

1 Design for Occupational Safety and Health: A Theoretical Framework for 2 Organisational Capability

3 4 Abstract

5 For several decades, scholars and practitioners have searched for the underlying causes of OSH
6 incidents on construction projects. One of the insights from the investigations is the fact that the
7 seeds of accidents, fatalities and occupational related ill-health are sown across various design and
8 procurement decisions made during the pre-construction stage of project development. This insight
9 has given rise to the design for occupational safety and health (DfOSH) initiative which has even
10 informed regulations in certain countries, particularly the UK. However, knowledge and
11 understanding of what, specifically, constitutes the organisational capability of design firms of
12 generating designs which are inherently safe is very limited. Hence, this study undertakes a
13 systematic review of prior conceptualisations of organisational capability, carries out contents
14 analyses of the conceptualisations and provides a robust conceptualisation of the construct. The
15 robust conceptualisation underpins the development of a nomological network to operationalise
16 the construct organisational capability in respect of design firms' ability to ensure design for
17 occupational safety and health (DfOSH). Organisational capability is presented as a multi-
18 dimensional construct that can be operationalised at various levels of specificity. The proposed
19 framework can support the identification of organisational capability gaps that design firms
20 seeking to build their DfOSH capability can address while at the same time assisting project clients
21 to clarify the organisational capability of design firms in the procurement process.
22

23 **Keywords:** Design, construction, occupational safety and health; prevention through design;
24 organisational capability; theoretical framework.
25

26 1. Introduction

27 The construction industry is considered one of the highest contributors to work-related accidents
28 and ill-health in most economies around the world (Hadikusumo and Rowlinson, 2002; Sousa, et
29 al., 2014; Yuan et al., 2018). For example, in the UK, the construction industry accounted for 30%
30 of work-related fatalities in the 2018/2019 reporting year (HSE, 2019a). Statistics from HSE
31 (2019b) indicate that, annually, about 3% of UK construction industry workforce suffers from
32 occupation-related illness while about another 2% becomes victims of work-related injuries. This

1 undesirable phenomenon has set both practitioners and scholars, over some decades now,
2 searching for the underlying causes of poor occupational safety and health (OSH) performance on
3 construction projects. In this search, it has been revealed that the seeds of accidents, fatalities and
4 occupational related ill-health are sown during the design stage of the project development process
5 (Szymberski, 1997; Williams, 1998; Gibb et al., 2004; Gambatese et al. 2005; Behm, 2005; Toole,
6 2007; Cooke et al., 2008; Lingard et al., 2015; Manu et al., 2019). Several studies (see for example
7 Gambatese et al., 2005; López-Arquillos et al., 2015; Goh and Chua, 2016) have made calls for
8 awareness creation and capacity building among designers to enhance their contributions to
9 effective **management of OSH** on projects, particularly at the pre-construction stage. This call is,
10 primarily, informed by the design for occupational safety and health (DfOSH) initiative.

11
12 The influence of design decisions and other pre-construction procurement decisions on
13 downstream accidents and ill-health came to the attention of the European Union and **the** European
14 Council responded by adopting Council Directive 1992/57/EEC on the implementation of
15 minimum safety and health requirements at temporary or mobile construction sites. This Directive
16 requires the appointment of two types of coordinators for safety and health matters on construction
17 projects that will require more than one contractor on the construction site. Referred to in this paper
18 as the Pre-Construction Phase Coordinator (PCPC), the first type is to take responsibility for
19 coordination during the design and project preparation stage of projects. The second type of
20 coordinator is referred to as the Construction Phase Coordinator (CPC) and must be engaged for
21 coordination of OSH matters during the construction phase of projects. Having a national law
22 providing for the appointment of these two dutyholders on projects is a mandatory requirement of
23 Member States although no details are prescribed for the roles (for example, the type of
24 professional to exercise it and whether the two roles may be performed by the same entity). In
25 1994 the UK, which had been a full member of the EU until recently, transposed the Directive into
26 UK legislation as part of the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 (CDM
27 1994). These Regulations imposed statutory health and safety duties on the traditional members of
28 construction project **stakeholders**: clients, designers and contractors. They also created the
29 dutyholders of “Planning Supervisor” and “Principal Contractor” with defined statutory duties to
30 take on the performance of the roles of the PCPC and CPC, respectively, under the EU Directive.

31

1 The UK's Health and Safety Executive (HSE), the national regulatory authority for health and
2 safety, has had to respond twice to concerns about pre-construction coordination health and safety
3 matters, attempting to change the role for **this** each time. About ten years after the CDM 1994
4 came into force, they were replaced with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations
5 2007 (CDM 2007) which changed the label for the pre-construction coordinator from "Planning
6 Supervisor" to "CDM Coordinator". The CDM 2007 required clients to appoint individuals or
7 organisations with individual competence and corporate competence, respectively, in the design
8 and management of construction projects. However, one of the unintended consequences of the
9 regulatory prescription of *competence* and **its** assessment in an approved code of practice (ACOP)
10 was the proliferation of third party assessment schemes that were uncoordinated, bureaucratic and
11 costly to organisations, particularly the smaller ones (HSE, 2014). CDM 2007 was in turn replaced
12 about eight years later with the Construction (Design and Management) 2015 Regulations (CDM
13 2015). The key changes made in CDM 2015 are: (a) putting much greater emphasis on the
14 coordination of the pre-construction design process and replacing "CDM Coordinator" with
15 "Principal Designer" (PD); (b) replacement of the requirement for competences of dutyholders
16 with skills, knowledge and experience (SKE) of individual dutyholders and "organisational
17 capability" where a dutyholder is an organisation.

18
19 The Principal Designer, **according to the current Regulations**, is appointed by the client at the early
20 stage of the project development process to plan, manage and monitor the pre-construction phase
21 and coordinate matters relating to health and safety during the pre-construction phase to ensure
22 that, so far as is reasonable practicable, the project is carried out without risks to health or safety.
23 Again, in the replacement of the CDM 2007 with CDM 2015, the HSE has indicated that the health
24 and safety *competence* should be **addressed by** professional bodies and the industry rather than by
25 a regulatory requirement (HSE, 2014). Thus, the current view of HSE **and CDM on** assigning
26 DfOSH **competence** of designers to professional bodies justifies an investigation into what,
27 specifically, constitutes SKE for the individual designer and organisational capability for the
28 corporate designer and how **they** can be assessed. This study particularly focuses on the explication
29 and operationalisation of organisational capability for DfOSH as it relates to design firms. It is
30 expected that this will spawn further studies on SKE as they relate to individual designers.

31

1 Paragraph 8 of the CDM 2015 puts on anyone appointing a corporate CDM dutyholder, including
2 a design firm, a duty to take reasonable steps to satisfy itself that the appointee has the
3 organisational capability to carry out the work in a way that secures health and safety.
4 Correspondingly, a design firm must not accept an appointment unless it has the corporate
5 capability to carry out the assignment in way that secures health and safety. Failure to fulfil these
6 duties is a criminal offence for which the appointer and the appointee may be prosecuted.
7 Assessment and measures of organisational capability are therefore of paramount importance. One
8 of the most recent studies to investigate the organisational capability for DfOSH **was conducted**
9 by Manu et al. (2019). Their study employed a combined approach of focused group discussion
10 (FGD), a Delphi technique and voting analytic hierarchy process (VAHP) to empirically ascertain
11 the elements of organisational capability of design firms in respect of DfOSH. **The study above**
12 provides a useful empirical basis to understand the organisational capability construct with regard
13 to DfOSH.

14
15 The study from which this paper is developed takes an alternative approach based on the wide
16 recognition in the research literature (Collins and Stockton, 2018; Rule and John, 2015) that a
17 theoretical framework of a construct is not only an essential precursor of its assessment and
18 measurement but also a necessary underpinning for the development of knowledge about it.
19 Further, prior studies on organisational capability of design firms in respect of DfOSH do not
20 indicate any clear levels of performance at which the organisational capability of design firms can
21 be expected and measured. **Considering the above, this** study seeks to advance knowledge in this
22 area and contribute to the literature in several ways. First, the study makes a contribution by
23 explicating or providing a conceptual understanding of the organisational capability construct.
24 Second, it provides an integrated **framework** for the assessment and measurement of the
25 organisational capability of design firms in respect of DfOSH. An important part of this integrated
26 **framework** is the ability to indicate the alternative levels of performance at which organisational
27 capability of design firms can be expected or measured.

28
29 The paper is structured in eight sections. The first section introduces the study. In the second
30 section, an overview is provided for the OSH concept. A literature review of the DfOSH initiative
31 in construction is presented in the third section. The method or approach to the study is indicated

1 in the fourth section. The fifth section focuses on the meaning of the organisational capability
2 construct. In the sixth section, the theoretical integrated **framework** for assessing and measuring
3 organisational capability of design firms is presented. The seventh section offers some discussions
4 on the **framework** with pointers for further research. The conclusions of the study are offered in
5 the final section.

