



Prevention through design: Conceptual models for the assessment of a Principal Designer's skills, knowledge and experience

Journal:	<i>Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	JEDT-07-2020-0278.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Prevention through design, Skills, Knowledge, Experience, Integrated model, Construction

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Prevention through design: Conceptual models for the assessment of a Principal Designer's skills, knowledge and experience

Abstract

Purpose - The prevention through design (PtD) initiative places a duty on designers to originate designs that are inherently safe for construction, maintenance, occupation and demolition. In the UK, legislation has been introduced creating a new statutory role called the Principal Designer (PD) to ensure that PtD occurs during the design process. In order to realize this objective, Principal Designers under the Regulations must have appropriate skills, knowledge and experience (SKE) of occupational safety and health (OSH) risks as they relate to construction products. However, there is a paucity of knowledge, in the extant literature and in practice, regarding what specifically constitutes Principal Designers' skills, knowledge and experience of PtD as well as how to measure same.

Design/Methodology/Approach – The study undertook a systematic review of meanings of skills, knowledge and experience, and carried out content analyses to provide robust conceptualizations of the constructs skill, knowledge and experience. This underpinned the development of nomological networks to operationalize the constructs skills, knowledge and experience in respect of Principal Designers' ability to ensure PtD.

Results – Principal Designers' skills, knowledge and experience of PtD are presented as multi-dimensional constructs that can be operationalized at different levels of specificity in three theoretical models.

Practical implications – The models indicated in this study can assist project clients to clarify the PtD skills, knowledge and experience of prospective Principal Designers in the procurement process. Correspondingly, Principal Designers can look to these frameworks to identify their skills, knowledge and experience gaps and take steps to address them.

Originality/Value – This study contributes to the PtD literature by providing theoretical frameworks to clarify the PtD skills, knowledge and experience of Principal Designers. The study provides a basis for future research to empirically test the attributes of these as they relate to Principal Designers' competence to ensure PtD.

1
2
3 **Keywords:** Prevention through design; Skills; Knowledge; Experience; Integrated model;
4 Construction
5
6
7
8

9 **1. Introduction**

10
11
12 The construction industry has been the main stay of most economies around the world for many
13 decades (Ruddock and Lopes 2006, Wong et al. 2008, Chiang et al. 2015). It provides several
14 millions of direct and indirect jobs (Ofori 1990, Aires et al. 2016). However, the industry has an
15 unenviable reputation for poor occupational safety and health (OSH) performance relative to other
16 industries (Hughes and Ferrett 2007; Benjaoran and Bhokha 2010). This situation exists in the
17 industry as a result of the varied views and uncoordinated efforts of stakeholders along the project
18 development process in respect of OSH risks management (Krane et al. 2012, Willumsen et al.
19 2019). In the past, the management of OSH risks on construction projects has been deemed to be
20 the main responsibility of contractors (Rechnitzer 2001, Hare et al. 2006). However, investigations
21 into the root causes of poor OSH performance on construction projects **have pointed** to the
22 unacceptable procurement and design decisions at the pre-construction stages of the project
23 development process. This revelation now serves as a driver for focusing efforts, in the effective
24 management of OSH risks, on stakeholders (clients and designers) upstream of the project
25 development process in a philosophy termed as “prevention through design (PtD)” (Szymberski
26 1997, Gibb et al. 2004, Gambatese et al. 2005, Cooke et al. 2008, Lingard et al. 2015). This
27 philosophy places a moral, as well as in some jurisdictions a legal, duty on designers to originate
28 designs or construction products that are inherently safe for construction, occupation, maintenance
29 and demolition. Some researchers (for example, Gambatese et al. 2005, López-Arquillos et al.
30 2015, Goh and Chua 2016, Poghosyan et al. 2018) have made calls for awareness creation and
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 capacity building among designers to enhance their contributions to effective OSH risk
4 management on projects, particularly at the pre-construction stage.
5
6
7
8
9

10 The nexus between procurement as well as design decisions and OSH risks downstream of the
11 project development process came to the attention of the European Union (EU) and its European
12 Council (EC) responded by adopting Council Directive 1992/57/EEC on the implementation of
13 minimum safety and health requirements at temporary or mobile construction sites. This Directive
14 requires the appointment of two types of coordinators for health and safety matters on construction
15 projects that will require more than one contractor on the construction site. Referred to in this paper
16 as the Pre-Construction Phase Coordinator (PCPC), the first type is to take responsibility for
17 coordination during the design and project preparation stage of projects. The second type of
18 coordinator is referred to as the Construction Phase Coordinator (CPC) who is engaged for
19 coordination of OSH matters during the construction phase of projects. Having national laws
20 providing for the appointment of these two dutyholders on projects is a mandatory requirement of
21 Member States although no details are prescribed for the roles (e.g., the type of professional to
22 exercise it and whether the two roles may be performed by the same entity). In 1994 the UK, then
23 a full member of the EU, transposed the Directive into UK legislation as part of the Construction
24 (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 (CDM 1994). These Regulations imposed statutory
25 safety and health duties on the traditional stakeholders of construction projects – clients, designers,
26 and contractors. They also created the dutyholders of “Planning Supervisor” and “Principal
27 Contractor” with defined statutory duties to take on the performance of the roles of the PCPC and
28 CPC, respectively, under the EC Directive.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The UK's Health and Safety Executive (HSE), the national regulatory authority for health and
4 safety, has had to respond twice to concerns about pre-construction coordination of health and
5 safety matters, attempting to change the role for it each time. About ten years after the CDM 1994
6 came into force, they were replaced with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations
7 2007 (CDM 2007) which changed the label for the pre-construction coordinator from "Planning
8 Supervisor" to "CDM Coordinator". Coordination among relevant stakeholders is at the root of
9 effective OSH risks management on construction projects, particularly at the early stages of the
10 design process (Putsman and McArthur 2015, Bussey 2015). However, under the CDM 2007,
11 evidence from practice indicated that the CDM Coordinators (i.e. PCPCs) were usually not
12 appointed early enough by clients to facilitate the health and safety coordination process (HSE
13 2014) **defeating** the PtD ethos espoused by the Regulations. Hence, a review of the CDM 2007 by
14 the HSE considered incorporating the role of the PCPC into the main designer of the construction
15 project as a way of effectively embedding the principle of coordination, in respect of PtD, into the
16 design process (HSE 2014). Additionally, the CDM 2007 required clients to appoint individuals
17 or organizations with individual competence and corporate competence, respectively, in the design
18 and management of construction projects. However, one of the unintended consequences of the
19 regulatory prescription of *competence* and its assessment in an approved code of practice (ACOP)
20 was the proliferation of third party assessment schemes that were uncoordinated, bureaucratic and
21 costly to organizations, particularly the smaller ones (HSE, 2014). CDM 2007 was in turn replaced
22 about eight years later with the Construction (Design and Management) 2015 Regulations (CDM
23 2015). The key changes made in CDM 2015 **were**: (a) putting much greater emphasis on the
24 coordination of the pre-construction design process and replacing "CDM Coordinator" with
25 "Principal Designer"; (b) replacement of the requirement for *competences* of dutyholders with
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *skills, knowledge and experience* of individual dutyholders and *organizational capability* where a
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

dutyholder is an organization.

The Principal Designer, by the Regulations, is appointed by the client at the early stage of the project development process to “plan, manage and monitor the pre-construction phase and coordinate matters relating to health and safety during the pre-construction phase to ensure that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the project is carried out without risks to health or safety” (HSE, 2015). Again, in the replacement of the CDM 2007 with CDM 2015, the HSE has indicated that the health and safety *competence* should be dealt with by way of professional bodies and the industry rather than by a regulatory requirement (HSE 2014). However, there is paucity of knowledge in the extant literature as well as in the construction industry as to what specifically constitutes the skills, knowledge and experience of designers, particularly Principal Designers to ensure that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the design of the construction product is thought out without risks to health or safety. Further, how this competence (skills, knowledge and experience) of the Principal Designer can be specifically assessed is not so clear in the extant literature and in practice. To be able to assess the PtD skills, knowledge and experience of Principal Designers requires an understanding of the attributes of these constructs. **In the development of knowledge in a field**, the role of theoretical underpinning cannot be over-emphasized (Rule and John 2015; Collins and Stockton 2018). This study, therefore, aims to elucidate or conceptualize **through a theoretical lens** the **skills, knowledge and experience** constructs as they relate to Principal Designers’ abilities to ensure PtD on projects as a basis for their meaningful operationalization. Second, it provides three integrated models for the measurement and assessment of the PtD skills, knowledge and experience of Principal Designers. **These** models also provide a basis for

1
2
3 taxonomizing the PtD skills, knowledge and experience of Principal Designers. This study
4
5 particularly focuses on individual Principal Designers. It is expected that further studies consider
6
7 same for organizational capability as they relate to design firms.
8
9

10
11
12 The article is structured in seven sections. The first section provides an introduction and motivation
13
14 for this study. The second section discusses the prevention through design (PtD) philosophy in
15
16 construction. The method or approach to the study is provided in the third section. The fourth
17
18 section focuses on the meanings and theoretical models for measuring and assessing the PtD skills,
19
20 knowledge and experience constructs. The fifth section provides some discussions on the models
21
22 with some implications for practice. **The sixth section considers the limitations of the study and**
23
24 **directions for future studies regarding Principal Designers' PtD competence research.** In section
25
26 seven, the conclusions of the study are offered.
27
28
29
30

31 32 33 **2. Prevention through design (PtD) philosophy in construction**

34
35
36 Effective risk management requires proactiveness in efforts and decisions. After-thought decisions
37
38 and efforts undermine meaningful risk management on any project. Construction risks, particularly
39
40 OSH risks, until recently have not been managed proactively (Szymberski, 1997; Hare et al.,
41
42 2006). Consideration of their management, generally, was at points in the project development
43
44 process (i.e. construction stages) when opportunities to influence them were almost lost or reduced
45
46 significantly (Szymberski, 1997; Gambatese et al. 2005; Behm, 2005; Hare et al., 2006; Lingard
47
48 et al., 2015; Manu et al., 2019a). **This situation was not helped by the fact that** the connection
49
50 between procurement as well as design decisions upstream of the project development process and
51
52 OSH risks downstream (i.e. construction, occupation and demolition) of same was not clearly
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 established until recently. This insight has catalyzed stakeholders of the construction product
4
5 development process, particularly upstream of the chain, to take collective responsibility in
6
7 minimising OSH risks on construction projects (Gambatese et al. 2005; Behm, 2005; Lingard et
8
9 al., 2015). This is what has informed the 'Prevention through Design (PtD)' initiative, otherwise
10
11 considered in literature as 'Design for Safety (DfS)', 'Design for Occupational Safety and Health
12
13 (DfOSH)', 'Safety in Design (SiD)', 'Construction Hazard Prevention through Design (CHPtD)'
14
15 and 'Safe Design (SD)'. The ethos of the PtD initiative is to encourage designers to be proactive
16
17 about OSH risks management, particularly at the early stages of the project development process,
18
19 to avert harm to project stakeholders downstream of the project chain.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Mostly, when designers make decisions on construction products, their choices determine the
27
28 materials selection, the dimensions and positions of project features as well as the construction
29
30 approach which can significantly influence the safety and health of persons involved in
31
32 constructing, occupying, maintaining and eventually demolishing those construction products
33
34 (Hinze and Gambatese, 1994; ECI, 1996; Manu et al., 2012; Gambatese and AlOmari, 2016).
35
36 Hence, some researchers (for example, Cooke et al., 2008; Lingard et al., 2015) indicate that failure
37
38 to address OSH concerns, early at the design stage of construction products, is at odds with
39
40 contemporary view of risk management.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Literature indicates that challenges exist regarding the effective implementation of the PtD
48
49 initiative in practice. For instance, in the USA, Gambatese et al. (2005) indicated the lack of
50
51 consideration for PtD was mainly due to the designer mindset towards safety as well as lack of
52
53 knowledge among designers. Additionally, studies (for example, López-Arquillos et al., 2015; Goh
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Chua, 2016) have also highlighted the lack of emphasis on PtD in the education of designers
4
5 in tertiary education institutions.
6
7
8
9

