

Stakeholder perceptions of the Considerate Constructors Scheme in UK Construction

- Article type: paper
 - Date text written or revised = May 2020
 - Number of words in main text = 4991
-

Stakeholder perceptions of the Considerate Constructors Scheme in UK Construction

Author 1

- Greg Watts, BSc (hons), PgCert, FHEA, EngD, MRICS
- School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, UK,

Author 2

- Anthony Higham, BSc (hons), PgCert, MSc, PhD, MRICS, MCIQB, FHEA
- School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, UK,

Author 3

- Ali Alotaibi, BSc (hons), PhD
- College of Engineering, Shaqra University, Dawadmi, Ar Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Greg Watts, G.N.Watts@Salford.ac.uk

Stakeholder perceptions of the Considerate Constructors Scheme in UK Construction

Abstract

The Considerate Constructors Scheme was introduced in 1997 to improve the image of the UK construction industry and has grown dramatically with over 6,000 construction and infrastructure projects registered valued at £43 billion. Whilst evidence exists that the industry's image is improving, there is little research into the CCS perceptions of those tasked with the schemes delivery. It is not clear if contractors engage with CCS willingly as proactive participants or succumb to the requirements of clients to simply win work. The aim of this paper is to gain an insight into contractor perceptions of CCS to ultimately aid clients and contractors in their delivery of the scheme, and ensure the CCS delivers the maximum benefit for stakeholders. A case study of a single infrastructure project registered with the CCS is utilised. All CCS documents were critically analysed, and interviews conducted with clients, the contractor and residents. The findings contribute to an unexplored area of research and reveal the motivations behind why a contractor engages with the CCS, the advantages and drawbacks in the scheme's current enactment, and key lessons on how the CCS could be administered and delivered more effectively for the benefit of all stakeholders.

Keywords chosen from ICE Publishing list

Keyword 1; Contracting.

Keyword 2; Corporate Responsibility

Keyword 3; Sustainability

Stakeholder perceptions of the Considerate Constructors Scheme in UK Construction

1 1. Introduction

2 The importance of the engineering and construction industry to the economies of most countries
3 cannot be underestimated. .Despite this importance the industry has always suffered from a
4 negative public imagine and a bad reputation. The fact that almost all projects are undertaken in
5 the highly visible public arena and cause some sort of short term inconvenience cannot help
6 this, but then neither can the industry's disruptive nature and resource exploitative use of raw
7 materials (Barthorpe, 2010).It has been argued therefore, that the construction industry has
8 ample reason to look for methods of improving their reputation by becoming more
9 environmentally and socially responsible (Murray and Dainty, 2009). To this end, numerous
10 initiatives have been delivered with the aim of improving the image of the engineering and
11 construction sector, all arguably resulting in differing degrees of success. One such initiative
12 that began life from inside of the construction industry itself is called the Considerate
13 Constructors Scheme (CCS). This is a voluntary scheme aimed at improving the image of the
14 construction industry and is now widely adopted on thousands of UK engineering and
15 construction projects every year. The CCS claim to have made a positive difference to the
16 industry's image with numerous case studies released as evidence of the positive impacts the
17 Scheme brings (CCS, 2019). However, despite such an impressive take up and well publicised
18 benefits for all involved, there is relatively little research on the benefits CCS brings or on the
19 wider perceptions of CCS amongst construction professionals. Therefore, it is unknown if clients
20 and contractors engage with the requirements of the scheme willingly as proactive partners or
21 are simply abiding by requirements placed upon them to simply win work. This could mean the
22 CCS is not being delivered and enacted as effectively as it could be to take advantage of its
23 wide market adoption. Gaining an insight into the perceptions and interpretations of CCS
24 practitioners, contractors and clients, can help achieve a better understanding of the Scheme.
25 This greater understanding will ultimately aid clients and contractors in their delivery of the
26 Scheme, and ensure the CCS delivers the maximum possible benefit for all stakeholders.