6

7 **2. The concept of occupational safety and health (OSH)**

8 OSH is a concern in all countries of the world and across all economic sectors. Hence, it is
9 susceptible to a wide range of conceptualisations. A proper and a general understanding of OSH
10 is therefore required to ensure its effective management. The International Labour Organisation
11 (ILO) (2011) defines OSH as a discipline dealing with the prevention of work-related injuries and
12 diseases including the protection and promotion of the health of workers. Similarly, Luczak et al.
13 (2000) conceive OSH as the elimination of hazardous conditions and the promotion of health in
14 the context of occupation. Generally, how OSH is defined and understood may vary across sectors
15 and cultures. However, OSH primarily targets the improvement of the working conditions and
16 environment of workers. This goal is normally pursued in Alli (2008)'s definition of OSH as the
17 science of anticipation, recognition, evaluation and control of hazards arising in or from workplace
18 that could impair the health and well-being of workers while also considering the possible impact
19 on the surrounding communities and the general environment.

20

21 Alli (2008)'s conceptualization of OSH does not only indicate a clear and a systematic approach
22 to managing OSH in the context of occupation but also elicit an important view. The notion of
23 hazards arising in or from the workplace has both present and forward dimensions. Every work
24 type, that follows a process, leads to an output or product (Germain et al. 2001). Hence, the
25 prevention of hazardous conditions and the promotion of the health of workers during the process
26 represent the present look. Again, it is expected that the output, or the product which arises from
27 the process, also continues to maintain the capability of prevention of hazardous conditions as well
28 as the promotion of health and that represents the forward look.

29

30 The construction industry, like other industries such as aircraft and automobile manufacturing,
31 deals with products that do not only provide and influence the environments of several people but

1 also provide further work for those who need to maintain the products after they have been built.
2 Hence, in understanding OSH as it relates to construction, the scope or emphasis should not only
3 be on hazards arising in the workplace (the process) but also attention should be paid to hazards
4 arising from the work (product). Such an understanding will put OSH risk in its proper perspective,
5 especially on construction projects, and ensure it effective management.

6


7 **3. Overview of the design for occupational safety and health (DfOSH) concept in** 8 **construction**

9 OSH risk on construction projects has been a thorny issue in the industry for some time now. This
10 has spawned a number of studies, for some decades now, as to how to address the challenge of
11 OSH risk albeit with nebulous results. Findings from prior studies on OSH risk management in the
12 construction industry seem to point to a new thinking of addressing OSH risks at source
13 (Szymberski, 1997; Williams, 1998; Gibb et al., 2004; Gambatese et al. 2005; Behm, 2005; Toole,
14 2007; Cooke et al., 2008; Lingard et al., 2015; Manu et al., 2019). In other words, the task of
15 managing OSH risks should be assigned to stakeholders of the industry who generate those risks
16 as they have the most opportunity to manage them (Gambatese, 2008; Rajendran and Gambatese,
17 2009; HSE, 2015). This notion has informed a new research agenda in the area of Design for
18 Occupational Health and Safety” (DfOSH) [also referred to as “Design for Safety” (DfS),
19 “Prevention through Design” (PtD), “Safety in Design” (SiD), “Construction Hazard Prevention
20 through Design” (CHPtD), “Safe Design” (SD)], all in an attempt to effectively deal with the
21 challenge of OSH risks on construction projects. Traditionally, the responsibility for managing
22 OSH risks had been left with main contractors, especially at the project implementation or
23 construction phase of projects (Hare et al., 2006). However, this new way of managing OSH risks
24 advocates for a shared responsibility among project stakeholders.

25

26 The Australian Safety and Compensation Council (2006) defines DfOSH as a process of “the
27 integration of hazard identification and risk assessment methods early in the design process to
28 eliminate or minimise the risks of injury throughout the life of the product being designed.” This
29 definition corroborates and extends an earlier understanding provided by Gambatese et al. (2005)
30 who indicated that “designing for construction safety entails addressing the safety of construction
31 workers in the design features of a project”. Proactiveness is the bedrock of risk management and

1 this equally underpins the DfOSH concept. Hence, Cooke et al (2008) argue that the failure to
 2 address health and safety in construction designs is at odds with contemporary thinking in risk
 3 management, where the most opportune time for dealing with hazards is their elimination or
 4 minimisation at source. Generally, when designers make decisions on construction products, they
 5 are influencing the material choices, the sizes and positions of project features as well as the
 6 construction methods which can significantly impact the safety and health of individuals who
 7 build, occupy, maintain and eventually demolish those construction products (Hinze and
 8 Gambatese, 1994; ECI, 1996). This suggests that effective OSH risk management on construction
 9 projects must emanate from the project source. Figure 1 indicates the place or region of influence
 10 of DfOSH in the construction project development process. Generally, on most projects, as a result
 11 of speed required by clients, designs (particularly specialist engineering ones) can still progress
 12 deep into the construction phase of the project development process. However, the most
 13 opportunity to influence the project OSH outcomes – downstream of the construction supply chain
 14 – through design is presented at the pre-construction phase.



24 Figure 1: Region of influence for DfOSH philosophy in the project development process

25 Many studies (for example, Szymberski, 1997; Williams, 1998; Gibb et al., 2004; Gambatese et
 26 al. 2005; Behm, 2005; Toole, 2007; Cooke et al., 2008; Lingard et al., 2015; Bong et al., 2015;
 27 Goh and Chua, 2016; Poghosyan et al., 2018) have investigated the connection between design
 28 and accidents in the construction industry. For instance, in Australia, Driscoll et al. (2008) reported
 29 44 percent of construction fatalities to be design-related. In the UK, an investigation of 100 non-
 30

1 fatal accidents in the construction industry indicted design as a contributing factor in about 50
2 percent of the cases (HSE, 2003). Behm (2005) undertook a review of 224 construction fatalities
3 in the USA and realised that in 94 of the cases (representing 42 percent), the fatalities could be
4 linked to the design. In the construction industry, the assertion that the opportunities to eliminate
5 or minimise OSH risks are highest at the beginning of a project and diminishes as the project
6 development phases progress is often cited in literature (Szymbersky, 1997; Toole, 2007).

7
8 Under the concept of DfOSH, the call for all key stakeholders in the construction industry
9 (particularly, clients, architects, engineers and contractors) to take collective responsibility to
10 minimise OSH risks to construction workers, maintenance workers, users of the construction
11 product as well as the demolition workers is an important one (Goh and Chua, 2016), particularly
12 at the upstream stage of the construction supply chain. However, there are a number of barriers to
13 effective implementation of this concept in practice and these have often been articulated in
14 literature. For example, in the USA, Gambatese et al. (2005) indicated that the lack of
15 consideration for DfOSH was largely due to designer mindset towards safety and lack of
16 knowledge among designers. In the UK, Larsen and Whyte (2013) realised that after about two
17 decades of regulation [under the Construction (Design and Management) (CDM) Regulations
18 (1994, 2007)] to ensure DfOSH in the construction industry, there were still challenges in getting
19 buy-in from designers as “safety is very much seen as an afterthought or bolt-on to the design”.

20
21 Other studies (López-Arquillos et al., 2015; Goh and Chua, 2016) have also highlighted the lack
22 of emphasis on DfOSH in the training of designers in tertiary institutions. Weak support from
23 clients is also pointed out as one of the barriers to effective implementation of DfOSH (Oney-
24 Yazici and Dulaimi, 2014; Hwang et al., 2014). In a study conducted by Goh and Chua (2016) in
25 Singapore, about 70 percent of 43 civil and structural engineers surveyed felt that the client and
26 end-users provide the greatest motivation for undertaking DfOSH in the construction industry.
27 This brings to the fore, the role of clients in enabling or constraining the practice of DfOSH on
28 construction projects. This has been recently re-emphasised by Poghosyan et al. (2018). **Further,**
29 **even if training and motivation were in place, we still lack a uniform and standardised framework**
30 **for DfOSH capability.**

31

1 Many studies in the extant literature have considered different aspects of DfOSH in an attempt to
2 enhance its implementation and broaden the body of knowledge in this area. For example, Behm
3 et al. (2014) carried out a study on developing DfOSH thinking among undergraduate engineering
4 students. Their study developed and implemented a DfOSH education intervention with
5 engineering students and measured the change in knowledge and comprehension of DfOSH
6 principles among the students at the end of their programme. The study found out that the students'
7 thinking in respect of DfOSH developed and changed regarding their design responsibilities.
8 Further, Hallowell and Hansen (2016) conducted a study that sought to ascertain the extent that
9 construction hazards are recognizable by designers during designs as well as identifying
10 approaches to improve the hazard recognition skills of designers. Their study employed a multi-
11 phase experiment that identified 12 representative construction modules. 17 designers observed
12 these modules; subsequently an interview was conducted to ascertain their recognition of hazards
13 present. Their study found out that the average designer's hazard recognition skill was 51%. Again,
14 the study revealed that the hazard recognition skill of designers with construction experience, was
15 on the average, 45% higher than designers with no construction field experience. Still on the
16 training of designers regarding the DfOSH concept, Din and Gibson (2019) embarked on a study
17 that sought to explore the most effective approach to getting students to accept DfOSH thinking.
18 Their study developed three approaches (a computer-based serious game, a paper-based game [the
19 paper version of the computer game] and a traditional lecture), implemented them and measured
20 their pedagogical value on students. The computer-based serious game was found to be more
21 effective as compared to the lecture. The paper-based game failed to motivate students to learn
22 DfOSH thinking.