10 To augment the PtD initiative, some researchers have developed PtD tools as a way of supporting
11
12 designers to make contributions in minimising OSH risks on projects. Examples of such tools are
13
14 design for construction safety toolbox (Gambatese et al., 1997), ToolSHeD (Cooke et al., 2008),
15
16 injury prevention tool for leadership in energy and environmental design (LEED) (Dewlaney and
17
18 Hallowell, 2012), construction project features risk management toolkit (Manu, 2012), hierarchy
19
20 of control (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 2015) and Building Information
21
22 Modelling (BIM) (Autodesk Incorporated, 2020).
23
24
25
26
27

28 Hardison and Hallowell (2019) indicate that relying on the input or information provided by safety
29
30 experts as the basis of PtD tools presents three major problems: (1) safety experts may fail to
31
32 recognize high risk areas in designs due to unfamiliarity of the design itself; (2) a design solution
33
34 in one environment may not be an optimal design solution in another; (3) a design change that may
35
36 be optimal in one context may shuffle risk to other locations, phases, exposures, and tasks thereby
37
38 inadvertently increasing lifecycle risk through sub-optimization. Thus, it appears that, although
39
40 PtD tools provide opportunity for hazards recognition and realization, they fail to address the
41
42 effects that PtD suggestions have on the lifecycle safety risks (Hardison and Hallowell, 2019).
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Whilst the standard tools and knowledge developed to aid designers in their PtD efforts are
50
51 commendable, since most projects are unique, some level of PtD skills, knowledge and experience
52
53 will be expected of Principal Designers and designers to assure project clients of some minimum
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 level of performance. Recent studies (for instance, Goh and Chua, 2016; Poghosyan et al., 2018)
4 have also indicated that clients and end-users provide the greatest motivation for undertaking PtD
5 in the construction industry. Unfortunately, clients are usually indicted for their weak support for
6 PtD on construction projects (Oney-Yazici and Dulaimi, 2014; Hwang et al., 2014). However, are
7 clients of construction projects completely to blame for their inadequate contributions to PtD
8 when, in part, there are no decision support systems to assist them to clarify the PtD skills,
9 knowledge and experience of Principal Designers prior to their engagement? Further, must
10 Principal Designers or designers be solely indicted for their poor contributions to PtD when there
11 are no PtD skills, knowledge and experience frameworks to offer them an opportunity to self-
12 assess and take steps to improve their PtD abilities? In view of this, any efforts to develop
13 frameworks that can assist project clients to clarify the skills, knowledge and experience of
14 Principal Designers and designers prior to engagement as well as offer opportunities for Principal
15 Designers and designers to assess their own performances will be in the right direction.

3. Methods

36
37
38 This study initially conceptualizes the PtD skills, knowledge and experience constructs of the
39 Principal Designer on a construction project, and subsequently develops an integrated model for
40 the operationalization of the constructs. To fulfil the first part, a review of literature on how prior
41 studies have sought to conceptualize skills, knowledge and experience of a worker was undertaken.
42 This was to provide a basis for conceptual content analysis, synthesis and provision of broad
43 conceptualizations of the constructs. Scopus was used as the main database for the literature search
44 with additional information from Google Scholar. In comparison with other databases (e.g.
45 PubMed, Web of Science and Google Scholar), Scopus has an extensive coverage in all fields
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 including science, technology, social sciences, arts and humanities (Chadegani et al. 2013,
4 Mongeon and Paul-Hus 2016). The key search words or phrases were “Concept of skill”,
5
6 “Definition of knowledge”, “Concept” AND “Work experience” as well as “Worker Skill,
7
8 Knowledge and Experience”. The search word “Concept of Skill” in Scopus returned 88 results.
9
10 The search word “Definition of knowledge” in the same database returned 372 results. The
11
12 “Concept” AND “Work experience” search word returned 936 results while “Worker Skill,
13
14 Knowledge and Experience” search phrase returned no results. The key search words or phrases
15
16 were selected to focus the search on studies (such as Aune, 1970; Leplat, 1990; Engestrom, 1994,
17
18 Quinones et al., 1995; Tesluk and Jacobs, 1998; Sanchez, 2004; Clarke and Winch, 2006; Manu
19
20 et al., 2019b) that have attempted to define or conceptualize the constructs skills, knowledge and
21
22 experience as required by the first step of this study approach. The search results in each case
23
24 covered over 10 subject categories such as construction; engineering; social science; economics
25
26 and finance; medicine; education; psychology; arts and humanities; computer science; medicine;
27
28 business, management and accounting, among others. The year ranges, as supplied by Scopus, for
29
30 the search results were 1976 – 2020, 1964 – 2020 and 1966 – 2020 for the skills, knowledge and
31
32 experience key search words or phrases, respectively. The searches were done on February 8, 2020.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The identified publications were screened, preliminarily, by checking the abstracts to establish
43
44 their usefulness to the review. 46, 95 and 150 were passed unto the eligibility stage, respectively
45
46 for the constructs skill, knowledge and experience. The screened publications were subsequently
47
48 assessed for eligibility. The main criterion for eligibility was that the publication must clearly
49
50 indicate a definition for the construct skill or knowledge or experience. 7, 13 and 5 publications
51
52 were subsequently included in the conceptual analysis and synthesis of the three constructs
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respectively. As not many publications specifically provided definitions for the constructs in the
4
5 first search, the reference sections of the publications that provided specific definitions of the
6
7 constructs were specifically analysed to locate additional relevant publications from Google
8
9 Scholar in a second search. This second search added 11, 10 and 3 more publications making a
10
11 total of 18, 23 and 8 publications that were finally considered for the conceptual analysis and
12
13 synthesis of the constructs skill, knowledge and experience, respectively. Figure 1 indicates the
14
15 publication selection process adapted from Moher et al. (2009) PRISMA systematic literature
16
17 review process. This approach was adapted because it uses a systematic and explicit method to
18
19 identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyse data from the
20
21 studies that are included in the review.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The conceptualizations of the skills, knowledge and experience constructs in the first part of the
29
30 research approach provided a basis for identifying the common components that explicate each
31
32 construct, at least from the perspective of previous studies. The common components identified
33
34 also provided theoretical underpinnings in establishing specific domains or modes of measurement
35
36 for each construct. Combined with Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998)'s
37
38 postulation of levels of specificity of construct measurement, a nomological network was
39
40 developed to operationalize these constructs as they relate to the Principal Designer's ability to
41
42 ensure PtD. They considered the levels of specificity as task, job, work group, organizational and
43
44 occupational. A nomological network establishes a linkage between the theoretical construct and
45
46 its observable attributes in an attempt to operationalize the construct (Cronbach and Meehl 1955).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 [Figure 1 about here]
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. Meanings and theoretical models for measuring the PtD skills, knowledge and experience constructs of Principal Designers

The Principal Designer's role, like all other roles in every field of engagement, requires some level of competence to effectively fulfill it. One of the key requirements under the CDM 2015 Regulations is that any individual intending to fulfill or be appointed for that role should have skills, knowledge and experience.

4.1 Meaning of skill construct

The concept of skill has always been an elusive one (Barrow 1987, Griffiths 1987, Vallas 1990, Ainley 1993, Evans 1993, Grugulis and Vincent 2009), and has long been contested in the literature (Smith and Teicher 2017). There seems to be diverse theoretical perspectives regarding the **construct** (Thursfield 2001, Esposito 2008). Sawchuk (2006) indicates that researchers have failed to develop an overarching conceptual framework for skill, partly because the skill literature is highly "siloeed" across a range of disciplines including economics, psychology, management, industrial relations, sociology, education and human resource development. That notwithstanding, the understanding of the construct skill has generally been a strong divergence between those, such as psychologists and human capital theorists or economists, who construe skills as being the properties of the job holder rather than the job, and those sociologists who interpret skills from the job requirements' perspective (Vallas 1990, Spenner 1990). Spenner (1990) classify those properties (for example, talents, abilities, capacities **and the like**) that people bring to the job as individual possessions while those that are required by the job (for instance, task demands, role requirements and positional demands) as social roles.

1
2
3
4
5
6 To better understand the construct skill, a number of definitions are extracted from the extant
7 literature as to how researchers in the past have sought to construe the construct. Such an approach
8 offers an opportunity to do a conceptual or content analysis of prior conceptions of the skill
9 construct to identify some common elements regarding its explication. In this way, a basis is
10 provided to offer a more robust conceptualization of the skill construct to support its objective and
11 systematic measurement. Table 1 indicates the definitions of the skill construct from the extant
12 literature. Critically looking at how various researchers have conceptualized skill, certain
13 commonalities or basic elements of the construct skill become evident. As indicated in Table 1,
14 most researchers (for example, ASME 2010, Sanchez 2004, Leplat 1990, International Labour
15 Office 1990, Attewell 1990, Ainley 1993, Preston 2003, Grugulis 2007, Anderson 2009, Winch
16 2011, Manu et al. 2019b) construe skill from the perspective of *ability*. **Ability** here, as indicated
17 in Table 1, **refers to** attributes independent of the job and are as already possessed by the job holder
18 (see for example, Blunden 1996, Blackmore 1999, IPMA 2015) as well as attributes dependent on
19 and required by the job. Again, another way of conceiving ability is know-how (see for example,
20 ASME 2010, Winch 2011, Clarke and Winch 2006) which will, similarly, be job holder or job
21 dependent.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 [Table 1 about here]
46
47
48

49 Further, a common element in the understanding of the skill construct is *task*. Researchers (for
50 example, Attewell 1990, Leplat 1990, ILO 1990, Ainley 1993, Blunden 1996, Strebler et al. 1997,
51 Preston 2003, Clark and Winch 2006, Grugulis 2007, ASME 2010, Winch 2011, IPMA 2015,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Manu et al. 2019b) have conceptualized skills from the perspective of a task. This supports Leplat
4
5 (1990)'s claim that skill cannot be separated from its object or task in its notion, as to be skilled is
6
7 basically to be skilled at a task or a class of tasks. Work psychology generally defines a task as "a
8
9 goal to be achieved in given conditions" (Leplat 1990). In that sense, the value of skills is in its
10
11 requirement for a goal to be achieved and will most likely be demonstrated or revealed when
12
13 applied to that goal (Clarke and Winch 2006) under given conditions. In thinking of a task (goal)
14
15 to be fulfilled, the two fundamental questions that are asked inadvertently simultaneously are: what
16
17 is required to get this task (goal) done (sociologists perspective) and who is able to get this task
18
19 (goal) done (psychologists and human capital theorists or economists perspective)? The dichotomy
20
21 of how skill is conceptualized by these two groups of philosophers is basically reduced to how
22
23 each group intends to measure skill. This, potentially, can conceal the non-mutual exclusiveness
24
25 of the "what is required" and "who is able" concerns when thinking of a task (goal) to be fulfilled.
26
27 Not having an integrated view and looking at the phenomenon in part can underpin a measurement
28
29 error as far as the construct skill is concerned.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Performance* or realisation of desired outcomes is one element that provides understanding of the
39
40 skill construct. Some researchers (for example, Blackmore 1990, Attewell 1990, ILO 1990,
41
42 Preston 2003, Grugulis 2007, Manu et al., 2019b) suggest performance in their exposition of the
43
44 skill construct as indicated in Table 1. The application of ability to a task must, in the end,
45
46 engender desired outcomes to give true meaning to a skill. Hence, ability (the level of which is
47
48 determined by the degree of automaticity) should just not be applied to a task but must be combined
49
50 with awareness (i.e. conscious monitoring of efforts) (Tønnessen 2011) to produce desired
51
52 outcomes. Elucidating the skill construct from a performance perspective is thus a useful idea.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Holmes and Joyce (1993) indicate three dimensions (job-focused/technical; role-focused/social
7
8 and person-focused/biographical) in analysing managerial performance. The job-focused/technical
9
10 dimension considers the specific technical managerial requirements or tasks and what is necessary
11
12 for carrying out such tasks to deliver performance. On the other hand, the role-focused/social
13
14 dimension focuses on how managers perceive their environments and negotiate relationships with
15
16 others to deliver performance. The person-focused/biographical dimension considers managers'
17
18 dispositions, values, attitudes, behaviours, **among others**, required in ensuring performance. These
19
20 dimensions are necessary to understand the skill construct. Abilities are required along all these
21
22 three dimensions to carry out a task or a group of tasks acceptably. That is to say, one needs to be
23
24 skilled technically, interpersonally and attitudinally or behaviourally to deliver performance on a
25
26 task or a group of tasks. Superior performers of tasks do not merely apply required actions, but
27
28 reflect **on** their actions (Tønnessen 2011), experiment, and in so doing learn and develop
29
30 themselves (Kolb and Fry 1984, Dainty et al. 2004). This, therefore, indicates the necessity of
31
32 attitudes or some underlying characteristics of an individual in demonstrating superior
33
34 performance at a task (Boyatzis 1982). Over some decades now, studies have used the Big Five
35
36 personality traits (i.e. openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism)
37
38 in understanding, and as proxies for, non-cognitive skills (Mueller and Plug 2006, Heineck and
39
40 Anger 2010, Valerio et al. 2016)
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Again, some researchers (for example, Ashton and Green 1996, Strebler et al. 1997, ASME 2010)
50
51 perceive skill as training dependent as indicated in Table 1. This view is based on the fact that the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ability to perform a task under given conditions must be predicated on a level of training. In other
4
5 words, ability necessary for the performance of a task must be developed through training.
6
7
8
9