27

28 2. The image of the UK construction Industry

29 The engineering and construction industry encompasses the design, construction, maintenance
30 and demolition of assets, buildings, engineering and infrastructure works. It accounts for

31 approximately 6% of the UK economic output with an annual value of over £113bn (Rhodes,
32 2019). The benefits of the industry are also wider, in that the work undertaken improves the very
33 fabric of society (Glass and Simmonds, 2007). Irrespective of such benefits, the construction
34 industry has always been negatively perceived, with positive success stories often overlooked
35 yet the slightest of environmental or societal transgressions are widely publicised (Barthorpe,
36 2010). In this respect the industry does not help its own cause as construction operations often
37 result in increased dust, noise, water and air pollution (Glass and Simmonds, 2007). In addition
38 to the adverse health impacts, a reduction in the quality of life of stakeholders local to projects,
39 an increase in anti-social behaviour around sites and an increase in site traffic related
40 congestion can all contribute to wider economic loss (Glass and Simmonds, 2007). Such
41 impacts then lead to negative publicity which in turn attracts hostility from stakeholders (Curran
42 et al., 2019) and has ultimately resulted in a decades old image problem the industry needs to
43 address (Murray et al., 2010).

44

45 Improving the image of construction has been described as central to the industry's future
46 growth (Petter, 2019). Numerous attempts have been employed to address construction's
47 image problem, both from outside the industry and from within. For example, legislation has
48 been introduced by the Government such as the Local Democracy, Economic Development and
49 Construction Act (2009) to put in place procedures to help resolve disputes and improve the
50 financial treatment of the construction supply chain (Hughes et al., 2015). Such legislation is
51 designed and implemented with the intention of forcing organisational behaviour change by
52 introducing requirements enforceable in a criminal court. Another example of legislation
53 applicable to the construction industry is that of The Public Services (Social Value) Act (2012).
54 The Social Value Act compels public bodies to compare the social value contractors can bring
55 to projects in addition to the traditional criteria of time, cost and quality – thereby encouraging
56 contractors to become involved in more social value activities (Watts et al., 2019).

57

58 Initiatives arguably launched from both within and external to the construction industry include
59 the idea of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Whilst no widely agreed definition of CSR
60 has been reached, CSR has been broadly described as an umbrella term encompassing an

61 organisation's legal, ethical, economic, and voluntary strategies and practices that have an
62 impact upon on society and the environment (Watts et al., 2016). Whilst evidence exists of
63 businesses from hundreds of years ago embracing the principles of CSR, the modern advent of
64 CSR in the general business domain can be traced back to the publication of the book 'Social
65 Responsibilities of the Businessman' (Bowen 1953). It is argued that business prosperity should
66 result in more philanthropic activity and that wealthy individuals had a responsibility to give back
67 to society (Bowen, 1953). CSR then grew as a concept over the proceeding decades to an item
68 high on the agenda of most businesses and stakeholders (Carroll, 2015). A survey on the CSR
69 practices of 4,900 organisations across 49 countries reveals that CSR has been widely
70 embraced throughout all industries by numerous leading organisations as a part of their core
71 business identity (KPMG, 2017).

72

73 The construction industry has however, been described as lagging behind others when it comes
74 to embracing CSR (Glass, 2012). The CSR survey further reveals that the number of
75 construction companies reporting on CSR has fallen from 2015 and that engineering and
76 construction companies are less likely to report on CSR than companies in other industries such
77 as financial services, chemical and the automotive industry (KPMG, 2017). It is argued this is
78 due to the fragmentation of the construction industry as well as the industry's short-term focus
79 and reactive attitude (Alotaibi et al 2019). However, within the UK construction industry
80 examples of CSR practices have been discussed with initiatives such as allowing employees
81 fully paid work days in which they can volunteer at charitable organisations (Loosemore and
82 Bridgeman, 2018) and providing work experience placements to those wishing to gain
83 construction experience (Morton et al., 2014). Whilst it cannot be said that all businesses
84 operating within the construction industry engage with and report upon CSR, such practices are
85 becoming more commonplace. This is beneficial for all parties involved, as whilst there are
86 acknowledged widespread benefits to intended recipients of CSR activities, there are also
87 numerous benefits to be experienced by the organisation(s) responsible. These include an
88 enhanced organisational reputation, appeal as a workplace of choice for potential staff (Du et
89 al., 2010) and increasing both job satisfaction and staff retention (Brammer at al., 2007) as well
90 as improved financial performance through being an organisation of choice for customers

91 (Saeidi et al, 2014). It can be argued that all these benefits are directly achieved from an
92 organisation adopting CSR practices, thereby helping to improve the organisations image
93 amongst stakeholders.

94

95 Finally, initiatives have been launched from within the construction industry itself with the aim of
96 improving its image. The most notable of these is arguably the Considerate Constructors
97 Scheme. The CCS shares many principles with CSR such as attempts to address the negative
98 industry image and improve the often troublesome relationship between the construction and its
99 stakeholders (Glass and Simmonds, 2007). One of the driving forces of the CCS is the idea that
100 to improve the image of construction, CSR practices need to be implemented at a project level
101 (Curran et al., 2019).

