

Accepted Manuscript

Between a rock and a hard place: managers' work–family issues in the construction industry and how they compare to workers

Mélanie Trottier, Mélanie Lefrançois

[Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management](#) ISSN: 0969-9988

Article publication date: 1 October 2024

DOI to official published version: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-04-2023-0387>

Trottier, M. and Lefrançois, M. (2024), "Between a rock and a hard place: managers' work–family issues in the construction industry and how they compare to workers", [Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management](#), Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-04-2023-0387>

© 2024, Emerald Publishing Limited. This AAM is provided for your own personal use only. It may not be used for resale, reprinting, systematic distribution, emailing, or for any other commercial purpose without the permission of the publisher.



Between a rock and a hard place: Managers' work-family issues in the construction industry and how they compare to workers

Journal:	<i>Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management</i>
Manuscript ID	ECAM-04-2023-0387.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Construction, Management, Organization, Questionnaire survey, Interview
Abstract:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

Purpose - Set in the construction industry, this study aims to better understand managers' work-family conflict (WFC) and their challenges regarding work-family (WF) issues, and to compare site workers' and managers' perceptions of work-family balance (WFB) practices in this male-dominated industry.

Design - Using a mixed-method participatory design (qual-QUAN), this study was conducted in Quebec's (Canada's) construction industry. Semi-structured interviews with managers (n=17) and workers (n=20) were conducted, along with a survey of managers (n=692) and workers (n=789).

Findings - Triangulation of results shows that managers have significantly higher levels of WFC than workers and that the factors contributing to their WFC are similar (e.g. heavy workload, unsupportive organizational culture). The results suggest a discrepancy between workers' and managers' perceptions. While managers report offering a wide variety of WF measures, many of which stem from collective agreements, workers report little use of those measures.

Originality - These results contribute to the literature by characterizing issues managers themselves face in the construction industry. The study also discusses managers' support of workers in the context of their own organizational, interpersonal and individual constraints. Finally, this study contributes by paralleling data from managers and workers in the industry regarding WFB measures and policies.

1
2
3 **Practical implications** - Results highlight the contrast between availability and
4 accessibility of WF measures in the construction industry and question both managers'
5 and workers' possible lack of awareness of WFB measures and practices.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Keywords** Construction industry, managers' work-family conflict, organizational culture,
14 work-family practices, workplace support
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **1. Introduction**

23
24 80% of companies in Quebec's construction industry have less than 5 employees. This
25 unionized male-dominated job sector is a challenging environment for balancing work and
26 family. Among other obstacles, employment and working conditions are affected by labour
27 shortages, seasonal work, and heavy work. Collective agreements, regulations and laws
28 governing the four sectors of the industry are managed by a regulatory body, Quebec's
29 Construction Board, also referred to as CCQ. Parents in construction jobs report high
30 levels of work-family conflict (WFC) (Lefrançois & Trottier, 2022). As observed in other
31 industries, managers' support plays an important role in reducing workers' WFC and
32 consequent health issues through supportive organizational culture (Galardo and Trottier,
33 2022; Lefrançois and Trottier, 2022). However, construction managers themselves face
34 challenges balancing their work and family roles, partly because they often are both
35 owners and workers and thus exposed to the same working conditions as their employees.
36 Moreover, they frequently act as intermediaries between workers and the industry's
37 regulatory bodies regarding wages, schedules, social benefits, etc. Although managers'
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 support is identified as key in facilitating WFC for workers in this industry, little is known
4
5 about their own work-family (WF) issues and well-being. The importance of focussing on
6
7 this population is twofold: 1) to better understand managers' needs regarding their own
8
9 WF issues; and 2) to better support managers in their roles as key resources for workers
10
11 through the WF culture they convey and their application of existing policies and practices.
12
13 Thus, the underlying question of the present study is as follows: What is the WF reality of
14
15 managers in the construction industry, and how do they compare with workers in the same
16
17 industry? In response to this need for research on managers whose role is central to this
18
19 industry, this paper describes the WF issues they face in Quebec's construction industry.
20
21 Specifically, it focuses on targeted results from a wide study that provide a better
22
23 understanding of managers' WFC, their challenges regarding WF issues, and a
24
25 comparison of workers' and managers' perceptions of WF practices in the construction
26
27 industry.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Consequently, this study contributes to the WFC literature by elucidating WF issues
35
36 managers themselves confront in the construction industry, thereby highlighting the
37
38 complexity of management in an organizational structure involving many actors (workers,
39
40 trade unions, employers' association, CCQ, clients). The study also discusses how
41
42 managers' supportive role toward their workers is influenced by organizational,
43
44 interpersonal and individual constraints. This study makes a significant contribution by
45
46 paralleling data regarding managers' and workers' perceptions of WF measures and
47
48 policies in the industry. Finally, the study discusses possible courses of action with respect
49
50 to the WF practices already available and those required in the industry. Therefore, this
51
52 study may be of interest to various audiences related to the issues experienced within this
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 industry, whether they are policy makers, trade unions, employers' organizations,
4
5 managers, or workers.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **2. Literature review** 12 13

