

Enhancing Knowledge Transfer for Sustainable Construction through Social Network Analysis

Enhancing Knowledge Transfer for Sustainable Construction through Social Network Analysis

By

Veronika Lilly Meta Schröpfer

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Enhancing Knowledge Transfer for Sustainable Construction through Social
Network Analysis

By Veronika Lilly Meta Schröpfer

This book was first published in 2025

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2025 by Veronika Lilly Meta Schröpfer

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 978-1-0364-4319-1

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-4320-7

For André, Scarlett, and Jocelyn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xiv
LIST OF TABLES	xviii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xxiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
1- INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. SUSTAINABILITY IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	1
1.2. TRANSFERRING SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION KNOWLEDGE AND THE SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS APPROACH	4
1.3. METHODOLOGY AND METHODS	6
1.4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS	7
2- SUSTAINABILITY IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	11
2.1. POLICY BACKGROUND	11
2.2. INVESTOR BEHAVIOUR	13
2.3. THE PERFORMANCE GAP	16
2.4. THE FOCUS ON GERMANY AND THE U.K.	17
2.5. KNOWLEDGE OF HOW TO BUILD SUSTAINABLY	20
2.5.1. <i>Knowledge and awareness of the construction industry's workforce</i>	21
2.5.2. <i>Apprenticeships, skills, and training of the construction industry's workforce</i>	22
2.5.3. <i>How to overcome the knowledge gap</i>	23
3-THE SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGE	27
3.1. INTRODUCTION	27
3.2. KNOWLEDGE TYPES	28
3.3. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	31
3.3.1. <i>Significance of Knowledge Management in the Built Environment</i>	34
3.3.2. <i>Innovation: Managing Knowledge on Sustainable Construction</i>	38

3.3.3. <i>Key Concepts in the Area of Knowledge Management</i>	42
3.4. KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER	44
3.4.1. <i>The Knowledge Source and Recipient</i>	45
3.4.1.1. Cultural Background and Hierarchical Levels	46
3.4.1.2. 'Who knows What?'	47
3.4.1.3. Motivation for Knowledge Transfer	48
3.4.2. <i>The Knowledge Transfer Process and Methods</i>	49
3.4.2.1. Vital Preconditions for Knowledge Transfer	49
3.4.2.2. Time to Transfer Knowledge	50
3.4.2.3. The Path of Knowledge – Unpacking the 'Knowledge Transfer Box'	51
3.4.2.4. Barriers to the Knowledge Transfer Path	54
3.4.2.5. Enhancing and Inhibiting Factors of Knowledge Transfer	55
3.5. CONCLUSION	59
4-NAVIGATING SOCIAL NETWORKS	62
4.1. INTRODUCTION	62
4.2. KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND SOCIAL NETWORKS	62
4.2.1. <i>Social Network Theory</i>	64
4.2.1.1. Main components of Social Network Analysis	65
4.2.1.2. Social Network Theory and Knowledge Transfer	68
4.2.2. <i>Social Capital Theory</i>	69
4.2.2.1. Social Capital Theory and Knowledge Transfer	71
4.2.3. <i>Reasoning for Adopting Social Network Theory</i>	72
4.3. SOCIAL NETWORK MODELS ON KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER	75
4.4. SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER	78
4.4.1. <i>Network Structure</i>	78
4.4.2. <i>Tie Characteristics</i>	81
4.4.3. <i>Actor Attributes</i>	83
4.5. CONCLUSION	85
5- THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND ITS VALIDATION	87
5.1. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	87
5.1.1. <i>Knowledge Input</i>	89
5.1.2. <i>Knowledge Transfer Process and Influencing Factors</i>	90
5.1.3. <i>Output</i>	92
5.2. MULTIPLE CASE STUDY APPROACH	92
5.2.1. <i>Case Study Selection</i>	94