23
24 On the aspect of regulations, Aires et al. (2010) studied the effect of the European Directives on
25 construction workplace accidents as a result of DfOSH. Their study first analysed policies
26 regarding accident prevention in the European Union, as initially stipulated in the European
27 Framework Directive 89/391/EEC, and more specifically in Directive 92/57/EEC, on the
28 implementation of minimum safety and health requirements at temporary or mobile construction
29 sites. Subsequently, the study analysed the incidence rate of workplace injuries and fatalities in the
30 construction sector in each country from the year when these regulations came into force until the
31 time of study. The study realised that, although these regulations were not the only factor to be

1 considered, evidence indicates that, since the regulations came into force, the outlook in the
2 European countries is positive and the incidence rate has decreased. In an attempt to streamline
3 the DfOSH research agenda, Hardison and Hallowell (2019) in their recent study conducted a
4 review of the DfOSH research to provide perspectives, evidence and future objective research
5 agenda. The study found out that no objective evidence exists to validate the actual risk reduction
6 over the project lifecycle as a result of the DfOSH concept. Again, their study recommends that
7 future objective research should: consider understanding hazard recognition during design using
8 available documentation and technological platforms, and experimentally test the efficacy of
9 DfOSH tool and lifecycle safety risk assessments of proposed DfOSH solutions.

10
11 The study by Poghosyan et al. (2020) is the most relevant to the scope of this study. Drawing on
12 the capability maturity concept combined with the application of expert group techniques, their
13 study developed a maturity model that enables design firms to assess their DfOSH capability. Their
14 model captured 18 DfOSH organisational capability attributes through expert group techniques.
15 These were subsequently mapped onto five stages of capability maturation. However, there has
16 been no study in the DfOSH area particularly aimed at explicating or conceptualising the
17 organisational capability construct as it relates to DfOSH as a basis for its meaningful
18 operationalisation. Further, the DfOSH capability maturity model by Poghosyan et al. (2020)
19 considers the DfOSH capability of design firms at the project level. The challenges facing clients
20 and business, nowadays, are getting complex which requires multiple projects, and not a single
21 project, to be delivered to address them. This takes the DfOSH capability requirement of design
22 firms beyond the level of projects to programmes and possibly portfolios. This study, thus,
23 provides a theoretical framework that considers the DfOSH capability of design firms as a multi-
24 dimensional construct that can be operationalised from a task to a portfolio level.

25 26 **4. Method**

27 This study initially conceptualises the organisational capability construct, as it related to firms with
28 responsibility to DfOSH, and subsequently develops an integrated framework for the
29 operationalisation of the construct. To fulfil the first part, a review of literature of how prior studies
30 have sought to conceptualise organisational capability was undertaken. This was to provide a basis
31 for a conceptual content analysis, synthesis and provision of broad and comprehensive

1 conceptualisation of the construct. Scopus was used as the main database for the literature search
2 with additional information from Google Scholar. In comparison with other databases (e.g.
3 PubMed, Web of Science and Google Scholar), Scopus has an extensive coverage in all fields
4 including science, technology, social sciences, arts and humanities (Chadegani et al., 2013;
5 Mongeon and Paul-Hus, 2016). The key search words or phrases were “Organisational capability”
6 AND “Design” and the search returned a total result of 456. Conference papers and grey literature
7 sources were excluded in the literature search, after Hardison and Hallowell (2019), for two
8 reasons: (a) the peer-review processes and standards for publication are highly variable and
9 difficult to measure with those sources (b) the inclusion of only journal articles provides a quality
10 standard and appropriate scope for this search. After the application of the exclusion criteria
11 indicated above, the total result was reduced to 335. The search results covered over 15 subject
12 areas such as business, management and accounting; engineering; social sciences; arts and
13 humanities; decision sciences; economics and finance; medicine; psychology; computer science;
14 etc. The year range for the literature search was from 1981 – 2020, as offered by Scopus. Only
15 literature in English were considered.

16
17 The identified publications were screened, preliminarily, by checking the abstracts to establish
18 their usefulness to the review. The screened publications were subsequently assessed for
19 eligibility. The main criterion for eligibility was that the publication must clearly provide or
20 indicate a definition for the organisational capability construct. Out of the 335 publications
21 screened, preliminarily, 128 were passed unto the eligibility stage, and 207 publications were
22 excluded for their lack of relevance to the review. Next, 113 publications were excluded from the
23 conceptual analysis and synthesis, as they did not provide or indicate any specific definitions for
24 the construct – organisational capability. Additionally, the reference sections of the publications
25 that provided specific definitions of the construct were specifically analysed to locate further
26 relevant publications from Google Scholar in a second search. This second search added 7 more
27 publications to the existing 15 publications from Scopus. In total, 22 publications were finally
28 considered for the conceptual content analysis and synthesis of the organisational capability
29 construct. Figure 2 indicates the publication selection process adapted from Moher et al. (2009)
30 PRISMA systematic literature review process.

31




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

The conceptualisation of the organisational capability construct in the first part of the research approach provided a basis for identifying the common components that explicate the construct from the perspective of prior studies. Components that were suggested in at least about 30% of the total number of studies that conceptualised organisational capability were deemed important in explicating the construct as indicated in the Appendix. The 30% criterion is specific to this study as a robust conceptualisation of the organisational capability construct cannot be obtained without these components. Any component below the 30% was further analysed to ascertain its potential encapsulation by the important or main components. The common components identified

1 engendered theoretical underpinnings in establishing specific domains or modes of measurement
 2 for the construct. Combined with Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998)'s
 3 postulation of levels of specificity of construct measurement, a nomological network was
 4 developed to operationalise the organisational capability construct as it relates to design firms'
 5 ability to DfOSH. A nomological network establishes a linkage between the theoretical construct
 6 and its observable attributes in an attempt to operationalise the construct (Cronbach and Meehl,
 7 1955).

8

9 **5. Meaning and components of the organizational capability construct**

10 The concept of organisational capability, in the extant literature, is construed in various ways by
 11 researchers. However, to measure organisational capability objectively and systematically,
 12 particularly as it relates to design firms with responsibilities for DfOSH, there is a need to provide
 13 a conceptual understanding of the construct. To this end, definitions in the literature are critically
 14 examined as the first step in its explication as indicated in Table 1.

15 Table 1: Definitions of organisational capability

16

Definition	Source
Ability of an organisation to integrate people, resources, processes, structures and cultures in projects, programmes and portfolios within a supporting governance and management system.	International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2016)
Arise from the coordinated activities of groups of people who pool their individual skills in using assets.	Sanchez (2004)
A combination of resources that creates higher-order competencies.	Madhok (1997)
A firm's collective physical facilities and skills of employees, and in particular, the abilities and expertise of the top management layers.	Chandler (1990)
Complex bundles of skills and collective learning, exercised through organisational processes, that ensure superior coordination of functional activities	Day (1994)
The capacity to deploy resources by integrating knowledge, business processes and organisational learning	Mahoney and Pandian (1992)

A higher-order structure reflecting functions and integration	Verona (1999)
A set of business processes strategically understood to deliver value to the customer	Stalk, et al (1992)
A firm's capacity to deploy its assets, tangible and intangible, to perform a task or activity to improve performance	Teece et al. (1997)
The firm attributes that enable organisations to coordinate and utilise their resources.	Barney (2002)
The ability to perform repeatedly a productive task which relates either directly or indirectly to a firm's capacity for creating value through effecting the transformation of inputs into outputs	Grant (1996)
The collective skills, abilities, and expertise of an organization	Maier et al. (2012)
An organisation's capacity to deploy its assets, tangible or intangible, to perform a task or activity to improve performance	Maritan (2001)
The organisation's capacity and processes to deploy its resources to improve organisational performance by creating superior customer value	Nasution and Mavondo (2008)
Ability of a company to deploy resources for a desired final result	Helfat and Lieberman (2002)
Ability of an organisation to perform a coordinated set of tasks, utilizing organisation resources, for the purpose of achieving a particular end result.	Helfat and Peteraf (2003)
A firm's ability to perform a set of tasks using company resources	HassabElnaby et al. (2012)
Essentially a constituted high-level organizational practices used to coordinate the productive activities of the firm	Winter (2003)
Intangible assets consisting of competencies along with dynamics of integrating and deploying those competencies with inimitable resources across organizational boundaries to operate business	Hall et al. (2011)
Ability to combine different types of resources, especially firm-specific knowledge embodied in their employees, in order to create new resources that enable firms to achieve and sustain their competitive advantage.	Un and Montoro-Sanchez (2010)

The firm's ability to manage resources in order to gain competitive advantage	Rauffet et al. (2016)
The collective skills, abilities and expertise of the organization	Ulrich and Smallwood (2004)

1
2 Organisational capability as a construct has its roots in the resource-based view (RBV) theory,
3 which mainly argues that a firm is a bundle of heterogeneous resources and capabilities, which
4 supports competitive advantage and explains the variance in performance across organisations
5 (Barney, 2002; Un and Montoro-Sanchez, 2010). The RBV theory which founds organisational
6 capability has been adopted in strategic management (Grant 1996; Barney, 2002), information
7 systems (Andreu and Ciborra, 1996; Caldeira and Ward, 2003) and other fields of research in
8 explaining the ability of organisations to meet customer needs. With the DfOSH concept gaining
9 momentum and informing **regulations** in the UK and other parts of the world, the ability of design
10 firms to develop capability for DfOSH will set them apart in the future market as far as the
11 construction industry is concerned.