10 None of the prior studies attempts to conceptualize the skill construct by considering all the
11
12 common components supporting its explication. To provide a broad view in the conceptualization
13
14 of the skill construct and to underpin its meaningful operationalization, this study therefore defines
15
16 skill as the ability, both job holder and job dependent, obtained through training, required to
17
18 perform a task acceptably.
19
20
21
22
23

24 *4.2 Measurement of skill*

25
26
27 The development of a framework for the measurement of skills is based on Quinones et al. (1995)'s
28
29 framework which was later extended by Tesluk and Jacobs (1998). Quinones et al. (1995) and
30
31 Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) adopted a levels approach in the development of a framework for the
32
33 measurement of worker experience. A levels perspective demands an appropriate definition of
34
35 constructs and the domain of interest (dimensions of construct) as well as the level of measurement
36
37 specificity (Klein et al., 1994). A levels perspective, in this case, forces the investigator to think
38
39 conceptually about the individual, team, organizational and occupational issues as well as possible
40
41 cross-level effects or domains (Quinones et al. 1995, Tesluk and Jacobs 1998).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 This measurement focuses on skills at the individual level and to elicit understanding so that there
49
50 can be congruence across conceptualization, operationalization and interpretation of the skill
51
52 construct. Therefore, the first step in the process is to develop a framework that indicates the
53
54 domain of interest as well as the measures that may be appropriate for each "cell" in the framework.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The framework specifies the main dimensions that describe the various measures of skill as well
4 as the different levels of specificity within each domain (Quinones et al. 1995, Tesluk and Jacobs
5 1998). This approach juxtaposes the mode of measurement of the skill construct with the specific
6 level where performance is required in order to ascertain the nuances of skill measures or attributes.
7 In that sense, an opportunity is provided to establish a congruence between the measurement mode
8 and the required performance level of the skill construct in a nomological network. The
9 nomological network has two main dimensions as *measurement mode* and *level of specificity*.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Considering the measurement mode dimension, researchers over the past decades have sought to
22 indicate the multidimensional view of the skill construct. For example, sociology researchers
23 (focusing on the nature of skill as a property of the job) have indicated four broad approaches by
24 which skill can be measured (Smith and Teicher 2017). These broad approaches are:
25 positivist/technicist approach; proxy measures approach; social construction approach and soft or
26 generic skills approach. The positivist/technicist approach views skill as a measurable quantity
27 (Felstead et al. 2005) based on indicators such as complexity and autonomy (Adler 2007) in
28 working with things or information. The proxy measures approach views skill in terms of the
29 length of training and wage rate (Spenner 1990, Elias and McKnight 2001, Ruggles et al. 2010,
30 Boucher 2020). Proxy measures are usually criticised as problematic (Grugulis and Lloyd 2010)
31 and mostly used as a result of lack of any other means to measure skill directly (Gatta et al. 2007).
32 On the other hand, the social construction approach attempts to provide belief about skill, as well
33 as their associated hierarchies, through some industrial relations arrangements or institutions. It is
34 considered that the proxy measures of skill as well as the measures used for the positivist/technicist
35 approaches are products of social construction (Steinberg 1990, Smith and Teicher 2017). The soft
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or generic skills approach, unlike the positivist/technicist, which views skills from working with
4 things and information, considers skills from working with people (Shanmugham and Kishore
5 2012, Cabral and Dhar 2019). Typical examples being communication and inter-personal skills.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 From the conceptual view of the skill construct as well as sociologists' view (Smith and Teicher
13 2017) of how skill is measured, the specific domains considered for the measurement of skills are:
14 technical/training, autonomy, attitude and interpersonal. The *technical/training* dimension focuses
15 on what specific cognitive abilities (Shanmugham and Kishore 2012), for manipulating things and
16 information, are required for a goal to be achieved. These kinds of abilities can be developed
17 through training.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27
28 Technical abilities alone are not enough for individuals to fulfil goals acceptably. Some researchers
29 (for example, Boyatzis 1982, Dainty et al. 2004, Valerio et al. 2016) emphasise the need for certain
30 attitude or behavioral characteristics in fulfilment of goals. An individual may have the technical
31 ability or training but without the requisite attitude or behavioural tendencies, the technical/training
32 ability may not be deployed to best effect with regard to task fulfilment. This is the thrust for the
33 *attitude* measure or domain.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Skill in its infancy or at its lowest level has a low degree of automaticity (Tønnessen 2011) and
45 therefore requires some degree of control or supervision. Thus, an increasing amount of skills is
46 noticed by the level or increasing automaticity in respect of the individual. Further views taken by
47 some researchers (for example, Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1986, Breivik 2016) are that experts (who
48 generally are considered to have high levels of skills) are identified by their immediate and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 intuitive responses to tasks as opposed to novices who follow instructions and have to be
4 monitored. Skill, thus, can be measured in the domain of *autonomy*.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Tasks are carried out in environments that require interactions and negotiations with other persons
11 (Holmes and Joyce 1993, Smith and Teicher 2017). Interpersonal abilities are, thus, necessary in
12 achieving goals. Hence, *interpersonal* abilities are considered as a mode of measuring the skill
13 construct. Further, considering both the conceptualization and the domains or mode for clarifying
14 skill, the PtD skill required by the Principal Designer to perform optimally, as indicated in Figure
15 2, can be broadly taxonomized as job-focused/technical skills; person-focused/biographical skill;
16 and role-focused/social skill.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The measures or domains of skill can also vary along the level of specificity (Dubois and McKee
29 1994, Quinones et al. 1995) at which performance is required. For instance, an individual's level
30 of skill can be linked to specific tasks, jobs, work groups, organizations as well as occupations.
31 The appropriate level of specificity will, very much, depend on the theoretical linkage between
32 skills and the performance or outcome expected. For instance, the technical task requirement is
33 more useful than occupational type when one is interested in task performance. On the other hand,
34 when one is interested in occupational performance, then it will be more relevant to consider the
35 occupational type as opposed to a technical task requirement. As indicated in Figure 2, each of the
36 modes of the skill construct can be operationalized at five levels of specificity (task, job, work
37 group, organizational and occupational) creating a 5 X 4 nomological network for measuring a
38 skill. Illustrations of measures of skills, represented in each cell, are subsequently discussed.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Principal Designers can vary in their level of skill with respect to the performance of specific tasks.

1
2
3 First, Principal Designers can vary in their task technical abilities. While some Principal Designers
4 may have deeper cognitive ability about the performance of a task in respect of PtD, some others
5 may not. Second, Principal Designers' level of proficiency, indicating the level of autonomy, at
6 the task level can vary. While some Principal Designers may be very proficient, and thus highly
7 autonomous, in the performance of PtD tasks without support or supervision, other may not. Third,
8 Principal Designers can vary in their attitude towards the performance of a task. For instance, in
9 the performance of tasks in respect of PtD, conscientiousness is required and Principal Designers
10 can vary on this. Fourth, Principal Designers can vary on their task interpersonal abilities. The ease
11 with which Principal Designers can communicate or relate with superiors to obtain information
12 for the performance of their tasks can vary.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 At the level of a job, Principal Designers can vary in their job technical abilities. For instance,
29 while some Principal Designers may have a deeper appreciation or technical ability over a wide
30 range or collection of PtD tasks, others may not. Second, the level of autonomy exhibited in the
31 performance of PtD jobs can serve as a distinguishing factor among Principal Designers. For
32 example, while some Principal Designers may require some level of supervision in the
33 performance of their PtD job, others may require absolutely none. Third, the attitude required to
34 carry out a job in respect of PtD can be a distinguishing factor among Principal Designers.
35 Openness to potential risks inherent in construction designs may be a necessary attitude by
36 Principal Designers in the performance of their PtD jobs. Principal Designers can vary on this.
37 Fourth, Principal Designers can vary on their job interpersonal abilities. For example, while some
38 Principal Designers can easily and aptly communicate information in respect of their PtD jobs,
39 others cannot.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Considering** the level of work group, Principal Designers can vary in terms of the nature or type
7
8 of work group they function or may have functioned in. Some Principal Designers may belong to
9
10 groups that only work on conceptual designs while others may function in detailed design groups.
11
12 Second, the level of autonomy of groups Principal Designers belong to or have belonged to may
13
14 distinguish them. For example, some Principal Designers may belong to or might have belonged
15
16 to design groups that performed autonomously with little or no supervision while others may
17
18 belong to same with high degree of supervision. Third, the attitude required of Principal Designers
19
20 at the group level may differentiate them. For instance, at the work group level, an attitude such
21
22 as agreeableness will be required and Principal Designers can vary along this. Fourth, Principal
23
24 Designers can vary in their group interpersonal abilities. The Principal Designer role, on projects,
25
26 requires a significant coordinating ability. Hence, while some Principal Designers have team
27
28 building spirit and can motivate other team members to deliver optimal performance with regard
29
30 to PtD, **others** may not have **this attribute**.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **For** the level of organization, Principal Designers may differ in terms of the type of organization
39
40 **in which** they have obtained their training or technical abilities over time. Some may be from
41
42 public organizations where innovation and state-of-the-art knowledge, in respect of PtD, may be
43
44 limited whereas some may be from private organizations where these are underlying drivers.
45
46 Second, the position or role a Principal Designer holds in an organization indicates, somewhat, the
47
48 level of proficiency and hence autonomy he or she possesses in a given craft and Principal
49
50 Designers can vary on this. Third, Principal Designers can vary on organizational attitude.
51
52 Construction projects requiring PtD most likely will require the participation of other
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 organizations, particularly at the design stage. An attitude such as extraversion will be necessary
4
5 to ensure effective performance in respect of PtD and Principal Designers can vary on this. Fourth,
6
7 Principal Designers can vary on organizational interpersonal ability. Conflict resolution among
8
9 groups or organizations will be a critical interpersonal ability a Principal Designer must have at
10
11 the level of organization and Principal Designers can vary on this.
12
13
14
15

