

Hans VOORDIJK, Marc VAN DEN BERG

Taking practitioners' experiences seriously: Using phenomenological methodologies in construction research

© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract Phenomenological methodologies are fruitful to illuminate the meaning of human experiences but are rarely applied in construction research. These methodologies could reveal insights into the tacit and contextual dimensions of construction practice that are often overlooked by more traditional, quantitative approaches. Learning from practitioners' experiences is particularly appropriate for construction, where much expertise is embedded in everyday practice rather than explicit documentation. It is therefore argued that construction research can benefit from methodologies that attempt to more fully appreciate practitioners' experiences. As the lived experiences of construction professionals remain understudied, there is surprisingly little guidance for selecting any appropriate phenomenological methodology to tackle questions of concern. The objective of this paper is to offer such methodological guidance. Three phenomenological methodologies are discussed, and guidelines are provided for helping to select and apply one of them.

Keywords human experience, qualitative methodology, phenomenology, construction research

1 Introduction

Addressing the grand challenges of our field necessitates a commitment to taking people's experiences seriously. The construction industry is increasingly pressured to deliver solutions in response to climate change, resource scarcity and other challenges. For this reason, experimental and interventionist methodologies are particularly popular for their potential to developing solution concepts. Such

methodologies, however, tend to overlook practitioners' experiences. While solutions can be more effective when they take earlier lessons learned into account, the lived experiences of construction professionals have remained remarkably understudied.

Construction research can benefit from methodologies that attempt to more fully appreciate practitioners' experiences. This argument resonates with a recent call to increase the maturity of construction research by borrowing methodologies from outside our field (Leiringer and Dainty (2023)). In particular, construction management research focuses on people, processes, and organizations involved in delivering construction projects. These temporary projects require interorganizational collaboration between parties and they influence culture, communication, and adoption of digital technologies within construction. The need to understand these human and social dimensions of construction makes learning from lived experiences through phenomenological methodologies a relevant research approach.

The significance of learning from people's experiences is widely recognized in construction (Chang et al., 2008, He et al., 2021, Lindblad and Karrbom Gustavsson, 2021, Styhre and Gluch, 2010). Linked to ideas of experimentation and learning-by-doing, learning is essential for preventing mistakes and rework (Hartmann et al., 2010), development of project capabilities (Liu et al., 2024) and changing work practices (Kokkonen and Alin, 2015). Delving into the understanding of specific phenomena often requires knowledge of others' experiences, facilitating the extraction of fresh insights. For instance, when devising a treatment for a particular disease, it is highly informative to grasp the first-hand experiences of individuals grappling with the disease itself (Carel, 2016). Some even view learning from such experiences as the fundamental premise of all research (Neubauer et al., 2019).

Phenomenology deals with those experiences. The term refers to both a philosophy and a methodology. As disciplinary field within philosophy, phenomenology is the

Received Oct. 27, 2025; revised Apr. 21, 2026; accepted Apr. 29, 2026

Hans VOORDIJK (✉), Marc VAN DEN BERG
Civil Engineering and Management, University of Twente, 7500 AE
Enschede, Netherlands
E-mail: j.t.voordijk@utwente.nl

study of *phenomena*: the appearance of anything that presents itself to our conscious experience (Moran, 2002). This can be a real or imagined object or idea (Van Manen, 1997). As methodology, phenomenology explores a phenomenon from the perspective of those who have experienced it (Neubauer et al., 2019). It involves the study of a 'phenomenon' through individuals' lived experiences (Van Manen, 1997) – that is, the experience as it is lived through, prior to taking a reflective stance on it (Langdridge, 2007). Phenomenology is concerned with the meaning of such experiences, both in terms of *what* and *how* they are experienced. Examining those meanings can reveal a deeper meaning of the lived experiences (Lavery, 2003). This sets phenomenology apart from related methodologies, such as grounded theory: phenomenology seeks to understand the essence of lived experiences whereas grounded theory seeks to generate theory grounded in data. Rather than producing theories that explain processes, as the latter does, phenomenology is concerned with producing detailed accounts of certain experiences.