12
13 **An analysis of the various ways in which researchers have attempted to conceptualise the**
14 **organisational capability construct reveals certain common components of the construct. One of**
15 **such common elements is *resources*. Out of the 22 studies reviewed, 19 construe organisational**
16 **capability from resources perspective as indicated in Table 1 and the Appendix. The resources, as**
17 **referred to here, include tangible ones as physical assets, employees together with their skills,**
18 **knowledge and experiences (Ulrich and Smallwood, 2004; Un and Montoro-Sanchez, 2010) as**
19 **well as intangible ones such as organisational processes, learning and reputation (Barney, 2002;**
20 **Rauffet et al., 2016). As indicated shown in Table 1 and the Appendix, the component of *physical***
21 ***facilities* is suggested once. However, broadly, a firm's facilities can be considered as part of its**
22 **resources (Un and Montoro-Sanchez, 2010).**

23
24 The resources on their own are not productive (Grant, 1996) and require to be organised in such a
25 way that value can be captured from them (Barney, 2002). In other words, **the ability to organise**
26 **these resources to ensure the superior performance of a task or fulfillment of a goal underpins their**
27 **value. Hence, out of the 22 studies reviewed, 12 suggest *ability* while 15 suggest *integration* in the**
28 **explication of the organisational capability construct as shown in Table 1 and the Appendix.**

1 Verona (1999) classify organisational resources as either having functional or integrative
2 capabilities. The former allows the organisation to deepen its technical knowledge (Verona, 1999)
3 while the latter acts as an adhesive by drawing salient knowledge from external sources as well as
4 blending the different technical competences developed in various units in the organisation (Teece
5 et al., 1997). **The component *attributes* was suggested once as indicated in Table 1 and the**
6 **Appendix. However, generically, attributes as indicated in Barney (2002)'s conceptualisation of**
7 **organisational capability can also be construed as firm's ability.**

8
9 The **ability to integrate** organisational resources to perform a task or fulfil a goal must happen
10 within and under a certain governance and management system. **Hence, out of the 22 studies**
11 **reviewed, 10 suggest *governance and management system* as a critical component in**
12 **understanding the organisational capability construct as indicated in Table 1 and the Appendix.**

13
14 Further, in the conceptualisation of the organisational capability construct, as indicated in Table 1
15 **and the Appendix, considerations have** to be made to the **objects** of organisational capability –
16 well-executed **tasks and** value to the customer. **Thus, out of the 22 studies reviewed, 8 suggest *task***
17 **while 10 suggest *value or superior performance* of tasks as shown in Table 1 and the Appendix.**
18 Organisational capabilities are required of firms, particularly design firms, because tasks are
19 required by clients to be well-executed. In other words, value (as required by clients or customers)
20 drive organisational capabilities (Helfat and Lieberman, 2002). Therefore, in explicating the
21 organisational capability construct, considerations need to be made to the object **and** expected
22 value that emanates from organisational capability.

23
24 **Conclusively,** based on the analysis of prior conceptualisation of the organisational capability
25 construct, **six** main commonalities or components emerge in how the construct organisational
26 capability is construed by prior researchers. These are: resources, **ability**, integration, governance
27 and management system, **task, and** superior performance. None of these conceptualisations, as
28 indicated in Table 1 and the Appendix, construes organisational capability from the perspective of
29 all these **six** main commonalities or components at the same time. Again, since there is no firm
30 agreement on the definition or conceptualisation of the construct, at least from literature
31 perspective and to provide a more robust understanding of the organisational capability construct,

1 this study proceeds to define organisational capability as **the firm's ability to integrate resources,**
2 both tangible and intangible, within a governance and management system to ensure superior
3 performance **of a task.** This definition is necessary to provide a consistent and systematic basis for
4 the measurement of the organisational capability construct.

6 **6. A framework for organisational capability measurement**

7 The development of a framework for the measurement of organisational capability is based on
8 Quinones et al. (1995)'s framework which was later extended by Tesluk and Jacobs (1998).
9 Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) adopted a levels approach in the development
10 of a framework for the measurement of worker experience. A levels perspective demands an
11 appropriate definition of constructs and the domain of interest (dimensions of construct) as well as
12 the level of measurement specificity (Klein et al., 1994). A levels perspective forces the
13 investigator to think conceptually about the various levels of specificity as well as possible cross-
14 level effects or domains (Quinones et al., 1995; Tesluk and Jacobs, 1998).

15
16 This **framework** elicits understanding by ensuring congruence across conceptualisation,
17 operationalisation and interpretation of the organisational capability construct. Therefore, the first
18 step in the process is to develop a framework that indicates the domain of interest as well as the
19 measures that may be appropriate for each "cell" in the framework. The framework essentially
20 indicates the main dimensions that describe the various measures of organisational capability as
21 well as the different levels of specificity within each domain (Quinones et al., 1995; Tesluk and
22 Jacobs, 1998). **This approach juxtaposes the domains or mode of measurement of the**
23 **organisational capability construct with the specific level where performance is required in order**
24 **to ascertain the fine-grained or specific organisational capability measure in question.** In that sense,
25 an opportunity is provided to ensure congruence and effective operationalisation of the
26 organisational capability construct in a nomological network. The nomological network has two
27 main dimensions as *measurement mode* and *level of specificity*.

28
29 Considering the measurement mode dimension, recently, Manu et al. (2019) empirically identified
30 six main categories of attributes constituting organisational capability of design firms, having
31 responsibility for design to minimise OSH risks on construction projects as: *competence* (skill,

1 knowledge and experience of the organisation's design staff); *strategy*; *corporate experience*;
2 *systems* (processes and procedures); *infrastructure* (physical and information communication
3 technology); *collaboration* (inter and intra-organisation). Their study makes a useful contribution
4 in this area by, empirically, identifying domains or modes of measuring the organisational
5 capability construct.

6
7 Many researchers have emphasised the human resource as a determinant of organisational
8 performance (Karami et al., 2004; Chang and Huang, 2010). Manu et al. (2019) **reference to**
9 **competence** corroborates an earlier study by Duhan (2007) who proposed a three-level
10 organisational capability model. Duhan (2007)'s model indicates that the skills and knowledge of
11 the employees, at the individual level, determine the core competence of the organisation at the
12 intra-organisational level. Further, the core competence determines the capability of the
13 organisation at the business level. Hence, in this **framework**, *competence* is viewed as a domain in
14 which organisational capability **could** be measured.

15
16 Organisations usually integrate resources (O'Regan and Ghobadian, 2004) through processes and
17 procedures to undertake tasks to fulfil goals. This may require both intra and inter-organisational
18 collaborations. This integrative **ability** manifests as an adhesive that pulls critical knowledge from
19 the various units in the organisation as well as blending it with external sources (Cohen and
20 Levinthal, 1990; Teece et al., 1997) to undertake a task or fulfil a goal. Again, since capabilities
21 are also composed of knowledge, their "main source" is learning that takes place within the
22 organisation (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Andreu and Ciborra, 1996; Teece
23 et al., 1997; Wang and Ahmed, 2003; Chiva et al., 2007; Imran et al., 2016) and such as may be
24 occasioned by external sources. Teece et al. (1997) indicate that organisations will need to
25 reconfigure, consistently, both their internal and external competences in order to stay relevant in
26 the rapidly changing economic and business environments. However, it is through learning that
27 this reconfiguration can take place. Learning emanates from the activities undertaken by
28 employees (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Chiva et al., 2007; Imran et al., 2016) in conditions of
29 uncertainty, complexity, and conflict (Amit & Schoemaker, 1993) and requires social interaction
30 for the continuous conversion of tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka, 1994). In that sense,
31 *learning* can be considered as one of the domains of measuring organisational capability.

1
2 Organisational reputation is considered a capability that creates an advantage for organisations as
3 it is difficult to acquire from the external environment (Chen and Lee, 2009; Zaidi and Othman,
4 2014) due to its intangibility (Ayuso et al., 2006). However, organisational reputation does not just
5 happen. It is a function of time and functional superiority. Essentially, an organisation's
6 cumulative-superior performance of a task or fulfilment of a goal builds or establishes its
7 reputation in a positive sense. Again, this provides an opportunity or another lens to understand
8 how to appropriately measure the organisational capability construct. *Reputation*, which is a
9 benefit of superior performance of a task over time, is then being considered a domain in the
10 measurement of organisational capability.

11
12 The organisation's ability to deliver superior performance, consistently, hinges on its managerial
13 skills at resource selection, development (Sirmon et al., 2007), maintenance and retention. Again,
14 for a consistent delivery of superior performance, there will be a need for a top layer of
15 management that provides perspectives (IPMA, 2016) as well as creating and supporting values or
16 culture that promote learning. The governance and management system, thus, does not only
17 provide a substrate for learning but also provides a curative function to guide the optimal
18 deployment of resources. In that sense, *governance and management system can be considered as*
19 *a domain for measuring* organisational capability of design firms.