14 WFC occurs when work and family responsibilities are incompatible due to tension, time
15 or expected behaviours (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This conflict can be bidirectional,
16
17 interference can occur both from work (i.e. work-to-family conflict) and from family (i.e.
18
19 family-to-work conflict). There is a consensus in the literature on the main determinants of
20
21 WFC. Work characteristics such as overload, lack of flexibility, atypical working hours and
22
23 a non-family-oriented culture are well-recognised determinants of WFC (Lippel et al.,
24
25 2011; Mihelic et al., 2014). Unsurprisingly, WFC is particularly important in sectors with
26
27 these conditions, such as the construction industry. Traditional gender roles also influence
28
29 how individuals navigate the work-family interface and the challenges they may face in
30
31 their workplace (Williams et al. 2013). In Quebec (Canada) for instance, despite advances
32
33 fostered by provincial family policies regarding fathers' involvement in childcare, it remains
34
35 primarily women who take on these responsibilities (Statistics Canada, 2020). The
36
37 gendered composition of the workplace also influences the level of work-family support
38
39 received (Minnotte et al. 2010; Williams et al. 2013). In that sense, very few studies
40
41 investigated work-family balance (WFB) in male-dominated environments, but it is known
42
43 that these contexts have workplace cultures and working conditions that complicate WFB
44
45 for both women and men (Minnotte et al. 2010; Williams et al. 2013). More specifically, in
46
47 male-dominated sectors such as construction, engineering, and technologies, men and
48
49 women who take on caring responsibilities deviate from gender norms where the ideal
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 worker is an unencumbered men always available for work, with a stay-at-home spouse
4
5 (Acker, 1990; Williams et al. 2013).
6
7

8 The Quebec construction industry encapsulates these dimensions with a strong male
9
10 culture reflected exacerbated by chronic challenged to attract and retain women in the
11
12 industry despite a rise in girls' interests for vocational training in construction trades
13
14 (Quebec Women Status Council, 2013). It is noteworthy to mention the low representation
15
16 of women in this field. Indeed, the presence of women is progressing slowly (2.13% in
17
18 2018; 3,27% in 2021). With the sector still predominantly male-dominated (Quebec
19
20 Construction Board, 2022), WFC is an even more sensitive issue that requires attention.
21
22
23
24

25 *2.1 Work-family conflict (WFC) and the role of managers in the construction industry*