Given the significance of learning from practitioner's experiences in construction research, we argue that research in this field could benefit from phenomenological methodologies that attempt to more fully appreciate these experiences. The problem is, however, that a clear and detailed description of the methodological steps taken in the rare number of phenomenological studies in this field is often lacking. As a result, these methodologies are used relatively little in construction research and lived experiences remain understudied. The objective of this article is, therefore, to support researchers in this field in applying phenomenological methodologies by showing the necessary steps to conduct a phenomenological study.

This paper is structured as follows. First, two major phenomenological approaches are introduced that have informed several descriptive and interpretative methodologies. Second, drawing on this divide, three phenomenological methodologies used in construction research studies are classified: one descriptive and one interpretative methodology and a methodology that combines both approaches. Three examples of phenomenological studies in the field of construction research refer to each of the three phenomenological methodologies. Third, by providing guidelines to support researchers in selecting a certain methodology, the possibilities of applying phenomenology as research methodology in the field of construction research are outlined.

2 Approaches and methodologies

Contemporary phenomenological methodologies can be traced back to two major traditions or approaches: Edmund Husserl's descriptive and Martin Heidegger's

interpretative approach. These approaches are discussed first, after which three methodologies are presented that build on those approaches.

2.1 Two approaches in phenomenology

Descriptive phenomenology (Husserl, 1970) tries to identify those features that represent the true nature of a phenomenon, the so-called *universal* essences of an experience. A phenomenon can be reduced to its essence through two important methods: 'bracketing' and 'imaginative variation'. Bracketing implies that the researcher needs to set aside — or as in a mathematical equation bracket off — one's own beliefs, assumptions, preconceptions and expectations in order to fully focus on those features that define a certain phenomenon (Lopez and Willis, 2004). Identification of commonly perceived features through the method of 'imaginative variation' results in a generalizable description of the essence of a phenomenon (Gill, 2014). 'Imaginative variation' is performed by the researcher to determine which aspects of a phenomenon are essential and which ones accidental. As such, this method aims to achieve the essence of a phenomenon. Both methods, 'bracketing' and 'imaginative variation' help describe the essence of an experience.

Interpretative (also called hermeneutic) phenomenology rejects the idea of bracketing. Instead, it views prior knowledge, beliefs and pre-understandings as an inevitable and valuable part of interpreting lived experience. Interpretative phenomenology encompasses the interpretation to understand the meaning of these experiences. The approach can be traced back to Heidegger's school of thought. For Heidegger (2008, 191–192), actions and experiences of an individual cannot be separated from the world they are living in. Individuals' actions in and perceptions of reality are inherently shaped by the environment in which they exist (Lopez and Willis, 2004). He refers to the way human beings exist and act in their lifeworld as their 'being-in-the-world' (Aagaard, 2017). Human consciousness is, therefore, shaped by historically lived and culturally mediated experiences (Lopez and Willis, 2004). It is an inescapable part of 'being-in-the-world' (Aagaard, 2017). Human beings always have the notion of 'pre-theoretical' shared practices (Dias, 2006). Human experience of phenomena is, in this approach, inevitably intertwined with these pre-existing frameworks of understanding.

2.2 Three methodologies

Several phenomenological methodologies have been developed based on either the descriptive or interpretative approaches. Three methodologies that have been applied to construction settings are discussed here: a descriptive methodology by Moustakas' (1994) descriptive method-

ology, Smith's (2004) interpretative methodology, and Van Manen' (1997) methodology that borrows aspects of both descriptive and interpretive approaches. The use of three methodologies is illustrated with selected example studies within the field of construction (see Table 1 and Table 2). This review can help other construction researchers in selecting and applying one particular methodology and deal with their difficulties.

