CRISP
Knowledge Capture Task Group

Lessons learned from M⁴I and Housing Forum demonstration projects

Final report

Prepared by

Eclipse Research Consultants
The Eden Centre
47 City Road
Cambridge CB1 1DP

Phone 01223 500847
Fax   500852
Email   icooper@dircon.co.uk

and

Blyth Consulting
240 Hertingfordbury Road
Hertford
Hertfordshire SG14 2LG

Phone 01992 589151
Fax   0870 168 9200
Email alastair@ablyth.co.uk

31 January 2002

Contents

Executive Summary

A scoping study looking at the dissemination of key messages from M4I and Housing Forum demonstration projects suggests that a prime barrier to dissemination is that many businesses within the construction industry are not 'learning organisations.' It also suggests that people value highly the interaction achieved by taking part in the demonstration project process attending events like cluster group meetings because they believe that they learn most from discussion with others.

Conclusions
- Knowledge transfer rarely ripples out from the demonstration projects either back into the companies involved in them or to other organisations

- Few organisations appear to have a 'learning culture' or formal systems in place to capture and disseminate learning

- Taking part in the demonstration project process is generally perceived as the greatest benefit

- Results from demonstration projects when written down are frequently distrusted

- Questions raised as to whether demonstration projects do demonstrate benefits

- Demonstration of a 'bottom-line' benefit from innovative processes or techniques is the type of evidence most valued by those who are looking to adopt those ideas

Recommendations
- Much more time and effort, than expended to date, needs to be invested by M4I and the Housing Forum in discovering how the lessons learned about innovation and performance improvement from demonstration projects can be disseminated effectively

- A clear 'best practice' template should be assembled by M4I and the Housing Forum of the knowledge management roles, mechanisms and structures required within a company for it to be capable of capturing and disseminating lessons learned effectively from demonstration projects

- Adoption of this best practice template should be used as an eligibility criterion by M4I and the Housing Forum for organisations seeking to take part in demonstration projects

- Monitoring should be undertaken by M4I and the Housing Forum to ensure these knowledge management roles, mechanisms and structures operate effectively in organisations engaged in demonstration projects

- Case studies should be published by M4I and the Housing Forum of the successful capture and dissemination of lessons learned by organisations involved in demonstration projects

- Much more time and effort, than expended to date, needs to be invested by M4I and the Housing Forum in discovering how the validity of lessons learned about innovation and performance improvement from demonstration projects is judged – both by organisations involved in them and by those outside

- Urgent action is required by M4I and the Housing Forum to discover whether third parties, not involved in the demonstration project programme, also regard written version of lessons learned as subject to 'spin'

- If 'taking part' is indeed the most effective way of persuading organisations to accept the validity of lessons learned from demonstration projects, the M4I and the Housing Forum should seek to maximise the number of organisations that experience the demonstration project process – both directly and indirectly.

PART ONE

Introduction

A new 'streamlined' structure is currently being put in place for the Rethinking Construction initiative. It has been agreed that the Rethinking Construction 'brand' will act as the overall umbrella within which the strands of the initiative – such as the Movement for Innovation (M4I) and the Housing Forum (HF) and including the Construction Best Practice Programme (CBPP) – will operate. This streamlining is a response to the report from the National Audit Office in January 2001 that identified a degree of confusion in the market place due to the separate focus of each of the strands. In addition, a number of cross-cutting themes have identified that will be handled by a new company to be known as Rethinking Construction Ltd. Staff resources are to be deployed more cost-effectively by bringing together the management of key activities, including Demonstration Projects – currently managed separately by M4I and the Housing Forum.

In October 2001, the Knowledge Capture Task Group of CRISP commissioned Eclipse Research Consultants and Blyth Consulting jointly to undertake research on the lessons learnt to date from the demonstration projects supported by the M4I and Housing Forum. The research took the form of a scoping study to inform the future work of the newly formed Task Group. Its remit was:

> "to identify how to effectively disseminate messages from demonstration projects to target groups, including clients, consultants, contractors and product manufacturers."

This report documents the work undertaken. It is structured in three parts so that those who only require a brief overview of the research conducted need only read the Executive Summary (and Part One). Those interested in the more substantive findings of the research are invited to read Part Two. Those interested in a detailed understanding are directed to the appendices. These contain even more detailed material, including transcripts of the interviews conducted and copies of the interview schedules used and the workbooks employed in the workshops.

In Parts 1 and 2, efforts have been made to respect the confidentially of the members of the demonstration projects who agreed to be interviewed and of those who took part in the workshops. Full lists of interviewees and workshop participants are provided in the appendices.

Approach adopted

The models underpinning learning from demonstration projects

An (in part implicit) model underpins how information is expected to be disseminated from Demonstration Projects. This, in turn, rests on a fairly simple model of 'communications'. In this report, both of these models are teased out and checked against both the experience of those who manage the M4I and HF demonstration projects and those who are involved in them as team members.

Since being set up in 1998 following a report from the Rethinking Construction Task Force led by Sir John Egan, the M4I and the Housing Forum have accepted more than 300 demonstration projects. The purpose of these is to foster innovation, and through example, drive change – in the form of performance improvement - through out the construction industry. However, CRISP was concerned that the learning from the demonstration projects is not permeating the rest of the industry and, just as importantly since they are seen as major drivers for change, not reaching clients.

The teams for demonstration project include clients, consultants, contractors and suppliers. Members regularly gather in regional cluster groups to discuss their projects and exchange knowledge and ideas. However, the number of individuals, project teams, and organisations involved in M4I and the Housing Forum constitute a tiny proportion of the construction industry and its clients.

For the real changes foreseen by the Egan Report to take place, the rest of the construction industry must be able to appreciate the relevance of the benefits of new approaches adopted in the demonstration projects. So a key objective of this study was to look at how to spread the lessons learnt beyond the immediate circle of the M4I and the Housing Forum and the members of their demonstration projects.

Models of learning/dissemination

The Rethinking Construction Task Force saw demonstration projects as the best medium for showing how innovations would benefit construction. They were to be case studies where information would be recorded during the project and written up once M4I or the Housing Forum was satisfied that the project had demonstrated the benefit of the innovation or performance improvement under scrutiny. Both M4I and the HF see innovation as context dependent, i.e. an innovation can be something that is new to the specific team involved rather than never having been invented or tried before in the UK construction industry.

One of the expectations behind using a demonstration project process is that the benefits from projects would radiate out into the construction industry, behaving like the ripples caused by throwing a pebble into a pond. According to this analogy, key messages and lessons learned would ripple out to the industry and its clients in many different ways:

1. *Intra-team transfer* of 'lessons learned' - among the member organisations involved in each demonstration project team so that all the organisations would benefit from each others' learning
2. *In-house transfer* within an organisation involved in a demonstration project – upwards to the board and senior management, downwards to middle management, operational and site staff, and across on to other project teams, etc. For this type of transfer to occur, such organisations have to be capable of acting as 'learning organisations'. They would have to have in place the roles, structures and mechanisms that enable them to effectively capture and disseminate information from a demonstration project and a culture that is receptive to change and capable of benefiting from the lessons on offer
3. *Inter-organisation transfer* - between those organisations involved in demonstration projects to others not involved in the demonstration project process
4. *Broadcast transfer* - to both participating and non-participating organisations via a range of media, from the web sites (M4I /HF/CBPP), conferences, hard copy reports and the press
5. *Baton-passing transfer* - through the formation of new demonstration project teams made up of some individual members/organisations involved in a previous demonstration project and some who are new to the process
6. *Cluster transfer* - between different cluster or regional groups within M4I and the Housing Forum at meetings, conferences, seminars and visits.

Other analogies have also been used to describe the demonstration project process fore example, dissemination as a 'virus'. Here infectious individuals (infected/enthused by their involvement in demonstration projects) are introduced into other organisations/project teams and infect/enthuse them, eventually infecting the rest of the industry by contagion. Similarly, there is the notion of dissemination as 'pollination'. Here people and organisations mix ideas (with pollen as the lessons learned) between them so producing (propagating) new (and possibly hybrid) ones.

Such analogies have been frequently encountered in this study, particularly when Rethinking Construction/Task Group members sought to explain how they think learning should be occurring. In this study, these analogies are gauged against respondents' reported experience of their involvement in demonstration projects to test whether these *ripple/infection/pollination* analogies effectively describe what has been happening in practice.

Models of communication

Another key area of concern was apparent from the brief for the study - the effectiveness of communication strategies. In the context of the demonstration projects, communication demands attention to a range of different factors.
* The *content* of a message, its relevance to the perceived audience, the way that it is presented, particularly the language used. In particular, has it been written for a specific or general audience?
* The *messenger* or vehicle used to disseminate the message. Is the medium relevant to the audience? Peer group members have often been found to be the most effective message bearers.
* The *senders*, their intentions and understanding of the audience needs. The perceived motives of senders often have a critical impact on recipients' responses.

- The *receiver* who may communicate in a different 'language' from the sender. Clients, in particular, often find that information they receive from the construction industry is presented as if it were for other supply side members of the industry. What is important to clients is different and this needs to be acknowledged in those communications

It was implicit in the brief for this scoping study that a primary reason why the lessons learned from demonstration projects have not been taken up more widely is because of deficiencies in their contents or the formats in which they have been disseminated. As the findings reported below indicate, this view is not typically shared by those interviewed who have been involved in demonstration projects.

Key Questions

By considering these models/analogies, a key set of initial questions was identified for further investigation.

- Is the right/most useful information being captured on demonstration projects?
- What are the means of dissemination?
- Do these match how target groups receive information?
- What information do target groups respond to?
- When do they need particular types of information within project cycles?
- What information (evidence/arguments) convince different target groups to adopt new approaches?

The findings from both the interviews and the workshops presented below suggest that these are not the most appropriate questions to ask. These questions reflect the original perception that the main problem lies with the form and content of the key messages emerging from the demonstration projects. The remainder of this report suggests that primary problems lie elsewhere in 'organisational learning' - in the lack of knowledge management roles, structures and mechanisms in the organisations that are the target audiences for these messages.

Data collection methods

Literature review and constituencies

Initally, a range of documents including related work by other bodies and a range of outputs from both M4I and the Housing Forum was compiled. These were used to set the context of the research. Further data was collected from three different constituencies:

- M4I/HF and CBPP/CCC programme managers
- selected members of demonstration project teams, and
- members of CRISP Knowledge Capture Task Group

using two different techniques

1. focused and structured interviews, and
2. interactive workshops.

Initial review with the Task Group

An initial meeting was undertaken with the Knowledge Capture Task Group to review the brief for the study, confirm its nature and scope, and to present the proposed research design and interview schedule for comment.

The interviews

Focused interviews with M4I/HF and CBPP/CCC

A joint interview was conducted with Housing Forum and M4I managers to explore how the information from demonstration projects had been collected, collated and disseminated to date. The primary aim was to gain an understanding, from the perspective of programme managers, of the problems and issues that these organisations have encountered when disseminating the key messages and lessons learnt from M4I/HF demonstration projects. A secondary aim was to explore (similarities and differences in) the nature and purpose of the demonstration project processes managed by M4I and the Housing Forum.

Following the interview, the M4I and Housing Forum managers were used as a source for selecting contacts for interviews within the target groups. In this way, the research team sought to use their insight into organisations that are already involved in demonstration projects as well as those who are not but whom the programme managers thought ought to be. Within the highly constrained time available for this study (about 2 months), this approach was adopted as the most efficient way of assembling a list of contacts for the interviews. In addition, Zara Lamont - the Chief Executive of the Confederation of Construction Clients and until October 2001 Chief Executive of the Construction Best Practice Programme – was also interviewed. Her posts made her ideally placed to give a view on the relationship of the CBPP with the Housing Forum and M4I as well as to explain the remit and objectives of CBPP. She was also able to paint a broad picture of the information needs of clients of construction and how they respond to information presented to them by the industry.

Interviews with target audiences

The M4I and Housing Forum managers were asked to nominate 30 members of demonstration projects for interview, representing four target groups as follows:

- 9 clients
- 9 consultants
- 9 contractors, and
- 3 product manufacturers.

(Appendix 1 sets out the sampling framework in more detail):

The structured interviews

Structured telephone interviews were conducted with nominated members of demonstration projects at times negotiated with the interviewees – Appendix 2 shows the breakdown of interviewees by category. After a preliminary telephone call, interviewees were sent a copy of the interview schedule, see Appendix 3, to enable them to reflect on the questions being asked. Three nominated members of demonstration projects declined to be interviewed. Six others were unable to make themselves available within the time available. Given the difficulties encountered, 'opportunistic sampling' was used. Possible contacts were chased until the time slot available for interviews ran out. As a result, the proposed split between the target groups identified in the sampling frame in Appendix 1 was not achieved. Whilst this skewed the eventual proportion of interviewees in each target group, enough people were still interviewed to provide findings and conclusions appropriate to an initial scoping study.

Interviews typically lasted between half and three quarters of an hour, although there were both longer and shorter exceptions. The researchers then wrote up the interviews and collated the responses.