Enhancing Knowledge Transfer for Sustainable Construction through Social Network Analysis	ix
5.2.2. <i>Sampling</i>	95
5.3. METHODS USED FOR VALIDATION	98
5.3.1. <i>Survey Research</i>	99
5.3.2. <i>The Social Network Perspective</i>	101
5.3.2.1. How to design a questionnaire for SNA	102
5.3.2.2. Participant Observation during Questionnaire Administration	105
5.3.3. <i>Documentation Sources</i>	106
5.4. DATA ANALYSES	106
5.4.1. <i>Descriptive Statistics</i>	106
5.4.2. <i>Cross Tabulation</i>	107
5.4.3. <i>Content Analysis</i>	108
5.4.4. <i>Social Network Analysis</i>	109
6-UK CASE STUDIES	114
6.1. INTRODUCTION	114
6.2. CASE STUDY UK 1-LONDON	114
6.2.1. <i>Research Setting</i>	114
6.2.2. <i>Actor Attributes</i>	115
6.2.2.1. Age, Gender, and Nationality/ Cultural Background	116
6.2.2.2. Educational Background and Job Levels	117
6.2.2.3. Awareness of Sustainability	119
6.2.2.4. Perceived Use of Sustainable Materials and Technologies	122
6.2.2.5. Received and Required Training on Sustainable Construction	126
6.2.3. <i>Social Network Characteristics</i>	132
6.2.3.1. Size of the Network	133
6.2.3.2. Network Structure	134
6.2.3.3. Cut-points and Hierarchy Models	135
6.2.3.4. Relationship between Network Density and Tie Characteristics and Tie Contents	138
6.2.3.5. Relationships between Tie Contents and the Actor Attribute Job Level	141
6.2.3.6. Relationships between Centrality Measures and the Actor Attributes Job Level and Age	143
6.2.3.7. Knowledge Sources	148
6.2.3.8. Relationships between Knowledge Transfer Methods and the Actor Attributes Age, Job Level, and Actor Centrality	151
6.2.4. <i>Conclusion</i>	158

6.3. CASE STUDY UK 2 – LONDON	166
6.3.1. <i>Research Setting</i>	166
6.3.2. <i>Actor Attributes</i>	166
6.3.2.1. Age, Gender, and Nationality	167
6.3.2.2. Educational Background and Job Levels	168
6.3.2.3. Awareness of Sustainability	170
6.3.2.4. Perceived Use of Sustainable Materials and Technologies	172
6.3.2.5. Received and Required Training on Sustainable Construction	175
6.3.3. <i>Social Network Characteristics</i>	181
6.3.3.1. Size of the Network	182
6.3.3.2. Network Structure	183
6.3.3.3. Cut-points and Hierarchy Levels	183
6.3.3.4. Relationship between Network Density and Tie Characteristics and Tie Contents	184
6.3.3.5. Relationship between Tie Contents and the Actor Attribute Job Level	186
6.3.3.6. Relationships between Centrality Measures and the Actor Attributes Job Level and Age	188
6.3.3.7. Knowledge Sources	193
6.3.3.8. Relationships between Knowledge Transfer Methods and the Actor Attributes Age, Job Level, and Actor Centrality	196
6.3.3.9. Duration of Knowledge Transfer	203
6.3.4. <i>Conclusion</i>	204
6.4. DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES OF THE UK CASE STUDIES	210
7-GERMAN CASE STUDIES	221
7.1. INTRODUCTION	221
7.2. CASE STUDY GERMANY 1-SOUTHWEST	221
7.2.1. <i>Research Setting</i>	221
7.2.2. <i>Actor Attributes</i>	222
7.2.2.1. Age, Gender, and Nationality	222
7.2.2.2. Educational Background and Job Levels	224
7.2.2.3. Awareness of Sustainability	226
7.2.2.4. Perceived Use of Sustainable Materials and Technologies	227
7.2.2.5. Received and Required Training on Sustainable Construction	229
7.2.3. <i>Social Network Characteristics</i>	234
7.2.3.1. Size of the Network	234