20
21 In Manu et al. (2019)'s empirical study on the key attributes of organisational capabilities for
22 design firms with responsibility for minimising OSH risks on construction projects, they indicate
23 one of the attributes as *infrastructure*. The infrastructure attribute, they indicate, involves both
24 physical and information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure. The rapidly
25 changing working environment is increasingly being reliant on ICT. Essentially, ICT improves
26 organisational processes (Porter, 1985; Koc and Bozdog, 2017) and enhances the productivity of
27 human resource at the workplace. Organisational infrastructure required to deliver superior
28 performance and to create value for the customer or the client does not only consist physical and
29 ICT infrastructure, but also financial, control and planning systems (Porter, 1985; Koc and Bozdog,
30 2017). *Infrastructure* then can be considered as one of the modes of measuring organisational
31 capability.

1
2 Quinones et al. (1995) and Tesluk and Jacobs (1998) in their measurement of work experience
3 construct considered the level of specificity of the construct at the levels of task, job, team,
4 organisation and occupation. However, in projectized environments, as the case is with design
5 firms, the level of specificity of organisational capability is considered at the levels of task or
6 activity; project; programme and portfolio (PMI, 2017; IPMA, 2015; IPMA, 2016). As indicated
7 in Figure 3, each of the modes of organisational capability can be operationalised at four levels of
8 specificity (task, project, programme and portfolio) creating a 5 X 4 nomological network for
9 measuring organisational capability. Illustrations of measures of organisational capability,
10 represented in each cell, are subsequently discussed. Firms with responsibility for design can vary
11 in their level of organisational capability with respect to the performance of specific tasks. First,
12 design firms can vary in the task competence of their employees. The skills, knowledge and
13 experience of employees of design firms may differ. For example, a design firm may have a mix
14 of employees who have in-depth skills, knowledge and experience in the performance of tasks
15 related to OSH risk management at the pre-construction phases of projects as opposed to other
16 firms. Second, design firms may vary in their accumulation or how much learning has taken place
17 in the performance of OSH risk management tasks. Interactions among employees (under
18 conditions of uncertainty, complexity and uncertainty) on OSH risk management tasks may
19 engender new ideas and insights as a result of collective wisdom. However, organisations may
20 differ in the arrangements that exist to capture and consolidate these new ideas and insights that
21 emanate from such interactions, particularly at the OSH risks management task level. Further,
22 design firms can lose skillful, knowledgeable and experienced employees. In that sense, it is the
23 accumulated OSH risk management learning, at the task level, independent of any individual or
24 employee that can guarantee the organisational capability of a firm and most design firms can
25 differ significantly on this.

26
27 Third, design firms can vary in their reputation of OSH risk management tasks performances.
28 Some may have excellent records of OSH risks management task performance in terms of novelty
29 and superior performance while others may have poor records in same. Fourth, design firms can
30 vary in the governance and management systems in place for the performance of OSH risk
31 management tasks. Some may have policies and culture that promote doing things right the first

1 time (Kano, 1993; Teece, 2017), even if more time may be required, while others may have no
 2 such policies and embark on quick fixes. Again, in organisations, certain individuals or teams may
 3 have unique abilities in performing certain tasks. The governance and management systems in
 4 place to get such individuals and teams to perform tasks that match their unique abilities may vary
 5 among design firms.

6

Level of Specificity	<i>Portfolio</i>	Portfolio skills, knowledge and experience of employees	Portfolio learning records	Portfolio reputation	Portfolio governance and management system	Portfolio infrastructure arrangement
	<i>Programme</i>	Programme skills, knowledge and experience of employees	Programme learning records	Programme reputation	Programme governance and management system	Programme infrastructure arrangement
	<i>Project</i>	Project skills, knowledge and experience of employees	Project learning records	Project reputation	Project governance and management system	Project infrastructure arrangement
	<i>Task</i>	Task skills, knowledge and experience of employees	Task learning records	Task reputation	Task governance and management system	Task infrastructure arrangement
		<i>Competence</i>	<i>Learning</i>	<i>Reputation</i>	<i>Governance and management system</i>	<i>Infrastructure</i>
		Measurement Mode				

7
8
9

10 Figure 3: A conceptual framework of occupational capability measures

11 Finally, design firms may vary in their possession of infrastructure for the effective performance
 12 of OSH risk management tasks. Some organisations may have more infrastructure (physical, ICT,
 13 financial, planning and control systems) for the performance of OSH risk management tasks as
 14 compared to others. Again, the incentive or reward schemes available in organisations for novelty
 15

1 and superior performance of DfOSH tasks can all be underlying features or infrastructure (Amin
2 and Cohendet, 2000; Yahya and Goh, 2002) embedded in design firms for optimal OSH risks
3 management. This can vary significantly among design firms.

4

5 At the level of project specificity, differences can exist among design firms in respect of
6 organisational capability. First, the skills, knowledge and experiences of design firm employees
7 may vary in respect of projects. For example, the skills, knowledge and experience set of a design
8 firm employees may be more within the domain of hospital buildings as opposed to shopping
9 malls. Second, design firms may vary in organisational capability from the learning they have
10 accumulated on projects. A design firm may have executed several projects in the past but may
11 not have any concrete arrangements in place to capture learning on such prior projects. This
12 undermines the ability to build and increase organisational process assets (Adaku et al., 2018)
13 which can benefit future projects in terms of optimal decisions. Third, design firms can vary in
14 terms of their reputations for projects. OSH risks management features embedded in project
15 designs, by design firms, may reflect novelty and value for clients. Such cumulative positive
16 decisions may lead to project awards and establish some level of reputation among construction
17 project clients. There may be some design firms who may have never won such awards for optimal
18 OSH risk management decisions for their designs. Fourth, design firms can vary on project
19 governance and management system. While some design firms have, in place, robust governance
20 and management systems to select and assemble the requisite employees to deliver projects with
21 optimal OSH risk performance, others may lack such systems. Further, some design firms may not
22 have the requisite policies to guide project team members in the delivery of projects that minimise
23 OSH risks (Manu et al., 2019). Finally, design firms can vary on the infrastructure that are made
24 available for delivery of OSH risk optimal projects. For example, some design firms may have, in
25 place, available infrastructure (physical facilities; state-of-the-art ICT resources and tools such as
26 building information modelling [BIM]; financial, planning and control systems) for effective OSH
27 risk management at pre-construction stages of projects. On the other hand, there may be some
28 design firms who lack or have inadequate infrastructure for the same purpose. The incentive
29 schemes, at the project level, to ensure effective OSH risk management during designs can be
30 underlying features or infrastructure (Amin and Cohendet, 2000; Yahya and Goh, 2002) that can
31 support safe designs. Design firms, generally, can vary on this.

1

2 Differences in organisational capability can also exist at the programme level of specificity. First,
3 the skills, knowledge and experiences of design firms can vary in terms of programmes. Some
4 project clients may require multiple or a group of projects to fulfill certain objectives that otherwise
5 may not be possible with individual projects (IPMA, 2016; PMI, 2017). This makes the programme
6 level of specificity necessary in the construction industry. Some design firms may have employees
7 with competence at this level while others may not have and this can establish a difference among
8 design firms in respect of organisational capability. Second, how design firms have sought to
9 accumulate learning on programmes can establish differences among them. For instance, two
10 design firms may be involved in similar programmes but may differ in arrangements and how
11 learning is captured and consolidated on the programmes. One may have effective arrangements
12 to capture and consolidate learning, so as to benefit future programmes, while the other may lack
13 or have inadequate arrangements for same. Third, design firms can vary on programme reputation.
14 For example, a design firm may demonstrate consistent superior performance in the handling of
15 multiple and complex projects and may have a reputation for that while another firm may show
16 inconsistent performance, even with normal and less complex programmes.

17

18 Fourth, design firms can vary on programme governance and management systems. Delivering
19 multiple projects requires adequate coordination and integration efforts. Hence, the governance
20 and management system in place to engender effective coordination and integration are key to a
21 programme success, particularly from OSH risk management perspective. A design firm may have
22 a robust governance and management system for this while the other may not have. Lastly, design
23 firms can vary on the arrangement of infrastructure for programmes. For instance, while some
24 design firms may have elaborate infrastructure (physical facilities; start-of-the-art ICT resources
25 and tools; financial, planning and controlling systems), others may lack or possess inadequate
26 infrastructure for effective programme OSH risks management, particularly at the pre-construction
27 stages of the projects development processes. Again, at the level of a programme, the degree of
28 complexity (in respect of the different parts that ought to be effectively coordinated or integrated
29 to ensure a successful programme delivery) increases. Thus, somewhat incentive schemes
30 embedded in design firms to incentivise the programme team members will be critical underlying

1 features or infrastructure to ensure coordination and integration at the programme level. Again,
2 design firms can differ on this dimension.