26
27

28 The construction industry combines multiple sources of WF obstacles, such as working
29
30 and employment conditions influenced by seasonal work, labour mobility, variable
31
32 employment relationships (e.g. subcontracting), and atypical schedules (Ministry of the
33
34 Family, 2016). The academic literature on WF issues in the construction industry is sparse
35
36 and most empirical studies on the subject have been conducted abroad, particularly in
37
38 Australia. Furthermore, several of these studies are primarily concerned with engineers,
39
40 office employees or other professionals (Aghimien et al., 2022; Lingard & Francis, 2005;
41
42 Lingard & Francis, 2007; Lingard et al., 2010a; Lingard et al., 2010b; Lingard et al. 2012;
43
44 Soundarya Priya et al., 2023). In addition, as Adah et al. (2023)'s literature review shows,
45
46 of the 15 articles selected for their narrative analysis, only one (1) published study focused
47
48 on on-site workers. In this study, Chan et al. (2020) administered a survey to manual
49
50 workers including building, civil engineering, and electrical and mechanical (E&M).
51
52 Results highlighted workplace support as the paramount issue. Furthermore, a
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 considerable impact of WFB on workers' perceived health and safety was noted. Adah et
4 al. (2023) did not report any studies on managers in the construction industry. Similarly,
5
6 al. (2023) did not report any studies on managers in the construction industry. Similarly,
7
8 Tijani et al. (2022)'s review of the literature identifies four (4) publications (out of 40)
9
10 focusing on on-site workers however none on managers. It should be noted that these
11
12 workers (engineers, professionals, architects, etc.) have more regular work schedules
13
14 than on-site workers and that the national contexts of the construction industry have
15
16 characteristics different from Quebec. For example, the Australian normal work week is 6
17
18 days for a total of 56 hours per week (Lingard et al., 2007), compared to 5 days in the
19
20 Quebec construction industry for a total of 40 hours per week, with exceptions for some
21
22 occupations (Quebec Construction Board, 2023). The province of Quebec is also often
23
24 compared to Scandinavian countries' WF social policies, including parental leaves for
25
26 mothers and fathers, as well as subsidised daycare, whereas other Canadian provinces
27
28 and Anglo-Saxon countries are more liberal in their policies to support working parents
29
30 (Tremblay, 2014). Nevertheless, many relevant parallels can be drawn from these studies
31
32 to examine specific work-family issues in the Quebec construction sector.
33
34
35
36
37

38 According to this literature, demands from work are directly related to WFC (Lingard &
39 Francis, 2005; Lingard & Francis, 2007; Lingard et al., 2010a; Lingard et al., 2010b;
40
41 Lingard et al. 2012; Turner, 2013; Turner & Mariani, 2016), and the number of hours
42
43 worked is crucial, as this affects the ability to fulfil tasks associated with family roles
44
45 (Lingard et al., 2010a). Irregular work hours are another factor (Lingard & Francis, 2005)
46
47 and stem from demands that vary depending on the phases of a project (Turner et al.,
48
49 2009), as well as the weather for outdoor construction sites (Lingard & Turner, 2015).
50
51 Studies examining the consequences of WFC in the construction industry show that it is
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 strongly related to emotional exhaustion (Lingard & Francis, 2005; Lingard & Francis,
4 2006). However, tangible support from the supervisor (e.g., accommodation of family
5 responsibilities) reduces the negative impact of WFC on emotional exhaustion (Galardo
6 & Trottier, 2022; Lingard & Francis, 2006).
7
8
9

10
11
12 In addition, culture and beliefs within construction firms may affect WFC (Galardo &
13 Trottier, 2022; Lingard & Turner, 2015; Turner et al., 2009). Expectations of long working
14 hours and peer pressure cause employees to prioritize work over family (Turner et al.,
15 2009). Few studies have investigated WFC in male-dominated blue-collar work settings,
16 but it is known that these contexts have cultures complicating the reconciliation of work
17 and family spheres for both women and men (Heymann, 2016).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *2.2 WFC in the construction industry through a conservation of resources perspective*