7.2.3.2. Network Structure	235
7.2.3.3. Cut-points and Hierarchy Levels	236
7.2.3.4. Relationship between Network Density and Tie Characteristics and Tie Contents	236
7.2.3.5. Relationship between Tie Contents and the Actor Attribute Job Level	239
7.2.3.6. Relationships between Centrality Measures and the Actor Attributes Job Level and Age	241
7.2.3.7. Knowledge Sources	245
7.2.3.8. Relationships between Knowledge Transfer Methods and the Actor Attributes Age, Job Level, and Actor Centrality	247
7.2.3.9. Duration of Knowledge Transfer	253
7.2.4. Conclusion	253
7.3. CASE STUDY GERMANY 2 – HAMBURG	259
7.3.1. Research Setting	259
7.3.2. Actor Attributes	259
7.3.2.1. Age, Gender, and Nationality	259
7.3.2.2. Educational Background and Job Levels	262
7.3.2.3. Awareness of Sustainability	264
7.3.2.4. Perceived Use of Sustainable Materials and Technologies	266
7.3.2.5. Received and Required Training on Sustainable Construction	270
7.3.3. Social Network Characteristics	274
7.3.3.1. Size of the Network	275
7.3.3.2. Network Structure	276
7.3.3.3. Cut-Points and Hierarchy Levels	276
7.3.3.4. Relationship between Network Density and Tie Characteristics and Tie Contents	277
7.3.3.5. Relationship between Tie Contents and the Actor Attribute Job Level	279
7.3.3.6. Relationships between Centrality Measures and the Actor Attributes Job Level and Age	281
7.3.3.7. Knowledge Sources	286
7.3.3.8. Relationships between Knowledge Transfer Methods and the Actor Attributes Age, Job Level, and Actor Centrality	288
7.3.3.9. Duration of Knowledge Transfer	294
7.3.4. Conclusion	295
7.4. CASE STUDY GERMANY 3 – NORTH	301
7.4.1. Research Setting	301
7.4.2. Actor Attributes	301

7.4.2.1. Age, Gender, and Nationality	301
7.4.2.2. Educational Background and Job Levels	303
7.4.2.3. Awareness of Sustainability	305
7.4.2.4. Perceived Use of Sustainable Materials and Technologies	306
7.4.2.5. Received and Required Training on Sustainable Construction	308
7.4.3. <i>Social Network Characteristics</i>	313
7.4.3.1. Size of the Network	314
7.4.3.2. Network Structure	314
7.4.3.3. Cut-Points and Hierarchy Levels	315
7.4.3.4. Relationship between Network Density and Tie Characteristics and Tie Contents	316
7.4.3.5. Relationship between Tie Contents and the Actor Attribute Job Level	318
7.4.3.6. Relationships between Centrality Measures and the Actor Attributes Job Level and Age	320
7.4.3.7. Knowledge Sources	325
7.4.3.8. Relationship between Knowledge Transfer Methods and the Actor Attributes Age, Job Level, and Actor Centrality	328
7.4.3.9. Duration of Knowledge Transfer	333
7.4.4. CONCLUSION	334
7.5. DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES OF THE GERMAN CASE STUDIES	340
8-KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	352
8.1. COMPARISON AND DISCUSSION OF THE KEY FINDINGS FOR GERMANY AND THE UK	354
8.1.1. <i>General Knowledge Transfer Enhancers and Inhibitors</i>	356
8.1.1.1. Actor Attributes	356
8.1.1.2. Knowledge Transfer Process	360
8.1.2. <i>Influencing Social Network Characteristics</i>	361
8.2. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	368
8.2.1. <i>Revision of the Framework</i>	368
8.2.2. <i>How to Use the Framework in Practice</i>	372
8.3. CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE	375
8.3.1. <i>Contribution to Knowledge</i>	375
8.3.2. <i>Contribution to Practice</i>	376

APPENDICES	378
APPENDIX A – PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET	378
APPENDIX B – CONSENT FORM	380
APPENDIX C – QUESTIONNAIRE	381
APPENDIX D – CASE STUDY UK1: CLOSENESS AND EIGENVECTOR CENTRALITY RESULTS	391
REFERENCES	392