The workshops

Two interactive workshops were held. The first was an open workshop and had an invited audience from the construction industry, selected by DLC mainly from those known to be involved in demonstration projects. The aim of the first workshop was to expose participants to selected statements drawn from the interviews as a basis for identifying further key issues and for considering how these might be tackled.

At the second workshop, which was restricted to members of the Knowledge Capture Task Group, the exercises run at the first were repeated. The aim of the second workshop was to identify whether there were differences between the views expressed by members of the Task Group and those previously expressed by members of demonstration projects at the open workshop.

At both workshops, breakout and plenary sessions were used to gauge participants' reactions to selected statements taken from the interviews with members of demonstration projects. Their individual responses were collected in workbooks, see Appendix 5, and their collective ones through plenary sessions and a final general discussion for subsequent analysis, see Part Two.

Conclusions and recommendations

Main conclusions

The scoping study revealed a range of issues on the systems in place to capture demonstration project messages as well as the ability of organisations to receive and use this information effectively. The size of the sampling in the study and the time available meant that it was not possible to determine particular 'group views' of the target audiences, nor was it possible to tease out the particular difference between experiences of M4I and Housing Forum demonstration project members. However, the study does suggest that there are such differences and that these could be looked at in more detail.

Model of demonstration projects

- The assumed model for the dissemination of 'lessons learned' from demonstration projects is a *ripple/virus effect* – an ever-widening circle of dissemination driven by enthusiastic members of demonstration projects infecting third parties - in project teams, their own companies, and other organisations (up and down the supply chain) - through a distinct set of transfer mechanisms (see pages 7-8)

- The evidence collected by this scoping study suggests that, in practice, this *ripple/virus effect* is not operating

- Instead, individual members typically appear more like *isolated islands of learning*, surrounded by third parties untouched by their involvement in the demonstration project process

- As a result, dissemination of the lessons learned is constrained: the baton of how to innovate or improve performance is not being handed on via the transfer mechanisms assumed

- There are, of course, exemplary exceptions to this - to be found amongst clients, consultants, contractors and suppliers - but relatively few of these were uncovered by this scoping study

M4I and Housing Forum resources for capturing and disseminating lessons learned

- The setting up and operation of M4I and the Housing Forum demonstration projects has been resource (staff/cash/time) constrained

- To date, the limited resources available have predominantly been invested in data generation, rather than capture, processes

Capturing lessons learned by M4I and the Housing Forum

- The primary mechanism employed by M4I to date for capturing learning and dissemination has been through initial interviews with the project teams and presentations to M4I cluster group meetings

- The primary mechanism employed by the Housing Forum to date for capturing learning and dissemination has been through initial interviews, questionnaires and presentations to regional group meetings

- This is supplemented in both cases by interviews conducted with team members by the professional writer who produces demonstration project 'case histories'

- M4I recognises that primary data capture has not been sufficiently robust – difficulties have been experienced, for instance, in capturing information from demonstration projects about performance against KPIs

- M4I is now seeking to improve the level of primary data capture by requesting cluster groups to approach local universities about providing students/researchers to capture data for them at their meetings

Dissemination of lessons learned by M4I and the Housing Forum

- Responsibility for dissemination from the demonstration projects is currently fragmented

- CBPP has owned primary responsibility for disseminating key messages from M4I demonstration projects but not from Housing Forum demonstration projects

- Dissemination is also undertaken directly by M4I and the Housing Forum although the processes are different

- There is at present a lack of an integrated dissemination strategy across these three bodies

- To date, limited resources appear to have been invested in targeting key messages at specific audiences or in evaluating their take-up and impact in particular market sectors

Organisational learning as a barrier

- Only a very few of the members of demonstration project interviewed work in what they reported as *learning organisations* – companies where the knowledge management roles, mechanisms and structures necessary for capturing and

disseminating the lessons learned from demonstration projects are in place and operating effectively

- The dissemination of information may be constrained more by the cultural attitudes inside the organisations targeted than by the information available. This study reveals a complex range of issues that M4I and the Housing Forum need to tackle

- Cultural attitudes within organisations seem in part responsible for poor organisational learning - with interviewees reporting that within their organisations there was a reluctance to change attitudes

- Organisations seem reluctant to raise the level of *'priority'* given to organisational learning and so do not facilitate the activity by providing enough time and resource needed to gather information and assimilate it

- Despite, or perhaps because of poorly structured organisational learning systems, organisations feel overwhelmed by the amount of information available. Respondents are confused by the role played by bodies like M4I, HF and CBPP and perceive them to be duplicating activities

How organisations capture and disseminate learning

- Many of the members of demonstration projects interviewed found answering questions about how they capture and disseminate lessons learned difficult since they operate less as pro-active knowledge managers, more as passive knowledge recipients

- Organisations get information from a variety of different places yet despite their membership of M4I or Housing Forum demonstration projects, very few identified these two as sources of information

- Few interviewees reported that their organisations had formal systems in place to capture learning, place it in their own context and disseminate it throughout the company

- Examples of the mechanisms that some organisations have in place to capture information from demonstration projects included in-house M4I champions or an information filtering system

- Learning is often captured by individuals on their own initiative but fails to permeate through the organisation

- However, some respondents did see themselves as playing a formal information gathering role in their organisation, but it was difficult to identify whether this information effectively permeated their organisations

- Respondents noted that people in their organisations who have an informal role tend to be driven by personal interest rather than organisational need – so information gathered may well be restricted to a particular interest

- There was evidence that people may not be aware of demonstration projects that their organisations are involved in

- Also, there was evidence that individuals involved in one demonstration project in a company may not be aware of other demonstration projects in the same organisation, let alone be aware of the lessons from them

Using information from demonstration projects

- There is little evidence of '*demand-side pull*' for information from demonstration projects, and this seems to reflect a more general organisational learning problem

- Respondents had given very little consideration to what information they needed from demonstration projects, how they would use it and how best to collect it. Less than a quarter of respondents could identify how, when and where such information could be used within their organisations

Form of delivery of lessons learned from demonstration projects

- Respondents did not agree on the form in which they wanted to receive information about *'lessons learned'*

- Interviewees gave less detailed responses about the nature of useful information than they did to other parts of the survey – suggesting how little thought the respondents had given to the issue even though they were given the interview schedule several days before the interview

- However, the survey does show that people are receptive to a variety of media.

- Some preferred hard copy because useful emails are often swamped by junk email and it is difficult to quickly spot which is which. Other people prefer electronic media, although a few organisations are restricting staff access to the internet.

- Respondents were critical of the emphasis by M4I and HF on providing information on individual projects - they want to see the broad picture on particular topics with individual lessons brought together to give an understanding of the overall or thematic lessons.

- Demonstration projects and associated cluster meetings appear to have provided those involved with a 'comfort factor' - based on safety in numbers, a reassurance that they are not alone in attempting to manage change in the face of widespread apathy or resistance

Lessons learned from demonstration projects

- A quarter of respondents were unable to say whether or not lessons from demonstration projects had changed the way that their organisations do things

- And some respondents placed low priority on demonstration projects and cluster group meetings claiming they had nothing to learn since they were ahead of the game - some also believed that their own projects are so unique that lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their *'special circumstances'*
- But evidence from the interviews does suggest that when information influences an organisation's actions it is because the company culture is already receptive and supportive

- Very few of the interviewees could identify specific lessons learned from their own or other M4I and Housing Forum demonstration projects

- And where they could identify a topic for example partnering, they were unable to give much detail on the particular lesson learned

- There may be several reasons for this:
    - the lessons were not persuasive
    - they were poorly articulated
    - the organisation did not see the relevance of the lesson

- Despite not being able to identify many specific lessons, a third of the respondents were positive about those they had learned from demonstration projects so long as they were relevant to their own business or resonated with their own experiences

- Respondents identified that an explanation of the *'bottom line'* benefits was the single most important characteristic of *'lessons learned'* if they are to be useful and persuasive. They also felt that generally this evidence was missing or not persuasive as presented. While they see *'cost savings'* as important, that view was not unanimous and they identified a variety of other forms of information such as giving contacts as valuable

- One danger noted was that the '*lessons learned*' as articulated in the outputs from M4I and the Housing Forum appear to offer a simple 'golden key' whereas, in practice, if they are going to benefit recipients need to translate them for use in their own specific contexts

Validity of lessons learned from demonstration projects

- The validity of the messages was a significant issue raised during the enquiry

- For many, the most effective method of learning and valued element of the demonstration project programme is face-to-face contact. It enables them to get a deeper understanding of the information, understand the context of the particular project, interrogate those involved and evaluate the information against their own problems. In the words of one respondent, it enables them to 'see the whites of the eyes' of the member of the demonstration project reporting on its innovation and performance improvement

- When written down, the 'lessons learned' from demonstration projects are frequently distrusted by those involved in the programme

- However, once information from such meetings is captured and written down, many of those interviewed view it with suspicion, dismissing it as 'spin'
- This makes widespread dissemination and take up of 'lessons learned' difficult since their perceived validity is closely bound up with the trust generated by 'being there' and 'taking part'

- This basis for judging 'validity' cannot be widely replicated for other potential audiences of the lessons learned beyond the inner circle of the demonstration project process

- If wider potential audiences share demonstration project members' perception that written versions of lessons learned are 'spin', then this will further constrain the take-up performance improvements and innovations promoted by M4I and the Housing Forum

- This perception of *'spin'* was reinforced by the views that:
  - the information generated from the projects is inadequate
  - organisations are not going to admit to failure because it would endanger their credibility
  - M4I and the Housing Forum have a vested interest in promoting particular kinds of message

- Respondents queried whether the demonstration projects '*really do demonstrate benefits*'

- They were deeply suspicious because they do not perceive any reporting of the '*things that go wrong*' on projects and believe that *'the projects cannot have run as smoothly as they are presented'*

- The dissemination needs to draw out lessons from approaches and techniques that failed or did not work well as well as from those that were successful

Main recommendations

How are lessons learned?
- M4I and the Housing Forum need to spend more resource on discovering how the lessons learned about innovation and performance improvement from demonstration projects can be disseminated effectively:
  - M4I and HF should prioritise investment of resources in data capture and dissemination
  - M4I and HF should prioritise the evaluation of the take-up and impact of the key messages
  - Carrying out research into how transfer mechanisms can work effectively
  - Identifying a 'learning strategy' for organisations
  - Evaluating effective sizes of cluster / regional groups that enable learning, feedback and discussion, and how to set up parallel groups to cater for larger numbers of projects

Identify best practice templates for organisational learning

- A clear 'best practice' template should be assembled by M4I and the Housing Forum of the knowledge management roles, mechanisms and structures required within a company for it to be capable of capturing and disseminating lessons learned effectively from demonstration projects by:
    - Evaluating how different organisations effectively manage 'learning'
    - Setting down models of learning for different types of organisation that others can use
    - Identifying how organisations can evaluate learning progress
    - Identifying 'best practice' lessons

Use 'best practice' model as eligibility criterion for demonstration projects

- Adoption of this 'best practice' should be used as an eligibility criterion by M4I and the Housing Forum for organisations seeking to take part in demonstration projects document format by:
    - Asking organisations to prioritise learning – ask for senior managers to underwrite this objective (devise a learning charter?)
    - Requiring organisations to follow one of the models of learning
    - Inviting organisations to evaluate their learning against business performance

- Monitoring should be undertaken by M4I and the Housing Forum to ensure these knowledge management roles, mechanisms and structures operate effectively in organisations engaged in demonstration projects by:
    - Periodically reviewing demonstration project organisations' evaluation of learning at group meetings
    - Revisiting 'best practice' models after 6-12 months and re-evaluating them.

Produce case studies of successful capture and dissemination

- Case studies should be published by M4I and the Housing Forum of the successful capture and dissemination of lessons learned by organisations involved in demonstration projects. Case studies should identify:
    - The model of learning most appropriate to the type of organisation under review
    - Evaluate against each best practice criteria
    - Report where the problems are
    - Evaluate against organisational business performance

Identify how validity of lessons learned is judged

- Much more time and effort, than expended to date, needs to be invested by M4I and the Housing Forum in discovering how the validity of lessons learned about innovation and performance improvement from demonstration projects is judged – both by organisations involved in them and by those outside by:
  - Carrying out a research study to evaluate how organisations judge information generally – through questionnaires / semi-structured interviews
  - Using workshops to evaluate actual examples of information produced by M4I and HF

Reduce the impression of 'spin' in case studies

- Urgent action is required by M4I and the Housing Forum to ensure that those involved in demonstration projects accept that written versions of lessons learned are valid and not subject to 'spin.' Case studies could:
  - Include the names of peer review panels – in effect providing a set of references
  - Broadly indicate problems which organisations may be reluctant to spell out
  - Periodically survey audience reception of case studies – the added value of this activity would be promotional

Maximise the number of organisations taking part in the demonstration project process

- If 'taking part' is indeed the most effective way of persuading organisations to accept the validity of lessons learned from demonstration projects, the M4I and the Housing Forum should seek to maximise the number of organisations that experience the demonstration project process – both directly and indirectly by:
  - Reviewing the resources needed, in particular the number of staff needed to promote demonstration projects and to talk to teams
  - Reviewing how the cluster / regional group structure is organised to cope with more projects – is there a maximum group size? If so, how do you manage several groups in an area?