16 [Figure 2 about here]
17
18

19 At the level of occupation, Principal Designers can vary as to whether they are architects, civil
20
21 engineers, services engineers and the like. Though all these occupations are considered under the
22
23 built environment, individuals from any of these professions receive specific technical education
24
25 and training which may influence their PtD abilities. Principal Designers can vary significantly on
26
27 this. Second, the establishment of an individual's authority or leadership in an occupation reflects
28
29 his or her level of expertise and autonomy and Principal Designers can vary on this. Third,
30
31 Principal Designers can vary on occupational attitude. The current changing socio-economic and
32
33 technological environments mean that new OSH risks emerge and old ones may no more be
34
35 relevant. Hence, an occupational attitude of self-efficacy will be required of Principal Designers
36
37 to keep abreast with current OSH risks in respect of PtD. Fourth, Principal Designers can vary on
38
39 interpersonal abilities at the occupational level. For example, at the occupational level, excellent
40
41 communication and persuasive abilities may be required to convince clients and other relevant
42
43 stakeholders to lend support to the PtD initiative on projects. Principal Designers can vary on this.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *4.3 Meaning of knowledge construct* 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The construct knowledge and skill seem to go together. However, they are both conceptually and
4 practically different (Clarke and Winch 2006). A skill can only be demonstrated through its
5 application to perform or do something while knowledge can be revealed through abstract means
6 of conversation, questioning or working (Clarke and Winch 2006). Therefore, in the context of
7 work, a skill becomes the substrate for eliciting knowledge.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Viewing from a cognitive psychology perspective, different kinds of knowledge can be
18 distinguished, and the distinction between declarative and procedural knowledge is the most
19 widely discussed (Baartman and de Bruijn 2011). Declarative knowledge is the factual information
20 that a person knows and can be reported on (Anderson and Schunn 2000, Hefter et al. 2018). This
21 is often termed as “know what” (Miller 1990, Baartman and de Bruijn 2011, Bernaert and Poels
22 2011, Śliwa and Kosicka 2017). On the other hand, procedural knowledge is the connection or use
23 of pieces of declarative knowledge and are usually knowledge that cannot be easily communicated
24 (Baartman and de Bruijn 2011) and often considered as “know how” (Miller 1990, Baartman and
25 de Bruijn 2011, Bernaert and Poels 2011, Śliwa and Kosicka 2017). Tacit knowledge (Polanyi
26 1958, Grant 2007, Ferrari et al. 2016) is a critical part of this knowledge type. A third dimension
27 of knowledge has emerged, referred to as strategic or metacognitive knowledge which pertains to
28 knowledge about the task, context, problem-solving processes as well as oneself (Krathwahl 2002,
29 Barzilai and Zohar 2014, Pathuddin et al. 2018).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 To elicit an understanding of the construct knowledge, the same approach as was taken with the
50 skill construct was followed. As indicated in Table 2, the knowledge construct, at least from the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perspective of researchers, deconstructs into three main components – information, experience and
4
5 capability or ability.
6
7
8
9

10 Some researchers (for example, James 1907, Plato 1953, Sveiby and Lloyd 1987, Mansfield 1990;
11 Engestrom 1994, Blacker 1995, Myers 1996, Davenport et al. 1998, Nickols 2000, Albino et al.
12 2001, David and Foray 2003, Kakabadse et al. 2003, Gorelick and Tantawy-Monsou 2005, ASME
13 2010, Liu 2015, Unger and Hopkins 2016, Manu et al. 2019b) understand knowledge from the
14
15 perspective of a *collection of information* as indicated in Table 2. However, in the context of work
16
17 (where performance is desired), information or a collection of it in itself is not useful unless it is
18
19 situated in context (Aune 1970) and targeted at a particular task (Kakabadse 2003, ASME 2010).
20
21 For instance, an individual can have information or a collection of it about farming practices.
22
23 However, in the context of medical practice, that information or a collection of it is not useful and
24
25 may not constitute knowledge. Context (Aune 1970) justifies the worth of information and adds
26
27 value to it (Sveiby and Lloyd 1987) in our understanding of knowledge from the perspective of
28
29 work.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Further, in understanding the knowledge construct, how the knowledge comes about is one element
41 that explicates the construct. Some researchers (for example, James 1907, Blacker 1995, Alle
42 1997, Davenport et al. 1998, Gorelick and Tantawy-Monsou 2005, Liu 2015, Unger and Hopkins
43 2016, Manu et al. 2019b), as indicated in Table 2, suggest that *experience* is the bedrock that
44
45 **underlies** the acquisition of information about a phenomenon or task which constitutes knowledge.
46
47 In addition to experience, education or study (for example, Unger and Hopkins 2016, Manu et al.
48
49 2019b), **is another** avenue through which individuals can obtain relevant information, about a
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

phenomenon, which constitutes knowledge. Generally, information obtained about a phenomenon which are recorded and passed on to others through education or study are based on other persons' experiences and views. The underlying conditions and environments that support the validity of the information about a phenomenon may change and thus discredit or invalidate the information. Hence, information through education or study which constitutes knowledge may not be adequate in itself in establishing true knowledge. On the hand, experience as an avenue for information about a phenomenon provides an opportunity for the information to be proven and validated by the individual in certain contexts. This corroborates Plato (1953)'s conceptualization of knowledge as "justified true belief". Experience in this sense engenders a "moment of truth" in respect of information held about a phenomenon which constitutes knowledge.

[Table 2 about here]

There are some researchers (for example, Sveiby 1997, Albino et al. 2001, Gorelick and Tantawy-Monsou 2005, Bennet and Bennet 2008, Liu 2015), as suggested in Table 2, who construe knowledge from the perspective of *capability or ability*. These researchers take the view that the existence of knowledge should make the individual functional or able to carry out a desirable task. This means true knowledge is not about an individual possessing a collection of information about a phenomenon but rather the ability of the individual to leverage the collection of information to perform a task. In that sense, what kind of information an individual, particularly the Principal Designer, must possess in order to be functional establishes a foundation for effective measurement of the individual's knowledge.

1
2
3 An agreement does not exist in literature on the specific conceptualization of the construct
4
5 knowledge as indicated in Table 2. None of the prior conceptualizations of the construct
6
7 knowledge considers all the critical elements that explicate the construct. Hence, a more robust
8
9 conceptualization which encapsulates all the critical elements that explicate the construct
10
11 knowledge will be necessary. Thus, from the perspective of work and what knowledge is required
12
13 for, this study proceeds to define knowledge as the collection of information about a phenomenon
14
15 in a given context obtained through study and experience that enables an individual to perform a
16
17 task.
18
19
20
21
22

23 24 *4.4 Measurement of knowledge*

25
26 The same approach after Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) as used in the
27
28 measurement of the skill construct is employed in the measurement of knowledge. There is a
29
30 paucity of research on the measurement of the knowledge construct across occupations. Attempts
31
32 have been made at measuring knowledge in the educational field (Phelps 2004, Hill et al. 2004)
33
34 but those measurement approaches do so without providing congruence and operationalization of
35
36 knowledge across different levels of performance requirements. Emphasis of researchers (for
37
38 example, Phelps 2004, Hill et al 2004) have been on the domains of knowledge measures. For
39
40 instance, Shulman (1986) in assessing and measuring a subject-matter knowledge for teaching by
41
42 teachers proposed three dimensions as content knowledge; subject matter knowledge for teaching
43
44 and curriculum knowledge. The first dimension, content knowledge, according to Shulman
45
46 includes facts and concepts in the domain as well as why those facts and concepts are true. This
47
48 dimension of teachers' knowledge corroborated by other researchers (for instance, Ball 1990, Hill
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 et al. 2004) can be considered as *declarative knowledge* (Anderson and Schunn 2000, Baartman
4
5 and de Bruijn 2011).
6
7
8
9

10 The second dimension, subject matter knowledge for teaching, considers what makes a topic under
11 a subject difficult or easy and most importantly how to teach it to the understanding of students.
12
13 This is an insight beyond the declarative knowledge and focuses on stringing the declarative
14
15 knowledge to achieve a goal. In essence, this dimension is considered as a *procedural knowledge*
16
17
18 (Baartman and de Bruijn 2011).
19
20
21
22
23

24 [Figure 3 about here]
25
26
27

28 The third dimension, curriculum knowledge, Shulman indicates involves how topics under a
29 subject are both arranged within a school year and over longer periods of time as well as using
30
31 curriculum resources, such as textbooks, to organise a programme of study for students. Insight
32
33 **into** this domain requires a better appreciation of the environment and context and can be
34
35
36 considered as a *metacognitive knowledge* (Krathwahl 2002).
37
38
39
40
41

42 The measurement of knowledge of an individual required to carry out a task can therefore be
43 considered in the mode or domains of *content*, *procedural* and *metacognitive* information on the
44
45 phenomenon. This naturally taxonomizes the knowledge required by an individual to perform a
46
47 task, particularly the Principal Designer – as indicated in Figure 3 – as content, procedural and
48
49 metacognitive. Again, relating the domains of knowledge to some levels of performance
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 specificity engenders some congruence and provides, somewhat, comprehensive framework for

1
2
3 measuring the knowledge of an individual required to undertake a task, as shown in Figure 3. As
4
5 indicated in Figure 3, each of the modes of the knowledge construct can be operationalized at five
6
7 levels of specificity creating a 5 X 3 nomological network for measuring the knowledge of a
8
9 Principal Designer. Illustrations of measures of knowledge at the levels of task and occupation are
10
11 discussed, briefly, to provide an overview of the model. Similar discussions hold for the job, work
12
13 group and organizational levels. Principal Designers can vary on their task content information
14
15 with regard to what a specific PtD entails. While some Principal Designers may possess more task
16
17 content information in respect of PtD, others may not. Second, Principal Designers can vary on
18
19 their task procedural information. Some Principal Designers may possess more tacit information
20
21 than others regarding how a specific PtD task ought to be performed. Third, metacognitive
22
23 information about tasks with regard to PtD is another dimension that can distinguish Principal
24
25 Designers. Some Principal Designers may have more information about when a task required to
26
27 ensure PtD ought to be performed in the design process as opposed to others.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 At the level of occupation, Principal Designers can vary on occupational content information. That
36
37 will depend on the type of Principal Designer's occupation, whether an architect, civil engineer or
38
39 services engineer. For example, in a building project design, an architect may have more
40
41 involvement and possess more OSH risks information about the design as opposed to a services
42
43 engineer who only focuses on a section of the entire design. Second, Principal Designers can vary
44
45 on occupational procedural information. For example, some Principal Designers may be more
46
47 familiar with standards and protocols adopted by some professional bodies in respect of PtD than
48
49 others. Third, Principal Designers can vary on occupational metacognitive information.
50
51 Information about which occupations or professions may be required on designs to make effective
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contributions to PtD may not be possessed or obvious to all Principal Designers and hence
4
5 distinguish them.
6
7
8
9

10 *4.5 Meaning of experience construct*

11
12 The same approach as was with the skill and knowledge constructs was followed in understanding
13
14 the experience construct. Table 3 indicates the conceptualizations of the experience construct from
15
16 *extant literature*. For instance, in *explaining* the experience construct, some researchers (for
17
18 example, Fiedler 1970, Pinder and Schroeder 1987, McCall et al. 1988, Quinones et al. 1995,
19
20 Tesluk and Jacobs 1998, ASME 2010, Manu et al. 2019b), as indicated in Table 3, suggest or
21
22 emphasize the element of *task*. A task is the object of experience. In the context of work, the
23
24 requirement for experience becomes relevant when a task has to be performed. Again, a task has
25
26 to be performed in a particular setting and so some researchers (for example, Marsick and Watkins
27
28 1990, Hunt and Wallace 1997) point to the element of *environment* in conceptualising the
29
30 experience construct. The performance of a task in a given environment provides an opportunity
31
32 for useful information or knowledge to be obtained. Such information or knowledge, arising from
33
34 the endeavour in a given environment, either confirm or invalidate prior information or knowledge
35
36 about a phenomenon, thereby enhancing the understanding of an individual about a phenomenon.
37
38 In that sense, as indicated in Table 3, some researchers (for example, Fiedler 1970, McCall et al.
39
40 1988, Tesluk and Jacobs 1998, Manu et al. 2019b) indicate the element of *information or*
41
42 *knowledge* in understanding experience.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The enhancement of the understanding of the individual about a phenomenon with information or
53
54 knowledge arising from an endeavour occurs over a period of time. Therefore, it is agreed among
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 some researchers (for example, Fiedler 1970, McCall et al. 1988, Quinones et al. 1995, Tesluk and
4
5 Jacobs 1998) that in explicating the experience construct, there should be the element of *time*.
6
7
8
9

10 The usefulness of experience, from the perspective of work, lies in an individual being able to
11 transfer information or knowledge from one context to another. Understanding, through
12 information and knowledge, arising from the performance of a task in a given context is diminished
13 in value, if such understanding cannot be transferred to another context. Again, the ability of an
14 individual to overcome contextual disparities (Pratzner 1985, Blunden 1996) and to demonstrate
15 flexibility in different contexts (Wood 1989) is a critical justification for experience in respect of
16 work performance. Hence, in construing the experience construct, some researchers (for example,
17 Marsick and Watkins 1990, Pinder and Schroeder 1987, Hunt and Wallace 1997) suggest the
18 element of *perceptual or cognitive flexibility*.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 There seems to be no specific agreement in the extant literature on the definition or
34 conceptualization of the experience construct. Hence, to provide a broad definition that seeks to
35 reflect all the common elements that clarify experience and to lay a foundation for its measurement,
36 this study – and from the perspective of work – defines experience as the information or knowledge
37 obtained over time by performing a task in a given context, including the ability to overcome
38 contextual disparity.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 [Table 3 about here]
50
51
52
53

54 ***4.6 Measurement of experience*** 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The same approach after Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) as used in the
4 measurement of the skill and knowledge constructs is employed in the measurement of experience.