102

103 **3. The Considerate Constructors Scheme**

104 Founded in 1997 the CCS is an independent body created by the construction industry itself
105 with the aim of improving the image of construction through the implementation of a voluntary
106 code of considerate practice (Barthorpe, 2010). The primary aim of the CCS is to improve the
107 image of construction through competent management, environmental awareness and
108 'neighbourliness' (CCS, 2019). Indeed, it is argued that CCS plays an important role in
109 promoting the industry's positive image and helping raise standards year on year (Petter, 2019).
110 You can register with the CCS as a construction project, a contractor, a supplier or as a
111 professional service organisation. At a fundamental level the CCS is all about creating a link
112 between the site and the local stakeholders. If such stakeholders witness practices they deem
113 not in keeping with a modern construction industry, they can quickly report this to the CCS who
114 can take action, usually through the designated Scheme Monitor (SM). A project registered with
115 the CCS will be visited at set intervals by the SM who assesses the project using their own
116 discretion, and awards the site a score against a standard 'code of considerate practice'.

117

118 The SM's are arguably key to the success of the CCS, and usually consist of construction
119 professionals who want to help maintain and improve industry standards. To this end an annual
120 awards event is held to reward and acknowledge the highest scoring projects of that year. With

121 awards for the most considerate projects in several categories. In 2018 there were over 6,000
122 construction projects registered with the CCS, with the total project value exceeding £43 billion
123 (CCS, 2019). It is also important to note that the scheme gets no government funding, is a non-
124 profit organisation and is financed purely from the fees paid from contractors voluntarily signing
125 up (Murray et al., 2010).

126

127 As the purpose of the CCS is to improve the image of the UK construction industry and
128 encourage engagement with both the local community and wider stakeholders (Curran et al.,
129 2019) the Scheme has been described as a perfect framework to address societal concerns and
130 attempt to rectify the negative image of the industry (Glass and Simmonds, 2007). Companies
131 that sign up are compelled to consider the impact their practices have on staff, contractors and
132 the environment. Such a framework is governed by the scoring of a project against five key
133 headings: appearance, community, environment, safety and workforce. There is a minimum
134 expectation against each heading with the score of 5 representing 'compliance'. The Scheme
135 Monitors (SM) are responsible for visiting each project and initially award an indicative score
136 against each heading. These indicative scores are then revised as further visits are held. Finally
137 a validated score is provided. The scoring mechanism has matured and evolved since its initial
138 conception with the most recent iteration in January 2019. The purpose of this is to ensure the
139 CCS remains the vanguard of standards and at the forefront of encouraging, fairly scoring and
140 rewarding both company and site based innovation. Since 2019 scores against each heading
141 are out of 9, giving a total of 45. At the discretion of the SM five additional points are then
142 available to be awarded for the five best examples of innovation as put forward by the project
143 team.

144

145 Murray et al., (2010) explore the actions of the construction team who successfully delivered
146 'the most considerate construction site' as awarded at the annual CCS award ceremony in
147 2009. It was found that examples of considerate behaviour by contractors can include
148 maintenance of surrounding vegetation, implementation of temporary speed limits, rearranging
149 the programme of works so noisy and dusty activities occur in school holidays, reducing waste
150 and pollution, and maintaining high levels of communication with neighbours (Murray et al.,

151 2010). The research also revealed that innovative and unique CCS practices are often the result
152 of a leadership team that encourage and support creative solutions and activities proposed by
153 those on site. It should however, be added that the CCS requirements are purposefully broad in
154 nature to serve more as a platform for each site to base their actions and behaviours on.
155 Therefore, contractors who are larger and more experienced with the CCS typically do not need
156 the CCS to drive their CSR behaviours. Such contractors may tend to have innovative and
157 creative initiatives more readily available when compared to smaller contractors who do not
158 have much experience with the CCS. This is where the broad nature of the requirements are
159 advantageous as they allow all companies and sites to participate. Murray et al., (2010) go
160 further and report that a proactive rather than passive site management team is needed in
161 order for a construction project to achieve a high CCS score. Overall it is concluded that the
162 CCS is helping to reduce the negative impact of construction works and therefore helping to
163 improve the image of the general construction industry (Murray et al., 2010). A single company
164 case study of different live construction projects found that a more structured relationship
165 between the construction site and main stakeholders, such as that facilitated by the CCS, is
166 needed to enhance the image of construction (Glass and Simmonds, 2007).