A descriptive methodology of phenomenology from psychology and used in construction research is the one of Moustakas (1994). In applying this methodology, researchers try to follow Husserl's thought by bracketing off any biases or preconceptions, irrespective where that comes from (common sense or with scientific evidence). The researcher adopting this methodology aims to provide a universal description of the essence of a lived experience. The research steps of Moustakas' methodology

(1994) are data collection through interviews and transcription, bracketing, 'horizontalizing', imaginative variation and universal description. Moustakas adds to Husserl's approach the concept of 'horizontalizing' or giving equal importance to statements made by the participants (Chance et al., 2020). The study on the experiences of African-American female engineers of Somerville-Midgett (2014) is a rare but comprehensive example of applying the steps of Moustakas' methodology in construction research (Table 2). Two other examples of studies using Moustakas' methodology in construction-related research are those of Ajayi et al. (2016) and Chance et al. (2020). The first applied Moustakas' methodology in a very general way to investigate the cultural influences that amplify waste in the construction sector. Chance et al. (2020) employed Moustakas' methodology to explore lived experience of engineering

Table 1 Three phenomenological methodologies

	Descriptive Moustakas	Interpretive Smith	Descriptive and interpretive Van Manen
Origin	Psychology	Psychology	Pedagogy
Major aim	Universal description of the essence of a lived experience	Constructing an understanding through double hermeneutics	Explaining lived experience by understanding the meaning of an experience
Epistemological assumptions	Bracketing: setting aside prejudgements, unbiased receptive presence	Making sense of a participant's meaning requires interpretation	Every description of a phenomenon entails an interpretation
Ontological assumptions	What appears in consciousness is absolute reality	Lived experience is based on individuals making meaning of their world	Lived experience is situated in the individual's lifeworld
Data collection	In-depth interviews with participants (no typical sample size suggested)	In-depth interviews with participants (small sample size)	Different methods: interviews, observations, biographies, diaries, journals etc. (no typical sample size suggested)
Data analysis	Transcription Reading written script Bracketing and listing relevant expressions through horizontalising Imaginative variation Individual and composite textural description Individual and composite structural description Universal description	Transcription Multiple reading or listening recordings Making notes Transforming notes into themes Thematic clustering Explaining most important themes in narrative account	Turn to a phenomenon of serious interest Investigate the experience as it is lived Reflecting on themes that reveal the essence of a phenomenon Describe phenomena through writing and rewriting Maintaining a strong and orientated relation to the phenomenon Balance research context by considering parts and whole

Table 2 Three construction phenomenological research studies

	Somerville-Midgett (2014) Moustakas	Van den Berg et al. (2024) Smith	Mathews (2021) Van Manen
Phenomenological methodology applied			
Illustrative case study of the methodology	Careers of African-American female engineers	Circular design experiences in construction	Impact of BIM on the professional in the workplace
Sample size	Six African-American female engineers	Ten frontrunning Dutch designers	Fourteen AEC professionals
Participant selection	Purposeful convenience sampling based on availability and ease of access of the participants	Purposively selected for their firsthand experience with circular design	Purposeful sample to ensure diversity in discipline, age, gender, seniority, and BIM experience.
Major themes identified	• Academic Achievement • Factors that Led to Persistence • Strong Support System • African-American Female Engineer Identity	• Proclaiming responsibility toward the Earth • Materializing future-oriented solutions • Dealing with a multi-headed monster • Orchestrating a design ecosystem	• Identity • Empowerment • Disarrangement. • Collaborative Practice
Methodological concepts uses	• Horizontalization • Imaginative variation • Textural and structural synthesis	• Exploratory notes • Emergent theme generation • Clustering and abstraction	• Mapping experience • Meaning of experience • Synthesis and theme development

educators implementing problem-based learning.

The interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) of Smith (2004) also stems from psychology. Instead of bracketing off the researcher's subjective viewpoint, applying this methodology implies recognizing that individuals cannot be free of their lifeworld (Neubauer et al., 2019). IPA focuses on a detailed examination of participants' understanding of their own experiences. IPA is characterized, first, as double hermeneutic, where the researcher endeavors to interpret the sense-making process of human beings dealing with their experiences (Smith, 2011). A second characteristic is ideography: it emphasizes a concentration on the specific rather than the universal. Thirdly, IPA is interrogative, aspiring to make theoretical contributions to a field by discussing results not on their own but in relation to the extant literature (Smith, 2004). Major steps of IPA are: data collection through interviews, data analysis through reading of the transcripts, creating emergent themes and clustering them. The study of Van den Berg et al. (2024) on the circular design experiences as lived by designers in the field of construction is a rare but comprehensive example of applying the methodology of Smith in the field of construction research (Table 2). Other example studies that applied Smith's IPA in construction-related research are those by Zakaria et al. (2018) and Krystallis et al. (2015). Zakaria et al. (2018) studied patterns of interaction between construction professionals making decisions on Industrialized Building Systems adoption; Krystallis et al. (2015) examined BIM in healthcare projects with the aim of developing a taxonomy of interactions between BIM and future-proofing approaches.

In his phenomenology from pedagogy, Van Manen (2016, 1997) combines elements from the descriptive and interpretive methodology. He also seeks the essence of a phenomenon but rejects the idea of bracketing (Beck, 2019). Van Manen believes that researchers should recognize their presuppositions because assumptions or prior knowledge of the researcher directs the enquiry. Van Manen suggests about six methodological 'suggestions' or 'phases' that may aid in conducting hermeneutic phenomenological research (Van Manen, 1997) (see Table 1 – Data analysis). These suggestions or phases should not be viewed as a rigid protocol to be followed step-by-step, but rather as methodological considerations to bear in mind during the research process. There is a dynamic interplay of these phases. A rare but comprehensive example of applying the methodology of Van Manen in the field of construction research is the study on the experiences of the adoption of Building Information Modeling (BIM) in the workplace by Mathews (2021) (Table 2). Two other examples of studies using van Manen's methodology in construction-related research are Grosse (2019) and Roche et al. (2022). Grosse (2019) explores his own experiences of running a construction company. Roche et al. (2022) employed Van Manen's

methodology to investigate the engagement of infection prevention and control specialists employed by the client during the development of new hospital buildings.

3 Selecting a methodology

Practitioners' experiences are widely recognized as essential learning sources in the construction management literature. Phenomenological methodologies can help explicating these experiences in a systematic manner. Since it can nevertheless be challenging to apply phenomenology in a research study, this article has outlined three different methodologies that could be used in future construction research. As such, we encourage construction researchers to consider applying these methodologies and offer practical suggestions to select a particular one.

In this selection process, construction researchers must ask themselves the following three questions. A first question is whether phenomenological methodologies at all may add value to their research project. If yes, a second question for construction researchers should be whether or not they think it is possible to view reality via bracketing one's everyday way of perceiving the world by setting aside prejudgments and predispositions toward the phenomenon. A third question concerns the practical conditions for applying phenomenology regarding the sampling strategy, data collection and analysis. Through elaborating these three different questions, this section offers construction researchers pointers to choose a particular phenomenological methodology.

3.1 Added value of a phenomenological methodology

A first question is whether phenomenological methodologies may be valuable for a certain construction research study. In general, selecting a methodology depends on the objective, type of research question, and the kind of knowledge to be generated.

Phenomenology offers new ways to learn from experiences by taking experience of practitioners seriously. Phenomenologists' overarching goal is to fully understand and appreciate an experience, rather than predict or explain behavior (Gill, 2014). Phenomenological studies generate rich, reflective accounts of how individuals experience and make sense of a particular phenomenon. The aim is not to change practice but to illuminate the essence of an experience as it is lived through. Unlike action research, which is intervention-based and aims to improve practice or solve a problem through cycles of action and reflection (Wisner et al., 1991), phenomenology remains non-interventionist. In action research, participants actively shape the research process, implement actions, and evaluate outcomes; data collection is tied to organisational change rather than to uncovering the

meaning structure of lived experience. Thus, while both may involve interviews, action research seeks practical improvement, whereas phenomenology seeks deep experiential understanding.