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE 4.1: EXAMPLE OF A SOCIAL NETWORK WITH VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS FROM CHAPTER 6	67
FIGURE 4.2: POSSIBLE SUBGROUPS IN A SUSTAINABLE OFFICE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT, INCLUDING NEW ‘GREEN’ JOB ROLES	74
FIGURE 5.1: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	88
FIGURE 5.2: EXAMPLE OF A SOCIAL NETWORK QUESTION (SEE ANNEX)..	103
FIGURE 5.3: CROSS TABULATIONS: RELATIONSHIPS UNDER INVESTIGATION	108
FIGURE 5.4: EXAMPLE OF A SOCIOGRAM IN COLOUR	112
FIGURE 6.1: AGE RANGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	116
FIGURE 6.2: GENDER OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	117
FIGURE 6.3: NATIONALITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	117
FIGURE 6.4: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1	118
FIGURE 6.5: JOB LEVELS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	119
FIGURE 6.6: AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1	120
FIGURE 6.7: PERCEIVED USE OF GREEN MATERIALS OR TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1	123
FIGURE 6.8: RECEIVED TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	126
FIGURE 6.9: PERCEIVED REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1..	127
FIGURE 6.11: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY UK1 – CUT-POINTS MAIN COMPONENT.....	136
FIGURE 6.12: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY UK1 – DEGREE CENTRALITY	143
FIGURE 6.13: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS WHEN SEEKING AND RECEIVING KNOWLEDGE IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	153
FIGURE 6.14: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH AGE GROUPS IN CASE STUDY UK1	155

FIGURE 6.15: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH JOB LEVELS IN CASE STUDY UK1	156
FIGURE 6.16: AGE RANGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	167
FIGURE 6.17: GENDER OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	168
FIGURE 6.18: NATIONALITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	168
FIGURE 6.19: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2	169
FIGURE 6.20: JOB LEVEL OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	169
FIGURE 6.21: AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	171
FIGURE 6.22: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2 .	172
FIGURE 6.23: RECEIVED TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	176
FIGURE 6.24: PERCEIVED REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2..	176
FIGURE 6.25: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY UK2 .	182
FIGURE 6.26: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY UK2 – DEGREE CENTRALITY	189
FIGURE 6.27: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS WHEN SEEKING AND RECEIVING KNOWLEDGE IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	197
FIGURE 6.28: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH AGE GROUPS IN CASE STUDY UK2	200
FIGURE 6.29: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH JOB LEVELS IN CASE STUDY UK2	202
FIGURE 6.30: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK – INPUT SECTION.....	210
FIGURE 6.31: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK – PROCESS SECTION	213
FIGURE 7.1: AGE RANGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1.....	223
FIGURE 7.2: GENDER OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1.....	223
FIGURE 7.3: NATIONALITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1.....	224
FIGURE 7.4: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	225
FIGURE 7.5: JOB LEVEL OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1.....	225

FIGURE 7.6: AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	226
FIGURE 7.7: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	227
FIGURE 7.8: TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	229
FIGURE 7.9: PERCEIVED REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	230
FIGURE 7.10: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY1	234
FIGURE 7.11: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY1 – DEGREE CENTRALITY	242
FIGURE 7.12: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS WHEN SEEKING AND RECEIVING KNOWLEDGE IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	249
FIGURE 7.13: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH AGE GROUPS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	251
FIGURE 7.14: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	252
FIGURE 7.15: AGE RANGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	260
FIGURE 7.16: GENDER OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	261
FIGURE 7.17: NATIONALITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	261
FIGURE 7.18: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	262
FIGURE 7.19: JOB LEVEL OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	263
FIGURE 7.20: AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	264
FIGURE 7.21: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	266
FIGURE 7.22: TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	270
FIGURE 7.23: PERCEIVED REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	271
FIGURE 7.24: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	275