28
29

30 The emergence of WFC in the construction industry can be understood through Hobfoll's
31 conservation of resources theory (1989) whereby the numerous constraints in this job
32 sector constitute demands threatening workers' resources such as time and energy. The
33 Conservation of Resources theory, as outlined by Hobfoll (1989), offers a valuable lens to
34 understand the depletion of managers' time and energy due to high work demands, which
35 in turn creates a strain between their work and family lives. This theory posits that an
36 individual's foremost objective is to safeguard, accumulate, and prevent the loss of
37 personal resources like time and energy, which are critical to avoid stress. Resources, in
38 this context, are defined as any objects, personal attributes, conditions, or sources of
39 energy that are valuable to an individual (Hobfoll, 1989). When individuals experience a
40 loss or a threat to their resources, it leads to tension. Resources, on the counterpart, allow
41 for reducing, protecting against, or compensating for these work demands. In this regard,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the literature on WFC identifies managers as an important resource helping workers to
4 cope with work demands (Hammer et al. 2011). However, while the literature on WFC
5 clearly identifies the importance of managers in reducing workers' WFC, little is known
6 about managers' WF situation. Few studies have focused on the work-family (WF) conflict
7 of managers (for examples, see O'Neill et al., 2009; Haar et al., 2018). Yet, recognized
8 determinants of work-family conflict such as workload and other job demands are also
9 encountered by managers in organizations (Wallin et al., 2014), suggesting that they too
10 experience issues of work-family conflict (WFC). To our knowledge, no study has
11 paralleled the WF issues of managers with those of workers, but it is clearly established
12 that supervisor support is an important resource to reduce workers' perception of WFC
13 (Kossek et al. 2011). This may increase demands for managers and affect their resources
14 for their own WFC, an understudied question. Managers in Quebec's construction industry
15 face two types of challenges. First, they are in dual jobs, especially in small and medium-
16 sized organizations, often being simultaneously workers and managers. Secondly, their
17 position in this atypical industry implies that they have to manage workers while
18 simultaneously considering the many other actors (e.g. union, subcontractors, clients) and
19 regulatory mechanisms governing the industry.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Family-supportive organizational culture is recognised as being a vital resource in
44 balancing work and family, and managers are important conveyors of this culture (Thomas
45 & Ganster, 1995; Hammer & al., 2007; Mihelic & Tekavcic, 2014). This can be expressed
46 through facilitating WF workplace measures and practices, which are key resources to
47 reduce WFC (Brough & O'Driscoll, 2010). In addition, managers are crucial in
48 implementing and applying such measures and practices to support WFC via the culture
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they embody or the social support they provide (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). While less
4
5 numerous, studies specific to the construction industry identify supervisors and managers
6
7 as responsible for providing facilitating conditions for workers, in terms of both physical
8
9 and mental health (Xie, Luo, & Lia, 2022). They also emphasize the importance of
10
11 managers in WF issues, stressing their supportive role (Talukder & al., 2018; Galardo &
12
13 Trottier, 2022) or competencies they should possess (Arditi & al., 2013). However, this
14
15 literature frames managers as an independent variable intervening in WF issues without
16
17 considering their own WF situation. To have a fuller portrait of WF issues in this industry,
18
19 it is also important to examine managers' own WF demands and resources.
20
21
22

23
24 Rooted in a resource-based model (Hobfoll, 1989), this study delves into managers'
25
26 situation regarding WF issues. More specifically, it documents demands contributing to
27
28 their own WFC, and resources they can draw from, and compares managers' perceptions
29
30 of available WF resources to those of workers.
31
32
33

3. Methods

34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41
42
43 Using a sequential mixed-method participatory design (qual-QUAN), this study was
44
45 initiated at the request of partners from Quebec (Canada) construction industry and
46
47 governmental representatives.
48
49

50
51 The participatory component of the research design was supported by a steering
52
53 committee composed of academic and non-academic partners to co-construct all phases
54
55 of the study (research questions, access to recruitment lists, validation of data collection
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tools, and interpretation of results). A total of nine (9) meetings took place between 2017
4
5 and 2023. This approach aims at ensuring that research participants' needs and views
6
7 are anchored in the research process and supports integrated knowledge mobilization
8
9 (Jull et al. 2017). Among partners, Quebec's Construction Board (CCQ) played a specific
10
11 role in the data collection by providing access to its database. Semi-structured interviews
12
13 were initially conducted to understand the experienced WF issues. Based on these
14
15 interviews, a survey was then developed in order to verify the findings on a larger sample
16
17 with the aim of generalizing them. Data collection took place during fall 2018 (interviews)
18
19 and winter 2024 (online survey).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *3.1 Interviews*

28
29
30 Interviews were first conducted with 17 managers (14 men, 3 women) working in all
31
32 sectors of the industry (residential, industrial, institutional/commercial, and civil
33
34 engineering and roads) and in companies with less than 5 employees (n=5), between 6
35
36 and 50 employees (n=9), and over 50 employees (n=3). Interviews were also conducted
37
38 with 20 on-site workers (14 men, 6 women) but those results are not emphasised in this
39
40 paper (see Lefrançois and Trottier, 2022). The interviews were conducted in person
41
42 whenever possible, otherwise they were conducted via videoconference and lasted about
43
44 60 minutes .
45
46
47
48