Phenomenology is also distinct from ethnography (Oluka, 2025). Ethnography focuses on studying cultures, behaviors, and social contexts, often through months of fieldwork, participant observation, and immersion in daily life of a group. Its interest lies in cultural patterns and collective practices. In contrast, phenomenology does not aim to understand a culture but rather the personal, subjective experience of individuals (Sanders, 1982). Ethnography focuses on what people do, whereas phenomenology studies what people experience and how they attribute meaning to those experiences. Phenomenological methodologies can serve as an alternative to what Ahiaga-Dagbui and Martek (2023) describe as the ‘ubiquitous use of questionnaire surveys’ in construction research for doing perception-based research. In line with their call to move away from such questionnaires, phenomenological studies of perceptions may provide better insights of actual practices and how there are experienced firsthand (Sokolowski, 2000).

Phenomenological methodologies may particularly add value in relation to the issue of learning within and across construction projects. Project processes typically exhibit a temporary and unique nature, characterized by non-routine elements. In such temporary organizations, knowledge acquired from experiences during one project may not naturally translate into insights for other projects or contexts unless deliberate efforts are made to capture and share them (Williams, 2008). With a focus on learning from people’s experiences, phenomenological methodologies can add value by collecting and disseminating relevant experiences in a systematic way. By learning from these experiences, mistakes can be avoided (Love and Smith, 2016). This, in turn, is particularly appropriate for an industry that relies heavily on tacit knowledge, such as construction. By using descriptive phenomenology, common ‘routine’ features or the essences of practitioners’ project experiences can be identified.

Learning in and across construction projects, however, also occurs in a particular organizational and cultural context of previous projects and the wider organization (Hartmann and Dorée, 2015; Newell et al., 2006). People’s experiences will be colored by these specific contexts and lifeworlds. By using interpretative phenomenology, the significance individuals attribute to their lived experiences can be understood within the framework of organizational and cultural contexts. Moreover, project management, traditionally viewed as primarily technical, is increasingly recognized as requiring a broader understanding of management practices to ensure successful project outcomes (Crawford et al., 2006). Instead of using abstract models, learning is seen as a central enabler to change project management practices (Kokkonen and

Alin, 2015). Phenomenology can play an important role in being such an enabler: it allows learning from the experience of others.

Phenomenological approaches in general offer valuable opportunities for deepening construction management research by uncovering how individuals experience and interpret their work environments. The experience of collaboration in project teams is a central theme in this field of research. Given construction’s reliance on multi-organizational collaboration, phenomenology reveals how practitioners experience fragmentation and (dis-) trust across organizational boundaries. Phenomenology also supports the exploration of practitioners’ lived experiences when they are learning new skills. Safety is another longstanding and central theme in construction that lends itself well to phenomenological studies, for example by exploring workers’ lived experiences of ‘near-miss situations’ and practitioners’ perceptions of risk. Phenomenology also helps to understand how the adoption of new technologies such as AI, BIM and robotics changes work experience. The topics identified - including collaboration, learning, safety, and technology adoption - are inherently experiential and therefore well-suited to phenomenological approaches.

3.2 Bracketing one’s everyday way perception or not

A second question relates to the construction researchers’ own worldviews. They should ask themselves whether they believe it is possible to view reality via bracketing one’s everyday way of perceiving the world. The need for bracketing of presuppositions and beliefs when doing phenomenological construction research is relevant in selecting either a descriptive or an interpretative phenomenological methodology. Bracketing is essential to the methodology of Moustakas but less relevant in those of Van Manen and Smith. Reflecting on one’s epistemological and ontological assumptions will help researchers in selecting a methodology.

By using descriptive phenomenology, common features, or universal essences, people have experienced about a phenomenon are identified. To identify these essences of construction project management, requires researchers to temporarily suspend their own assumptions and preconceptions in order to focus on the participants’ experience of a phenomenon (Lopez and Willis, 2004).

Bracketing allows construction researchers to critically reflect on their own presuppositions and interpretations that may influence their understanding of a certain phenomenon. By suspending these biases, construction researchers can focus on the phenomena as they are presented by the construction project participants, without imposing their own theoretical or conceptual frameworks. This contributes to the robustness and validity of the findings, as it assists in ensuring that the description of the phenomenon is based on the participants’ own experiences

and meanings. Trying to identify these common features, or universal essences, in construction research argues for a descriptive phenomenology.