5
6
7 Quinones et al. (1995) initially indicated three measures (i.e. amount, time and type) under the
8 measurement mode dimension which were later extended by Tesluk and Jacob (1998) by two
9 additional measures as “timing” and “density”.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 The *time-based* measure of experience reflects the traditional reliance on tenure on a task, a job or
18 in an organization (Medoff and Abraham 1980, Schmidt et al. 1986, McDaniel et al. 1988). The
19 next measurement mode, *amount*, as a quantitative component measures the number of times a
20 task or duty has been performed (Ford et al. 1991, 1992) as an indicator of individual experience.
21
22 However, similar to the time-based measure, the amount measure only considers experience in
23 quantitative terms. Little information concerning the nature of those experiences is known and
24 therefore **only helps** to partially measure the construct experience (Quinones et al. 1995, Tesluk
25 and Jacobs 1998). In clarifying the quality of experience, Quinones et al (1995) indicate the *type*
26 measure. This measure emphasizes the specific work situation that informs the experience by
27 indicating the level of criticality or complexity of the task.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) indicate the *density* measure as the intensity of the experience. For
43 example, differences exist in the levels of experience of two individuals who have the same tenure
44 on a task or a job (say one year) but are involved in different number of assignments within the
45 same tenure. Lastly, in extending Quinones et al. (1995)’s measures, Tesluk and Jacobs (1998)
46 indicate the *timing* measure. This measure involves occurrence of work event relative to successive
47 experiences. With the present dynamic work environment, current work experience may appear

1
2
3 more useful to very remote experiences. Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) indicate these two additional
4
5 measures (i.e. density and timing) as interaction components as opposed to the two main categories
6
7 of measures (i.e. quantitative and qualitative) indicated by Quinones et al. (1995).
8
9

10
11
12 Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) indicate a further extension of the
13
14 nomological network. Hence, in responding to this call, this study attempts to extend the individual
15
16 work experience measures within the measurement mode dimension. Very little or no attention is
17
18 paid to the issue of *perceptual or cognitive flexibility* in the measurement of individual work
19
20 experience. However, the importance of individual work experience in the assessment of future
21
22 work performance rests on the ability to transfer salient information and knowledge from one or
23
24 prior work context to another. Thus, perceptual or cognitive flexibility (Pratzner 1985, Wood 1989,
25
26 Blunden 1996) is one key measure that must be considered in the measurement of experience.
27
28
29
30
31 **This** view of how experience is conceptualized as well as the mode or domains for its clarification
32
33 points to how the experience required by an individual to perform a task, especially the Principal
34
35 Designer, can be taxonomized. As indicated in Figure 4, the experience of a worker (i.e. Principal
36
37 Designer) organically taxonomizes into three broad categories as quantitative; qualitative and
38
39 interaction experiences. The interaction experience mediates the quantitative and qualitative
40
41 experiences and describes the various types of acquired experiences that depend on a particular
42
43 dimension of time.
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 As shown in Figure 4, each of the modes of the experience construct can be operationalized at five
51
52 levels of specificity creating a 5 X 6 nomological network for measuring the experience of a
53
54 Principal Designer. Illustrations of measures of experience at the levels of task and occupation, as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the case of the knowledge construct, are discussed briefly to provide an overview of the model.
4
5 Principal Designers can vary on the number of times they have performed a PtD task. While some
6
7 Principal Designers may have performed a specific PtD task several times, indicating their levels
8
9 of experiences, others may not. Second, Principal Designers can vary on the time spent on the
10
11 performance of a specific PtD task. For instance, some Principal Designers may have relatively
12
13 longer tenure in the performance of PtD tasks as compared to others.
14
15
16
17
18

19 [Figure 4 about here]
20
21
22
23

24 Third, Principal Designers can vary on the type of a PtD task performed in respect of its difficulty,
25
26 complexity and criticality. While some may be engaged with more difficult, complex and critical
27
28 tasks, other may not. Fourth, Principal Designers can vary on their PtD task density. Given the
29
30 same amount of time, some Principal Designers may have performed more PtD tasks, reflecting
31
32 their level of experience, as compared to others. Fifth, Principal Designers can vary in respect of
33
34 the recency of the performance of a PtD task. Some may have more recent performance records as
35
36 opposed to others. Sixth, Principal Designers can vary on their PtD task perceptual or cognitive
37
38 flexibility. Some Principal Designers can more easily transfer their information and knowledge
39
40 from one PtD task context to the other in comparison with others.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 At the level of occupation, Principal Designers can vary in the number of occupations in which
48
49 they have been involved. While some may have been involved in several relevant occupations that
50
51 support their PtD appreciation on projects, others may not. Second, Principal Designers can vary
52
53 on the amount of time they have spent in an occupation, reflecting their level of experience in that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occupation vis-à-vis PtD on projects. Third, Principal Designers can vary on the type of occupation
4 they are engaged in, whether architecture, engineering, or physical science. The level of criticality
5 or complexity of PtD requirements faced by each occupation may differ. Fourth, the dimension of
6 occupational density can distinguish Principal Designers. Given the same amount of time, a
7 Principal Designer may have been engaged in several relevant occupations which may enhance
8 his or her PtD performance in comparison with another. Fifth, Principal Designers can vary on the
9 recency of occupational engagement. While some Principal Designers may demonstrate more
10 recent engagements with occupations relevant for PtD performance on projects, others may not.
11 Sixth, Principal Designers can also vary on occupational perceptual flexibility. The ease with
12 which Principal Designers can transfer relevant information or knowledge obtained in one or prior
13 occupation to another may vary among them.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **5. Discussions**

32
33
34 The constructs **skills, knowledge and experience** as they relate to the Principal Designer's
35 competence to ensure PtD are considered as being multi-dimensional in their measurements.
36
37 Construing **these constructs** from a single or narrow perspective can potentially undermine their
38 **useful** measurement. Further, **they** must be considered as multi-level. Competences of Principal
39 Designers cannot be assumed to exist at all levels (for instance, from a task to an occupational
40 level). The competences that are required at the task level may not be the same as required at the
41 occupational level. Hence, these models have provided effective ways to juxtapose the domains or
42 modes of measurements of the **skills, knowledge and experience** constructs with the levels where
43 performances are required in order to ascertain the fine-grained or specific skill, knowledge or
44 experience measure under consideration. In this way, the attributes of the **constructs** as they relate
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to the Principal Designer to ensure PtD are unpacked from a theoretical perspective. This, thus,
4
5 contributes to the PtD literature, particularly Principal Designers' or designers' PtD competence
6
7 research.
8
9

10
11
12 Additionally, the Principal Designer's **PtD skills, knowledge and experience** must be considered
13
14 as dynamic (Kianto 2008, Teece 2012). Competences, as they reside in Principal Designers, can
15
16 be considered as assets (Andreu and Ciborra 1996, Mentzas 2004, Adaku et al. 2018). In that
17
18 regard, it can increase through deliberate and conscious efforts by individuals or deteriorate as a
19
20 result of lack of individuals' self-efficacy and neglect. Over time, the **skills, knowledge and**
21
22 **experience** of Principal Designers can increase or deteriorate along the *mode of measurement* or
23
24 the *level of specificity*.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **5.1 Practical implications of the models**

32
33 The proposed models can support project clients to clarify the required **skills, knowledge and**
34
35 **experience** of Principal Designers in the procurement process. Specifically, the attributes of **PtD**
36
37 **skills, knowledge and experience** of Principal Designers as indicated by these models can inform
38
39 pre-tender interview questions or pre-qualification questionnaires of project clients in the selection
40
41 of Principal Designers. Correspondingly, the models can similarly serve as a guide for Principal
42
43 Designers intending to develop their **PtD skills, knowledge and experience** by providing domains
44
45 and levels of specificity relevant for such realizations. In other words, Principal Designers can
46
47 refer to the attributes of **PtD skills, knowledge and experience** indicated by these models, identify
48
49 gaps in their **PtD competence** and take appropriate steps to address such **skills, knowledge and**
50
51 **experience** deficiencies. Some countries have public specifications that assist project clients in
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assessing and selecting designers, including Principal Designers. For example, in the UK, the
4 publicly available specification (PAS) 91 is one such instrument for construction-related
5 procurement and these models can inform its utilization. The core criteria of Safety Schemes in
6 Procurement (SSIP), a private sector initiative in the UK to assist project clients in the procurement
7 of **professional** services, can also benefit from these models in a similar way.

17 **6. Limitations and future directions of Principal Designers' PtD competence research**

19 **This study has some limitations.** Therefore, interpretations placed on the results should be done
20 cautiously. First, the models proposed by this study are not yet validated by the industry.

23 **Validation** will be required to ascertain which of the attributes of the **skills, knowledge and**
24 **experience** constructs, as indicated in the cells, are more relevant and practical in assessing the **PtD**
25 **skills, knowledge and experience** of Principal Designers, at least from practice perspective.

28 Second, the models only indicate the attributes **of these constructs as they relate to** the Principal
29 Designer without specifying which indicators or evidences must be adduced to satisfy those
30 competence attributes. Thus, future studies on Principal Designers' **PtD competence** should focus
31 **on ascertaining** the indicators or evidences that must be presented as fulfillment of the attributes.

34 Further, as the **PtD skills, knowledge and experience** of Principal Designers are dynamic, an
35 industry framework that seeks to capture these dynamics will be a useful one. Such frameworks
36 could be in the form of competence maturity models and future studies can consider these. Again,
37 future studies can investigate the enablers or constraints of Principal Designers' **PtD skills,**
38 **knowledge and experience** development.