167

168 An in-depth study by Curran et al (2019) explores the CCS perceptions of UK construction
169 contractors and finds that perceived advantages include the raising of general industry
170 standards, improving of relationships with stakeholders and an increasingly positive image of
171 the industry as a whole. It has also been argued that CCS is a driver of contractors improving
172 their waste management practices (Adeji et al., 2018). Reported disadvantages to the CCS
173 include the costs associated with the registration and implementation of changes needed, the
174 subjectivity and inconsistency of inspectors and scores the sites receive and the weighting
175 applied to activities the contractors believe will not yield a high social and environmental impact
176 for the time and resources required (Curran et al., 2019). A previously reported disadvantage is
177 also that some construction professionals with responsibility for delivering the CCS activities on
178 a site level have stated it has been easy to achieve the minimum standards (Murray et al., 2010)
179 and therefore it could be argued that the CCS does not push those contractors hard enough
180 who are only aiming to achieve the minimum standards. However, despite the increasing

181 numbers of projects signing up to the CCS, there is limited research into the perceptions of the
182 scheme amongst construction professionals and wider stakeholders. Therefore, it is unknown if
183 clients and contractors engage with the requirements of the CCS willingly as proactive partners
184 or are simply abiding by requirements placed upon them to simply win work. The aim of this
185 paper is to understand the motivations and key stakeholder perceptions of the CCS on a project
186 level. Gaining an insight into the perceptions and interpretations of CCS practitioners,
187 contractors and clients can help achieve a better understanding of the CCS and address the
188 current gap in research. It may be that the CCS is not being delivered and enacted as effectively
189 as it could be to take advantage of its wide market adoption and so therefore, a greater
190 understanding will ultimately aid clients and contractors in their delivery of the scheme, and
191 ensure the CCS delivers the maximum possible benefit for all stakeholders.

192

193 **4. Method**

194 A single case study was identified of a construction project valued at £1million located in the
195 North East of England. The site is on the outskirts of a major city in a semi-rural area, set back
196 from the main road adjacent to farm land. A case study is a widely used analysis method in the
197 business and management fields and allows for an intensive and detailed exploration of a
198 particular phenomena (Bell et al., 2019) However, one noted limitation of the case study design
199 is a lack of generalisability as what is identified and investigated in one case may not occur in
200 another (Walliman, 2016). However, in this instance, as many construction projects are currently
201 registered with the CCS or have been previously, and case study research has been used in
202 some of the CCS research conducted to date (see Glass and Simmonds, 2007; Murray et al.,
203 2010) it was determined that a case study design would enable a deep and insightful
204 investigation into how CCS was perceived by individuals from the same project.

205

206 As part of the case study an analysis of all documents relating to the CCS on the project were
207 reviewed. These documents included the original CCS requirements issued by the client during
208 procurement, the CCS information submitted by the successful contractor as part of their tender,
209 the elements of the signed construction contract that related to the CCS, and finally all
210 contractor documents involved in the delivery of the CCS requirements such as invoices,

211 timesheets, meeting minutes, and completed scoring mechanisms. The scope of the document
212 review was included any document that mentioned or had indirect reference to the CCS
213 required or delivered on the project. Nine semi-structured interviews were conducted with
214 different project stakeholders as part of the case study. This allowed questions to be asked that
215 focused on relevant topics whilst allowing flexibility to pursue any emerging lines of enquiry that
216 were of interest to the research (Bell et al., 2019). For the client's consultant this consisted of
217 the Project Manager (PM) and Quantity Surveyor (QS). Interviews were also conducted with the
218 contractor's staff including the PM, QS and Construction Manager (CM). Two interviews were
219 also conducted with site operatives (SO) from two different sub-contractors who worked on the
220 project and two interviews with local residents. One resident was a farmer who owned land
221 adjacent to the project and another was the owner of a small local business. All interviewees
222 had direct responsibility for delivering an aspect of the CCS on the project, or were directly
223 impacted by the project, and so were best placed to inform the research.