By focusing on bracketing, setting aside researcher assumptions, and describing experiences as given, descriptive phenomenological methodologies help construction research to capture the essence of practitioners' lived experiences. Because descriptive phenomenology clarifies "what it is like" for practitioners, it is ideal when construction research aims to understand practice at the human experience level, rather than seeking explanations or interventions.

Alternatively, researchers' own worldviews may be more aligned with interpretative traditions. Each project, for instance, possesses unique characteristics that result in context-specific perceptions and actions. As such, in terms of Heidegger, a construction practitioner or engineer can be perceived as being "thrown" into a specific project. This "thrownness" stands in contrast to the detached analysis of an observer (Turk, 2001). When practitioners engage in reflective thinking, they disconnect themselves from this "thrownness" within a given project context, with its unique characteristics. Engineers could experience "blindness" if they solely rely on conceptual models of either the product or process they are involved in, without acknowledging this "thrownness" (Turk, 2001). This "thrownness" argues for an interpretative phenomenology with the double hermeneutics where researchers interpret the interpretations of certain construction practitioners (Pietkiewicz and Smith, 2014, Smith, 2004). Researchers document their reflections in writing and subsequently engage in further reflection and writing, establishing ongoing, iterative cycles aimed at developing more comprehensive and nuanced analyses.

Interpretative phenomenology explores the sense-making and context-embedded interpretations of construction work. It emphasizes interpretation rather than pure description and tries to understand how practitioners make sense of their construction environment. This approach is better suited to construction studies when researchers acknowledge the complex social and organizational dynamics that shape these contexts, where "meaning" influences actions.

3.3 Sampling strategy, data collection and analysis

The third question relates to the practical conditions of the research project. Selecting a particular phenomenological methodology, whether it is rooted in the descriptive or interpretative tradition, finally depends on the intended sampling strategy, and the data collection and analysis possibilities.

Different methodologies propose different numbers of participants. In general, phenomenological methodologies employ relatively small sample sizes. The more insights participants share about their experience, the smaller the

size needed (Beck, 2019). Moustakas and Van Manen do not suggest a typical sample size. Many studies that follow the IPA methodology have samples of 5–10 participants, with Pietkiewicz & Smith (2014, 9) arguing that even just one single participant "may well be justified if rich and meaningful data has been collected." While all methods employ individual interviews, Van Manen also suggests, when applicable, the inclusion of group interviews and observations (Gill, 2014). His approach also accepts multiple interviews with each participant to facilitate interpretation too. Van Manen's approach is also the only one that allows a collaborative interpretation with a research seminar or group (Beck, 2019).

Moustakas' descriptive phenomenology seeks to depict an experience universally, as one shared by many. The interpretative phenomenology of Van Manen methodology is a suitable option when exploring commonalities of experiences across several participants. If a researcher aims to elucidate individual experiences, then Smith's methodology of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) would be more appropriate. In contrast to Moustakas' general structure of the phenomenon being studied, Smith's IPA focuses on microanalysis of each individual's experience (Beck, 2019).

In terms of data analysis, the different methods put different accents. Van Manen differentiates between essential and incidental themes while Smith et al. (2009) categorized themes in superordinate and subordinate themes. Moustakas uses free imaginative variation. Typically, generalizations are confined to specific groups, with all methodologies prioritizing rich qualitative narratives over quantity of data. Additionally, each approach incorporates some form of thematic analysis to unravel the experiences under scrutiny (Gill, 2014). Practical conditions of any planned research project can, accordingly, guide researchers toward any specific phenomenological methodology.

Based on the three questions discussed in this section, five standards are defined for conducting phenomenological construction research (Table 3).

4 Conclusions

Construction research studies tend to overlook the *how* and *what* of experiencing certain phenomena. Descriptive or interpretative phenomenological methodologies can add value to this field by enabling learning from practitioners' lived experiences. We discussed the phenomenological methodologies of Moustakas, Smith, and Van Manen, all of which have been applied to construction phenomena. These three methodologies have in common that they each attempt to fully appreciate and grasp any relevant lived experiences in a systematic way. This is specifically appropriate for the construction industry, which relies heavily on tacit knowledge. The extent to

Table 3 Standards for conducting phenomenological construction research

Standard 1 — Take lived experience as the primary object of research.