FIGURE 7.25: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY2 – DEGREE CENTRALITY	282
FIGURE 7.26: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS WHEN SEEKING AND RECEIVING KNOWLEDGE IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	289
FIGURE 7.27: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH AGE GROUPS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	292
FIGURE 7.28: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	293
FIGURE 7.29: AGE RANGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	302
FIGURE 7.30: GENDER OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	302
FIGURE 7.31: NATIONALITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	303
FIGURE 7.32: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	304
FIGURE 7.33: JOB LEVEL OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	304
FIGURE 7.34: AWARENESS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	305
FIGURE 7.35: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	306
FIGURE 7.36: TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	309
FIGURE 7.37: PERCEIVED REQUIREMENT FOR TRAINING ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	309
FIGURE 7.38: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	314
FIGURE 7.39: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK OF CASE STUDY GERMANY3 – DEGREE CENTRALITY.....	321
FIGURE 7.40: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS WHEN SEEKING AND RECEIVING KNOWLEDGE IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	329
FIGURE 7.41: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	331
FIGURE 7.42: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER METHODS CROSS TABULATION WITH JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	332
FIGURE 7.43: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK – INPUT SECTION.....	340
FIGURE 7.44: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK – PROCESS SECTION	344
FIGURE 8.1: THE REVISED FRAMEWORK.....	369

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: BARRIERS TO SUSTAINABLE OFFICE BUILDINGS	16
TABLE 2.2: COMPARISON BREEAM – DGNB	19
TABLE 2.3: COMPARISON OF ENGLISH APPRENTICESHIP WITH OTHER EUROPEAN MODELS	22
TABLE 3.1: CLASSIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE HELD BY THE SUSTAINABILITY ADVISOR	30
TABLE 3.2: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER BARRIERS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM	55
TABLE 3.3: ENHANCING AND INHIBITING KT FACTORS	56
TABLE 4.1: FOCUS OF THIS STUDY INSIDE THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT LIFE CYCLE	64
TABLE 4.2: BENEFITS AND RISKS OF COHESIVE AND SPARSE NETWORKS....	80
TABLE 5.1: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK – CATEGORIES OF KT INFLUENCING FACTORS.....	91
TABLE 5.2: CASE STUDY SELECTION CRITERIA	95
TABLE 5.3: KEY FEATURES OF STUDIED CASES.....	98
TABLE 5.4: EXAMPLE FOR NETWORK INFORMATION MATRIX ON FREQUENCY OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS	111
TABLE 6.1: SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT UK1	115
TABLE 6.2: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK1	119
TABLE 6.3: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK1	121
TABLE 6.4: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK1	121
TABLE 6.5: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	123
TABLE 6.6: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AGE IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	124
TABLE 6.7: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	125

TABLE 6.8: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AWARENESS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	125
TABLE 6.9: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN RECEIVED TRAINING AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK1	127
TABLE 6.10: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN TRAINING NEEDS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK1	128
TABLE 6.11: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND RECEIVED TRAINING IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	129
TABLE 6.12: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND TRAINING NEEDS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	129
TABLE 6.13: PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TRAINING IN CASE STUDY UK1	131
TABLE 6.14: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	140
TABLE 6.15: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS LINKED WITH ACTOR ATTRIBUTE JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK1	142
TABLE 6.16: CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY UK1	145
TABLE 6.17: BETWEENNESS MEASURES IN CASE STUDY UK1	147
TABLE 6.18: KNOWLEDGE SOURCES IN CASE STUDY UK1	149
TABLE 6.19: GENERAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KT ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION IN CASE STUDY UK1.....	159
TABLE 6.20: SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT UK2.....	166
TABLE 6.21: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK2	170
TABLE 6.22: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK2	171
TABLE 6.23: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK2	172
TABLE 6.24: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	173
TABLE 6.25: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AGE IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	174
TABLE 6.26: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	175
TABLE 6.27: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AWARENESS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	175

