). Chintha Jayasinghe

Signature of the supervisor: *UOM Verified Signature* Date: 06/02/2023

Name of the supervisor: Dr. K. Piyaruwan H. Perera

Signature of the supervisor: *UOM Verified Signature* Date: 05.02.2023

Name of the supervisor: Dr. Lepakshi Raju

Signature of the supervisor: *UOM Verified Signature* Date: 05.02.2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to gain this opportunity to express my thanks to the individuals who have so far guided me to successfully complete this research project.

I wish to thank my supervisor, Prof. (Mrs.). Chinth Jayasinghe, Head of the Department, Department of Civil Engineering, the University of Moratuwa for the immense support and guidance provided throughout the year to successfully complete the research study. My heartiest gratitude to my co-supervisor, Dr. K. Piyaruwan H. Perera, Principal Investigator (PI), Building Energy and Renewable Systems, Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, and Dr. Lepakshi Raju, Co-Founder and Managing Director, Anulekavi Ventures for the valuable advice, guidance, and support in the success of this research and report. Their valuable suggestions and comments are acknowledged.

I am obliged to give my special thanks to Industry professionals and Accredited Professionals of the Green Building Councils of Sri Lanka and India who shared their valuable experiences and opinions in order to complete the survey-based data collection. My special Thanks to the Chairpersons and officials of the Green Building councils of Sri Lanka and India for the shared contacts of the Accredited Professionals. Furthermore, my sincere thanks to the staff of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa for the support, comments during evaluations, and guidance provided towards this research.

I extend my gratitude to all previous researchers, whose contributions I have made use of in carrying out this research project. Last but not least, I am truly thankful to my parents who brought me up this far, and my husband who supported me in all ways possible.

Thank you.

G. Sharon Vanmathy

Department of civil engineering

University of Moratuwa

ABSTRACT

All over the world, sustainability has been given immense attention, thus novel state-of-the-art materials and building systems are emerging as alternatives. With those different alternatives, comparison and the selection of a better-performing material or a building system using diverse perspectives such as economic, ecological, social, and cultural are important to ensure the adaptation of the proposed research findings to the particular community. Even though many researchers introduced multiple material selection frameworks using economic and ecological parameters, a holistic approach including Social and Cultural adaptability of those selections has been overlooked in previous studies.

This study proposed an eco-design-based material selection approach that considers the individual and wholistic perspective of diverse themes including economic, ecological, social, and cultural. Several sub-themes are identified under each theme and are verified through expert surveys. The pairwise comparison of themes and sub-themes and analysis using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) leads to proposing weights for each theme and sub-theme and developing an eco-design-based material selection framework in ranking and choosing better-performing building materials. Accordingly, saving energy, reducing the overexploitation of natural resources, reducing energy emissions, and reducing construction, as well as operational cost, are the parameters that create a greater impact on the selection of sustainable material with the aid of eco-design.

Furthermore, the developed framework is validated by comparing an emerging walling material Cement Stabilized Earth Blocks (CSEB) with conventional materials such as Burnt Clay Bricks (BCB) and Cement Sand Blocks (CSB). Technique for Order Preference by Similarities to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) had been carried out to compare and rank the respective walling materials under different scenarios. Accordingly, CSEB is concluded to be the best alternative when analyzed in the eco-design concept. Furthermore, individual analysis of ecological and economic themes shows that CSEB is the best material over the long run while BCB is said to be performing well socially and culturally.

The proposed framework could be highly beneficial for industry practitioners such as contractors, building developers, planners, and policymakers in choosing community-preferred, affordable, and environmental-friendly construction materials. Moreover, this piece of research could be improved with the inclusion of fuzzy numbers which enables consideration of uncertainty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objective	2
1.3 Methodology	3
1.4 Arrangement of the Thesis	3
2. Literature review	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Factors affecting building material selection	7
2.3 Sustainable Buildings and materials	10
2.4 Life Cycle thinking-based approach and sustainability	12
2.5 Material selections with the aid of quantifiable methods.....	15
2.5.1 Experimental testing procedures	15

2.5.2	Calculations and computer simulations	16
2.6	Combination of qualitative and quantitative methods for building material selection	19
2.7	Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)	23
2.8	Summary	25
3.	QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS: DESIGN AND PROCESS	26
3.1	Survey on the level of importance of sub-themes	26
3.1.1	Design of Questionnaire and Pilot survey	26
3.1.2	Respondents to the survey	29
3.1.3	Process of survey	30
3.1.4	Quantification of the level of importance	30
3.2	Survey on pairwise comparison	31
3.2.1	Design of questionnaire	31
3.2.2	Selection of respondents and the process of the survey	32
3.2.3	Delphi technique	32
3.2.4	Analytical Hierarchy Process	33
3.3	Testing of the developed framework	34
3.3.1	Case study	34
3.3.2	Quantified parameters with the aid of a model house	37
3.3.3	Quantified parameters with the aid of expert interviews	37