Standard 2 — Use phenomenology only when the research question is experiential.

Phenomenological research must explicitly focus on how phenomena are experienced by participants, rather than on opinions or abstract variables.

Standard 3 — Explicitly state the phenomenological tradition followed.

Standard 4 — Discuss positionality explicitly in the methodology section.

Researchers should acknowledge their philosophical assumptions (descriptive or interpretive) and reflect on how their worldviews (bracketing or interpretation) shape their research.

Standard 5 — Data must reveal rich first-person descriptions of experience.

Primary data collection (e.g. interviews) should be designed to encourage concrete descriptions, focus on situations, practices, and meanings and avoid generalisations.

which assumptions and beliefs must and can be set aside (through bracketing) is critical when choosing between either a descriptive or an interpretative phenomenological methodology. Bracketing is essential to the methodologies of Moustakas' approach but less relevant in Van Manen's approach and not in Smith's IPA. Descriptive phenomenology is appropriate when the intended research outcome of a construction study is to identify universal essences of participants' experiences. Interpretative phenomenology, alternatively, acknowledges the Heideggerian "thrownness" in a given context and embraces context-specific perceptions of any practitioners involved. The choice for a certain phenomenological methodology also depends on, and influences, the conditions for the sampling strategy, data collection and analysis. Our three considerations and practical pointers offer guidance to deal with the challenge of selecting a particular phenomenological methodology for future construction research. Doing so will enable construction researchers to shed new light on important phenomena by taking the experiences of construction practitioners seriously.

Competing Interests The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data availability statement Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a creditline to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Aagaard J (2017). Introducing postphenomenological research: A brief and selective sketch of phenomenological research methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*: QSE, 30(6): 519–533
- Ahiaga-Dagbui D D, Martek I (2023). Fast and frugal research: the pervasive use of questionnaires in construction management research. In: Leiringer R, Dainty A, eds. *A Research Agenda for Construction Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 221–242
- Ajayi S O, Oyedele L O, Akinade O O, Bilal M, Owolabi H A, Alaka H A, Kadiri K O (2016). Reducing waste to landfill: A need for cultural change in the UK construction industry. *Journal of Building Engineering*, 5: 185–193
- Beck C T 2019. *Introduction to Phenomenology: Focus on Methodology*. London: Sage Publications
- Carel H (2016). *Phenomenology of Illness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Chance S, Duffy G, Bowe B (2020). Comparing grounded theory and phenomenology as methods to understand lived experience of engineering educators implementing problem-based learning. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 45(3): 405–442
- Chang C H, Lin Y C, Tserng H P (2008). Distilling and managing engineers' experience in construction projects using a pattern approach. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(3): 209–223
- Crawford L, Morris P, Thomas J, Winter M (2006). Practitioner development: From trained technicians to reflective practitioners. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(8): 722–733
- Dias W (2006). Heidegger's resonance with engineering: The primacy of practice. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 12(3): 523–532
- Gill M J (2014). The possibilities of phenomenology for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(2): 118–137
- Grosse H (2019). An insider's point of view: Autoethnography in the construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 37(9): 481–498
- Hartmann A, Davies A, Frederiksen L (2010). Learning to deliver service-enhanced public infrastructure: Balancing contractual and relational capabilities. *Construction Management and Economics*, 28(11): 1165–1175
- Hartmann A, Dorée A (2015). Learning between projects: More than sending messages in bottles. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(2): 341–351
- He Q, Xu J, Wang T, Chan A P (2021). Identifying the driving factors of successful megaproject construction management: Findings from three Chinese cases. *Frontiers of Engineering Management*, 8(1): 1–12