TABLE 6.28: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN RECEIVED TRAINING AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK2	177
TABLE 6.29: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN TRAINING NEEDS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY UK2	177
TABLE 6.30: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND RECEIVED TRAINING IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	178
TABLE 6.31: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND TRAINING NEEDS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	179
TABLE 6.32: PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TRAINING IN CASE STUDY UK2	180
TABLE 6.33: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	185
TABLE 6.34: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS LINKED WITH ACTOR ATTRIBUTE JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY UK2	187
TABLE 6.35: CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	190
TABLE 6.36: BETWEENNESS CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	193
TABLE 6.37: KNOWLEDGE SOURCES AND THE REASONING FOR THIS CHOICE IN CASE STUDY UK2	194
TABLE 6.38: DURATION OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY UK2	204
TABLE 6.39: GENERAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KT ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION IN CASE STUDY UK2.....	205
TABLE 6.40: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PROCESS/ METHODS AND MECHANISMS	214
TABLE 7.1: SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT GERMANY1	222
TABLE 7.2: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	226
TABLE 7.3: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	228
TABLE 7.4: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AGE GROUPS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	228
TABLE 7.5: PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	229
TABLE 7.6: CROSS TABULATIONS BETWEEN RECEIVED TRAINING AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	231
TABLE 7.7: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN TRAINING NEEDS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	231

TABLE 7.8: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND RECEIVED TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	232
TABLE 7.9: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND TRAINING NEEDS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	232
TABLE 7.10: PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	233
TABLE 7.11: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	237
TABLE 7.12: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS LINKED WITH ACTOR ATTRIBUTE JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	240
TABLE 7.13: CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	243
TABLE 7.14: BETWEENNESS CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	244
TABLE 7.15: KNOWLEDGE SOURCES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	246
TABLE 7.16: DURATION OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	253
TABLE 7.17: GENERAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KT ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION IN CASE STUDY GERMANY1	255
TABLE 7.18: SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT GERMANY2	259
TABLE 7.19: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	263
TABLE 7.20: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	265
TABLE 7.21: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN AWARENESS AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	265
TABLE 7.22: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	267
TABLE 7.23: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AGE IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	268
TABLE 7.24: SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AS PERCEIVED BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	269
TABLE 7.25: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AWARENESS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	270
TABLE 7.26: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN RECEIVED TRAINING AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	271
TABLE 7.27: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN TRAINING NEEDS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	272

TABLE 7.28: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND RECEIVED TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	272
TABLE 7.29: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND TRAINING NEEDS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	272
TABLE 7.30: PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	273
TABLE 7.31: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	278
TABLE 7.32: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS LINKED WITH ACTOR ATTRIBUTE JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	280
TABLE 7.33: CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	282
TABLE 7.34: BETWEENNESS MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	285
TABLE 7.35: KNOWLEDGE SOURCES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2	286
TABLE 7.36: DURATION OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	295
TABLE 7.37: GENERAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KT ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION IN CASE STUDY GERMANY2.....	296
TABLE 7.38: SUSTAINABLE PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT GERMANY3	301
TABLE 7.39: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	305
TABLE 7.40: CROSS-TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	307
TABLE 7.41: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED USE OF SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AND AGE IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	307
TABLE 7.42: SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS/ TECHNOLOGIES AS PERCEIVED BY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	308
TABLE 7.43: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN RECEIVED TRAINING AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	310
TABLE 7.44: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN TRAINING NEEDS AND AGE GROUP IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	310
TABLE 7.45: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND RECEIVED TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	311
TABLE 7.46: CROSS TABULATION BETWEEN JOB LEVEL AND TRAINING NEEDS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	311
TABLE 7.47: PERCEPTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TRAINING IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	312
TABLE 7.48: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	317