49 Managers' interview guide included questions regarding organization of their work, WF
50
51 difficulties experienced, strategies to cope with WFC, WF measures or practices available
52
53 in their environment, as well as their own WF needs. Participants chose the time and place
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for the interviews. Transcripts of the semi-structured interviews were analysed
4
5 thematically (Paillé & Mucchielli, 2016). The authors independently coded a sample of the
6
7 corpus to identify the main themes participants raised. Comparison and integration of both
8
9 vertical codings resulted in a joint coding tree regarding main dimensions of WF issues.
10
11 Drawing on Miles and Huberman's qualitative analysis approach (1994), our aim was to
12
13 map a variety of relevant dimensions and observe their similarity, complementarity or
14
15 contrast, regardless of the number of occurrences.
16
17
18

19
20 This classification was then applied to the entire corpus while allowing for new themes to
21
22 emerge using qualitative analysis software nVivo (version 11). Analysis was validated with
23
24 the project steering committee and interpreted considering data from the literature review.
25
26
27
28
29

30 *3.2 Survey*

31
32
33 Following the interviews, an online survey (available in English and French), was
34
35 conducted. An email invitation was sent to 20,000 workers and 10,000 managers,
36
37 randomly selected among all workers and managers within established criteria (sectors,
38
39 region, etc.) to ensure the sample was representative of the industry. To have a
40
41 representation of a maximum of women, the online survey was sent to all women
42
43 registered in the CCQ database, with a follow-up email 2 weeks later. Statistical analyses
44
45 (descriptive, correlations, and regression analysis) were carried out using SPSS (25).
46
47
48
49

50 The survey measured the following variables (on 5-point Likert scales). The survey
51
52 questions are presented in appendix A.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Work-family culture* was assessed with 2 dimensions of Lyness, Thompson, Francesco,
4 and Judiesch's scale (1999), translated into French and adapted. The first dimension (3
5 items) measured the culture related to managerial support ($\alpha=.78$). A sample item is "In
6 this organization, employees can easily combine career and family." The second
7 dimension (3 items) measured organizational expectations regarding time worked ($\alpha=.82$).
8 A sample item is "Employees are expected to put their jobs before their families."
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 *Work overload* was measured with the single item developed for the study: "I feel like I
18 work too hard at work".
19

20
21
22
23 *Work-family conflict*. The "Conflict Scale" from Netemeyer et al. (1996) was translated
24 and adapted to measure work interfering with family (WFC) (5 items, $\alpha=.92$ for managers
25 and $\alpha=.91$ for employees) and family interfering with work (FWC) (5 items, $\alpha=.90$ for
26 managers and $\alpha=.84$ for employees). A sample item is: "The amount of time my job takes
27 up makes it difficult to fulfil family responsibilities."
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35 *Work-family measures*. All WF measures identified in the interviews, the literature and the
36 collective agreements were included in the survey to identify the measures used (workers'
37 survey) and the measures offered (managers' survey) regarding WF issues. 17 measures
38 were identified (e.g. sick leave, possibility of choosing the work site, etc.).
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46 *Control variables*. Age, gender, children or dependents, salary, employment sector,
47 region, company size, and income were measured.
48
49
50

51 52 53 54 *3.3 Managers' sample* 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 692 managers, 48% of whom are male, in all sectors and in all regions of the province of
4
5 Quebec responded to the survey (response rate of nearly 7%). Most respondents were
6
7 between 35 and 54 years old (46%), and 55% of respondents reported an annual salary
8
9 between \$40k and \$80k. Interestingly, less than half had children or dependents (42%),
10
11 indicating that the interest in completing the survey was not solely related to respondents'
12
13 personal WF experience. While representative of the population in terms of industry
14
15 characteristics, it is noteworthy that companies with 5 or fewer employees were under-
16
17 represented (41% in the sample vs 82% in the industry). Possibly smaller firms have
18
19 fewer resources, thus limiting managers' ability to take time to complete a survey.
20
21
22
23

24 *Insert Table I here*

25 26 27 3.4 Workers' sample

28
29
30 As for the workers, 789 (84% men) representing all sectors and regions completed the
31
32 survey (response rate nearly 4%). Most were between 25 and 44 (79%), 60% reported
33
34 working 40 hours weekly and 61% reported an annual salary between 40k and 80k. 57%
35
36 had one or two children, while 43% had 3 children or more.
37
38
39