PART TWO

Interviews with M4I/HF/CCC

Introduction

A joint interview was conducted with managers from the Housing Forum and M4I to explore how the information from demonstration projects had been collected, collated and disseminated to date. An interview was also conducted with Zara Lamont - the Chief Executive of the Confederation of Construction Clients and until October 2001 Chief Executive of the Construction Best Practice Programme (CBPP). This interview gave an understanding of the relationship between M4I, HF and CBPP and a view from a broad client perspective.

Summary of findings

- Originally both M4I and HF sought to set up 'lean' mechanisms for capturing data from Demonstration Projects to reduce the reporting burdens on DP team members

- The primary mechanism employed to date has been presentations to M4I cluster and HF regional meetings

- This is supplemented in both cases by interviews conducted with team members by the professional writer who produces the DP 'case histories'

- M4I recognises that primary data capture has not been sufficiently rigorous – difficulties have been experienced, for instance, in capturing information from DP's about performance against KPIs

- M4I is now seeking to improve the level of primary data capture by requesting cluster groups to approach local universities about providing students/researchers to capture data for them at their meetings

- The setting up and operation of M4I and HF DPs has been resource (staff/cash/time) constrained

- To date, the limited resources available have predominantly been invested in data generation, rather than capture, processes

- The extension and alignment of the M4I and HF DP programmes mean that this priority should now be reviewed

- Improvements to data capture from DPs should now be seen as a pressing priority so that the key lessons learnt can be captured more rigorously

- Responsibility for dissemination from the DP is currently fragmented

- Primary responsibility for disseminating key messages from M4I DPs is owned by CBPP but from HF DPs

- Dissemination is also undertaken directly by M4I and HF

- There is at present a lack of an integrated dissemination strategy across these three bodies

- To date, limited resources appear to have been invested in targeting key messages at specific audiences or in evaluating their take-up and impact in particular market sectors
- This lack of attention to the production of 'bespoke' key messages and evaluation should now be redressed
- The key messages are not target audience specific, but they do have to be 'tailored' to suit different audiences
- A prime barrier to the uptake of lessons from the demonstration projects is the expectation that they offer the 'golden key' - the recipient needs to do some work to translate them into their context
- Information to Clients has to be in very clear terms with the buzz words removed
- One of the big problems is that people know that there is information available, but they have a day job to do
- From a client's point of view the material must focus on the benefits and gains to clients

Interviews of DP members

Analysis

This section of the report presents a summary of the analyses conducted and draws out a set of summary findings. Interviewees' responses are considered against each of the questions asked, see the Interview Schedule listed in Appendix 3. The interviewees are listed in Appendix 4.

Question 1.   Do you gather information and feedback from the construction industry about innovations and performance improvement issues?

	INFORMATION COLLECTED		HOW INFORMATION IS COLLECTED	
TOTALS	**Yes**	**20**	**Informal**	**9**
	Unclear	**1**	**Formal**	**6**
			Unspecified	**6**

All bar one of the DP interviewees suggested that they gathered information and feedback from the construction industry about innovations and performance improvement issues. But how they did this varied greatly, from explicit and formal roles and mechanisms for gathering such information through to ad hoc and informal activities. Comparatively few interviewees – less than a third (6/21) - identified themselves as playing a formal role in their organisations on this front, e.g.:

> "We have a special mechanism for doing this – our Egan Core Group. All the (18-20) members of senior management meet monthly to share best practice and KPIs on all our projects."
> *Consultant*

> "It is a continual process now. My job is to find information and bring it back and go through it with the Design guy and the Construction Manager. Then they hand on to the nuts and bolts people."
> *Contractor*

> "I feed information back to my team informally in team meetings and then I feed it up to senior management."
> *Contractor*

More (9/21) only did so informally,

> "We try to keep abreast of developments but we don't have a structured way of doing it."
> *Client*

> "We do informally. We don't have a research department which is what you'd need to do this on a formal basis."
> *Consultant*

> "The answer is generally no. This was not part of my remit on the DP we had. As far as feeding it back that was only done on an ad hoc basis when I was quizzed by interested parties."
> *Contractor*

A third of the interviewees (6/21) gave unspecific responses to this question.

Question 2.   When and how do you gather information about innovations and performance improvements?

	WHEN		HOW	
TOTALS	Rethinking Construction events	2	Rethinking Construction meetings	1
	CBPP	1	CBPP website	1
	M4I/HF meetings	4	M4I/HF website	3
	M4I/HF publications	2	OGC website	1
	M4I/HF Demonstration Projects	3	M4I/HF meetings	3
	CPN	2	Events/seminars	2
	BRE	2	Consultants	3
	Conferences/seminars	5	Contractors	1
	Magazines/Journals/Press	6	Professional involvement	1
	Clients	1	Personal contacts	2
	Consultants	1	Projects/building process	2
	Contractors	1	In-house meetings	1
	Projects	2		

The members of demonstration projects interviewed displayed highly diverse practices for when they gather information about innovations and performance improvements in the construction industry. No dominant set of practices stands out. Most commonly, they reported gathering such information from traditional sources – magazines, journals and the press in general - yet less than a third (6/21) reported doing this. Almost as many pointed to conferences and seminars as the source of their information (5/21). A contractor commented,

> "I gather some of it by attending events and by looking at the HF and CBPP websites. But my real preference is through working groups and meetings, followed by publications, and then, least of all, websites."

Despite their membership of M4I/HF demonstration projects, less than a quarter (4/21) identified cluster/regional group meetings as a source of information. Even fewer pointed directly to M4I/HF publications or demonstration projects themselves, just 2/21 and 3/21 respectively.

Equally diverse practices were cited for how they gathered such information. Again no dominant set of practices stands out. Surprisingly few (3/21) pointed to using the M4I/HF websites for this purpose. As one client explained:

> "I use the web a lot. A lot of HA websites have links to the HF. I wouldn't say it is widely used in my organisation. Part of the problem is the trust of giving people wide access. There's a change of culture required."

Just as many claimed to use consultants for this purpose. Almost no one spontaneously signalled that they used Rethinking Construction or the CBPP, just 1/21 a piece.

Question 3.   Are you familiar with M4I and the Housing Forum? Have you accessed information about their demonstration projects?

	M4I	HF
TOTALS		
Familiar with	17	11
Unfamiliar with	2	1
Not mentioned	2	9

Four fifths of members of M4I/HF demonstration projects (17/21) identified themselves as familiar with the Movement for Innovation, although two said they were not:

> "No, I'm not familiar with M4I. And nobody else is, in here. So what is it?"
> *Client*

> "I don't really know M4I. I haven't really got a clue about M4I demonstration projects."
> *Supliler*

The Housing Forum had a lower recognition rate. Only half (11/21) identified themselves as familiar with it. A third (9/21) did not mention it at all in responding to this question. A lack of cross-fertilisation between the membership of M4I (broadly conceived as 'commercial activity') and the Housing Forum ('the housing sector') is apparent from the responses received,

> "The HF is something we don't get involved in."
> *Consultant (M4I)*

> "I didn't know that the HF existed."
> *Consultant (M4I)*

> "There are a few [organisations] that straddle both sectors."
> *Supplier*

There was also little reference to the parallel remits of the Movement for Innovation and the Housing Forum,

> "Clearly there is a multi-agency approach in that M4I and HF are basically covering the same ground."
> *Consultant*

A wide range of problems experienced with accessing information about demonstration projects were cited.

- **Lack of visibility**

> "We've not seen any information from demonstration projects. I've not seen much in the general press though it may be reported in the industry press."
> *Client*

- **questionable validity**

> "The demonstration projects we've seen look as if they were slanted to suit the mission rather being absolutely rigorous research."
> *Consultant*

- **information over-load**

"The main issue is not getting the information. It's about sieving it. There's an awful lot of it. All of our development and construction managers have access to the web but it is getting the time to look at things and sort out the things that are relevant."

Client

- **lack of pro-active information gathering**

"I haven't consciously gone looking for information about DPs. I've done it passively by attending cluster meetings. But I haven't entered the website or actively gone seeking for information."

Contractor

"I am aware of other HF demonstration projects but only through looking at the reports on the projects. I've only followed one of them up."

Contractor

"I am familiar with other M4I demonstration projects via various publications and through visiting the website. I have to admit that I cannot afford the time to wade through the information located there. So it's mainly through information at meetings."

Contractor

- **poor in-house dissemination**

"It is very difficult to get that trickle back to the rest of the organisation and even to the rest of the team. Although the minutes of the regional meeting get circulated, they are not representative of what goes on at meetings."

Client

Only a very few organisations reported putting mechanisms in place to deal with these problems.

"We have an M4I champion in the office. He's the channel for this material. We've decided that one person isn't enough. We need to join this up with the way we manage the practice."

Consultant

"If I want to know about demonstration projects, I go to the website or have a look at the hard copy about them. Actually, ideally the scanning is done by our Marketing Manager to see what we can learn from them or who the competitors are coming up for ourselves."

Supplier

Question 4. What information about lessons learned on these demonstration projects have you seen? How/where did you get it from? What form was it in?

	LESSON CITED**		FORM CITED	
TOTALS	Partnering	3	M4I/HF meetings	4
	Lean construction	1	DP Fact Sheet/Report	5
	Management	1	Websites	4
	Fast build	1	M4I/HF Annual Reports	1
	Productivity/KPIs	1	M4I/HF Annual Conferences	1
	Respect for People	2	Publications/handouts	5
	Marketing	1	Case studies	1
	Unspecific	8	Conferences	1
	None mentioned	4	Phone calls	1

(**Note: Some respondents mentioned more than one lesson)*

Very few of the members of demonstration projects interviewed were able to point to specific lessons learned from their involvement with the Movement for Innovation or the Housing Forum. More than half either mentioned none or were unspecific in the responses they gave (12/21). Even those who identified a specific topic, such as partnering, gave little or no detail about the particular lesson they had learnt,

"Quite a lot is useful about the way people have gone into partnering."
Client
"Look for examples of what is best practice e.g. partnering."
Client

Some of the interviewees acknowledge the breadth of information now available,

"For each demonstration there is a two page fact sheet. By now there must be 190 with the key learning points."
Client

But others were critical of what has been published to date, their criticism ranging from unspecific to questioning the focus on individual projects.

"There are some publications on information that I have seen, although I couldn't identify exactly what it was that I read."
Consultant

"There has not been enough information on lessons learned from demonstration projects."
Client

"The specific reporting of projects is slightly frustrating. The problem is that the quality of information varies. The report is more a directory of projects rather than something that provides you with a great level of detail."
Client

"I am more interested in the overall lessons that come out of demonstration projects rather than individual ones."
Consultant

There was no general agreement amongst the interviewees about the form in which they wanted to receive 'lessons learned'. M4I/HF meetings and the Demonstration Project Fact Sheet were the most frequently mentioned but only a quarter (5/21) suggested they preferred these. Some interviewees favoured published material,

> "The 25 page pamphlet on FAQs – those booklets are damn good. There's lots of feedback on lessons learnt in those."
> *Consultant*

Others favoured electronic communication,

> "I like electronic communication because it is easier for me to circulate."
> *Client*

Others were critical of the use of the web,

> "If people are going to publish on the web, they are not going to admit gross failures and cock-ups. They want to talk about the successes so you get a one-sided view. I don't believe that on many of the projects people have made the effort to ensure that the information is representative of the project."
> *Consultant*

Some preferred face-to-face or person-to-person contact.

> "When you actually get people talking about their experiences, you learn much more."
> *Consultant*

> "The spoken word for the most part. I make my own notes and there are handouts at meetings. These are adequate for my needs."
> *Contractor*

> "I think the demonstration project reports are excellent. But what I do is make calls to people if I want to know something."
> *Supplier*

Question 5. Was the information relevant and useful?

	RELEVANCE/ USEFULNESS	
TOTALS	Positive	7
	Positive but	6
	Critical	6
	N/a	2

A third of the interviewees (7/21) were positive about the lessons they had learned from demonstration projects. But positive acceptance of the lessons offered appears to depend on whether the demonstration project providing them is perceived by the recipient as either
- relevant to their own business, or
- resonating with their own previous experience,

> "The information on the fact sheets is relevant and useful if the DP being reported is appropriate to your business."
> *Client*

> "The biggest thing I learnt from [a specific demonstration project] was that the mistakes they made in Phase 1 they put right in Phase 2 by improving the procurement of concrete packages. That rang bells. That was similar to my experience. So I've fed that across into other projects because that mirrors my experience. That's how demonstration projects provide the evidence you need."
> *Consultant*

The lessons learned seem particularly important by providing 'safety in numbers' for participants by re-assuring them that they are not acting alone and can benefit from other people's experience,

> "Yes, I think so. It gives you an idea of what other people in the industry are doing that's of an innovative nature. I think that broad scope is the way to go, learning from the way that people are improving different aspects of the business. It enables you to learn and implement best practice across all parts of your business."
> *Contractor*

> "Without doubt. And you learn that you shouldn't always be getting it right. And so you need to benchmark yourself against others … On sustainability for example, which we are particularly addressing on this project, I've taken on board some of the things said at cluster meetings."
> *Contractor*

About a third of interviewees' responses (6/21) were positive but expressed reservations or qualifications. The same proportion (6/21) were critical. These reservations or criticisms fall into two main categories.