3.3.4	Technique for Order Preference by Similarities to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS).....	38
4.	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF SURVEY RESPONSES	40
4.1	Survey on the level of importance of sub-themes	40
4.1.1	Hierarchy of themes and sub-themes under eco-design	43
4.1.2	The sample size of respondents	48
4.1.3	Reliability Analysis.....	48
4.1.4	Level of importance of identified sub-themes	49
4.2	Analysis and results of the Survey on pairwise comparison of themes and sub-themes	60
4.2.1	Selection of respondents for the pair-wise comparisons.....	60
4.2.2	Analysis of responses to pair-wise comparisons	60
4.3	Application of the developed framework in comparing materials	66
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
5.1	Conclusions	71
5.2	Recommendations	71
	REFERENCES	76
	APPENDIX - A.....	95
A1:	Request to participate in the survey 1: Cover letter	95
A2:	Survey Document 1.....	96
	APPENDIX – B	100

B1: Request to participate in the survey 2: Cover letter	100
B2: Survey Document 2.....	101
B3: Summary tables for Survey 2.....	116
APPENDIX - C.....	119
C1: Request to participate in the survey 3: Cover letter	119
C2: Survey Document: 3.....	120
C3: Summary tables for Survey 3	124

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Methodology Framework	4
Figure 2: Current Profession of pilot survey respondents	27
Figure 3: Pilot survey respondents whether Accredited Professionals or not.....	28
Figure 4: Years of experience in Green Projects of pilot survey respondents.....	28
Figure 5: Involvement in number of Green Projects by the pilot survey respondents	29
Figure 6: Plan view of the sample house considered	35
Figure 7: House modeled in Design Builder.....	37
Figure 8: Professional discipline of survey respondents.....	40
Figure 9: Profession of survey respondents	41
Figure 10: Survey respondents whether accredited professionals or not.....	41
Figure 11: Specified councils of Accredited Professionals	42
Figure 12: Years of experience in Green Projects of the respondents of Survey 1 ...	42
Figure 13: Involvement in number of Green Projects by the respondents of Survey 1	43
Figure 14: Hierarchy of themes and sub-themes under eco-design	44
Figure 15: Relative Indices of sub-themes.....	50
Figure 16: Relative importance with the level of expertise of respondents.....	53
Figure 17: Relative importance with the professional discipline of respondents	56
Figure 18: Relative importance based on the nationality of respondents	59

Figure 19: Years of experience in green projects of respondents of survey 2.....	61
Figure 20: Involvement in number of Green Projects by respondents of survey 2 ...	61
Figure 21: Performance score of alternatives under different scenarios.....	69
Figure 22: Diagrammatic representation of the developed material selection framework	73
Figure 23: Case study applied in Excel form of Framework	74
Figure 24: Excel form of the developed framework	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Sustainability issues related to construction	8
Table 2: Selective literature on finalizing material selection criteria	22
Table 3: Likert scale for level of importance	29
Table 4: Range of Relative Index and description	31
Table 5: Likert scale for pair-wise comparison	31
Table 6: RI values with the size of the matrix	34
Table 7: Five-point scale for material comparisons.....	38
Table 8: Cronbach's Alpha of responses	48
Table 9: Level of Importance of sub-themes	49
Table 10: RI of experts with more experience	51
Table 11: RI of experts with less experience	52
Table 12: RI of experts from Engineering discipline.....	54
Table 13: RI of experts from Architecture discipline	55
Table 14: RI of experts from Sri Lanka	57
Table 15: RI of experts from India.....	58
Table 16: Consistency Ratios of responses of each respondent	62
Table 17: Aggregated responses for the themes of Eco-design.....	62
Table 18: Aggregated responses for the ecological sub-themes	62
Table 19: Aggregated responses for the economic sub-themes.....	62

Table 20: Aggregated responses for the social sub-themes	63
Table 21: Local and Global weights of themes and sub-themes	63
Table 22: Aggregated fuzzy responses for the themes of Eco-design	64
Table 23: Aggregated fuzzy responses for the ecological sub-themes	65
Table 24: Aggregated fuzzy responses for the economic sub-themes	65
Table 25: Aggregated responses for the social sub-themes	65
Table 26: Local and Global weights of themes and sub-themes	66
Table 27: Parameters quantified with the aid of case study model house	67
Table 28: Parameters quantified through discussions.....	67
Table 29: The normalized weighted values of alternatives for each sub-theme.....	67
Table 30: The Ideal best and the Ideal worst of each sub-theme.....	68
Table 31: Performance score and ranking of alternatives.....	68
Table 32: Ranks of alternatives under different scenarios	69
Table 33: Descriptions of the considered scenarios for the analysis	70
Table 34: Framework for material selection with the aid of Eco-design.....	72

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SDG – Sustainable Development Goals

AP – Accredited Professionals

GBCSL – Green Building Council of Sri Lanka

IGBC – Indian Green Building Council

BREEAM - Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method

LEED - Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design

RI – Relative Index

MCDM – Multi-Criteria Decision Making

AHP – Analytical Hierarchy Process

TOPSIS - Technique for Order Preference by Similarities to Ideal Solution

BCB – Burnt Clay Bricks

CSB – Cement Sand Blocks

CSEB - Cement Stabilized Earth Blocks