3

4 At the level of portfolio specificity, differences exist among design firms in respect of
5 organisational capability. First, the portfolio competence of design firms' employees can vary. For
6 example, the skills, knowledge and experiences of the employees of a design firm may be related
7 to a portfolio in the area of resort or recreational infrastructure while another design firm may have
8 the portfolio competence of its employees in the area of transportation infrastructure. Second, the
9 amount of and how learning have been accumulated on portfolios by design firms can vary. Some
10 design firms may have extensive learning records as well as effective arrangements to capture
11 learning on portfolios while others may have managed several portfolios but lack or have
12 inadequate records as well as ineffective arrangements to capture learning. Third, differences can
13 exist among design firms in respect of portfolio reputation. Some design firms may have handled
14 diverse portfolios (recreational or resort infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, etc) and may
15 have demonstrated consistent and superior performances in the handling of these portfolios. As a
16 result these firms may have established and earned reputation in that regard. On the hand, other
17 design firms may have handled limited portfolios and perhaps have not been able to demonstrate
18 consistent and superior performances in the handling of those portfolios. In that sense, there can
19 be a reputation deficit. Fourth, design firms can vary in respect of the governance and management
20 systems in place for the management of portfolios. Some design firms may have elaborate
21 governance and management systems, in place, for effective integration and deployment of
22 resources on portfolios. This could be in the form of policies, culture and value systems that
23 engender desirable outcomes on portfolios (Bryde, 2003; Stare, 2011). Conversely, there may be
24 some design firms that have limited and inadequate governance and management systems in
25 respect of portfolio handling. Fifth, design firms can vary on the infrastructure required for the
26 handling of portfolios. While some design firms have extensive infrastructure (physical; ICT
27 resources and tools; financial, planning and controlling; incentive mechanisms) for the handling
28 of portfolios, others may be deficient in this (Porter, 1985; Koc and Bozdag, 2017; Manu et al.,
29 2019).

30

1 **7. Discussion and pointers for future directions for design firms’ organisational capability**
2 **research**

3 The construct of organisational capability as it relates to firms with responsibility for design,
4 particularly for optimal OSH risks management, is considered as being multi-dimensional in its
5 measurement. Understanding organisational capability from a single or narrow perspective can
6 potentially undermine a useful measurement of it. Again, a narrow view of it can also impair the
7 judgements and decisions of project clients who have to match project risk considerations to
8 designers based on their capabilities. Further, the organisational capability construct, in respect of
9 design firms, must be considered as a multi-level one. Capabilities of design firms cannot be
10 assumed to be uniform at all levels (from a task to a portfolio level). The capabilities that are
11 required at the task level may not be the same as required at the portfolio level. In that sense, for
12 optimal decision-making on the part of project clients intending to clarify the DfOSH abilities of
13 design firms, it will be appropriate to ascertain organisational capability at the various levels of
14 performance specificity or requirement.

15
16 The organisational capability construct, as it relates to design firms must be considered as dynamic
17 (Kianto, 2008; Teece, 2012). Capabilities, as they reside in firms, can be considered as assets
18 (Andreu and Ciborra, 1996; Mentzas, 2004; Adaku et al., 2018). In that regard, it can increase
19 through deliberate and conscious efforts by firms or deteriorate as a result of lack of governance
20 and managerial perspective and neglect. Over time, the organisational capabilities of design firms
21 can increase or deteriorate along the *mode of measurement* or the *level of specificity*. Hence, an
22 industry framework that seeks to capture the dynamics of organisational capability of design firms
23 will be a useful one. Such frameworks could be in the form of capability maturity models.
24 Recently, Poghosyan et al. (2020) have conducted a study that sought to develop a web-based
25 occupational safety and health (OSH) capability maturity indicator for the assessment of designers.
26 This and similar studies are in the right direction in respect of capturing the dynamic nature of
27 organisational capability of design firms.

28
29 The proposed **framework** for the measurement of the organisational capability construct in respect
30 of design firms can inform the criteria for the assessment and selection of designers, particularly
31 from the client perspective. Some countries have public specifications that assist clients in

1 assessing and selecting design firms. For example, in the UK, the publicly available specification
2 (PAS) 91 is one such instrument for construction-related procurement. A private sector initiative
3 like safety schemes in procurement (SSIP) in the UK is also another scheme to complement PAS
4 91. Further, the **suggested framework** can also serve as a guide for design firms intending to build
5 **their organisational capability regarding DfOSH. In this way, an insight is provided as to which**
6 **areas – constituting organisational capability – can be focused on as well as the levels of**
7 **performance these abilities are required in the attainment of organisational capability. It is** a broad
8 and comprehensive framework for the measurement of the organisational capability construct.
9 Future studies on organisational capability of design firms should focus on testing the measures
10 (particularly **the attributes** within the cells) of the organisational capability construct empirically
11 to distill the most relevant ones having regard to the current practice. Further, in such an empirical
12 test, attention should be paid to what constitutes each measure as well as the evidence or indicator
13 that must be adduced to reflect that measure in practice.

14
15 In some countries where there are regulations to ensure DfOSH in the construction industry,
16 requirement for organisational capability of design firms seems to target the project level of
17 specificity or performance requirement. An example is the Construction (Design and
18 Management) (CDM) 2015 regulations in the UK. Clearly, the focus of the regulators in respect
19 of the regulations is to provide a generic framework for the effective management of OSH risks in
20 the construction industry. However, inadvertently the focus seems to be on only projects.
21 **Meanwhile the complexity of the current business environment, sometimes, makes it impossible**
22 **to realise a corporate goal with only one project.** A typical example is the London 2012
23 construction programme for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Webster (2013) indicates that
24 for optimal performance of OSH on the programme, the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)
25 appointed a CDM integrator to manage and coordinate several CDM coordinators on projects
26 under the programme. This highlights the organisational capability requirement of design firms
27 (as far as OSH is concerned) beyond the project level of specificity. Hence, regulations should
28 emphasise performance requirement beyond the project level of specificity in respect of design
29 firms' organisational capability. Further studies on DfOSH capability maturity model like
30 Poghosyan et al. (2020)'s study, should consider capability maturity models at different levels of
31 specificity or performance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

As earlier indicated, the organisational capability of design firms, with responsibility for effective OSH risks management, can increase or deteriorate. Thus, future studies on organisational capability should investigate the enablers or constraints of organisational capability of design firms. Further, future studies are invited to also investigate the interrelationships between the measurement modes and the interdependencies of levels of specificity indicated in this framework.

This proposed framework or nomological network to measure the organisational capability of firms with responsibility for DfOSH cannot be deemed to be complete. Thus, further studies will be invited to extend the network to deepen our understanding of and ability to measure the organisational capability construct as it relates to design firms.

8. Conclusions

The issue of OSH risk on construction projects has been a thorny one among stakeholders of the industry. This has spawned a number of investigations among both scholars and practitioners as to how to deal with this risk, effectively. One of the insights from the investigations points to the DfOSH initiative. However, there is a paucity of knowledge in the extant literature as well as a misunderstanding in practice as to what specifically constitutes the DfOSH capability of design firms and most importantly how to measure it. This study has, thus, sought to deepen knowledge in this area in a number of ways. First, it conceptualises the construct organisational capability as a basis for its meaningful operationalisation. Second, it provides a comprehensive framework for an effective operationalisation of the construct as it relates to design firms. It does so by presenting organisational capability, in respect of DfOSH, as a multi-dimensional construct that can be operationalised at various levels of specificity. By this approach, a congruence is provided for a meaningful conceptualisation and operationalisation of the construct. Third, it signposts further studies, both theoretically and empirically, that can be undertaken to push the knowledge frontier of the DfOSH initiative outward. Such future studies should seek to meaningfully extend the nomological network by looking into the domains or mode of measurement as well as the levels of specificity of the organisational capability construct in respect of DfOSH.

Acknowledgement:

1 This research has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and
2 innovation programme under grant agreement No 837721.

3

4 **References:**

- 5 Adaku, E., Amoatey, C. T., Nornyibey, I., Famiyeh, S. and Asante-Darko, D. (2018). Delays in
6 new product introduction: experiences of a food processing company in a developing
7 economy, *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 29 (5), pp. 811-828.
- 8 Aires, M. D. M., Gámez, M. C. R. and Gibb, A. (2010). Prevention through design: The effect of
9 European Directives on construction workplace accidents, *Safety Science*, 48, pp. 248–258.
- 10 Alli, B. O. (2008). *Fundamental principles of occupational health and safety*, Geneva:
11 International Labour Office.
- 12 Amin, A. and Cohendet, P. (2000). Organisational Learning and Governance through Embedded
13 Practices, *Journal of Management and Governance*, 4, pp. 93–116.
- 14 Amit, R. and Schoemaker, P. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent, *Strategic
15 Management Journal*, 14, pp. 33-46.
- 16 Andreu, R., and Ciborra, C. (1996). Organizational Learning and Core Capabilities Development:
17 The Role of Information Technology, *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 5, pp. 117-
18 127.
- 19 Australian Safety and Compensation Council (2006). *Guidance on the Principles of Safe Design
20 for Work*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- 21 Ayuso, S., Rodriguez, M. A. and Ricart, J. E. (2006). Using Stakeholder Dialogue as a Source for
22 New Ideas: A Dynamic Capability Underlying Sustainable Innovation, *Corporate
23 Governance*, 6(4), pp. 475-490.
- 24 Barney, J. (2002). *Gaining and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
25 Prentice-Hall.
- 26 Behm, M. (2005). Linking construction fatalities to the design for construction safety concept,
27 *Safety Science*, 43(8), 589-611.
- 28 Behm, M., Culvenor, J. and Dixon, G. (2014). Development of safe design thinking among
29 engineering students, *Safety Science*, 63, pp. 1–7.
- 30 Bong, S., Rameezdeen, R., Zuo, J., Li, R. Y. M. and Ye, G. (2015) The designer's role in workplace
31 health and safety in the construction industry: postharmonized regulations in South
32 Australia, *International Journal of Construction Management*, 15(4), 276-287.
- 33 Bryde, D. (2003). Modelling project management performance, *International Journal of Quality
34 & Reliability Management*, 20 (2), pp. 229-254.