- **Confusing organisational overlap**

  > "There is an awful lot of overlap between different organisations. The greater worry is that it can't be sufficiently funded."
  > *Client*

  > "One of the difficulties I have is that there is quite a lot of overlapping organisations involved here and sorting out the exact nature of each organisation is hard. Where does the CBPP and CIRIA boundary lie? And then there's the CIB and HF and the BRE etc. I think that does cause quite a lot of confusion. There's a lot of people running around doing things and maybe crossing over each other's boundaries. Are people involved in these things doers or are they talkers about doing?"
  > *Client*

- **Questionable validity of lessons learned**

  > "The problem with a lot of the information that appears in the demonstration projects has been disappointing, is the consistent level of information. Everything has been a bit bland rather than objective evaluation. Everything is really unrelentingly positive. So you immediately start thinking that this isn't honest. What have the problems been?"
  > *Client*

"Yes it's useful but are they really demonstration projects. A demonstration project has got to do something significantly different and improves performance and quality. People have said they learn more from a scheme that has problems than they did from one where there weren't the same number of problems. Need to know more about failures."
Client

"The information was only partly useful. This is where it becomes really political. It's pitching a message. It seemed to me that it's more about doctrine and dogma than it is about research. A demonstration project almost by definition has to be a success, whereas a research project has to look as much at failure. We need to be more open about failures."
Consultant

"That depends – on the type of project and the truthfulness of those involved. And the problem is that, to get lessons learnt out, you may be searching for something very small, a tiny change in management procedures, for instance, that isn't even observable from outside but that has significant benefits. We could all do with sharing more information about our innovations. But, on most projects, people are still all going their own way, keeping knowledge to themselves, keeping back what went right and especially what went wrong."
Consultant

Question 6.   Did any of the information/messages persuade you or your organisation to change the way you do things? Why or why not?

	CHANGES MADE	
TOTALS	Positive	7
	Positive but	1
	Non-commital	5
	Critical	5
	N/a	3

A third of the members of demonstration projects interviewed (7/21) suggested that the information they gather persuaded their organisation to change the way it does things,

"It did change the way that we looked at the delivery of projects from the point of view of staff time and resources."
Client

"I can give two clear examples that I've already mentioned – logistical management and the occupational nurse."
Client

 "Yes, it did. We are changing. A good example here would be using benchmarking information. Before we didn't have any. And using benchmarks has given a factual basis to our perceptions."
Consultant

Two of those who responded positively emphasized that these changes had occurred because of their company's culture,

> "Because of our company culture, this is very easy here. All I have to do is say that I have this idea from HF and they will go for it. The culture is supportive. We have a phrase in the company – 'make it happen'."
> *Supplier*

> "Yes, some of them have certainly encouraged us to try a new method or new instrument. We are fairly focused on new ways of working as an organisation but there is always a new slant that you can pick up."
> *Supplier*

However, about a quarter of the members of demonstration projects interviewed (5/21) responded critically to this question. The nature of their criticisms varied.

- **Simplistic answers**

> "I've been to one or two sessions where I can say that I have not really learnt anything new. At these events, you're not necessarily going to get all the answers you're looking for. The audience is looking for answers and things are more complicated than that. For example, in partnering there is no one right answer."
> *Client*

- **Confusing buzz words**

> "One of the problems is the use of buzz words in the industry. And at the bottom of the industry, they don't have a clue what it all means and what they want are simple, practical tools … It's got to be simple, understandable, and achievable, and what can they do now to engage rather than what they'll get ten years down the line."
> *Client*

- **Non-comparable circumstances**

> "It didn't because we found ourselves in different circumstances. And this is what I perceive as the biggest problem. In the construction industry, we aren't even trying to compare apples and pears but pears and celery. And you just can't do it. And that's the fundamental problem with KPI information."
> *Client*

A quarter of the members of demonstration projects interviewed (5/21) gave non-committal answers. Typically these revolved around the respondents' perceptions that their organisation had nothing to learn because it was already converted or ahead of the game,

> "I don't think that it did. You see, we were changing anyway. And so I'm not sure how much would have happened anyway. Was it because or despite of the demonstration project. I have never been able to come to a conclusion in my own mind about that. It is fair to say that we didn't react directly to any lessons learned from our demonstration project."
> *Contractor*

> "The information hasn't persuaded us to do anything different perhaps because we didn't need persuading."
> *Consultant*

> "Cart and horse there. We were already doing things differently. We consider ourselves 100% part of the movement. We're evangelists."
> *Consultant*

Others were non-committal because of the inadequate nature of the information generated by the M4I/HF initiatives,

> "To some extent. Because of the HF/Egan agenda, people are more open to sharing … I could point to how we have changed things against specific project issues. But it is really a question of trust. Really we need to see things with our own eyes, to see that it really works. That's the problem with written material. It's all too easy to see the spin."
> *Consultant*

> "That's difficult to say. Our perception here is that we are having to change and we believe that is a good idea but it's actually how do we do it. It's not that we need the persuasion to change, the problem is looking for help to do that."
> *Consultant*

Question 7.   What do you currently see as the most significant barriers to the take up of lessons learned from demonstration projects in your company? In the construction industry as a whole or among clients?

TOTALS	BARRIERS WITHIN OWN ORGANISATION		BARRIERS WITHIN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY / CLIENTS	
	Too many sources	1	Not given all relevant info	1
	Language	1	Recognising value of different contexts	1
	Feedback from others	1	Too many sources	2
	Staff time	3	Caution	1
	None	2	Competition	1
	Lack of evidence	1	Procurement process	1
	Staff not encouraged to research	1	Low skill levels	1
	Reluctance to change	4	Poor dissemination	1
	Staff skills	1	Culture	1
	Conflict between business demands and learning demands	1	Adversarial stance	1
	Lack of relevance	2	Trust	1
	Trust	1	Relevance	1
			Reluctance to change	1

(Not all of the respondents gave examples of barriers)

The interviewees generally each had a different view of the significant barriers to the take up of lessons from the demonstration projects. The most common factor within organisations seems to be a reluctance to change (4/21). One consultant commented that on a particular issue:

> '… their response is that it's just another fad, just another trend, with no real benefits.'

The second most prominent issue within organisations was the lack of resources in terms of staff time (3/21). People need time to learn how they should be doing things and then implement what they have learned. As one consultant put it:

'The shortage of time to properly assimilate the information and to get it implemented in time for the next project so that the momentum carries you on.'

A client recognised that it gained long term benefits through the championing of the whole process by several individuals in the company, but:

'It comes down to people having the time and being given permission by the company to do this.'

Two interviewees noted lack of relevance as a significant barrier with one Contractor commenting that the lack of relevance means that:

'The whole concept of sharing information falls flat on its face.'

There are fewer common threads among the interviewees' responses about the barriers within the construction industry and among clients generally. Few distinguished between the two in their comments. One interesting comment from a client who saw feedback within the industry back to his organisation as a problem:

"We use a well known firm of construction industry consultants, but I don't ever recall them having said do you know anything about M4I, or partnering, they treat us as a traditional client who doesn't want to hear anything different."

A consultant commented that clients and their practices can be conservative and that:

"Ultimately, as members of the supply chain, we just have to fall in line, even if we know it isn't best practice."

Only one interviewee ascribed the same barrier to both his own organisation and the construction industry in general. This was the conflict between the need to balance immediate business results with the long term view. He commented that:

"It is difficult to take a step back and look at how to improve projects in the longer term against just having to deliver those that are already on the ground."

Otherwise, some of the same barriers were attributed to both categories but by different interviewees. For example, lack of trust, as one interviewee commented:

"There are a lot of expressions of desire out there about opening up, about working in teams, but all you need is someone, up or down the supply chain to abuse that position, and you are back to the traditional culture."

Other examples of barriers common to both categories are a reluctance to change and the number of different organisations perceived to be under the same umbrella and addressing the same issues so causing confusion. On the last point, one client commented that:

"There is a problem with confusion in what appears to be duplication of roles and responsibilities."

One tell-tale comment which reflects an internal organisational barrier was made by one contractor who said:

"I'm fairly certain there are [other dps in the company] but I don't have the full list in front of me. I don't talk to the people involved in them directly."

This comment shows just how difficult it can be to get information to permeate through an organisation when someone who is clearly interested in dps does not know what else is happening in their own company. People can be cocooned within their immediate environment in an organisation and find it difficult to break out.

Question 8   What characteristics would information on innovations and performance improvement have to have to be relevant and useful to your organisation? (Prompt in terms of content, presentation and form of delivery.)

TOTALS

CONTENT		PRESENTATION		DELIVERY		OTHER	
Relevance	1	Ease of access	1	Conferences	1	Remove sales edge	2
Evidence of 'bottom line'	8	Attractive graphically	1	Web sites	1	Restricted access	1
Evidence of predictability	1	Concise information	1	Hard copy	1	Layer of accessibility	1
Include contacts	1	Understandable – language	3	Data sheets	1	What went wrong	3
Trust	1	Sell benefits	1	Short	1	Make benefits real	1
Factual data	1			Face-to-face	2		
Business benefit	2						
Relevance	1						
Demonstrable improvement	2						
n/a	3	n/a	14	n/a	14		13

Interviewees had most to say about the characteristics of the content rather than presentation and delivery. Only 2/21 had nothing to say about the content whereas for presentation and delivery respectively it was 14/21 who did not comment. This may have been because respondents thought that content was more important and, if that is not right. But it does not matter how well it is presented or delivered. Also comments relevant to 'delivery' were made during responses to other questions, most notable on face-to-face meetings as a way of validating information.

The most significant characteristic that information on innovations and performance improvement would have to have is evidence of a bottom line improvement (6/21). Interviewees also suggested that there should be business benefit and demonstrable improvement. Typical comments included:
> "Practical and have demonstrable value against cost, time, predictability, quality or cost"
> "Demonstrable long term benefit in terms of cost and environmental gains"

Relevance: "Are these things really innovative?"

Trust: "I don't trust what is written. And it is too easy to see through the spin."

Factual data: "But to persuade senior management … what we really need is factual raw data."

Other comments included concern about not discussing 'what went wrong': this was also expressed in answers to other questions. Interviewees were also concerned about the marketing edge that the demonstration project write-ups have.

The responses do suggest that people want to see evidence of the bottom-line (8/21), presented clearly (3/21), preferably face-to-face (2/21) with indications of what went wrong (3/21).

Question 9   What form would evidence have to take if it is to persuade you or your organisation to take a different approach? Do you have any good examples?

TOTALS	FORM OF EVIDENCE		EXAMPLES	
	Gives key contacts	1	Detr web site	1
	Gives the problems	2	HF customer satisfaction survey	1
	Gives cost savings	5	Time	1
	Gives success criteria	1		
	To be outcome based	1		
	Knowledge not just information	1		
	Trust	1		
	Factual	1		
	Measures	1		
	Areas of benefit	1		
	n/a	5	n/a	18

The responses to this question need to be read along with those of Question 8 because interviewees seemed to confuse evidence with characteristics of information. However, there is a correlation between the two sets of answers. Here there was a strong desire to see evidence of cost savings (4/21) and this correlates with evidence of bottom line (8/21) in Question 8. Two of the interviewees in response to Question nine cited cost savings whereas they did not do so for Question 8. Cost and bottom-line evidence appear to be important considerations on the minds of the interviewees. But this needs to be presented in a persuasive form and there does not seem to be much evidence that it has been to date.

Other recurring themes include being open about what went wrong, trust, giving contacts so that people can talk to those involved. On this last point, one client commented:
> "Give people a series of bullet points and hooks to get people hooked, they'll take the bait and go and get more information."

Two apparently contradictory statements came from a consultant, who was looking for knowledge, and a contractor who was looking for factual evidence rather than subjective interpretation. The consultant said:
> "It needs to contain knowledge, not just data and information. The idea of knowledge is that it tells you how to do something."

Whereas the contractor commented:
> "If it's in a report or simply talking at a conference, then it has to be proven because it's published by a third party."

Few interviewees were able to give any practical examples of evidence sought and how it had persuaded their organisation to change. It is unclear whether this is because it is unusual that a single piece of evidence from one demonstration project will in itself persuade an organisation to change or whether the evidence is just not there. One supplier summed up the situation:
> "There are enough people around now who have seen the marketing advantage of Rethinking Construction, who can talk the talk. But there are far fewer who can walk the walk."