40 *Insert Table II here*

41 42 43 44 45 46 4. Results

47
48
49 The triangulated results of the interviews and survey are presented in such a way as to
50
51 bring out the richness of the insights gained. Minimal information is provided about
52
53 interview participants (source of data, sample, job sector) to protect confidentiality as per
54
55 institutional ethical board standards (certification #1985_e_2017).
56 4.1 Managers' WFC
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Interestingly, the means' comparison analyses show a significant difference between
4 WFC and FWC; managers report significantly higher levels of work interfering with family
5 than family interfering with work ($\bar{x}=2.6$, s.d.=.94; $t=10.32$, d.f.=283, $p<.01$), suggesting
6 respondents are less prone to let family demands to negatively influence work, while work
7 does interfere with family demands. ANOVA's conducted did not show significant
8 differences regarding the level of conflict reported according to industry or region of the
9 company. However, company size has a significant effect on the level of conflict managers
10 experienced. Regarding the size of the firm, means' comparison analyses show that
11 managers in firms with 5 or fewer employees reported experiencing more WFC than those
12 in firms with 11 employees or more ($F=6.62$, $p<.01$). These results are probably due to
13 small business managers' workload because of the many roles they must fulfil compared
14 to larger businesses where office employees have specific administrative tasks.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 *My normal work weeks are currently 60 hours. I've slowed down over*
33 *the last two years because it used to be over 70 hours a week (7 days a*
34 *week, unpredictable, day, night) because I was under-resourced;*
35 *deadlines were impossible and I couldn't bring myself to dump it all on*
36 *my workers so I'd go back to work at night to get the job done.*
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 *(interview, manager, civil engineering and roads)*
45
46
47

48 Many managers also reported that couple decisions leading to the spouse staying at home
49 were the only way to cope with high job demands and still handle family responsibilities,
50 thus impacting partners' sharing of family/domestic responsibilities.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *My wife doesn't work and with my schedule, an occupation is even out*
4 *of the question. I've got 4 kids on top of that, it would be impossible. So*
5
6
7 *I made my life easy. (interview, manager, commercial/residential)*
8
9

11 4.2 Determinants of managers' WFC

12
13 Results also show that the mechanisms usually involved in workers' WFC are also at play
14 with managers, namely workload and family-supportive organisational culture. More
15 specifically, the multiple regression analysis conducted show that work overload ($\beta = .43$,
16 $p < .01$), working hours predictability ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .01$) and perception of family-supportive
17 organisational culture ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$) are related to managers' experience of work
18 interfering with family.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 In interviews, some business owners reported limited time spent with their children
30 because of the extremely demanding nature of their work, especially in the context of a
31 very small business where they must assume all administrative tasks, business
32 development and, sometimes, even work on-site. This manager, after his separation, had
33 to adjust his daughter's custody because of his work obligations.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *At first, when I got divorced and I started my business, the daycare*
4 *opened at 8am but I was starting at 7am. I couldn't take custody of my*
5 *daughter and take her to daycare. My day would have started at*
6 *8:30am, I would have lost 1 hour and 30 minutes [of work]... If I start*
7 *later, I'm the one bringing the truck and the trailer on site... I wouldn't*
8 *have been the only one to lose time; it was everyone (interview,*
9 *manager, residential).*
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **4.3 Managers' perception of their organizations' WF measures**

22
23 While the previous section highlighted the fact that managers, like workers, face WF
24 issues, this section compares managers' perceptions of WF measures offered in their
25 organization to workers' perceptions. Since workers and managers were not matched
26 during data collection, the results presented in Table III (frequencies) regarding the use
27 and availability of a given measure are not necessarily related to the same workplace but
28 provide a wide perspective on the contrasting views within the industry.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Insert Table III here*
39
40
41
42
43

44 These results are interesting in several respects. First, they highlight the fact that
45 organizations offer a wide variety of measures, many of which stem from collective
46 agreements. Indeed, a large proportion of managers report these measures being offered
47 in their workplace. However, there seems to be a systematic difference between what
48 managers report offering and what workers utilize. For example, 60% of managers report
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 offering work schedule modifications for family reasons while 29% of workers report using
4 these. Overall, WF measures appear underutilized.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 4.4 Potential sources of the discrepancy between offer and utilization of WF measures 12