224

225 Narrative analysis was used both as a method of discussion and as a tool for analysis allowing
226 the interview questions to be framed from the perspective of requesting stories from
227 interviewees so that their motivations and perceptions can be elicited (Griffin and May, 2011).
228 Narrative analysis essentially encourages a participant to be the teller of stories allowing them
229 to recall events, and is a particularly good method of understanding how change is interpreted
230 by individuals within that organisation and the culture of the organisation itself (Bell et al., 2019).
231 Narrative analysis encourages the grouping together of relevant interviewee responses to allow
232 trends and patterns to be identified and people's thoughts, stories and opinions to be explored
233 allowing deeper meanings to be understood (Loosemore and Bridgeman, 2018).

234

235 **5. Results**

236 The critical analysis of the key CCS documents revealed interesting findings and also formed
237 the basis of some interview questions. The documents consisted of the original CCS
238 requirements issued by the client to potential contractors, the tender return of the successful
239 contractor, and all contractor documents involved in delivering the CCS including invoices,
240 timesheets, meeting minutes, and completed scoring records. The project contract containing all

241 contractually agreed CCS requirements was also reviewed. Interestingly the details included in
242 the originally issued project requirements, those returned by the contractor in their price, and
243 those contained in the project contract were somewhat sparse and where information was
244 included, it was rather vague. For example the client's tender invitation documents consisted of
245 four sentences stating the achievement of an 'Excellent' status was a high priority, the
246 contractor should achieve an average score of 40 in all CCS audits, and that the contractor
247 should include a sum to help this to be achieved. The successful contractor's tender return
248 consisted of a lump sum cost to deal with all CCS requirements but no further breakdown.
249 Analysis revealed this amounted to 2.91% of the overall price submitted for the project. The
250 contract simply contained the client's CCS tender information and the contractor's lump sum
251 price.

252

253 From a review of these initial documents it was impossible to see what CCS activities were
254 expected by the client and what had been included for by the contractor. The meeting minutes,
255 invoices and contractor CVR reports however, gave a more detailed insight into the CCS
256 activities conducted. Firstly, it is important to note that the final cost of all activities directly
257 related to the CCS requirements was almost double what the contractor had originally budgeted
258 for (4.85%). As the contract was based on the NEC Option A the price the contractor had
259 attributed to the CCS element was their own to manage, and additional costs couldn't be
260 claimed for. This was raised during the interviews with the client's PM and QS who were both of
261 the opinion it was the contractors responsibility to include a sum in the contract to ensure a
262 score of 40 was achieved at each visit, and that no requests for additional monies due to
263 increased costs incurred would be entertained. Interviews with the contractor QS revealed that
264 the CCS scores contractually required on the project were achieved, and that a Compensation
265 Event (the contractual mechanism by which increased costs are claimed by the contractor) had
266 been applied for and rejected. The interview with the contractor PM revealed that due to the
267 ambiguity of the CCS requirements at pre-tender stage, a figure was included in their tender
268 price without any real consideration or calculation of what could be achieved within this amount.
269 It could therefore be argued that the resulting increase in costs from this lack of thought is
270 ultimately the contractors fault, and a lesson learnt the hard way. However, this also illustrates

271 the very real financial ramifications that can occur from the lack of CCS understanding. Arguably
272 this lack of understanding is driven from the top down and the client in this instance is ultimately
273 benefiting as they received the project CCS score they desired, but at a reduced cost as the
274 contractor had to foot the bill for the CCS requirements that went above and beyond the figure
275 they had initially included.

276

277 A review of the timesheets, meeting minutes and score sheets revealed that initiatives on the
278 project included extensive site signage including CCS specific 'hunt for hazards' and 'spot the
279 job' posters, a bug and hedgehog 'hotel' to encourage local wildlife, the cleaning and trimming
280 back of overgrown foliage around the site, tokens from a local dry cleaners allowing site
281 operatives to get site clothing cleaned locally for free, and plenty of registers for recording local
282 spend on materials, carbon dioxide involved in site traffic and commuting to and from site, and
283 the amount of electricity used on site. The scoring documents revealed in meeting the
284 requirements of the client (to achieve a score of 40) the project received consistently high
285 scores. This was confirmed by the client's PM who viewed the project as a success and was
286 satisfied with all CCS activities and the scores received. However, the perspective of the
287 contractor QS was that the CCS was not a success due to the vast overspend incurred. It was
288 interesting to reveal the different areas of focus for judging the Scheme as successful, with the
289 client focussing on the scores achieved (which ultimately reflect the positive impacts on both the
290 site staff and the wider local community) and the contractor focussing on the financial
291 overspend. This illustrates how the ambiguity of CCS information at the start of a project can
292 lead to different perspectives on CCS success at the end of the project.