1
2
3 These proposed models or nomological networks to measure Principal Designers' PtD competence
4 cannot be deemed complete. Hence, further studies are invited to extend the networks to deepen
5
6 our understanding and measurement of Principal Designers' PtD skills, knowledge and experience.
7
8
9

10 11 12 **7. Conclusions** 13

14
15 The prevention through design (PtD) initiative is considered as one of the measures to address
16 occupational safety and health (OSH) risks on construction projects. The skills, knowledge and
17 experience required by Principal Designers to support this initiative are beginning to attract
18 research. The research interest in this areas is perhaps so, because in some parts of the world, such
19 as the UK, Regulations (e.g., CDM 2015) have been developed to place statutory duties on
20 Principal Designers and designers to originate designs that are inherently safe for construction,
21 occupation, maintenance and demolition. However, there are uncertainties as to what constitutes
22 the skills, knowledge and experience of Principal Designers who have an important role under the
23 Regulations to ensure safe designs at the design or pre-construction phase. Further, how to
24 specifically measure or assess the competence (skills, knowledge and experience) of Principal
25 Designers is unclear. Therefore, this study sought to offer understanding of the PtD, knowledge
26 and experience of Principal Designers by proposing three theoretical models that unpack the
27 attributes of these constructs. These models though not yet validated, can offer scope for project
28 clients to think about what skills, knowledge and experience attributes they should expect from
29 prospective Principal Designers regarding their engagements. Similarly, the models can serve as a
30 guide to Principal Designers in respect of their PtD competence development. The models also
31 offer opportunity for the Principal Designer's PtD skills, knowledge and experience to be
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 taxonomized. It is hoped that the theoretical foundation laid by this study will stimulate further
4
5 investigations regarding the Principal Designer's PtD competence research.
6
7
8
9

10 **Acknowledgement:**

11
12
13 This research has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
14
15 innovation programme under grant agreement No 837721.
16
17
18
19

