





Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes, CCR (1978) [1] presented a mathematical model for measuring efficiency score of each unit by comparing the score of each unit with that of its peers. The model was used for measuring efficiency of  $n$  units,  $m$  inputs, and  $s$  outputs. The model as follows:



Sunun and Thawatchai (2010) [7] researched the actual costs related to safety system during a building construction project in Thailand. The safety costs were categorized to two parts safety measure cost and safety program cost. The results found the safety measure cost was 1.85% and the safety program cost was 0.98% of total construction cost. The safety cost (safety measure and safety program cost) in the building construction project was 2.83%.

Research methodology was classified to be steps, studying the research problems and related theories, data collection, data analysis, and research results.

Scope of this research related to safety in 12 construction projects where the construction completed. Inputs, researcher has focused on records of the safety expenses in the 12 projects comprise of four parts of safety expenses for each project (I1–I4). The safety expenses in this study would be recorded in term of percentage (%) to total construction cost. Outputs, in this research would be number of total accident during the construction duration for each project including five types of accident (O1–O5). The inputs and outputs for safety performance evaluation in this research were:

- 1.) Expenses in health care ( $I_1$ )
- 2.) Expenses in safety training ( $I_2$ )
- 3.) Expenses in upgrading of process-related tools, instruments, machines, materials leading to the safety ( $I_3$ ) and,
- 4.) Expenses on personal protective equipment; PPE ( $I_4$ )

- 1.) Accident that do not cause any disability and do not involve any lost work days ( $O_1$ )
- 2.) Accident that do not cause any disability but involve lost work days ( $O_2$ )
- 3.) Accident that cause temporary disability ( $O_3$ )
- 4.) Accident that cause permanent partial disability ( $O_4$ ) and,
- 5.) Accident that cause permanent full disability or fatality ( $O_5$ )

```

graph LR
    subgraph Inputs
        I1[I1 Health care.]
        I2[I2 Safety training.]
        I3[I3 Upgrading of process-related tools, equipments, etc.]
        I4[I4 PPE.]
    end
    subgraph DMU [DMU]
        CP[Construction Projects (12 Projects)]
    end
    subgraph Outputs
        O1[O1 do not cause any disability and do not involve any lost work days.]
        O2[O2 do not cause any disability but involve lost work days.]
        O3[O3 cause temporary disability.]
        O4[O4 cause permanent partial disability.]
        O5[O5 cause permanent full disability or fatality.]
    end
    Inputs --> DMU
    DMU --> Outputs

```

Grit Ngowtanasuwan





**Table 2** Outputs, number of each accident type during the construction duration for each project case study

Project(DMU)	Project Duration(Year)	Outputs					Project Duration / Number of Accident
		O <sub>1</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>	O <sub>3</sub>	O <sub>4</sub>	O <sub>5</sub>	
1	1.50	10	7	2	1	1	0.0714
2	2.00	14	9	5	5	1	0.0588
3	1.75	11	4	0	4	2	0.0832
4	1.33	7	7	4	4	1	0.0578
5	1.67	12	8	8	5	1	0.0491
6	0.92	9	9	5	2	0	0.0368
7	0.83	8	5	6	3	2	0.0346
8	1.00	5	10	6	3	0	0.0417
9	1.79	10	11	7	1	1	0.0597
10	1.67	8	12	2	2	1	0.0668
11	1.50	13	5	4	4	0	0.0577
12	1.50	11	6	5	4	0	0.0577

In the Table 2, the researcher intended on number of total occurred accidents during the project duration for each project. Therefore, the last column in the Table 2 would be the ratio between the project duration over the number of total accidents.

## 4. Results

Evaluating safety performance in construction projects by using the DEA, the researcher has prepared the data (inputs/outputs) and a personal computer (PC) with the MaxDEA software (freeware). The data was inputted to the PC and RUN. The results were efficiency scores and rank for each the construction projects, shown in Table 3.



Project (DMU)	Efficiency Score	Rank
1	0.9495	4 <sup>th</sup>
2	0.9534	3 <sup>rd</sup>
3	1.0000	1 <sup>st</sup>
4	0.7726	8 <sup>th</sup>
5	0.8028	6 <sup>th</sup>
6	0.5330	11 <sup>th</sup>
7	0.6237	10 <sup>th</sup>
8	0.6870	9 <sup>th</sup>
9	0.9951	2 <sup>nd</sup>
10	1.0000	1 <sup>st</sup>
11	0.8859	5 <sup>th</sup>
12	0.7832	7 <sup>th</sup>

This research has presented a method for safety performance evaluation in construction projects by using a technique data envelopment analysis (DEA) which is a linear programming model. The four inputs (including expenses in health care, safety training, upgrading of process-related tools, instruments, machines, materials leading to the safety and personal protective equipment;PPE) and the five outputs (including accident that do not cause any disability and do not involve any lost work days, accident that do not cause any disability but involve lost work days, accident that cause temporary disability accident that cause permanent partial disability and accident that cause permanent full disability or fatality) were observed and collected as the data from the 12 construction project case studies in Thailand as shown in 3.1. Research found the DEA approach was applicable in the evaluation; the results could be ranked the safety performance of the 12 projects. The highest efficiency scores were the project no. 3 and no10. The next rank of efficiency scores were the project no. 9, 2, 1, 11, 5, 12, 4, 8, and 7 respectively. The lowest efficiency score was the project no. 6 (Table 3).

By this research, contractors, project owners, or project consultants can use this approach for evaluating safety performance in their construction projects. The project with highest efficiency score will be benchmark for other projects in improving their safety policy and program. The results can lead to a making decision in defining an appropriate safety budget for the most construction safety in the future projects. Moreover, the DEA can be applied to other evaluations such as contractor prequalification (in bidding process), construction project performance, company performance, etc.