TABLE 7.49: TIE CONTENTS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS LINKED WITH ACTOR ATTRIBUTE JOB LEVEL IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	319
TABLE 7.50: CENTRALITY MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	321
TABLE 7.51: BETWEENNESS MEASURES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	324
TABLE 7.52: KNOWLEDGE SOURCES IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3	326
TABLE 7.53: DURATION OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERS IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	334
TABLE 7.54: GENERAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING KT ON SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION IN CASE STUDY GERMANY3.....	335
TABLE 7.55: KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PROCESS/ METHODS AND MECHANISMS	345
TABLE 8.1: KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS ON GENERAL KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER ENHANCERS AND INHIBITORS PER COUNTRY	355
TABLE 8.2: KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS ON SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS PER COUNTRY	363

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially funded by the Department of Real Estate and Construction Management of Oxford Brookes University and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, UK.

My sincere gratitude goes to Professor Joseph Tah, Dr. Ramin Keivani, and Dr. Esra Kurul for their invaluable guidance and steadfast support throughout this research project. I am also deeply thankful to all the research participants, whose time and insights were essential to this study.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BRE	Building Research Establishment
BREEAM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
DGNB	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Nachhaltiges Bauen
DGNB	Deutsche Gütesiegel für Nachhaltiges Bauen
ENEV	Energieeinsparverordnung
ESG	Environmental, Social, and Corporate Governance
KM	Knowledge Management
KT	Knowledge Transfer
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions to the Paris agreement
RICS	Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
SN	Social Network
SNA	Social Network Analyses
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
WBCSD	World Business Council of Sustainable Development
WGBC	World Green Building Council

1- INTRODUCTION

1.1. Sustainability in the Built Environment

Almost half a century has passed since the Brundtland Commission Report in 1987 (Pitt *et al.*, 2009), and many policies, legislation, and initiatives relating to environmental performance and sustainability have emerged in the meantime. In December 2019, the EU heads of state and government agreed in the European Council that Europe should be the first continent to become climate-neutral by 2050. This resulted in the Green Deal (European Commission, 2019). According to the European Climate Change Act, EU countries must reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55% by 2030, leading to the Fit for 55 Package. The Twin Transition explains how these sustainability goals can be integrated with digital transformation strategies and enables companies to work more efficiently and sustainably at the same time. The green and digital transitions are political priorities of the European Commission and the European Member States (Muench et al., 2022; Schröpfer, 2024).

At the outset of this study, in 2009, it seemed the focus of built environment stakeholders lay mainly on the energy efficiency of buildings, and most investors saw the energy-saving costs as an incentive to build sustainably. Sustainable building certificates were seen as proof of a quality-built result, which justified the extra costs of green buildings, which were around 2.5% in Europe at that time (Galbraith, 2008). Commercial and public building owners were the forerunners. In the years that followed, the term payback period became more and more important in winning over private property owners to renovate their homes in an energy-efficient way. Nevertheless, the sector moved from this economic focus on energy to a wider perspective of environmental sustainability, looking at safeguarding natural resources. Following the Paris Agreement in 2015, the member states of the United Nations adopted 17 Sustainable

Development Goals (SDGs) (UN, 2024), of which five relate to the built environment. Adapting the built environment to climate change consequences became as vital as mitigating climate change.

The WGBC stated in 2021 that 37% of annual global greenhouse emissions derive from buildings and 75% from the wider built environment. Predictions are that between 2020 and 2050, around 50% of emissions from new buildings will be from embodied sources and the other half from operational sources (WGBC, 2021). When looking at resources and pollution, 40-50% of resources extracted from global materials are used for housing, construction, and infrastructure, while building materials account for half the solid waste generated worldwide (ibid).

The environmental pillar joined the economic one, and building sustainably became mainstream in recent years. The last of the so-called three pillars of sustainability (Elkington, 1998), i.e. social sustainability, followed thereafter, with the European Commission launching the New European Bauhaus Initiative in 2020 to make the built environment more inclusive and foster cultural heritage amongst other areas (JRC, 2021).