293

294 The motivation for the client's PM to implement the CCS on the project was due to requests
295 from the client themselves that the project do all it can during the construction phase to
296 maximise benefit to the local community and minimise the chance of local disruption resulting in
297 negative opinions of the project. CCS was viewed by the client as the perfect vehicle to achieve
298 this. The perceptions of CCS by the client's PM and QS were that it is a good and worthwhile
299 scheme. Despite their obligation to implement it from the client, they believed CCS in general

300 and on the project in question specifically, to be worthwhile and made a positive difference to
301 both the site operatives and local community.

302

303 When motivation was discussed with the contractor, the PM and QS agreed that they only
304 registered the project with the CCS due to requirements of the client. They also went further and
305 argued that the CCS was not focused enough on improving one aspect of construction, and
306 they didn't believe in the positive benefits CCS could bring and so therefore only paid lip service
307 to the requirements. Ensuring minimum engagement to allow efforts to be focused on the 'actual
308 construction work'. Both the contractors QS and PM also agreed that their perceptions of the
309 Scheme were influenced by the failed CE they submitted in which they sought to claim the
310 additional CCS expenses incurred. The initial misunderstanding of how the costs associated
311 with delivering the CCS requirements would be administered had ultimately resulted in a lack of
312 engagement with the CCS from the contractor's management team. The contractors CM
313 however, had a slightly different view, as they believed that the CCS could be a 'catalyst for
314 wider change' referring to both the immediate differences that could be seen on site and the
315 improvements that could be made across the industry as a whole. Although the CM did follow
316 this up with several responses on how in its current form and focus the CCS is 'lost' and is not
317 taken seriously by most contractor staff and site operatives. The CM argued that the CCS is
318 largely full of 'silly niceties...and all about beautification nonsense' and that drawing attention to
319 the project with signage is the worst thing can be done due to the increased risk of anti-social
320 behaviour. Plus, all the additional signage requirements on site, due to the amount of registers
321 and notices now required, has led to important site messages becoming lost in a 'daily barrage
322 of nonsense'. However, this was the first time the CM had worked on a CCS registered project
323 and admitted to feeling unsupported by the wider contractor management team in the delivery of
324 the CCS requirements. Despite such negativity, under the banner of CCS the contractor did
325 introduce several initiatives on site that achieved and surpassed the contractual CCS
326 requirements. Positive impacts on both site personnel and the wider community were also
327 discussed reinforcing findings in the literature that CCS adoption leads to positive impacts
328 (Curran et al., 2019; Adeji et al., 2018) and builds on this understanding by introducing the idea

329 that benefits are still achieved with the introduction of the CCS, even when the contractor does
330 not fully embrace the scheme.

331

332 The interviews with the SO's confirmed this, in that they felt on projects registered with the CCS,
333 there were many more factors to be aware of, and much more 'intrusion' into their actions on
334 site. Both SO's listed several aspects of CCS on the current project that they saw as positive
335 and several they saw as negative. Overall both SO's had a more negative than positive
336 perception of the CCS, with the reasons largely due to the additional intrusion and scrutiny they
337 felt they were under, and again, much like the PM and QS, the SO's stated that they only
338 complied with the minimum of CS requirements. Interestingly however, both SO's reported that
339 some of their experiences of the CCS were due to how it had been delivered on site, with
340 inconsistent and changing requirements as the site team would decide upon what approach and
341 initiatives they would take, only to change their minds at a later date. Both SO's also believed
342 the PM, QS and CM had negative perceptions of the CCS. This perhaps reveals more about the
343 management style required in the successful delivery of CCS objectives, with a clear and
344 consistent approach required with communication of the initiatives as important to the initiatives
345 themselves. Such findings resonate with arguments in the literature that successful CCS
346 adoption is driven by proactive rather than passive site management (Murray et al., 2010).

347

348 When the two local residents were interviewed, it was found they had quite different perceptions
349 of the construction project. Firstly, neither resident directly discussed the CCS, and seemed
350 unaware of the scheme and its intentions. They had only good things to say about the project
351 despite the noise during the day time that directly impacted upon the farmers operations, and
352 the fact the farmer was unable to use the field closest to where the project was located due to
353 noise and dust generated during the works. The interviews revealed that despite having no
354 knowledge of the CCS itself, the farmer's positive perceptions of the work were due to actions
355 that were undertaken by the contractor as a result of the CCS. The second local resident
356 interviewed, a local business owner, was not happy with the project as they saw no local benefit
357 to the immediate works, despite acknowledging the importance of the infrastructure asset itself.
358 The local business owner was also inconvenienced by congested traffic and speed restrictions

359 (albeit begrudgingly admitting the slower roads were safer). Also, somewhat interestingly, in
360 agreement with the contractors CM, the local residents felt the attention drawn to the project
361 with increased signage was unsightly for the area, and would increase anti-social behaviour.
362 This was despite the fact that no anti-social behaviour was ever recorded on the project during
363 its duration.