Question 10   How, when and where could such information used in your organisation? By whom?

TOTALS	HOW		WHEN		WHERE		BY WHOM	
	Workshop	6	Feasibility and evaluation	1	Best value team	1	Maintenance staff	1
	Comparison with own project	1	Procurement decisions	1	Development design group	1	Everyone	1
	Training	2			Management level	1	Depends on issue	1
	Senior level and passed down	4			Throughout org	1		
	Look at examples	1						
	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	

In comparison with responses to other questions, those to Question 10 were generally slight suggesting that interviewees have given little attention to how, when and where such information could be used.

Six of the interviewees saw workshops, meetings or discussion groups as an important method of using information within their organisations. Only two commented on training programmes. One client commented:

> "I tend to get the core group of architects, contractors and consultants together and I think and use that information at that forum. A lot of them wouldn't look to get that information themselves."

Several interviewees (3/21) commented that the information is passed down the organisation. A contractor commented that information is used by:

> " … the senior management team to start with and then they would start to disseminate it down to site agents and residential agents, and then down the supply chain to individual sub-contractors."

Question 11   Are different types of information needed by different people/activities within your organisation? Is the information already available targeted correctly by those who disseminate it?

TOTALS	DIFFERENT INFORMATION TYPES NEEDED. YES / NO	CORRECTLY TARGETED YES / NO
	Yes 15	Yes 5
	No 3	No 4
		Unsure 2
	n/a 3	n/a 10

Like the previous question, interviewees had relatively little to say about on this topic. Although 15/21 did say that different types of information are needed and only 5/21 thought that it was correctly targeted. Generally there was agreement that different types of information are needed by different people or activities within an organisation. For example, one consultant commented that:

> "We are split by discipline and split by level, people responsible for managing projects need information about regulatory issues whereas people lower down want to know about specific calculations."

However, one client's view was quite negative:

> "We all need the same kinds of information and that may be because we are starting at a very low base."

There was less consensus about whether the information is correctly targeted with nearly half the respondents not giving an answer. Again they did not seem to have considered this issue. Two 'yes' responses were qualified, for example:

> "But generally it relies on people looking for it rather than being disseminated to the whole industry."

Another qualifying statement from a consultant was:

> "The information is there if they want to get up and read it. There are differences in the disciplines. Some still have their heads in the sand, especially the consultants."

This statement also reflects a reluctance to gather the information. Another consultant noted:

> "There is a move to encourage staff to look on the web but no specific initiative to encourage staff to take more notice of M4I."

The lack of responses to the second part of this question may reflect that it is difficult to accurately target such a diverse audience as the construction industry. One interviewee who thought that the information was not targeted correctly commented that:

> "In practice, what has to happen is that someone has to grab the information, split it up, re-organise it and then repackage it so that it gets taken up. But this won't work in SMEs. There the problem is resource management."

Question 12   Does information need to be presented differently depending on when it is likely to be used during the decision making processes?

TOTALS	YES / NO
	Yes 7
	No 7
	n/a 7

	YES	NO	N/A (did not respond)
Clients	4	1	3
Consultants	0	3	3
Contractors	2	2	1
Suppliers	1	1	0

A third of the respondents thought that the information does need to be presented differently depending on when it will be used. Clients were most concerned that it should be with no consultants agreeing. They tended to cite examples such as needing more strategic information at project inception and more detailed information later. A client commented:

> "To make the Egan agenda take place need more information, but at the strategic decision making level there's so much other information coming through, you need short sharp things to influence the process"

Another client commented:

> "From setting up the project, aims and objectives, then looking at what other people have done because you're now faced with doing it is slightly different, and the process of problems is very different."

A supplier said:

> "As we get down the management structure to someone who actually has to do something with the information, then it would be useful to have access to more detail, to a spreadsheet via a web site to do some hard analysis of the results of a DP."

However there were some qualifications with one contractor commenting:

> "At present, you have to draw out the lessons by reading the case study when a DP is finished. If you only want to know about timber frame, then you have to read them all and do you own sift."

Another third of the interviewees did not think that information needed to be presented differently. Consultants formed the largest group under this category. Two reflected the importance of making personal contact as the best way of getting the information. One commented:

> "I think that the most interesting part of being involved in a DP process is the forum for talking to others who are interested in discussing improvement."

The other said:

> "As long as people are accurate in how they present information from their DPs, then you can phone and seek it out individually."

Seven respondents did not answer this question as put, several saw question 11 and 12 as being combined.

The difference between Clients agreeing that information should be presented differently and Consultants saying that it should not be may reflect that Clients perceive a longer and more differentiated project process than the consultants. For Clients the project starts much earlier when they make early decisions about the need for the project.

Summary of findings

- Less than a third of the members of demonstration projects interviewed identified themselves as playing a formal role in their organisation gathering information about innovations or performance improvements

- More suggested that they did so only on an informal or ad hoc basis

- No dominant set of practices for gathering information about innovations and performance improvements in construction industry was identified

- Traditional sources – magazines, journals, the press, conferences, and seminars – were most frequently cited (but by less than a third)

- Despite their membership of demonstration projects, less than a quarter identified the M4I/HF as their source of such information

- Even fewer spontaneously identified using the M4I/HF or CBPP websites for this purpose

- Four fifths of those interviewed said they were familiar with the Movement for Innovation: the Housing Forum had a lower recognition rate at just over half

- A clear lack of cross-fertilisation between the membership of the two initiatives is apparent - a few members of each had never heard of the other

- There was little reference to the parallel remits of the two initiatives

- A wide range of problems experienced with accessing information about demonstration projects were cited
  - lack of visibility of information
  - questionable validity of information – 'slanted to suit mission'
  - information over-load
  - lack of pro-active information gathering
  - poor in-house dissemination

- Only a very few organisations reported putting mechanisms in place to deal with these problems – such as an in-house M4I champion or an information-filtering process

- Very few of the members of demonstration projects interviewed were able to point to specific lessons learned from their involvement with the Movement for Innovation or the Housing Forum

- More than half either mentioned none or were unspecific in the responses they gave (12/21): even those who identified a specific topic, such as partnering, gave little or no detail about the particular lesson they had learnt

- While a few acknowledged the breadth of information now available – "190 two page fact sheets with the key learning points" – others were critical of what has been published to date, including the emphasis on individual projects rather than overall or thematic lessons learned

- There was no general agreement amongst the interviewees about the form in which they wanted to receive 'lessons learned'

- M4I/HF meetings and the Demonstration Project Fact Sheet were the most frequently mentioned forms but only a quarter (5/21) suggested they preferred these.

- Some interviewees favoured published material, others electronic communication, and others face-to-face or personal contact

- Some queried whether participants would allow "gross failures and cock-ups" to be included on the websites, so calling in question how representative the information on them about demonstration projects is
- A third of the interviewees (7/21) were positive about the lessons they had learned from demonstration projects
- But positive acceptance of the lessons offered appears to depend on whether the demonstration project providing them is perceived by the recipient as either
  - relevant to their own business, or
  - resonating with their own previous experience
- The lessons learned seem particularly important by providing 'safety in numbers' for participants, re-assuring them that they are not acting alone and can benefit from other people's experience
- About a third of interviewees' responses (6/21) about the value of lesson learned were positive but expressed reservations or qualifications: the same proportion (6/21) were critical
- These reservations or criticisms fall into two main categories
  - confusing organisational overlap in the source of messages
  - questionable validity of 'lessons learned' – due to political spin and the unacknowledgement of failure
- The validity of 'lessons learned' from is questioned by a significant proportion of those who have taken part in the M4I/HF initiatives
- A third of the members of demonstration projects interviewed (7/21) suggested that the information they gather had persuaded their organisation to change the way it does things
- Two of those who responded positively emphasized that these changes had occurred because of their company's culture was already receptive and supportive
- About a quarter (5/21) responded with a variety of criticisms
  - simplistic answers
  - confusing buzz words
  - non-comparable circumstances
- A quarter (5/21) gave non-commital answers when asked about changes made due to their involvement in the M4I/HF initiatives
- Such non-commital responses often revolved around respondents' perceptions that their organisation had nothing to learn because it was already converted or ahead of the game
- Others were non-commital because of what they saw as the inadequate (spin-based) nature of the information generated by the M4I/HF initiatives
- The most identified barrier to the take up of lessons from demonstration projects is a reluctance to change attitudes within organisations
- A significant barrier to the take up of lessons from demonstration projects is the amount of staff time required to assimilate and implement changes
- Those engaged with demonstration projects can still be unaware of similar initiatives elsewhere - even in their own organisation
- Over a third of respondents (8/21) identified 'bottom-line' benefits to the project or organisation as the single most important characteristic that information on innovations and performance improvement must have to be useful and relevant

- Most respondents considered that the content of messages was more worthy of comment than presentation or delivery of information
- Respondents require a range of different forms of evidence to persuade them to change the way they do things
- About a quarter of respondents (5/21) said that cost savings were the most important piece of evidence that will persuade an organisation to take a different approach
- The respondents did not offer any examples of evidence that would encourage them to do things differently
- There is no evidence that the results of individual demonstration projects in themselves persuade organisations to do things differently: instead they seem to form just part of a broader picture that does so
- About a third of interviewees (6/21) said that they would use information from demonstration projects in workshops, meetings and discussion groups
- About a quarter of respondents (5/21) could not identify how, when and where information on demonstration projects could be used in their organisations
- Two thirds of respondents (14/21) could identify 'how' they would use information from demonstration projects in their organisations whereas only two respondents could identify 'when' they would use it
- About three-quarters of respondents believe that different types of information are needed by different people in their organisations, but only a quarter thought that the information was correctly targeted
- It is hard to target information accurately at a diverse industry like construction, the audience needs to translate the information it gets into its own context
- There was no conclusive evidence that information needs to be presented differently depending on when it is used although unspecific indications were voiced that it should be
- A third of the respondents (7/21) were unable to indicate whether information should be presented differently depending on when it is used
- There is little evidence of demand-side pull for information from demonstration projects - respondents appear to have given very little consideration as to what information they needed from demonstration projects and how they would use it.

Open Workshop

An open workshop was held with participants invited from both the Movement for Innovation and Housing Forum demonstration projects, see attendance list (*not yet included*). At the workshop, participants were exposed to selected statements taken from the interviews conducted with members of demonstration project and asked whether they agreed with each of them. Working in small groups, participants were asked first to complete the exercises in their workbooks, see Appendix 5, as individuals and then to discuss their responses with other members of their groups. Key points made during these discussions were recorded and then reported in follow-up plenary sessions.

Analysis

Participants were asked to respond to selected statements made by interviewees when questioned about their experience of being involved in demonstration projects. Participants were asked to rate their responses on a five point scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree). Eleven participants submitted their workbooks for analysis. Their individual responses have been collated and are presented below.

Table A: Breakout Session 1 part 1

	Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. **11 responded, collectively 55= strongly agree, 33= neutral, 11= strongly disagree**		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	You have got to get people to be more open and honest, even if you do it anonymously.	**47**	**0**
2	In-house dissemination is best done by team leaders cascading information down to their own particular team members.	**46**	**0**
3	You need a high level mechanism (like a dedicated senior management group) to manage the dissemination of best practice effectively in-house.	**43**	**1**
4=	Our organisation tends to be a bit blinkered about learning about innovation/performance improvement, concentrating only on the major sector in which we operate.	**41**	**0**
4=	People will only publish information they're prepared to go public on and that means the successes.	**41**	**0**
6	The core of people in our company who've looked at what's been learnt and passed it on is very small because they don't have the spare time or a lot of vision	**37**	**2**
7	Taking part in the cluster/regional group meetings is the best way to access lessons learnt from demonstration projects	**35**	**1**
8	Lessons learnt are often very small – for instance, tiny changes in management procedures – which aren't observable from outside.	**34**	**1**
9	There's not much reporting of failure on demonstration projects.	**32**	**2**
10=	At cluster/regional group meetings, people are pretty candid because they know there's no hidden agenda – we are all just learning.	**30**	**2**
10=	The most beneficial part of the demonstration project was seeing people who were luke warm to start with become enthusiastic.	**30**	**1**

Participants' responses have been aggregated in the table above. A maximum total score of 55 would mean that they all agreed strongly with a statement. A minimum total of 11 would mean that they all strongly disagreed. Participants were also able to indicate that they did not know whether they agreed or disagreed.

Collectively, their responses to these statements typically fall within the positive to neutral range, i.e. from 55 to 33. About half of the statements elicited strong agreement. In aggregate, the highest score is 47 (more than 'agree fairly strongly') and the lowest is 30 (just below 'neutral'). In this sense, collectively the participants did not disagree with any of the statements offered describing the experience of demonstration projects reported. Indeed few individual respondents disagreed with any of the statements offered. Only two disagreed strongly with any of them, both indicating their dissenting from:

> "Our organisation tends to be a bit blinkered about learning about innovation/performance improvement, concentrating only on the major sector in which we operate.