20 **Declarations of interest:**

21
22
23 None.
24

25 **References:**

- 26
27 Adaku, E., Amoatey, C. T., Norniyibey, I., Famiyeh, S. and Asante-Darko, D., 2018. Delays in new
28 product introduction: experiences of a food processing company in a developing economy,
29 *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 29 (5), 811-828.
30
31 Adler, P., 2007. The Future of Critical Management Studies: A Paleo-Marxist Critique of Labour
32 Process Theory, *Organization Studies*, 28 (9), 1313–1345.
33
34 Ainley, P., 1993. *Class and Skill*, London: Cassell.
35
36 Aires, D.M.; Rubio, M.C. and Gibb, A.G.F., 2016. The impact of occupational health and safety
37 regulations on prevention through design in construction projects: Perspectives from Spain
38 and the United Kingdom, *Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation*,
39 53, 181-191 DOI 10.3233/WOR-152148
40
41 Albino, V., Garavelli, A. C. and Schiuma, G., 2001. A metric for measuring knowledge
42 codification in organization learning, *Technovation*, 21(7), 413-422.
43
44 Allee, V., 1997. *The Knowledge Evolution: Expanding Organizational Intelligence*, Boston, MA:
45 Butterworth-Heinemann
46
47 American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2010. *Pipeline Personnel Qualification*, American
48 Society of Mechanical Engineers. ASME B31Q-2010.
49
50 Anderson, J. R., and Schunn, C. D., 2000. *Implications of the ACT-R learning theory: No magic*
51 *bullets*. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology*, Vol. 5, educational
52 design and cognitive science. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Anderson, P., 2009. Intermediate occupations and the conceptual and empirical limitations of the
4 hour glass economy thesis, *Work, Employment and Society*, 23(1), 169–180.
- 5
6 Andreu, R. and Ciborra, C. U., 1996. Organizational learning and core capabilities development:
7 The role of IT, *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 5(2), 111–127.
- 8
9 Ashton, D. and Green, F., 1996. *Education, Training and the Global Economy*, Aldershot: Edward
10 Elgar
- 11
12 Attewell, P., 1990. What is skill?, *Work and Occupations*, 17(4), 422 – 448.
- 13
14 Aune, B., 1970. *Rationalism, Empiricism, and Pragmatism*, New York: Random House.
- 15
16 Autodesk Incorporated, 2020. Designing and building better with BIM. Retrieved from
17 <https://www.autodesk.com/solutions/bim> – last accessed April 5, 2020.
- 18
19 Baartman, L. K. J. and de Bruijn, E., 2011. Integrating knowledge, skills and attitudes:
20 Conceptualising learning processes towards vocational competence, *Educational Research*
21 *Review*, 6(2), 125–134
- 22
23 Ball, D. L., 1990. The mathematical understandings that prospective teachers bring to teacher
24 education, *Elementary School Journal*, 90(4), 449–466.
- 25
26 Barrow, R., 1987. Skill talk, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 21(2), 187-195.
- 27
28 Barzilai, S. and Zohar, A., 2014. Reconsidering Personal Epistemology as Metacognition: A
29 Multifaceted Approach to the Analysis of Epistemic Thinking, *Educational Psychologist*,
30 49(1), 13-35.
- 31
32 Behm, M., 2005. Linking construction fatalities to the design for construction safety concept,
33 *Safety Science*, 43(8), 589-611.
- 34
35 Benjaoran, V. and Bhokha, S., 2010. An integrated safety management with construction
36 management using 4D CAD model, *Safety Science*, 48 (3), 395-403.
- 37
38 Bennet, A. and Bennet, D., 2000. Characterizing the Next Generation Knowledge Organization,
39 Knowledge and Innovation: *Journal of the KMCI*, 1(1), 8-42.
- 40
41 Bennet, D. and Bennet, A., 2008. Engaging tacit knowledge in support of organizational learning,
42 *VINE*, 38(1), 72-94.
- 43
44 Bernaert, M., and Poels, G., 2011. The Quest for Know-How, Know-Why, Know-What and
45 Know-Who: Using KAOS for Enterprise Modelling. In: Salinesi C., Pastor O. (eds)
46 Advanced Information Systems Engineering Workshops. CAiSE 2011. Lecture Notes in
47 Business Information Processing, Vol 83. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
48 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22056-2_4
- 49
50 Blacker, F., 1995. Knowledge, knowledge work and organizations: An overview and
51 interpretation, *Organization Studies*, 15(6), 1021-1046.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Blackmore, P., 1999. A categorisation of approaches to occupational analysis, *Journal of*
4 *Vocational Education and Training*, 51(1), 61-78.
5
6 Blunden, R., 1996. The Mind Dependency of Vocational Skills, *Journal of Vocational Education*
7 *and Training*, 48(2), 167-188, DOI: 10.1080/1363682960480205
8
9 Boucher, A. K., 2020. How 'skill' definition affects the diversity of skilled immigration policies,
10 *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(12), pp. 2533 – 2550. DOI:
11 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1561063
12
13 Boyatzis, R.E., 1982. *The competent manager*, New York: Wiley.
14
15 Breivik, G., 2016. The role of skill in sport, *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy*, 10(3), pp. 222-236,
16 DOI: 10.1080/17511321.2016.1217917
17
18 Bussey, P., 2015. CDM 2015: *A practical guide for architects and designers*, New Castle upon
19 Tyne: RIBA Publishing.
20
21 Cabral, C. and Dhar, R. L., 2019. Skill development research in India: a systematic literature
22 review and future research agenda, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 26(7), 2242-
23 2266
24
25 Chadehgan, A. A., Salehi, H., Yenus, M. M., Farhadi, H., Fooladi, M., Farhadi, M. and Ebrahim,
26 N. A., 2013. A Comparison between Two Main Academic Literature Collections: Web of
27 Science and Scopus Databases, *Asian Social Science*, 9(5), 18-26.
28
29 Chiang, Y., Tao, L. and Wong, F. K., 2015. Causal relationship between construction activities,
30 employment and GDP: The case of Hong Kong, *Habitat International*, 46(1), 1-12.
31
32 Clarke, L. and Winch, C., 2006. A European skills framework? – but what are skills? Anglo-Saxon
33 versus German concepts, *Journal of Education and Work*, 19(3), 255-269.
34
35 Collins, C. S. and Stockton, C. M., 2018. The Central Role of Theory in Qualitative Research,
36 *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), 1–10.
37
38 Cooke, T., Lingard, H., Blismas, N. and Stranieri, A., 2008. ToolSHedTM: the development and
39 evaluation of a decision support tool for health and safety in construction design,
40 *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(4), 336–351.
41
42 Council Directive 92/57/EEC, 1992. *On the implementation of minimum safety and health*
43 *requirements at temporary or mobile constructions sites*, Official Journal No. L 245,
44 26.08.1992, 6–22.
45
46 Cronbach, L. and Meehl, P., 1955. Construct validity in psychological tests, *Psychological*
47 *Bulletin*, 52(4), 281-302.
48
49 Dainty, A. R. J, Cheng, M-I and Moore, D. R., 2004. A competency-based performance model for
50 construction project managers, *Construction Management and Economics*, 22(8), 877-886,
51 DOI: 10.1080/0144619042000202726
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Davenport, T. H., De Long, D. W. and Beers, M. C., 1998. Successful knowledge management
4 projects, *Sloan Management Review*, 39(2), 43-57.
5
6 David, P.A. and Foray, D., 2003. Economic Fundamentals of the Knowledge Society, *Policy
7 Futures in Education*, 1(1), 20-49.
8
9 Dewlaney, K. S. and Hallowell, M., 2012. Prevention through design and construction safety
10 management strategies for high performance sustainable building construction,
11 *Construction Management and Economics*, 30 (2), 165–177.
12
13 Dreyfus, H. L. and Dreyfus, S. E., 1986. *Mind over machine: The power of human intuition and
14 expertise in the era of the computer*, New York, NY: Free Press.
15
16 Dubois, D. and McKee, A. S., 1994, Facets of work experience. Paper presented at the Ninth
17 *Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Nashville,
18 TN.
19
20 Elias, P. and McKnight, A., 2001. Skill Measurement in Official Statistics: Recent Developments
21 in the UK and the Rest of Europe, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 53(3), pp. 508-540.
22
23 Engestrom, Y., 1994. *Training for Change: New Approach to Instruction and Learning in Working
24 Life*, Geneva: International Labour Office.
25
26 Esposto, A., 2008. Skill: An Elusive and Ambiguous Concept in Labour Market Studies,
27 *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 34 (1), 100–124.
28
29 European Construction Institute (ECI), 1996. *Total Project Management of Construction Safety,
30 Health and Environment*, London: Thomas Telford.
31
32 Evans, G., 1993. Windows on education: a skills-referenced perspective, *New Horizons in
33 Education*, 88, pp. 14-27.
34
35 Felstead, A., A. Fuller, L. Unwin, D. Ashton, P. Butler, T. Lee, and S. Walters., 2005. *Applying
36 the Survey Method to Learning at Work: A Recent UK Experiment*. Leicester: Centre for
37 Labour Market Studies, University of Leicester.
38
39 Ferrari, A., Spoletini, P. and Gnesi, S., 2016. Ambiguity and tacit knowledge in requirements
40 elicitation interviews, *Requirements Engineering*, 21(3), 333–355.
41
42 Fiedler, F. E., 1970. Leadership experience and leader performance: Another hypothesis shot to
43 hell, *Organisaional Behaviour and Human Performance*, 5(1), 1-14.
44
45 Ford, J. K., Quinones, M, Sego, D. J. and Speer-Sorra J., 1992. Factors affecting the opportunity
46 to perform trained tasks on the job, *Personnel Psychology*, 45(3), 511-527.
47
48 Ford, J. K., Sego, D. and Teachout, M. S., 1991. The effects of cognitive ability, job tenure, and
49 the amount of task experience on task proficiency, Paper presented at the *6th Annual
50 Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, St. Louis, MO.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gambatese, J. A., Hinze, J. W. and Haas, C. T., 1997. Tool to Design for Construction Worker
4 Safety, *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 3(1), 32-41.
5
6 Gambatese, J. and AlOmari, K., 2016. Degrees of connectivity: Systems model for upstream risk
7 assessment and mitigation, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 93, 251–259. DOI:
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2015.12.020>
9
10 Gambatese, J., Behm, M. and Hinze, J.W., 2005. Viability of Designing for Construction Worker
11 Safety, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(9), 1029-1036.
12
13 Gatta, M., Boushey, H. and Appelbaum, E., 2007. High-touch and Here-to-stay: Future Skills
14 Demands in Low Wage Service Occupations, Paper presented at the workshop organised
15 by the *National Academies Center for Education*, Washington, DC, May 31–June 1.
16
17
18 Gibb, A., Haslam, R., Hide, S. and Gyi, D., 2004. *The role of design in accident causality*, in
19 Hecker, S., Gambatese, J. and Weinstein, M. (Eds), *Designing for Safety and Health in*
20 *Construction: Proc., Research and Practice Symposium*, Eugene, OR.: UO Press.
21
22
23 Goh, Y. M. and Chua, S., 2016. Knowledge, attitude and practices for design for safety: A study
24 on civil and structural engineers, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 93, 260–266. DOI:
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2015.09.023>
26
27
28 Gorelick, C. and Tantawy-Monsou, B., 2005. For Performance through Learning, Knowledge
29 Management Is Critical Practice, *Learning Organization*, 12(2), 125-139.
30
31 Grant, K. A., 2007. Tacit knowledge revisited—we can still learn from Polanyi, *The Electronic*
32 *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(2), pp. 173–180.
33
34 Griffiths, M., 1987. The teaching of skills and the skills of teaching, *Journal of Philosophy of*
35 *Education*, 21(2), 203-214.
36
37 Grugulis, I., 2007. *Skills, training and human resource development: A critical text*, London,
38 England: Palgrave Macmillan.
39
40 Grugulis, I., and Lloyd, C., 2010. *Skill and the Labour Process: The Conditions and Consequences*
41 *of Change*. In *Working Life: Renewing Labour Process Analysis*, edited by P. Thompson,
42 and C. Smith, 91–112. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
43
44 Grugulis, I., and Vincent, S., 2009. Whose Skill is It Anyway? Soft Skills and Polarisation, *Work,*
45 *Employment and Society*, 23(4), 597–615.
46
47
48 Hall, D. T. and Associates, 1996. *The career is dead-long live the career*, San Francisco: Jossey
49 Bass.
50
51 Hardison, D. and Hallowell, M., 2019. Construction hazard prevention through design: Review
52 of perspectives, evidence, and future objective research agenda, *Safety Science*, 120, 517–
53 526. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.08.001>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hare, B., Cameron, I. and Duff, A. R., 2006. Exploring the integration of health and safety with
4 pre-construction planning, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*,
5 13(5), 438-450.
6
7 Hefter, M. H., Renkl, A., Riess, W., Schmid, S., Fries, S. and Berthold, K., 2018. Training
8 Interventions to Foster Skill and Will of Argumentative Thinking, *The Journal of*
9 *Experimental Education*, 86(3), 325-343.
10
11 Heineck, G. and Anger, S., 2010. The Returns to Cognitive Abilities and Personality Traits in
12 Germany, *Labour Economics*, 17(3), 535–46.
13
14 Hill, H. C., Schilling, S. G. and Ball, D. L., 2004. Developing Measures of Teachers' Mathematics
15 Knowledge for Teaching, *The Elementary School Journal*, 105(1), 11-30.
16
17 Hinze, J. and Gambatese, J.A., 1994. Design decisions that impact construction worker safety,
18 Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Rinker International Conference on Construction Safety
19 and Loss Control, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
20
21 Holmes, L. and Joyce, P., 1993. Rescuing the useful concept of managerial competence: From
22 outcomes back to process, *Personnel Review*, 22(6), 37-52.
23
24 HSE, 2014. *Consultation on replacement of the Construction (Design and Management)*
25 *Regulations 2007*, Bootle: HSE.
26
27 HSE, 2015. *Managing health and safety in construction: Construction (Design and Management)*
28 *Regulations 2015. Guidance on Regulations*, London: Health and Safety Executive.
29
30 Hughes, P. and Ferrett, E., 2007. *Introduction to Health and Safety in Construction*, Second
31 Edition. Butterworth-Heinemann, Elsevier.
32
33 Hunt, J. B. and Wallace, J., 1997. A Competency-based Approach to Assessing Managerial
34 Performance in the Australian Context, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 35(2),
35 52-66
36
37 Hwang, B.G., Zhao, X. and Toh, L.P., 2014. Risk management in small construction projects in
38 Singapore: status, barriers and impact, *International Journal of Project Management*, 32
39 (1), 116–124.
40
41 International Labour Office, 1990. *International Standard Classification of Occupations*, ISCO-
42 88, Geneva: International Labour Office.
43
44 International Project Management Association (IPMA), 2015. Individual competence baseline for
45 project, programme and portfolio management, Version 4.0, Nijkerk: IPMA.
46
47 James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism*, New York: Longmans.
48
49 Kakabadse, N., Kakabadse, A. and Kouzmin, A., 2003. Reviewing the knowledge management
50 literature: towards a taxonomy, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(4), 75-91.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kianto, A., 2008. Development and validation of a survey instrument for measuring organizational
4 renewal capability, *International Journal of Technology Management*, 42(1), 69-88.
5
6 Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F. and Hall, R. J., 1994. Levels issues in theory development, data
7 collection, and analysis, *Academy of Management Review*, 19(2), 195-229.
8
9 Kolb, D. and Fry, R., 1984. *Towards an applied theory of experiential learning*. In Cooper, C.
10 (Ed.), *Theories of Group Process*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
11
12 Krane, H.P., Olsson, N.O.E. and Rolstadås, A., 2012. How project manager-project owner
13 interaction can work within and influence project risk management, *Project Management*
14 *Journal*, 43(2), 54–67.
15
16
17 Krathwohl, D. R., 2002. A revision of Bloom’s taxonomy: An overview, *Theory into Practice*, 41,
18 212–218.
19
20 Leplat, J., 1990. Skills and Tacit Skills: A Psychological Perspective, *Applied Psychology: An*
21 *International Review*, 39 (2), 143-154.
22
23 Lingard, H., Saunders, L., Pirzadeh, P., Blismas, N., Kleiner, B. and Wakefield, R., 2015. The
24 relationship between pre-construction decision-making and the effectiveness of risk
25 control: Testing the time-safety influence curve, *Engineering, Construction and*
26 *Architectural Management*, 22 (1), 108–124.
27
28
29 Liu, F., 2015. Toward Wisdom: A Hierarchical Wisdom Ontology based on Chinese Classics,
30 *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 14(4), 1-14.
31
32 López-Arquillos, A., Rubio-Romero, J. C. and Martínez-Aires, M.D., 2015. Prevention through
33 Design (PtD). The importance of the concept in Engineering and Architecture University
34 courses, *Safety Science*, 73, 8–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.11.006>
35
36 Mansfield, B., 1990. *Knowledge, evidence and assessment*, in: H. BLACK H. and A. WOLF (Eds)
37 *Knowledge and Competence* (London, HMSO).
38
39 Manu, P. A, Ankrah, N. A., Proverbs, D. G. and Suresh, S., 2012. Investigating the multi-causal
40 and complex nature of the accident causal influence of construction project features,
41 *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 48, 126– 133. DOI:
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2011.05.008>
43
44
45 Manu, P. A., 2012. *An Investigation into the Accident Causal influence of Construction Project*
46 *Features*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, School of Technology, University of
47 Wolverhampton, UK.
48
49 Manu, P., Gibb, A., Drake, C., Jones, W., Bust, P., Mahamadu, A-M. and Behm, M., 2019b. *Skills-*
50 *Knowledge-Attitude-Training-Experience (SKATE) in “Designing for Occupational*
51 *Health of Construction Workers”*, Crawley: BandCE Charitable Trust.
52
53
54 Manu, P., Poghosyan, A., Mahamadu, A-M., Mahdjoubi, L., Gibb, A., Behm, M., and Akinade,
55 O., 2019a. Design for Occupational Safety and Health: Key Attributes for Organizational
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Capability, *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*, 26(11), 2614-
4 2636.
5
6 Marsick, V.J. and Watkins, K.E., 1990. *Informal and Incidental Learning in the Workplace*,
7 London: Routledge.
8
9 McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M. and Morrison, A. M., 1988. *The lessons of experience*, New
10 York: Lexington.
11
12 McDaniel, M. A., Schmidt, F. L. and Hunter J. E., 1988. Job experience correlates of job
13 performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 327-330.
14
15 Medoff, J. L. and Abraham, K.G., 1980. Experience, performance, and earnings, *Quarterly*
16 *Journal of Economics*, 90, 703-716.
17
18 Mentzas, G., 2004. A strategic management framework for leveraging knowledge assets,
19 *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 1(2), 115-42.
20
21 Miller, G. E., 1990. The assessment of clinical skills/competence/performance. *Academic*
22 *Medicine*, 65(9), 63–67.
23
24 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D., 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic
25 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 151(4),
26 264–269.
27
28 Mongeon, P., Paul-Hus, A., 2016. The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a
29 comparative analysis, *Scientometrics*, 106(1), 213–228.
30
31 Mueller, G. and Plug, E., 2006. Estimating the Effect of Personality on Male and Female Earnings,
32 *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 60(1), 3-22.
33
34 Myers, P. S., 1996. *Knowledge Management and Organizational Design*, Boston, MA: Oxford,
35 Butterworth-Heinemann.
36
37 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 2015. Hierarchy of controls.
38 Retrieved from www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hierarchy - last accessed November 28, 2019.
39
40 Nickols, F., 2000. *The Knowledge in knowledge (KM)*, *Knowledge Management Yearbook*,
41 London: Heinemann.
42
43 Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., and Nagata, A. 2000. A firm as a knowledge-creating entity: A new
44 perspective on the theory of the firm, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9(1), 1-20.
45
46 Ofori, G., 1990. *The construction industry: Aspects of its economics and management*, Singapore:
47 Singapore University Press.
48
49 Oney-Yazıcı E. and Dulaimi M. F., 2014. Understanding designing for construction safety: the
50 interaction between confidence and attitude of designers and safety culture, *Architectural*
51 *Engineering and Design Management*, 11(5), 325-337.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pathuddin, Budayasa, I. K. and Lukito, A., 2018. Metacognitive Knowledge of a Student in
4 Planning the Solution of Limit Problems, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, **1108(1)**,
5 **1-6**. DOI:10.1088/1742-6596/1108/1/012032
6
7 Phelps, G. and Schilling, S., 2004. Developing Measures of Content Knowledge for Teaching
8 Reading, *The Elementary School Journal*, 105(1), 31-48.
9
10 Pinder, C. C and Schroeder, K. G., 1987. Time to proficiency following job transfers, *Academy of*
11 *Management Journal*, 30(2), 336-356.
12
13 Plato, 1953. *Phaedo*, Plato I, trans. By Gower, H. N., Harvard University Press/The Loeb Classical
14 Library, Cambridge, MA, 117-24.
15
16 Poghosyan, A., Manu, P., Mahdjoubi, L., Gibb, A. G. F., Behm, M., and Mahamadu, A. M., 2018.
17 Design for safety implementation factors: a literature review. *Journal of Engineering,*
18 *Design and Technology*, 16(5), 783-797.
19
20 Polanyi, M., 1958. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, Chicago:
21 University of Chicago Press.
22
23 Pratzner, F.C., 1985. The vocational education paradigm: adjustment, replacement, or extinction?,
24 *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 22(2), 6-19.
25
26 Preston, J. E., 2003. *Studies in Management Module No. ILM5220*, 2nd edn. Aberystwyth: Open
27 learning Unit, University of Wales Aberystwyth.
28
29 Putsman, T. and McArthur, P., 2015. *Practical guide to using CDM Regulations 2015: teamwork*
30 *and paperwork*, London: ICE Publishing.
31
32 Quinones, M. A., Ford, J. K. and Teachout, M. S., 1995. The relationship between work experience
33 and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review, *Personnel Psychology*;
34 48(4), 887-910.
35
36 Rechnitzer, G., 2001. *The Role of Design in Occupational Health and Safety: A Discussion Paper*,
37 Melbourne: Safety Institute of Australia.
38
39 Reynolds, M. and Salters, M., 1995. Models of Competence and Teacher Training, *Cambridge*
40 *Journal of Education*, 25(3), 349-359, DOI: 10.1080/0305764950250306
41
42 Ruddock, L. and Lopes, J., 2006. The construction sector and economic development: The Bon
43 Curve, *Construction Management and Economics*, 24 (7), 717-723.
44
45 Ruggles, S., Trent A., Genadek, K., Goeken, R., Schroeder, M. and Matthew Sobek, M., 2010.
46 *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0*. Minneapolis: University of
47 Minnesota.
48
49 Rule, P., and John, V. M., 2015. A necessary dialogue: Theory in case study research. *International*
50 *Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14, 1-11. DOI:
51 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915611575>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sanchez, R., 2004. Understanding competence-based management Identifying and managing five
4 modes of competence, *Journal of Business Research*, 57(5), 518– 532.
5
6 Sawchuk, P. H., 2006. Use-value' and the Re-thinking of Skills, Learning and the Labour Process,
7 *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (5), 593–617.
8
9 Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E. and Outerbridge, A. N., 1986. Impact of job experience and ability
10 on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance,
11 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 432-439.
12
13 Shanmugham, M. and Kishore, S., 2012. Integration of prior learning and assessment in the
14 IGNOU community college system for Skill Development, *Turkish Online Journal of*
15 *Distance Education*, 13(2), 311-321.
16
17 Shulman, L. S., 1986. Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching, *Educational*
18 *Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
19
20 Śliwa, M., and Kosicka, E., 2017. A model of knowledge acquisition in the maintenance
21 department of a production company, *Applied Computer Science*, 13(3), 41–54.
22
23 Smith, E. and Teicher, J., 2017. Re-thinking skill through a new lens: evidence from three
24 Australian service industries, *Journal of Education and Work*, 30(5), 515-530.
25
26 Spenner, K., 1990. Skill: Meanings, Methods, and Measures, *Work and Occupations*, 17 (4), 399–
27 421.
28
29 Steinberg, R., 1990. Social Construction of Skill: Gender, Power, and Comparable Worth, *Work*
30 *and Occupations*, 17 (4), 449–482.
31
32 Strebler, M., Thompson, M. and Heron, P., 1997. *Skills, Competencies and Gender: Issues for pay*
33 *and training*, Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
34
35 Sveiby, K. E., 1997. *The New Organizational Wealth: Managing and Measuring Knowledge-*
36 *based Assets*, San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler.
37
38 Sveiby, K., and Lloyd, T., 1987. *Managing knowhow: Add value by valuing creativity*. London:
39 Bloomsbury.
40
41 Szymberski, R.T., 1997. Construction Project Safety Planning, *Tappi Journal*, 80(11), 69-74.
42
43 Teece, D. J., 2012. Dynamic capabilities: Routines versus entrepreneurial action, *Journal of*
44 *Management Studies*, 49(8), 1395–1401.
45
46 Tesluk, P. E. and Jacobs, R. R., 1998. Toward an Integrated Model of Work Experience, *Personnel*
47 *Psychology*, 51(2), 321-355.
48
49 Thursfield, D., 2001. Employees' perceptions of skill and some implications for training in three
50 UK manufacturing firms, *Human Resources Development International*, 4(4), 503–519.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tønnessen, F. E., 2011. What are skills? Some fundamental reflections. *L1-Educational Studies in*
4 *Language and Literature*, 11(1), 149-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2011.01.09>
5
6 Unger, M. and Hopkins, P., 2016. Training and Education: The Great Competence Divide...,
7 *Proceedings of the 11th International Pipeline Conference*. IPC2016 September 26-30,
8 2016; Calgary, Alberta, Canada. IPC2016-64500
9
10 Valerio, A., Puerta, M. L. S., Tognatta, N. and Monroy-Taborda, S., 2016. *Are There Skills Payoffs*
11 *in Low- and Middle-Income Countries? Empirical Evidence Using STEP Data*, Policy
12 *Research Working Paper 7879*, The World Bank Group.
13
14
15 Vallas, S., 1990. The concept of skill: A critical review, *Work and Occupations*, 17(4), 379-398.
16
17 Willumsen, P., Oehmen, J., Stingl, V. and Geraldi, J., 2019. Value creation through project risk
18 management, *International Journal of Project Management*, 37(5), 731– 749.
19
20 Winch, C., 2011. Skill: a concept manufactured in England. In: Brockmann, M., Clarke, L., Winch,
21 C., Hanf, G., Méhaut, P., Westerhuis, A. (Eds.), *Knowledge, Skills and Competence in the*
22 *European Labour Market: What's in a Vocational Qualification?* Routledge, Abingdon,
23 85–101.
24
25
26 Wong, J. M. W, Chiang, Y. H. and Ng, T.S., 2008. Construction and economic development: The
27 case of Hong Kong, *Construction Management and Economics*, 26 (8), 813-824
28
29 Wood, S., ed., 1989. *The Transformation of Work? Skill, flexibility and the labour process*.
30 London: Unwin Hyman.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Literature definitions of skill