- 1 Caldeira, M. and Ward, J. (2003). Using resource-based theory to interpret the successful adoption
2 and use of information systems and technology in manufacturing small and medium sized
3 enterprises, *European Journal of Information Systems*, 12, pp.114–127.
- 4 Chadegani, A. A., Salehi, H., Yenus, M. M., Farhadi, H., Fooladi, M., Farhadi, M. and Ebrahim,
5 N. A. (2013). A Comparison between Two Main Academic Literature Collections: Web of
6 Science and Scopus Databases, *Asian Social Science*, 9(5), pp. 18-26.
- 7 Chandler, A. D. Jr (1990). *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*, Cambridge,
8 MA: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press.
- 9 Chang, W-J. A. and Huang, T. C. (2010). The impact of human resource capabilities on internal
10 customer satisfaction and organisational effectiveness, *Total Quality Management*, 21(6),
11 pp. 633–648.
- 12 Chen, H.-H. and Lee, P.-Y. (2009). The Driving Drivers of Dynamic Competitive Capabilities: A
13 New Perspective on Competition, *European Business Review*, 21(1), pp. 78-91.
- 14 Chiva, R., Alegre, J. and Lapiedra, R. (2007). Measuring organisational learning capability among
15 the workforce, *International Journal of Manpower*, 28 (3/4), pp. 224-242.
- 16 Cohen, W. M. and Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning
17 and innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, pp. 128-152.
- 18 Collins, C. S. and Stockton, C. M. (2018). The Central Role of Theory in Qualitative Research,
19 *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17, pp. 1–10.
- 20 Cooke, T., Lingard, H., Blismas, N. & Stranieri, A. (2008). ToolSheDTM: the development and
21 evaluation of a decision support tool for health and safety in construction design,
22 *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(4), 336–351.
- 23 Council Directive 92/57/EEC (1992). *On the implementation of minimum safety and health*
24 *requirements at temporary or mobile constructions sites*, Official Journal No. L 245,
25 26.08.1992, 6–22.
- 26 Cronbach, L. and Meehl, P. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests, *Psychological*
27 *Bulletin*, 52(4), pp. 281-302.
- 28 Day, G. S. (1994). The capabilities of market-driven organizations, *Journal of Marketing*, 58, pp.
29 37-52.
- 30 Din, Z. U. and Gibson Jr. G. E. (2019). Serious games for learning prevention through design
31 concepts: An experimental study, *Safety Science*, 115, pp. 176–187.
- 32 Driscoll, T.R., Harrison, J.E., Bradley, C. and Newson, R.S. (2008). *Design Issues in Work-Related*
33 *Serious Injuries*, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations, Canberra:
34 Commonwealth of Australia.
- 35 Duhan, S. (2007). A capabilities based toolkit for strategic information systems planning in SMEs,
36 *International Journal of Information Management*, 27, pp. 352–367.

- 1 European Construction Institute (ECI) (1996). *Total Project Management of Construction Safety,*
2 *Health and Environment*, London: Thomas Telford.
- 3 Gambatese J. A. (2008). Research issues in prevention through design, *Journal of Safety Research,*
4 39, 153-156.
- 5 Gambatese, J., Behm, M. and Hinze, J.W. (2005). Viability of Designing for Construction Worker
6 Safety, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(9), 1029-1036.
- 7 Germain, R, Dröge, C., and William Christensen, W. (2001), The Mediating Role of Knowledge
8 in the Relationship of Context with Performance, *Journal of Operations Management,*
9 19(4), 453-69.
- 10 Gibb, A., Haslam, R., Hide, S. and Gyi, D. (2004). *The role of design in accident causality*, in
11 Hecker, S., Gambatese, J. and Weinstein, M. (Eds), *Designing for Safety and Health in*
12 *Construction: Proc., Research and Practice Symposium*, Eugene, OR.: UO Press.
- 13 Goh, Y. M. and Chua, S. (2016). Knowledge, attitude and practices for design for safety: A study
14 on civil & structural engineers, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 93, 260–266.
- 15 Grant, R.M. (1996). Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments: organizational
16 capability as knowledge integration, *Organization Science*, 7(4), pp. 375-87.
- 17 Hadikusumo, B. H. W. and Rowlinson, S (2002). Integration of virtually real construction model
18 and design-for-safety-process database, *Automation in Construction*, 11(5), pp. 501-509.
- 19 Hall J. H., Sarkani S., Mazzuchi T. A. (2011). Impacts of organizational capabilities in information
20 security, *Information Management & Computer Security*, 19(3), pp. 155-176.
- 21 Hallowell, M. R. and Hansen, D. (2016). Measuring and improving designer hazard recognition
22 skill: Critical competency to enable prevention through design, *Safety Science*, 82, pp. 254–
23 263.
- 24 Hardison, D. and Hallowell, M. (2019). Construction hazard prevention through design: Review
25 of perspectives, evidence, and future objective research agenda, *Safety Science*, 120, pp.
26 517–526.
- 27 Hare, B., Cameron, I. and Duff, A. R. (2006). Exploring the integration of health and safety with
28 pre-construction planning, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management,*
29 13(5), 438-450.
- 30 HassabElnaby, H. R., Hwang, W. and Vonderembse, M. A. (2012). The impact of ERP
31 implementation on organizational capabilities and firm performance, *Benchmarking,*
32 19(4), pp. 618-633.
- 33 Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (2003). *Causal factors in construction accidents*, Research
34 Report No. 156, Norwich: HMSO.
- 35 Helfat, C. E. and Lieberman, M. (2002). The birth of capabilities: market entry and the importance
36 of prehistory, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(4), pp. 725-60.

- 1 Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2003). The dynamic resource-based view: Capability lifecycles,
2 *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), pp. 997–1010.
- 3 Hinze, J. and Gambatese, J.A. (1994). Design decisions that impact construction worker safety,
4 Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Rinker International Conference on Construction Safety
5 and Loss Control, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- 6 HSE (2014). *Consultation on replacement of the Construction (Design and Management)*
7 *Regulations 2007*, Bootle: HSE.
- 8 HSE (2015). *Managing health and safety in construction: Construction (Design and Management)*
9 *Regulations 2015. Guidance on Regulations*, London: Health and Safety Executive.
- 10 HSE, (2019a). Fatal injuries in Great Britain, HSE. Available from:
11 <https://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/fatals.htm>, last accessed, 07/01/2020.
- 12 HSE, (2019b). Construction statistics in Great Britain, HSE. Available from:
13 <https://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/industry/construction.pdf>, last accessed, 07/01/2020.
- 14 Hwang, B.G., Zhao, X. & Toh, L.P. (2014). Risk management in small construction projects in
15 Singapore: status, barriers and impact, *International Journal of Project Management*, 32
16 (1), 116–124.
- 17 Imran, M.K., Ilyas, M., Aslam, U. and Ubaid-Ur-Rahman, U. (2016). Organizational learning
18 through transformational leadership, *The Learning Organization*, 23 (4), pp. 232-248.
- 19 International Labour Organisation (2011). *OSH Management System: A Tool for Continual*
20 *Improvement*, Turin: International Labour Organisation.
- 21 International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2015). *Individual competence baseline*
22 *for project, programme and portfolio management*, Version 4.0, Nijkerk: IPMA.
- 23 International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2016). *Organisational competence*
24 *baseline for developing competence in Managing by Projects*, Amsterdam: International
25 Project Management Association.
- 26 Kano, N. (1993). A Perspective on Quality Activities in American Firms, *California Management*
27 *Review*, 35, 3, pp. 12-31.
- 28 Karami, A., Analoui, F., and Cusworth, J. (2004). Strategic human resource management and
29 resource-based approach: The evidence from the British manufacturing industry,
30 *Management Research News*, 27(6), pp. 50–68.
- 31 Kianto, A. (2008). Development and validation of a survey instrument for measuring
32 organizational renewal capability, *International Journal of Technology Management*,
33 42(1), pp. 69-88.
- 34 Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F. and Hall, R. J. (1994). Levels issues in theory development, data
35 collection, and analysis, *Academy of Management Review*, 19, pp. 195-229.