5–16

- Heidegger M (2008). *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Husserl E (1970). *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press
- Kokkonen A, Alin P (2015). Practice-based learning in construction projects: a literature review. *Construction Management and Economics*, 33(7): 513–530
- Krystallis I, Demian P, Price A (2015). Using BIM to integrate and achieve holistic future-proofing objectives in healthcare projects. *Construction Management and Economics*, 33(11–12): 890–906
- Langdrige D (2007). *Phenomenological Psychology: Theory, Research and Method*. London: Pearson Education
- Laverty S M (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: A comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(3): 21–35
- Leiringer R, Dainty A (2023). Construction management research: A community at a crossroads? In: Leiringer R, Dainty A, eds. *A Research Agenda for Construction Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1–20
- Lindblad H, Karrbom Gustavsson T (2021). Public clients ability to drive industry change: The case of implementing BIM. *Construction Management and Economics*, 39(1): 21–35
- Liu Y, Houwing E J, Hertogh M, Bakker H (2024). Project-based learning principles: Insights from the development of large infrastructure. *Frontiers of Engineering Management*, 11(3): 501–515
- Lopez K A, Willis D G (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(5): 726–735
- Love P E, Smith J (2016). Error management: Implications for construction. *Construction Innovation*, 16(4): 418–424
- Mathews M (2021). *A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Study into the impact of BIM on the Social Dynamics of the AEC professional in the workplace*. Dissertation for the Doctoral Degree. Dublin: Technological University Dublin
- Moran D (2002). *Introduction to Phenomenology*. New York: Routledge
- Moustakas C (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications
- Neubauer B E, Witkop C T, Varpio L (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(2): 90–97
- Newell S, Bresnen M, Edelman L, Scarbrough H, Swan J (2006). Sharing knowledge across projects: Limits to ICT-led project review practices. *Management Learning*, 37(2): 167–185
- Oluka A (2025). Phenomenological research strategy: Descriptive and interpretive approaches. *F1000 Research*, 14(725): 1–16
- Pietkiewicz I, Smith J A (2014). A practical guide to using interpretative phenomenological analysis in qualitative research psychology. *Psychological journal*, 20(1): 7–14
- Roche F, Hare B, Curtis K, Price L (2022). Management of infection prevention and control in the development of new hospital buildings—effective stakeholder engagement during design and construction. In: *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. IOP Publishing, 032007
- Sanders P (1982). Phenomenology: A new way of viewing organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3): 353–360
- Smith J, Flowers P, Larkin M (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. London: Sage Publications
- Smith J A (2004). Reflecting on the development of interpretative phenomenological analysis and its contribution to qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1(1): 39–54
- Smith J A (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1): 9–27
- Sokolowski R (2000). *Introduction to Phenomenology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Somerville-Midgett K (2014). *An Engineering Journey: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study of African-American Engineers' Persistence*. Dissertation for the Doctoral Degree. Lynchburg: Liberty University
- Styhre A, Gluch P (2010). Managing knowledge in platforms: boundary objects and stocks and flows of knowledge. *Construction Management and Economics*, 28(6): 589–599
- Turk Ž (2001). Phenomenological foundations of conceptual product modelling in architecture, engineering and construction. *Artificial Intelligence in Engineering*, 15(2): 83–92
- Van den Berg M, Schraven D, De Wolf C, Voordijk H (2024). Materializing responsible futures: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of circular design experiences in construction. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 51: 92–104
- Van Manen M (1997). *Researching Lived Experience*. Ontario: The Athlone Press
- Van Manen M (2016). *Phenomenology of Practice. Methods of Building Meaning in Research and Phenomenological Writing*. New York: Routledge
- Williams T (2008). How do organizations learn lessons from projects—And do they? *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 55(2): 248–266
- Wisner B, Stea D, Kruks S (1991). Participatory and action research methods. In: Zube E H, Moore G T, eds. *Advances in Environment, Behavior, and Design*. Boston MA: Springer, 271–295
- Zakaria S A S, Gajendran T, Skitmore M, Brewer G (2018). Key factors influencing the decision to adopt industrialised building systems technology in the Malaysian construction industry: an inter-project perspective. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, 14(1–2): 27–45