Definition	Source
The ability to perform mental and physical activities acquired or developed through training or experience	American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) (2010)
The level of training a job requires	Strebler et al. (1997)
Special forms of capability, usually embedded in individuals or teams, that are useful in specialized situations or related to the use of a specialized asset	Sanchez (2004)
The human capacities that are required for successful performance.	Blackmore (1999)
The capacity (or ability) of an individual to execute a task or a class of tasks	Leplat (1990)
The ability to do something well.	Attewell (1990)
A specific ability of an individual, typically manual and/or coordinative features, which is geared to a task – or, more precisely, a task type – itself quite a narrow category, involving the application of a technique.	Winch (2011)
The ability to carry out the tasks and duties of a job in a competent, thorough and efficient manner	Anderson (2009)
Application of mental and manual abilities to a task or occupation	Ainley (1993)
The ability to perform a task or exercise that will result in a desired outcome	Preston (2003)
Skills are conceived in terms of social attributes, general education, training, qualifications, and technical skills	Ashton and Green (1996)
A possession of know-how appropriate to the task in hand and not necessarily a possession of a 'qualification' or certification	Clarke and Winch (2006)
The ability to carry out the and duties of a job in a competent manner	International Labour Office (ILO) (1990)
A relation between certain aspects of the worker and certain aspects of the job which he or she undertakes	Blunden (1996)

Combinations of automaticity and awareness (i.e. conscious monitoring and possible correction in the performance of the task) in a situationally appropriate manner.	Tønnessen (2011)
The ability to do something well, expertise, practice, capability, aptitude, etc	Manu et al. (2019b)
Specific individual capabilities that enables an individual to perform a task	International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2015)
Doing something well	Grugulis (2007)

Table 2: Literature definitions of knowledge

Definition	Source
Collection of information and experience an individual possesses	International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2015)
A body of information applied directly to the performance of a task	American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) (2010)
Understanding gained through experience or study	Unger and Hopkins (2016)
A collection of immovable, ready-made facts	Engestrom (1994)
Facts, information or data	Mansfield (1990)
Information, facts or familiarity gained by experience or education; the practical or theoretical understanding of a subject etc	Manu et al. (2019b)
Consists of cognitive states needed to interpret and otherwise process information	David and Foray (2003)
Justified true belief	Plato (1953); Nonaka et al. (2000)
Information put to productive use	Kakabadse, et al. (2003)
Meaningful and organised accumulation of information through experience, communication or inference	Blacker (1995)
Value added information	Sveiby and Lloyd (1987)
Information in context	Aune (1970)
Understanding based on experience	James (1907)
Experience or information that can be communicated or shared	Allee (1997)
Data and information that inform an understanding of a situation, relationships, causal phenomena, and the theories and rules (both explicit and implicit) that underlie a given domain or problem	Bennet and Bennet (2000)
A capacity to act	Sveiby (1997)
Knowing about something, knowing how to do something, or accumulated facts or records	Nickols (2000)
Processed information	Myers (1996)
Information combined with experience, context, interpretation and reflection, a high-value form of information.	Davenport et al. (1998)
The capacity (potential or actual) to take effective action in varied and uncertain situations	Bennet and Bennet (2008)
The know-how, experience, insight, and capabilities that assist teams and individuals in making correct and rapid decisions, taking action and creating new capabilities	Gorelick and Tantawy-Monsou (2005)

The information possessed by an entity that enables the entity to carry out a task.	Albino et al. (2001)
Memory of experience of decision making by consciousness, from cognition, rational thinking to hypothesis and belief, that leads to a solution to a problem	Liu (2015)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology

Table 3: Literature definitions of experience

Definition	Source
Work activities accomplished under the direction of qualified supervision but not including time spent in organised training programs	American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) (2010)
Involvement/participation in a given subject; actual observation or practical acquaintance with facts or events, with knowledge and/or skills resulting from this	Manu et al. (2019b)
A valuable understanding of a particular working environment or organizational context	Hunt and Wallace (1997)
Ways in which people make sense of situations they encounter in their daily lives and especially in workplace settings	Marsick and Watkins (1990)
The amount of time spent on or number of times a task has been performed	Quinones et al. (1995)
Job-relevant knowledge gained over time	Fiedler (1970); McCall et al. (1988)
The degree of similarity between a person's previous job and current job	Pinder and Schroeder (1987)
Job-related knowledge, skills and attitude an individual has accumulated over the course of his/her career	Tesluk and Jacobs (1998)




Figure 1: Publication selection process adapted from Moher et al. (2009)

		Job-focused/Technical Skill		Person-focused/Biographical Skill	Role-focused/Social Skill
Level of Specificity	Occupational	Occupational type (e.g. Architect, Civil Engineer, etc)	Occupational leadership	Occupational attitude	Occupational interpersonal ability
	Organizational	Organizational type (e.g. Public, private, etc)	Organizational position/role	Organizational attitude	Organizational interpersonal ability
	Work Group	Nature or type of work group	Group autonomy	Group attitude	Group interpersonal ability
	Job	Job technical ability	Job autonomy	Job attitude	Job interpersonal ability
	Task	Task technical ability	Task autonomy	Task attitude	Task interpersonal ability
		Technical/ Training	Autonomy	Attitude	Interpersonal

Measurement Mode

Figure 2: A conceptual framework of skill measures

		Content Knowledge	Procedural Knowledge	Metacognitive Knowledge
Level of Specificity	Occupational	Occupational content information (e.g. Architecture, Engineering, etc)	Occupational procedural information	Occupational metacognitive information
	Organizational	Organizational content information	Organizational procedural information	Organizational metacognitive information
	Work Group	Work group content information	Work group procedural information	Work group metacognitive information
	Job	Job content information	Job procedural information	Job metacognitive information
	Task	Task content information	Task procedural information	Task metacognitive information
		Content	Procedural	Metacognitive

Measurement Mode

Figure 3: A conceptual framework of knowledge measures

		Quantitative Experience		Qualitative Experience	Interaction Experience		
Level of Specificity	Occupational	Number of occupations	Occupational tenure/seniority	Type of occupation (e.g. Engineering, Architecture, etc)	Occupational density	Recency of occupational engagement	Occupational perceptual flexibility
	Organizational	Number of organizations	Organizational tenure/seniority	Type of organization (e.g. R&D, Public, etc)	Organizational density	Recency of Organizational engagement	Organizational perceptual flexibility
	Work Group	Number of work group	Group tenure/seniority	Group complexity	Group density	Recency of group engagement	Group perceptual flexibility
	Job	Number of jobs or aggregation of tasks	Job tenure/seniority	Job complexity	Job density	Recency of job	Job perceptual flexibility
	Task	Number of times of performing a task	Time on task	Task difficulty	Task density	Number of times of performing a task	Time on task
		Amount	Time	Type	Density	Timing	Perceptual/ Cognitive Flexibility

Measurement Mode

Figure 4: A conceptual framework of experience measures

Response to Reviewers

Reviewer #1:

We thank the reviewer for the insightful comments provided. We believe we have captured and addressed fully all the minor comments, concerns and suggestions. We use the table below to show the comments of the reviewer and our response to those comments. All our revisions are indicated in RED colour fonts in the main manuscript.

Comment	Response
1. Proof-read the manuscript to correct language errors	We are happy to indicate that the manuscript is now proof-read and all language errors corrected.
2. Consider reviewing the arrows and directions between stages “Included” and “Analysis and synthesis” in Figure 1.	We thank the Reviewer for this comment. Respectfully, we are of the view that a change in the arrows and directions will alter our considered and described approach to the systematic review under the method section. We did a second search, in Google Scholar, after analyzing the reference sections of the “included” studies from Scopus.