- 1 Koc, T. and Bozdog, E. (2017). Measuring the degree of novelty of innovation based on Porter's
2 value chain approach, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 257(2), pp. 559-567.
- 3 Larsen, G.D. and Whyte, J. (2013). Safe construction through design: perspectives from the site
4 team, *Construction Management and Economics*, 31(6), 675-690.
- 5 Leonard-Barton, D. (1995). *Wellsprings of knowledge: Building and sustaining the sources of*
6 *innovation*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- 7 Lingard, H., Saunders, L., Pirzadeh, P., Blismas, N., Kleiner, B. and Wakefield, R. (2015). The
8 relationship between pre-construction decision-making and the effectiveness of risk
9 control: Testing the time-safety influence curve, *Engineering, Construction and*
10 *Architectural Management*, 22 (1), 108–124.
- 11 López-Arquillos, A., Rubio-Romero, J. C. and Martinez-Aires, M.D. (2015). Prevention through
12 Design (PtD). The importance of the concept in Engineering and Architecture University
13 courses, *Safety Science*, 73, 8–14.
- 14 Luczak, H., Rötting, M., and Brueggmann, M. (2000). International comparison of OSH research.
15 In Proceedings of the IEA 2000/HFES 2000 Congress. July 29–August 4, 2000, San
16 Diego, California USA (pp. 4-652-4-655). Santa Monica, CA, USA: Human Factors and
17 Ergonomic Society.
- 18 Madhok, A. (1997). Cost, value and foreign market entry mode: the transaction and the firm,
19 *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18, pp. 39-61.
- 20 Mahoney, J. T. and Pandian, J. R. (1992). The resource-based view within the conversation of
21 strategic management, *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, pp. 363-80.
- 22 Maier, A. M. and Moultrie, J. and Clarkson, P. J. (2012). Assessing organizational capabilities:
23 reviewing and guiding the development of maturity grids, *IEEE Transactions on*
24 *Engineering Management*, 59. pp. 138-159.
- 25 Manu, P., Poghosyan, A., Mahamadu, A-M., Mahdjoubi, L., Gibb, A., Behm, M., and Akinade,
26 O. (2019). Design for Occupational Safety and Health: Key Attributes for Organisational
27 Capability, *Engineering Construction and Architectural Management*. 26(11), pp. 2614-
28 2636.
- 29 Maritan, C. A. (2001). Capital investment as investing in organizational capabilities: an
30 empirically grounded process model, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, pp. 513–531.
- 31 Mentzas, G. (2004). A strategic management framework for leveraging knowledge assets,
32 *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 1 (2), pp. 115-42.
- 33 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic
34 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 151 (4), pp.
35 264–269.

- 1 Mongeon, P., Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a
2 comparative analysis, *Scientometrics*, 106, pp. 213–228.
- 3 Nasution, H. N., and Mavondo, F. T. (2008). Organisational capabilities: Antecedents and
4 implications for customer value, *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(3), pp. 477-501.
- 5 Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation, *Organization Science*,
6 5, pp. 14-37.
- 7 O'Regan, N. and Ghobadian, A. (2004). The importance of capabilities for strategic direction and
8 performance, *Management Decision*, 42(2), pp. 292-312.
- 9 Oney-Yazıcı E. and Dulaimi M. F. (2014). Understanding designing for construction safety: the
10 interaction between confidence and attitude of designers and safety culture, *Architectural*
11 *Engineering and Design Management*, 11, 325-337.
- 12 Poghosyan, A., Manu, P., Mahdjoubi, L., Gibb, A., Behm, M., and Mahamadu, A-M. (2018).
13 Design for safety implementation factors: A literature review. *Journal of Engineering,*
14 *Design and Technology*, 16(5), 783-797.
- 15 Poghosyana, A., Manu, P., Mahamadu, A-M., Akinadee, O., Mahdjoubib, L., Gibb, A. and Behm,
16 M. (2020). A web-based design for occupational safety and health capability maturity
17 indicator, *Safety Science*, 122, pp. 1-24.
- 18 Porter, M.E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*, New
19 York: The Free Press.
- 20 Prahalad, C. K. and Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation, *Harvard Business*
21 *Review*, 68, pp. 79-91.
- 22 Project Management Institute (PMI) (2017). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge*
23 *(PMBOK guide)*, Sixth Edition, Newton Square, PA: Project Management Institute.
- 24 Quinones, M. A., Ford, J. K. and Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work
25 experience and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review, *Personnel*
26 *Psychology*; 48(4), pp. 887-910.
- 27 Rajendran, S. and Gambatese, J. A. (2009). Development and initial validation of sustainable
28 construction safety and health rating system, *Journal of Construction and Engineering*
29 *Management*, 135, 1067-1075.
- 30 Rauffet, P., Cunha, C. D., Bernard, A. (2016). Managing resource learning in distributed
31 organisations with the organisational capability approach, *International Journal of*
32 *Technology Management*, 2016, 70(4), pp. 300-322.
- 33 Rule, P., and John, V. M. (2015). A necessary dialogue: Theory in case study research.
34 *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14, 1–11.
- 35 Sanchez, R. (2004). Understanding competence-based management Identifying and managing five
36 modes of competence, *Journal of Business Research*, 57, pp. 518– 532.

- 1 Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A. and Ireland, R. D. (2007). Managing Firm Resources in Dynamic
2 Environments to Create Value: Looking Inside the Black Box, *Academy of Management*
3 *Review*, 32(1), 273-292.
- 4 Sousa, V., Almeida, N.M. and Dias, L.A. (2014). Risk-based management of occupational safety
5 and health in the construction industry – Part 1: Background knowledge, *Safety Science*,
6 66, pp. 75-86
- 7 Stalk, G., Evans, P. and Shulman, L. E. (1992). Competing on capabilities: The new rules of
8 corporate strategy, *Harvard Business Review*, March–April, pp. 57–69.
- 9 Stare, A., (2011). The Impact of the Organisational Structure and Project Organisational Culture
10 on Project Performance in Slovenian Enterprise, *Management Journal of Contemporary*
11 *Management*, 16, 2, 1-22.
- 12 Szymberski, R.T. (1997). Construction Project Safety Planning, *Tappi Journal*, 80(11), 69-74.
- 13 Teece, D. J. (2012). Dynamic capabilities: Routines versus entrepreneurial action, *Journal of*
14 *Management Studies*, 49(8), 1395–1401.
- 15 Teece, D. J. (2017). Toward A Capability Theory of (innovating) Firms: Implications for
16 Management and Policy, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 41, pp. 693–720.
- 17 Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management,
18 *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, pp. 509-533.
- 19 Tesluk, P. E. and Jacobs, R. R. (1998). Toward an Integrated Model of Work Experience,
20 *Personnel Psychology*, 51, pp. 321-355.
- 21 Toole, T.M. (2007). Design engineers’ responses to safety situations, *ASCE Journal of*
22 *Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 133(2), 26-131.
- 23 Ulrich, D. and Smallwood, N. (2004). Capitalizing on capabilities, *Harvard Business Review*,
24 82(6), pp. 1-10.
- 25 Un, C. A. and Montoro-Sanchez, A. (2010). Innovative capability development for
26 entrepreneurship: A theoretical framework, *Journal of Organizational Change*
27 *Management; Bradford*, 23(4), pp. 413-434.
- 28 Verona, G. (1999). A resource-based view of product development, *Academy of Management*
29 *Review*, 241, pp. 132-42.
- 30 Wang, C. L. and Ahmed P. K. (2003). Organisational learning: a critical review, *The Learning*
31 *Organization*, 10(1), pp. 8-17.
- 32 Webster, M. (2013). The use of CDM (2007) in the London 2012 construction programme.
33 *Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineering*, 166, 35–41. doi:10.1680/cien.12.00010.
- 34 Williams, M.A. (1998). *Designing for safety*, in Barnard, M. (Ed.), *Health and Safety for*
35 *Engineers*, London: Thomas Telford.

1 Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities, *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, pp.
2 991-995

3 Yahya, S. and Goh, W. (2002). Managing human resources toward achieving knowledge
4 management, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6 (5), pp. 457-468.

5 Yuan, J., Yi, W., Moao, M. and Zhang, L. (2018). Evaluating the Impacts of Health, Social
6 Network and Capital on Craft Efficiency and Productivity: A Case Study of Construction
7 Workers in China, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*,
8 5(2), pp. 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15020345>

9 Zaidi, M. F. A. and Othman, S. N. (2014). The Concept of Dynamic Capability for Managing
10 Technology and Change, *Strategic Management Quarterly*, 2(2), pp. 93-108.

11

12 **Appendix:**

13 **Table 2: Components of organisational capability construct**

SN	Study/Literature	Organisational capability components							
		Resources	Integration	Governance and management system	Superior performance	Facilities	Task	Attributes	Ability
1	International Project Management Association (IPMA) (2016)	X	X	X					X
2	Sanchez (2004)	X	X						
3	Madhok (1997)	X	X	X					
4	Chandler (1990)	X	X	X		X			X
5	Day (1994)	X	X	X	X		X		
6	Mahoney and Pandian (1992)	X	X	X					X
7	Verona (1999)		X	X			X		
8	Stalk, et al (1992)		X	X	X				
9	Teece et al. (1997)	X			X		X		X
10	Barney (2002)	X	X					X	
11	Grant (1996)	X			X		X		X

12	Maier et al. (2012)	X	X						
13	Maritan (2001)	X			X		X		X
14	Nasution and Mavondo (2008)	X		X	X				X
15	Helfat and Lieberman (2002)	X			X				X
16	Helfat and Peteraf (2003)	X	X		X		X		X
17	HassabElnaby et al. (2012)	X					X		X
18	Winter (2003)		X	X			X		
19	Hall et al. (2011)	X	X						
20	Un and Montoro-Sanchez (2010)	X	X		X				X
21	Rauffet et al. (2016)	X		X	X				X
22	Ulrich and Smallwood (2004)	X	X						
	Total count in studies	19	15	10	10	1	8	1	12
	Proportion of total studies	86%	68%	45%	45%	0.05%	36%	0.05%	55%

1