364

365 **4. Conclusions**

366 This paper identified a research gap in existing construction industry literature regarding how
367 the Considerate Constructors Scheme is perceived by those involved with and impacted by its
368 delivery. A case study of a single construction project was undertaken which consisted of
369 analysis of all the tender, contractual and commercial CCS project data, and nine semi-
370 structured interviews conducted with the project stakeholders. The analysis of all contractual
371 and commercial CCS data revealed vague requirements in both the tender documentation and
372 contract had led to a misunderstanding between the client's consultants and contractor resulting
373 in the contractor under-pricing the work involved in the CCS delivery. This led to disagreements
374 on site and left the contractor feeling disengaged from the CCS.

375

376 The interviews also revealed that whilst the client's PM and QS believed in the benefits CCS
377 could bring to both the specific project and the wider construction industry, the contractor staff
378 were more negative towards the CCS. This could explain why in this instance, the contractor
379 engaged with CCS as a requirement to win work, and once the project had begun attempted to
380 complete the minimum stipulated requirements. However, it is important to note that this was
381 the first experience of CCS for many of the contractor staff, and due to a misunderstanding
382 between the contractor and client's consultants the contractors costs to successfully deliver the
383 CCS (as contractually required) were far more than originally anticipated and priced for.
384 Nevertheless, if this was to be replicated nationwide across all CCS registered projects with
385 contractors engaging in the same way, the positive impacts arising from delivery of CCS
386 initiatives nationwide may not be as effective as they could be. Where positive perceptions of
387 the CCS did exist amongst the contractor's PM, QS and CM, it was felt the CCS was misguided
388 and needed more focus on single issues of importance, with clear unaccompanied

389 communications so that all resources could be focussed for maximum positive impact. However,
390 the research also revealed that despite negative CCS contractor perceptions resulting from a
391 lack of CCS understanding the Scheme did result in positive experiences for both the site team
392 and local community. The interviews with local residents also revealed that their perceptions of
393 the construction project differ. Whilst neither resident was aware of the CCS, the resident who
394 was directly impacted by a CCS initiative had a favourable perception of the construction
395 project. However, the second resident interviewed was inconvenienced by the construction
396 works and felt the increased signage (due to the CCS) may attract anti-social behaviour by
397 drawing attention to the site and so had a negative perception of the project. This was despite
398 no record of anti-social behaviour actually occurring. However, the resident's concerns were to
399 do with the works themselves, and not the CCS. Therefore it could be speculated that the CCS
400 actually served to reduce some of the resident's concerns over the project. It could therefore be
401 concluded that even in instances where the CCS is not fully understood or embraced by the site
402 team; positive impacts (or less negative impacts) are still felt both within the project and in the
403 local community. Going forward therefore, clear communications from the client to the
404 contractor would assist with contractor understanding, which would in turn enable a more
405 effective delivery of the CCS initiatives, potentially minimising the negative perceptions felt
406 amongst contractor staff and maximising the potential positive impacts of the CCS for all
407 stakeholders.

408

409 A limitation of this study is the use of only a single case study as it limits the generalisability of
410 the results. The project was also of a smaller value, in a semi-rural location and the contractor
411 was inexperienced in CCS delivery. A more experienced contractor, a higher value project and
412 in an urban setting may not experience the same restraints and issues as highlighted in this
413 study. However, as the CCS can be used on all schemes regardless of size and location, and
414 by all contractors regardless of experience, it is felt this paper offer an interesting insight into
415 previously underexplored areas of CCS delivery.

416 One recommendation of this paper is for further research into the perceptions of the CCS
417 across a range of stakeholders over multiple case studies, to see if the perceptions identified in
418 this case study can be generalised. Secondly it is recommended that those enforcing CCS use

419 reconsider how contractor requirements are communicated. The CCS does bring benefits to all
420 stakeholders even when the contractor shows little understanding and willingness to fully
421 engage. Therefore if engagement could be increased amongst contractors, it would be
422 interesting to see if and by how much the positive CCS benefits can be improved for all
423 stakeholders, and in turn continue to improve the reputation of the wider construction industry.