The strongest level disagreement was recorded against only one statement:

> "Lessons learnt are often very small – for instance, tiny changes in management procedures – which aren't observable from outside".

More than half of the participants (6) recorded disagreeing fairly strongly with this, implying that the lessons learnt can be large and easily observable.

The participants were also asked to identify what they saw as the three key issues that these statements raised for them about demonstration projects. They signalled that they raised a host of unresolved issues. Typically, these centred around the effective conduct of demonstration projects, both between members of project teams and within the organisations from which they are drawn. The issues identified can be summarised under three headings.

1. Procedural issues
- The maximum effective size for cluster and regional groups
- The openness and honesty of presentations from group members
- The effectiveness of reporting between group members
- Doubts about model underpining demonstration projects - 'learning while doing'
- The comparative absence of learning from mistakes and failure within groups.

2. Awareness and understanding
- Under-publicisation of (participation in) demonstration project group meetings
- Limited awareness of sources of information
- Limited understanding of KPIs
- Limited acceptance/implementation of the need to act as 'learning organisations'

3. Dissemination
- A need for top/senior management buy-in to dissemination
- A need for dissemination throughout participating companies
- A need for dissemination to other supply chain members
- Lack of structure to dissemination to date
- A need for dissemination about specific/generic issues not just projects
- Different dissemination needs of large and small companies
- Lack of access to lessons learnt to date.

Table B: Breakout Session 1 part 2

	Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. **11 responded, collectively 55= strongly agree, 33= neutral, 11= strongly disagree**		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	The information produced by demonstration projects is fine if people are motivated to read it.	**47**	**0**
2=	Hearing about how other people improve their performance has really motivated us to do it too.	**44**	**0**
2=	You want a concise summary plus the key innovation because, to get more information, you've got to go and talk to these people.	**44**	**1**
4=	There is too much credence put on the quality of information generated: it's being involved in demonstration projects that delivers the benefits.	**36**	**2**
4=	I like electronic communications because it's easier for me to circulate.	**36**	**0**
4=	We're more interested in the overall lessons that have come out of demonstration projects than individual ones.	**36**	**1**
7=	Personally I find reading a piece of paper easier, so I can mark it up.	**35**	**0**
7=	The main issue is not getting the information, it's about sieving it, there's an awful lot of it.	**35**	**1**
8	What you can do with the brief summaries from demonstration projects is go further into it and get more information if you need it.	**33**	**1**
9	We tend to download information on demonstration projects off the web, it's reasonably easily accessible.	**31**	**0**
10=	I prefer information delivered face-to-face: I just don't trust what is written down.	**28**	**0**
10=	Demonstration projects really do provide the evidence you need to make clients willing to change.	**28**	**1**
12	We haven't accessed the website for benefit because it's simply a list of individual projects.	**25**	**0**

Few of this second set of statements elicited strong collective agreement from the participants. However, collectively, they did agree fairly strongly that no changes are needed to the information being produced on the back of the demonstration projects,

"The information produced by demonstration projects is fine if people are motivated to read it" (yet see key issues raised below).

Instead they saw the motivation of potential readers as being problematic, rather than the form or content of the information currently provided. The participants showed more agreement about this statement than any of the others offered – their responses ranging only from 'strongly agree' to 'agree'. They showed similar levels of unanimity about and agreement with:

"Hearing about how other people improve their performance has really motivated us to do it too",

and

"You want a concise summary plus the key innovation because, to get more information, you've got to go and talk to these people."

However there is little agreement about the quality of the evidence provided by demonstration projects. Participants' responses were most polarised by the statement that:

"Demonstration projects really do provide the evidence you need to make clients willing to change."

While four agreed that it did, 5 disagreed, one was neutral and one didn't know. Participants also disagreed about the value of face-to-face delivery of information at cluster and regional group meetings. But they were united in their rejection of the criticism that the websites are simply lists of individual projects.

Collectively, the participants were fairly neutral about some of the statements offered. This is because of the polarised responses these elicited. For some of these statements drew agreement from half of the participants, e.g.:

"There is too much credence put on the quality of information generated: it's being involved in demonstration projects that delivers the benefits",

and

"We're more interested in the overall lessons that have come out of demonstration projects than individual ones."

Similarly, overall participants' responses do not signal that any particular form of delivery for information arising from demonstration projects – face-to-face, paper- or web-based - is strongly preferred, at least by the members of its target audiences that attended the workshop.

The participants were also asked to identify what they saw as the three key issues that these statements raised for them about demonstration projects. Again they signalled that they raised a host of unresolved issues. Typically, these centred around the effective learning and dissemination from demonstration projects, both amongst members of project teams and out in the wider construction industry. The issues identified can be clustered under two headings.

1. Information quality, format and delivery mechanisms
- The quality of advice, guidance and evidence generated by demonstration projects
- The need for generic (repeated) lessons learned
- Disagreement about the (relevance of) different levels of information required – summaries and general principles v. more (context-specific) details
- Disagreement about whether changes to the formatting and packaging of information is critical

- Lack of clarity about the appropriateness of dissemination mechanisms - the value of face-to-face delivery as opposed to broadcast mediums
- Queries about the value of broadcasting as opposed to specific training

2. Learning, motivation and behaviour of target audiences
- A need to move from learning amongst DP members and cluster groups to effective take up across the industry
- Queries about the need for participation in DPs as the primary learning mechanism
- Concern about the lack of motivation (particularly willingness to read) in collecting information within the industry
- A need for target audiences to adopt a pro-active stance towards information gathering in order for change and improvement to occur
- Queries about how people learn best, especially about business benefits
- A need to aim DPs at clients if change is to be driven through the industry.

Table C: Breakout Session 2 part 1

	Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. 55= strongly agree, 33= neutral, 11= strongly disagree		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1=	The time of individuals who get involved in M4I and the Housing Forum is a valuable resource and we can only resource so many of them.	**40**	**0**
1=	The enthusiastic people are those you rely on to carry the message through.	**40**	**1**
3=	I am not sure how all the different organisations under the Rethinking Construction umbrella mesh together.	**38**	**0**
3=	A few people get the feedback either they're alive to it through their work or they are interested on the periphery.	**38**	**0**
3=	The long-term benefits have been through the championing of the M4I process by several individuals within our organisation.	**38**	**1**
6	One of the difficulties I have is that there are quite a lot of overlapping organisations involved here and sorting out the exact nature of each organisation is hard.	**33**	**1**
7	Perception is that although M4I has cluster groups they assume that once the information is on the web site it's the end of their responsibility.	**26**	**2**
8	At the moment we only gather information when we select contractors to undertake a piece of work.	**18**	**2**

In the first part of the second breakout session, the highest score is 40 (agree with the statement rather than strongly agree) and the lowest is 18 (fairly strongly disagree). The lowest scoring statement reflects that there were few (no?) clients at the workshop

> "One of the difficulties I have is that there is quite a lot of overlapping organisations involved here and sorting out the exact nature of each organisation is hard."

Three respondents disagreed strongly with this, two mildly disagreed and one strongly agreed. Apart from this statement, few respondents disagreed with the others offered with only one disagreeing strongly with any of them.

The strongest level of agreement was recorded against the statement that:

> "The enthusiastic people are those you rely on to carry the message through."

Four people strongly agreed with it and five fairly strongly agreed. However, the greatest level of consensus among the respondents was with the statement that:

"The time of individuals who get involved in M4I and the Housing Forum is a valuable resource and we can only resource so many of them."

Six out of the eleven respondents fairly strongly agreed (gave it the same rating), two strongly agreed and one mildly disagreed.

The participants were asked to say what they saw as the three key issues to emerge from these statements. These key issues fall into four broad categories and show the importance of feedback, the commitment of staff in dissemination and the extent that there may be confusion caused by too many organisations seemingly addressing the same issues.

1. Feedback
- Use of the information / feedback from demonstration projects is still very limited.
- Gathering information and feedback.
- Gathering new process knowledge is seldom seen as an imperative
- Chinese whispers i.e. message lost through many hand
- Dissemination within organisations is poor
- There is a lack of continuity from project to project

2. Number of organisations
- There are too many 'bodies' in Rethinking Construction.
- Confusion about different organisations doesn't help
- General construction people do not know how all the different organisations mesh together (M4I, CBPP, HF, DBF, CRISP, CCC)
- Overlapping, yes true but difference between housing and non-housing.

3. Importance of people
- Demonstration projects are reliant on outstanding individuals.
- Enthusiastic people / website are all we have
- Committed people very important
- Enthusiasm of team members and willingness to carry through.
- Can you have too many enthusiasts in a company.

4. Process
- Time taken for involvement balanced against long-term benefits for organisations.
- Need for co-ordination of information
- Clarity of message – interference patterns in the puddle
- Time is precious therefore meetings must be workmanlike

Table D: Breakout Session 2 part 2

	Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects.		
	55= strongly agree, 33= neutral, 11= strongly disagree		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	The thing that's missing is how you capitalise on the learning from experience and how do you create a tacit knowledge base.	42	1
2	One of the biggest barriers is shortage of time to properly assimilate the information and to get it implemented in time for the next project so that the momentum carries you on.	41	0
3	People who have been involved in demonstration projects are more open to sharing.	40	0
4	With the internet, it's a matter of choice whether you look at it.	39	0
5	A significant barrier is the time that it takes for practices to trickle through the system from senior management to workforce.	38	0
6=	With each demonstration project you get one bit of the story on an issue, you need to pull it all together.	36	0
6=	The prime barrier to the uptake of lessons from the demonstration projects is the expectation that they offer the 'golden key,' the recipient needs to do some work to translate them into their context.	36	1
8	The biggest barrier to learning lessons from other demonstration projects is that we can't find information that is relevant to what we are doing.	32	0
9=	Every company thinks it has a unique project and that lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their special circumstances.	25	0
9=	We haven't been able to learn a lot from other people's demonstration projects because they aren't like the work we do.	25	1

The responses from the second part of this Breakout session span from agreement with the statements to a mild disagreement. The highest score is 42 (agree with the statement rather than strongly agree) and the lowest is 25 (fairly strongly disagree). Most of the responses are between neutral (33) and strongly agree (55) with none provoking an extreme response either way.

The strongest level of agreement was rated against the statement that:
> "The thing that's missing is how you capitalise on the learning from experience and how do you create a tacit knowledge base."

Four participants rated this as strongly agree, four rated it as fairly strongly agree, two were neutral and one don't know.

The statement that provoked the greatest level of consensus was:
> "People who have been involved in demonstration projects are more open to sharing."

One participant strongly agreed with this statement, one was neutral and the rest fairly strongly agreed.

The two statements ranked 9= provoked a spread of responses among the participants rather than a polarisation towards the negative. Three participants strongly disagreed with the statement that:
> "Every company thinks it has a unique project and that lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their special circumstances."

Three people mildly agreed with it. The statement that:
> "We haven't been able to learn a lot from other people's demonstration projects because they aren't like the work we do"

provoked one strong disagreement and three mild agreements.

The participants were asked to say what they saw as the key issues to emerge from these statements. These can be grouped under four headings. Taken together these messages suggest that the group feels that learning is a very complex business, and takes time. However, there is a shortage of time for most organisations and people. There is uncertainty about whether the Internet helps the learning / information gathering process. The number of statements made by the group on distilling the principles from the demonstration projects suggests there is sympathy with the view expressed by interviewees that the messages need to be put into their broader context.

1. Process of learning
- It's always a matter of choice whether you learn. There needs to be a desire (benefits – clear)
- Understanding the learning cycle. How do you speed it up?
- Developing effective learning methods
- Housing has very generic issues therefore information shared is useful, although I accept there are differences between refurbishment and new build
- Processes are common – projects unique so benefits will always be denied.
- Tacit knowledge.

2. Time to learn
- Shortage of time to assimilate information
- Time to learn and understand is a clear barrier
- Information overload
- Time for reflection is a key to learning

3. Delivery of message
- Internet – is it really the answer?
- Need more market research on use of Internet.
- Sharing only takes place where commercial competition is not a major factor.
- There is a big difference between one-off and repeat clients

4. The messages
- Yes, unique issues should be available but at different level, 2 levels of dissemination
- Ease of access to the right information.
- Demonstration projects must clearly illustrate the principles to allow outside, non-related companies to learn
- Important to look at principles not specific examples. Often relates to cultural barriers.
- Develop issues from demonstration projects, assimilate and pass on.
- People are not able to understand the outputs – i.e. general issues
- Specific innovations require pooling and representing
- Translation of lessons needs distillation

Summary of findings

- Overall workshop participants responses and discussions suggest that they see the effective generation and delivery of lessons learnt from the M4I and HF demonstration projects as being beset by a very wide range of unresolved issues, most of which appear to have been given too little attention to date

Breakout Session 1 part 1

- Typically the workshop participants agreed with the selected statements taken from interviews with members of demonstration projects presented in this session
- Collectively, their responses to these statements typically fall within the positive to neutral range
- About half of the statements elicited fairly strong agreement
- Few of the participants disagreed with any of the statements offered
- In this sense, although not drawn from a representative sample of members of demonstration projects, the selected statements appear indicative of the experience of those who have taken part in them
- In discussion, participants signalled that the statements raised a host of unresolved issues about the effective conduct of demonstration projects, both between members of project teams and within the organisations from which they are drawn
- These issues can be summarised under three headings
- *Procedural issues*: maximum effective group size, openness and honesty between members, effectiveness of reporting, lack of learning from mistakes and failures, doubts about the model underpinning demonstration projects – 'learning from doing'
- *Awareness and understanding*: under-publicisation of meetings, limited awareness of sources of information, limited understanding of KPIs, limited acceptance/implementation of need to act as 'learning organisations'
- *Dissemination***:** need for top/senior management buy-in, need for dissemination throughout participating companies, and to other supply chain members, lack of structure for dissemination to date, need for dissemination about specific/generic issues not just projects, different needs of large/small companies, lack of access to lessons learned to date.