Research projects and legislation moved from energy efficiency to nearly zero energy buildings, to climate-neutral and plus-energy buildings. Circularity is the new buzzword, looking at urban mining, buildings as material banks, and design for disassembly. Whereas throughout history, mankind has been reusing building materials, hence this movement is not as new as one might assume (WGBC, 2023). However, in 2023, the circular use of materials is not moving in the right direction, as estimates calculate the world is only 7.2% circular, which is a reduction from 9.1% circularity in 2018 (WGBC, 2023).

Construction is the second largest of the 14 industrial ecosystems listed in the European Industrial Strategy. It is dominated by SMEs and micro-enterprises, employs 25 million people, and accounts for almost 10% of total value added in the EU. The construction industry faces several challenges, including an ageing labour force and difficulties in attracting young workers. A well-trained construction labour force is one of the key

factors in making a significant contribution to achieving climate targets (Schröpfer, 2024).

The green economy is defined as one in which value and growth are maximised throughout the economy while natural resources are managed sustainably. Such an economy is supported and enabled by a thriving low-carbon, environmentally friendly goods and services sector. Central to this new green economy is a dynamic design and construction sector that can greatly contribute to increasing resource efficiency and resilience to climate change. To achieve climate targets, up-to-date knowledge and skills of professionals in this sector are essential, not only for the transition to a green economy but also to attract more skilled labour to the sector. However, the construction sector is struggling to meet its carbon reduction targets due to labour shortages and skill gaps (Schröpfer, 2024).

There seems to be the assumption that each construction stakeholder group has the capacity and knowledge to build sustainably. Yet, despite the legal targets, still, only a small number of professionals in the industry possess the specialised knowledge and experience to design and operate sustainable buildings successfully (Cromwijk et al., 2017; Williams, Dair, 2007; Nelson, 2007; WBCSD, 2009). Moreover, there seem to be difficulties in the process of putting this new knowledge on how to build sustainably into practice (Ugwu, 2005). Previous research has shown that for professionals the main barriers to adopting sustainable building techniques are personal know-how and commitment (WBCSD, 2009), which reflects not only a lack of training and education in relevant techniques (Dixon, Colantonio, Shiers, 2008), but also personal commitment and a supportive environment and business acceptance.

The level of complexity in projects, where the goal is to deliver a ‘green building’, is higher than in standard ones (Myers, 2008). This is due to the increased number of people involved, but also because of the nature of technical knowledge required. Furthermore, sustainable buildings require more and more high-tech components, which are supplied by specialised companies, e.g., for renewable energy solutions. Hence, the supply chains are more distributed and intricate than before (Williams, Dair, 2007). Thus, various sorts of new services and consultancies become more

important, as a high level of expertise is required for solving the complex problems of ecological optimization (Rohrbacher, 2001; Williams, Dair, 2007).

The EU has funded a variety of research projects, and coordination and support actions to map existing skills, such as the Construction Blueprint project or PROF/TRAC, and to foster up-skilling within all professions in the construction sector, such as ARISE and BUS-GoCircular, as only a highly-skilled construction labour force can deliver on climate targets.

There have been several studies comparing the actual performance of sustainable buildings with their intended one, revealing differing results (e.g. Burman *et al.*, 2018, Hinge *et al.*, 2008; Robinson, 2008). Bordass *et al.* (2004) argue that there are many potential reasons for the performance gap that can be divided into four main categories linked to the life cycle stage of the building.

- Project initiation
- Design stage
- Construction and commissioning
- In-use

This book explores the third one, the construction stage, in order to examine the varied perceptions and practices of sustainability knowledge and skills among construction project participants, advocating for a better understanding of knowledge transfer (KT) dynamics to ease the workflow and ensure higher sustainable building quality standards.

1.2. Transferring Sustainable Construction Knowledge and the Social Network Analysis Approach

There is a very diverse range of professions within the construction sector, all carrying different kinds of knowledge that contribute to the project. As the diversity of knowledge is one of the main factors for innovation (Cohen, Levinthal, 1990), its effective management plays a vital role in gaining a competitive advantage (Sharkie, 2003). This is of greater significance in a project-based sector such as the construction industry,