424

425 **References**

- 426 Alotaibi, A., Edum-Fotwe, F., & Price, A. D. (2019). Critical barriers to social responsibility
427 implementation within mega-construction projects: The case of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
428 *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1755.
- 429 Adeji, S., Ankrah, N., Ndekugri, I and Searle, D. (2018). Sustainable Construction and
430 Demolition Waste Management Comparison of Corporate and Project Level Drivers. In Gorse
431 and Neilson (Eds) Procs 34th Annual ARCOM Conference, 3-5 September 2018, Belfast, UK,
432 Association of Researchers in Construction Management.
- 433 Barthorpe, S. (2010). Implementing corporate social responsibility in the UK construction
434 industry. *Property Management*, 28(1), p.4-17.
- 435 Bell, E., Bryman, A, and Harley, B. (2019). *Business Research Methods*. 5th Ed, Oxford
436 University Press. Oxford.
- 437 Bowen, H. (1953). *Social Responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- 438 Brammer, S., Millington, A. & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate
439 Carroll, A. (2015), *Corporate Social Responsibility: The centrepiece of competing and*
440 *complementary frameworks*. *Organisational Dynamics*. 44, p.87-96.
- 441 Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) (2019). About Us. Accessed at:
442 <https://www.ccscheme.org.uk/ccs-ltd/what-is-the-ccs2/>
- 443 Curran, M., Spillane, J and Clarke-Hagan. (2019). The Considerate Constructors Scheme.
444 Improving the Image of Construction, But How Considerate Are They to Contractors? In Gorse
445 (Ed) Procs 35th Annual ARCOM Conference, 2-4 September 2019, Leeds, UK, Association of
446 Researchers in Construction Management.
- 447 Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. and Sen, S. (2007). Reaping relational rewards from

448 Glass, J. (2012). The state of sustainability reporting in the construction sector. *Smart and*
449 *Sustainable Built Environment*. 1(1), p87-104.

450 Glass, J and Simmonds, M. (2007). "Considerate Construction": case studies of current
451 practice. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*. 44, 2, pp131-149.

452 Griffin, A, and May, V. (2012). Narrative analysis and interpretative phenomenological analysis.
453 In, Seale, C, *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd Ed. Sage Publications. London.

454 Hughes, W., Champion, R. and Murdoch, J. (2015). *Construction Contracts Law and*
455 *Management*, 5th Ed. Routledge, Oxon.

456 KPMG. (2017), *The Road Ahead; The KPMG Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting*
457 *2017*. KPMG Global Sustainability Services 2017.

458 Loosemore, M and Bridgeman, J (2018). The Social Impact of Construction Industry Schools-
459 Based Corporate Volunteering. *Construction Management and Economics*. 36(5), p243-258.

460 Morton, P., Goodwin, A., Kellond, A., Close, K, and, Collins, J. (2011). Investing in the Future
461 *Construction Workforce: CSR and Work Experience Placements*. *International Journal of*
462 *Construction Management*, 11(2), p.49–58.

463 Murray, M., and Dainty, A. (ed.) (2009), *Corporate Social Responsibility in the Construction*
464 *Industry*. Taylor and Francis, London.

465 Murray, M., Forbes, D, and Mason, S. (2010). Considerate Constructors Scheme: Glenfarg
466 Water Treatment Works. *Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers*. *Engineering*
467 *Sustainability*, p1-9.

468 Petter, M. (2019). Putting Civil Engineering at the Centre of Improving Construction's Image.
469 *Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers*. *Civil Engineering*, Vol. 179. p55.

470 Rhodes, C. (2015). *Construction Industry: statistics and policy*. Nr 01432. House of Commons
471 Library. www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/sn01432.pdf

472 Saeidi, S., Sofian, S., Saeidi, P., Saeidi, S.P. and Saaeidi, S. (2014). How does
473 social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human*
474 *Walliman, N. (2016). Social Research Methods*. Sage Publications. London.

475 Watts, G., Dainty, A. and Fernie, S (2016). The Influence of Public Sector Procurement Practice
476 in Shaping Construction CSR. Procs 2016 Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors COBRA
477 Conference, September, 2016.

478 Watts, G., Dainty, A. and Fernie, S. (2019). Paradox and Legitimacy in Construction: how CSR
479 Reports Restrict CSR Practice. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation*.
480 37(2), p231-246.