Breakout Session 1 part 2

- Participants agreed fairly strongly that no changes are needed to the information being produced from demonstration projects
- Instead they saw the motivation of potential readers, rather than the form or content of the information currently provided, as being problematic
- However, they showed little agreement about the quality of evidence provided by demonstration projects
- Their responses do not indicate that any particular form of delivery for information - face-to-face, paper-, or web-based – is strongly preferred
- In discussion they identified another host of unresolved issues

- *Information quality, format and delivery systems*: quality of evidence generated by demonstration projects, need for generic/repeated lessons, disagreement about levels of information required – general principles v context specific details, lack of clarity about efficacy of delivery systems, queries about value of broadcast delivery as opposed to specific training
- *Learning, motivation and behaviour of target audiences*: need to move from learning among DP members and cluster groups to effective take-up across industry, participation in DPs as primary learning mechanism, concern about lack of willingness to read in industry, need for target audiences to adopt pro-active stance towards information gathering, queries about how people learn best, need to aim DPs at clients to drive change through industry

Breakout Session 2 part 1
- Participants' responses to the statements presented in this session were more mixed, although few disagreed strongly with any of them
- Their strongest agreement was accorded to the statement about the value of the time of those involved in M4I/HF and the limited availability of this as resource
- In discussion they identified more unresolved issues
- *Feedback*: limited use of feedback from DPs to date, poor dissemination within organisations, gathering new process knowledge seldom an imperative, Chinese whispers – message lost through many hands, lack of continuity from project to project
- *Organisations involved*: too many bodies in Rethinking Construction, confusion about bodies involved, overlap between bodies but differences between housing/non-housing
- *People*: importance of people involved, DPs reliant on outstanding people, enthusiastic people/website 'all we have', too many enthusiasts possible in a company
- *Process*: time involved v long term nature of benefits, lack of clarity of message – interference caused by the number of sources, need for workmanlike meetings because time is precious.

Breakout Session 2 part 2
- Participants' responses to the statements presented in this session were also mixed, although few statements provoked strong responses either way
- The greatest consensus formed around the statement that people who have been involved in DPs are more open to sharing
- Participants polarised around the statement that every company thinks it has a unique project and so lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their special circumstances
- In discussion, the participants suggested that learning is a very complex business that takes time
- However, for most organisations and people, there is a shortage of time.
- There was uncertainty about whether the internet helps learning/information gathering
- There was sympathy for the interviewees' call for DP lessons to be placed in a broader context

- Once again, a range of unresolved issues were identified
- *Process of learning*: learning is a matter of choice – driven by needs desire/clear benefits, need to understand and speed up learning cycle, develop effective learning methods, issue of tacit knowledge, generic/process v project-specific learning
- *Time for learning*: shortage of time to assimilate information, time to learn and understand is clear barrier, information overload, time for reflection is key to learning
- *Message delivery*: is internet really the answer, more market research needed on use of internet, sharing only occurs where commercial competition is not a major factor, big difference between one-off/repeat clients
- *Messages*: more than one level of dissemination is required – generic and project-specific, principles need to be clearly identified to allow outsiders to learn, currently people aren't able to understand (general issue) outputs, lessons learnt need translation and distillation.

Task Group Workshop

A follow-on workshop was held with members of the Knowledge Capture Task Group, see attendance list (*not yet included*). . At this workshop, Task Group members were exposed to the same selected statements used with members of demonstration projects. Task Group members were also asked whether they agreed with each of them. The purpose of this follow-on workshop was to discover any similarities and difference in views between Task Group members and members of demonstration projects who attended the open workshop.

Analysis

As before, Task Group members were asked to respond to selected statements made by interviewees when asked about their experience of being involved in demonstration projects. They were asked to rate their responses on a five-point scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree). Seven Task Group members submitted their workbooks for analysis. Their individual responses have been collated and are presented below.

Table E: Breakout Session 1 part 1

	Task Group members were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. **7 responded, collectively 35= strongly agree, 21= neutral, 7= strongly disagree**		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	You need a high level mechanism (like a dedicated senior management group) to manage the dissemination of best practice effectively in-house.	**30**	**0**
2=	Taking part in the cluster/regional group meetings is the best way to access lessons learnt from demonstration projects	**29**	**0**
2=	The core of people in our company who've looked at what's been learnt and passed it on is very small because they don't have the spare time or a lot of vision	**29**	**0**
2=	At cluster/regional group meetings, people are pretty candid because they know there's no hidden agenda – we are all just learning.	**29**	**0**
5	You have got to get people to be more open and honest, even if you do it anonymously.	**28**	**1**
6	People will only publish information they're prepared to go public on and that means the successes.	**26**	**0**
7=	There's not much reporting of failure on demonstration projects.	**24**	**0**
7=	The most beneficial part of the demonstration project was seeing people who were luke warm to start with become enthusiastic.	**24**	**0**
7=	Our organisation tends to be a bit blinkered about learning about innovation/performance improvement, concentrating only on the major sector in which we operate.	**24**	**1**
10=	In-house dissemination is best done by team leaders cascading information down to their own particular team members.	**21**	**1**
8	Lessons learnt are often very small – for instance, tiny changes in management procedures – which aren't observable from outside.	**21**	**1**

Task Group members' responses have been aggregated in the table above. A maximum total score of 35 would mean that they all agreed strongly with a statement. A minimum total of 7 would mean that they all strongly disagreed. Participants were also able to indicate that they did not know whether they agreed or disagreed.

Viewed overall, these responses from the Task Group members suggest it is wrong to assume that they and the members of DPs who came to the open workshop have identical views of the strengths and weaknesses of M4I/HF DPs. For instance, the statement that Task Group members most strongly agreed with,

> "You need a high level mechanism (like a dedicated senior management group) to manage the dissemination of best practice effectively in-house",

was only fifth on the list at the open workshop, see Table A. The statement second on the list from the open workshop,

> "In-house dissemination is best done by team leaders cascading information down to their own particular team members",

was tenth on the Task Group members' list. This means that Task Group members need to recognise that their views (of what needs to be done) are not necessarily shared or given the same priority by the target audiences they are attempting to support.

The Task Group members were also asked to identify what they saw as the key issues that these statements raised for them about demonstration projects. In discussion, like the participants at the open workshop, they too signalled that these statements raised unresolved issues.

- Knowledge transfer issues within organisations
- Need for specific knowledge transfer managers
- Owning up to success and failure
- Need of business focused lessons
- Lack of clarity about learning points
- Need for 'bottom-line' evidence
- How best to make use of cluster group 'energy
- How to break out of the cluster group 'cosy circle'

Some of these map directly on to those raised in the open workshop, e.g.:

- Knowledge transfer issues v acting as learning organisations
- Knowledge transfer managers v lack of structure to date for dissemination
- Owning up to success and failure v absence of learning from mistakes and failures
- Lack of clarity v lack of access to lessons learnt to date.

For others there is no direct overlap.

Table F: Breakout Session 1 part 2

	Task Group members were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. **7 responded, collectively 35= strongly agree, 21= neutral, 71= strongly disagree**		
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	Hearing about how other people improve their performance has really motivated us to do it too.	**29**	**0**
2	I like electronic communications because it's easier for me to circulate.	**27**	**0**
3=	Personally I find reading a piece of paper easier, so I can mark it up.	**26**	**0**
3=	You want a concise summary plus the key innovation because, to get more information, you've got to go and talk to these people.	**26**	**0**
3=	The main issue is not getting the information, it's about sieving it, there's an awful lot of it.	**26**	**1**
6	The information produced by demonstration projects is fine if people are motivated to read it.	**24**	**0**
7	We tend to download information on demonstration projects off the web, it's reasonably easily accessible.	**23**	**0**
8=	What you can do with the brief summaries from demonstration projects is go further into it and get more information if you need it.	**22**	**0**
8=	Demonstration projects really do provide the evidence you need to make clients willing to change.	**22**	**0**
10	I prefer information delivered face-to-face: I just don't trust what is written down.	**20**	**1**
11	We haven't accessed the website for benefit because it's simply a list of individual projects.	**19**	**0**
12	We're more interested in the overall lessons that have come out of demonstration projects than individual ones.	**18**	**1**
13	There is too much credence put on the quality of information generated: it's being involved in demonstration projects that delivers the benefits.	**17**	**1**

As at the open workshop, few of this second set of statements elicited collective agreement from the Task Group members, see Table B. But unlike the participants at the open workshop, collectively Task Group members did not agree fairly strongly

that no changes are needed to the information being produced on the back of the demonstration projects. Whereas the following statement came top of the DP members' list,

> "The information produced by demonstration projects is fine if people are motivated to read it",

it was only fifth on the Task Group members list. And they disagreed with DP members even more sharply about,

> "There is too much credence put on the quality of information generated: it's being involved in demonstration projects that delivers the benefits."

This statement stands fourth on the DPs members' list while Task Group members relegated to last place (13th). As before, this signals that Task Group members cannot assume that their views (of what needs to be done) are necessarily shared or given the same priority by the target audiences they are attempting to support. However, for most of the other statements offered, there is a reasonable level of correspondence between the priorities accorded to them in the two workshops.

As before, Task Group members were asked to identify what they saw as the key issues that these statements raised for them about demonstration projects. In discussion, they identified more unresolved issues.

- Method of delivery seen as 'key' – IT v face-to-face (mentoring)?
- Need for route map/rapid access to key issues
- Maintenance of access to DP members, especially when DP over
- Benefits of M4I/HF initiatives – is it involvement or lessons disseminated?
- Emphasis on demonstration 'projects' or demonstration 'people'?
- Consolidation of project lessons into thematic lessons

Again, there is strong resonance with some of those raised in the open workshop, e.g.:

- Consolidation of project lessons into thematic lessons v need for generic/ repeated lessons
- Benefits of M4I/HF initiatives – is it involvement or lessons disseminated v need

For others there is no direct overlap.

Table G: Breakout Session 2 part 1

| | *Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects.* | | |
| | *35= strongly agree, 21= neutral, 7= strongly disagree* | | |
Rank order	**Statement**	**Total score**	**Don't know**
1	I am not sure how all the different organisations under the Rethinking Construction umbrella mesh together.	**30**	**0**
2=	The time of individuals who get involved in M4I and the Housing Forum is a valuable resource and we can only resource so many of them.	**29**	**0**
2=	Perception is that although M4I has cluster groups they assume that once the information is on the web site it's the end of their responsibility.	**29**	**0**
4	The enthusiastic people are those you rely on to carry the message through.	**28**	**0**
5	One of the difficulties I have is that there are quite a lot of overlapping organisations involved here and sorting out the exact nature of each organisation is hard.	**27**	**0**
6	A few people get the feedback either they're alive to it through their work or they are interested on the periphery.	**20**	**0**
7	The long-term benefits have been through the championing of the M4I process by several individuals within our organisation.	**19**	**2**
8	At the moment we only gather information when we select contractors to undertake a piece of work.	**18**	**2**

Overall, there is a fairly good correspondence between how Task Group members and DP members agreed with these statements, see Table C. The largest discrepancy occurred for :

> "Perception is that although M4I has cluster groups they assume that once the information is on the web site it's the end of their responsibility."

Task Group members place this second on their list while DP members located it second to bottom.

Table H: Breakout Session 2 part 2

Rank order	Statement	Total score	Don't know
	Participants were asked whether they agreed with these statements made by interviewees who had participated in demonstration projects. **55= strongly agree, 33= neutral, 11= strongly disagree**		
1	The thing that's missing is how you capitalise on the learning from experience and how do you create a tacit knowledge base.	32	0
2=	With the internet, it's a matter of choice whether you look at it.	30	0
2=	With each demonstration project you get one bit of the story on an issue, you need to pull it all together.	30	0
4	The prime barrier to the uptake of lessons from the demonstration projects is the expectation that they offer the 'golden key,' the recipient needs to do some work to translate them into their context.	29	0
5	One of the biggest barriers is shortage of time to properly assimilate the information and to get it implemented in time for the next project so that the momentum carries you on.	28	0
6	A significant barrier is the time that it takes for practices to trickle through the system from senior management to workforce.	26	0
7	Every company thinks it has a unique project and that lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their special circumstances.	24	1
8=	People who have been involved in demonstration projects are more open to sharing.	22	1
8=	We haven't been able to learn a lot from other people's demonstration projects because they aren't like the work we do.	22	0
10	The biggest barrier to learning lessons from other demonstration projects is that we can't find information that is relevant to what we are doing.	25	0

The Task Group members agree with DP members that,

> "The thing that's missing is how you capitalise on the learning from experience and how do you create a tacit knowledge base."

Both placed this at the top of their lists, see Table D. But while DP members think that those who have been involved in DPs are more open to sharing, Task Group members are less convinced. The former place this third in their list while the latter relegated it eighth.

As before, Task Group members were asked to identify what they saw as the key issues that these statements raised for them about demonstration projects. In discussion, they identified yet more unresolved issues.

- The lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities
- The need for more integration between between RC/M4I/HF/CBPP
- The lack of follow-through on projects – continuity, coherence, the role of the client, supply chain integration
- Resources (limits) v added value – why get involved?
- Project teams – organisation is complex, not all pulling in same direction – e.g. nominee v others

There is little resonance between these issues and those raised in the corresponding place in the open workshop.

Summary of findings

- The follow-up workshop revealed that Knowledge Capture Task Group cannot assume that its members' views of the strengths and weaknesses of demonstration projects are necessarily shared by those involved in them

- The open and follow-up workshops identified that, on a range of issues, e.g.
  - senior and management engagement with dissemination of lessons learnt
  - quality of information published v people's motivation to read it
  - importance of published information v involvement in demonstration projects

  the two groups have differing emphases and priorities

- However, for most of the statements offered, there was a reasonable level of correspondence between the agreement and priorities attached to them by both Task Group and demonstration project members

- There is strong resonance between some of the key issues identified by the two groups, e.g.
  - lack of clarity in lessons learnt to date
  - need for generic/repeated lessons as well as project-specific ones
  - need to own up to failures as well as successes
  - benefits of direct involvement in demonstration projects
  - lack of structure for dissemination in organisations
  - need for management of knowledge transfer

- However, for many of the other issues identified by the Task Group, especially those concerned with the management of M4I/HF initiatives, e.g.
  - lack of clarity over roles and relationships
  - need for more integration between RC/M4I/HF/CBPP
  - how best to use cluster group 'energy'
  - how to break out of the cluster group 'cosy circle'
  - need for route map/rapid access to key issues

  there was no direct overlap with those raised by demonstration project members.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Proposed sampling frame for data collection

M4I nominated organisations
- Six Clients
  - Two not involved in demonstration projects (dps) but who ought to be
  - Two involved in dps but where learning was not thought to be permeating the organisation
  - Two involved in dps where learning was thought to be permeating the organisation
- Six Consultants
  - Two not involved in demonstration projects (dps) but who ought to be
  - Two involved in dps but where learning was not thought to be permeating the organisation
  - Two involved in dps where learning was thought to be permeating the organisation
- Six Contractors
  - Two large
  - Two medium sized
  - Two small

Housing Forum nominated organisations
- Three Clients
  - One who is not involved but ought to be
  - Two who are involved
- Three Consultants classified as above
  - One who is not involved but ought to be
  - Two who are involved
- Three Contractors
  - One large
  - One medium sized
  - One small.

Table 1a. Breakdown of nominations of Clients and Consultants

Target	M4I / HF	Not involved in dp	Involved / learning	Involved / non-learning	TOTAL
Clients	M4I	2	2	2	6
	HF	1	1	1	3
Consultants	M4I	2	2	2	6
	HF	1	1	1	3
TOTAL		6	6	6	18

Table 1b. Breakdown of nominations of Contractors

Target	M4i / HF	Large	Medium	Small	TOTAL
Contractors	M4i	2	2	2	6
	HF	1	1	1	3
TOTAL		3	3	3	9

The Housing Forum and M4I managers were asked to nominate at least three Product Manufacturers - one with little involvement and two heavily involved.

Table 1c. Breakdown of nominations of Product Manufacturers

Target	M4i / HF	Heavily involved	Little involvement	TOTAL
Suppliers	M4i /HF	2	1	3

Appendix 2

Breakdown of interviewees by category

Table1a. Number of clients and consultants interviewed

Target	M4i / HF	Not involved in dp	Involved / learning	Involved / non-learning	Involved / unsure	TOTAL
Clients	M4I	2	1	0	2	5
	HF	0	1	0	2	3
Consultants	M4I	1	1	0	2	4
	HF	0	0	0	2	2
TOTAL		3	3	0	8	14

Table 1b. Number of contractors and product manufacturers interviewed

Target	M4i / HF	Large	Medium	Small	TOTAL
Contractors	M4i	2	0	0	2
	HF	1	1	1	3
Suppliers	M4i	1(?)	0	0	1
	HF	1	0	0	1
TOTAL		5	1	1	7

Appendix 3

Interview Schedule

Sir John Egan has recently reviewed the construction industry for the government. He has recommended that demonstration projects should be used as a primary vehicle for showing the benefits of new working practices across construction, from procurement to product manufacture. Both the Movement for Innovation and the Housing Forum were set up to promote change in construction and demonstrate how it can be achieved.

This project is looking at the lessons to be learnt from experience of their demonstration projects to date.

Schedule for interviews with Clients, Constructors, Consultants and Product Manufacturers

1. Do you gather information and feedback from the construction industry about innovations and performance improvement issues?

2. When and how do you gather this information?

3. Are you familiar with M4I and the Housing Forum? Have you accessed information about their demonstration projects?
    (Prompt: If 'no' go to Question 7)

4. What information about lessons learned on these demonstration projects have you seen? How/where did you get it from? What form was it in?

5. Was the information relevant and useful?

6. Did the information / messages persuade you or your organisation to change the way that you do things? Why or why not?

7. What do you currently see as the most significant barriers to the take up of lessons learned from demonstration projects in your company? In the construction industry as a whole or among clients?

8. What characteristics would information on innovations and performance improvement have to have to be relevant and useful to your organisation? (Prompt in terms of content, presentation and form of delivery.)

9. What form would evidence have to take if it is to persuade you or your organisation to take a different approach? Do you have any good examples?

10. How, when and where could such information used in your organisation? By whom?

11. Are different types of information needed by different people/activities within your organisation? Is the information already available targeted correctly by those who disseminate it?

12. Does information need to be presented differently depending on when it is likely to be used during the decision making processes?

Appendix 4

List of interviewees

Industry Organisations

Name	Role	Organisation
Zara Lamont	CEO	CCC
Peter Runacres	Senior Team Manager	M4I
Judith Harrison	Project Director	Housing Forum

Clients

Name	Role	Organisation
Bob Robinson	Special Programmes Manager	BAE Systems
Cliff Jones	Senior Procurement Manager	NHS Estates
Gordon Davies	Director of Property and facilities	Nycomed Amersham
Mary Mitchell	Business analyst	Transco
Bill Taylor	Strategy Support Manager	PFP Development
Diane Lea	Development director	Midland Area Housing Association
Eleanor Warwick	Research Manager	Peabody Trust
David Pyle	Production Manager	BAA

Consultants

Name	Role	Organisation
Alistair Sunderland	Director	Austin-Smith:Lord
Sunand Prasad	Director	Penoyre Prasad
Mark Smith	Associate	Gardiner and Theobald
Stuart Alexander	Group Technical Co-ordinator	WSP
Hugh Raven	Partner	The Raven Partnership
Tim Bush	Partner	Baily Garner

Contractors

Name	Role	Organisation
Tony Pressley	Construction Director	St Georges South London
Paul Bates	Construction Manager	Wates
Tony Wehby	Building Special Projects	Carillion
Marcus Keys	Partnering Manager	Lovells
Steve Wright	Chairman	Gusto Homes

Suppliers

Name	Role	Organisation
Adam Turk	Group Sales Marketing Director (UK)	Jeld Vin
Neil Yule	Managing Director	Waterloo Air Management

Appendix 5

Workbook for interactive workshops

CRISP
Knowledge Capture Task Group

Learning lessons from   M⁴I and Housing Forum Demonstration Projects

Name:

Organisation:

Participants' Workbook

Prepared by
Eclipse Research Consultants
&
Blyth Consulting

Breakout Session 1

Taking part in the cluster/regional group meetings is the best way to access lessons learnt from demonstration projects	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
At cluster/regional group meetings, people are pretty candid because they know there's no hidden agenda – we are all just learning.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
There's not much reporting of failure on demonstration projects.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
You have got to get people to be more open and honest, even if you do it anonymously.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
People will only publish information they're prepared to go public on and that means the successes.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The most beneficial part of the demonstration project was seeing people who were luke-warm to start with become enthusiastic.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Lessons learnt are often very small – for instance, tiny changes in management procedures – which aren't observable from outside.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
You need a high level mechanism (like a dedicated senior management group) to manage the dissemination of best practice effectively in-house.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Our organisation tends to be a bit blinkered about learning about innovation/performance improvement, concentrating only on the major sector in which we operate.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The core of people in our company who've looked at what's been learnt and passed it on is very small because they don't have the spare time or a lot of vision	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
In-house dissemination is best done by team leaders cascading information down to their own particular team members.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**

Please identify 3 key issues that these statements raise for you about demonstration projects.

1

2

3

Please circle your response to these statements made by our interviewees when asked about their experience of participating in demonstration projects. *1= strongly agree, 5= strongly disagree, DK= don't know*	
There is too much credence put on the quality of information generated: it's being involved in demonstration projects that delivers the benefits.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
I prefer information delivered face-to-face: I just don't trust what is written down.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Personally I find reading a piece of paper easier, so I can mark it up.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
I like electronic communications because it's easier for me to circulate.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Hearing about how other people improve their performance has really motivated us to do it too.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The information produced by demonstration projects is fine if people are motivated to read it.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
You want a concise summary plus the key innovation because, to get more information, you've got to go and talk to these people.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The main issue is not getting the information, it's about sieving it, there's an awful lot of it.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
What you can do with the brief summaries from demonstration projects is go further into it and get more information if you need it.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
We tend to download information on demonstration projects off the web, it's reasonably easily accessible.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
We haven't accessed the website for benefit because it's simply a list of individual projects.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
We're more interested in the overall lessons that have come out of demonstration projects than individual ones.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Demonstration projects really do provide the evidence you need to make clients willing to change.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Please identify 3 key issues that these statements raise for you about demonstration projects.	
1	
2	
3	

Plenary Session 1

What headline lessons do you think interviewees' statements offer about the mechanisms for, and the barriers to, distilling and disseminating the key messages arising from demonstration projects for the construction industry and its clients?

Breakout Session 2

Please circle your response to these statements made by our interviewees when asked about their experience of participating in demonstration projects.

1= strongly agree, 5= strongly disagree, DK= don't know

One of the difficulties I have is that there is quite a lot of overlapping organisations involved here and sorting out the exact nature of each organisation is hard.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The time of individuals who get involved in M4I and the Housing Forum are a valuable resource and we can only resource so many of them.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Perception is that although M4I has cluster groups they assume that once the information is on the web site it's the end of their responsibility.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
I am not sure how all the different organisations under the Rethinking Construction umbrella mesh together.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The long-term benefits have been through the championing of the M4I process by several individuals within our organisation.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The enthusiastic people are those you rely on to carry the message through.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
A few people get the feedback either their alive to it through their work or they are interested on the periphery.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
At the moment we only gather information when we select contractors to undertake a piece of work.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**

Please identify 3 key issues that these statements raise for you about demonstration projects.

1

2

3

Please circle your response to these statements made by our interviewees when asked about their experience of participating in demonstration projects. *1= strongly agree, 5= strongly disagree, DK= don't know*	
Every company thinks it has a unique project and that lessons from elsewhere are not relevant to their special circumstances.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The thing that's missing is how you capitalise on the learning from experience and how do you create a tacit knowledge base.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
With the internet, it's a matter of choice whether you look at it.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
With each demonstration project you get one bit of the story on an issue, you need to pull it all together.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
A significant barrier is the time that it takes for practises to trickle through the system from senior management to workforce.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
One of the biggest barriers is shortage of time to properly assimilate the information and to get it implemented in time for the next project so that the momentum carries you on.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The prime barrier to the uptake of lessons from the demonstration projects is the expectation that they offer the 'golden key,' the recipient needs to do some work to translate them into their context.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
People who have been involved in demonstration projects are more open to sharing.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
We haven't been able to learn a lot from other people's demonstration projects because they aren't like the work we do.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
The biggest barrier to learning lessons from other demonstration projects is that we can't find information that is relevant to what we are doing.	**1 2 3 4 5 DK**
Please identify 3 key issues that these statements raise for you about demonstration projects.	
1	
2	
3	

What headline lessons do you think interviewees' statements offer about the use of demonstration projects as a means of spreading key messages through the construction industry?