13
14 Some results pointing in the direction of a possible lack of awareness of these measures
15 and practices might explain this. For example, among the wishes expressed in the open-
16 ended survey responses, a top request of workers was paid time off for illness. Although
17 this is already part of workers' benefits, many were unaware of this. Others, however,
18 knew of the measure but questioned the payment method and would have preferred that
19 sick days be compensated in the paycheque when the leave was taken, rather than paid
20 with vacation pay. This raised questions regarding the adequacy of available measures.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 *Paid sick leaves should be on our weekly pay and not in the 13%*
33
34 *vacation pay we get, because [if] you miss one day of work to care for*
35
36 *your kids and [there is] one day of rain [in the same week], it affects your*
37
38 *pay (workers' survey, open response).*
39
40
41

42
43 In interviews, managers reported that many workers were unaware of the scope of their
44 collective agreement or of other family benefits such as group insurance.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *[for benefits] we have many things. Not a lot of people are aware, most*
4
5 *don't have kids you know ... (interview, worker, institutional and*
6
7 *commercial)*
8
9

10
11 In fact, a small business owner reported lacking knowledge about the programs and
12
13 measures offered to him or his employees in terms of WFB.
14
15

16
17 *I wouldn't know what to do; if I have any requests or questions I don't*
18
19 *know where to call. I didn't even know that there was a ministry that was*
20
21 *interested in this, but I don't know what questions I could have*
22
23 *(interview, manager, residential)*
24
25
26

27
28 Another angle to explain the underutilization of the measures belongs to the perceived
29
30 willingness of managers to allow workers to prevail themselves of WF measures which
31
32 could be related to the company's capacity to support its workers,
33
34
35

36
37 *In the past four months I got to realize that I was working in a good and*
38
39 *accommodating company where we were supported with all the*
40
41 *measures that we are entitled to in our collective agreement. Because*
42
43 *there are companies where bosses don't pay for gas or parking, where*
44
45 *you almost have to pay to go to work. (interview, worker, institutional*
46
47 *and commercial)*
48
49
50

51
52 Results also provide some interesting nuances regarding how managers perceived a
53
54 downside to workers' using some WF measures. Some participants reported the pressure
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 last-minute absences put on the business and co-workers. This concern is enmeshed in
4
5 regulations to meet journeyperson/apprentice ratios and a preoccupation with fairness for
6
7 workers impacted by others' absence.
8
9

10
11 *It could talk about it and get a little mad... I got a \$1,500 fine...Come on...*
12
13 *the guy calls in the morning because he's ill and the other guy is already*
14
15 *on the job, I have to send him back home? [...] the guy came to work in*
16
17 *the morning; the other one has stomach flu and he finds out overnight [...]*
18
19 *he loses 8 hours [on his paycheque] to eat that week because the other*
20
21 *one has stomach flu ... (interview, manager, residential).*
22
23
24
25

26
27 The interdependence of trades, resulting in a form of assembly line work organization,
28
29 also affects managers' ability to accommodate workers' WF needs. It sometimes implies
30
31 bottlenecks and, therefore, partial control over work time if certain tasks are delayed.
32
33 Similarly, some tasks cannot be abandoned and finished the next day, either to protect
34
35 the equipment or to ensure that the sequence of tasks to be performed is respected.
36
37
38

39
40 *For instance, there is material missing but we can't get the 12-wheels*
41
42 *with crushed stone before 4:30-5 pm and so, when it gets there, the 12-*
43
44 *wheels with crushed stone, they dump it; you can't just leave it there, so*
45
46 *we lay it on the ground, the work shift can extend a little ... (interview,*
47
48 *worker, civil engineering and roads).*
49
50
51

52
53 Workers who report being able to make changes to their work schedule also report less
54
55 WFC. It is important to note the particular importance of this measure according to the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 managers surveyed, who emphasize the need for more flexibility to accommodate
4
5 individuals who are separated and have a 50/50 custody arrangement.
6
7

8
9 *In another case, the employee has custody of his child every other*
10
11 *week. The week in which he has custody, he starts later and finishes*
12
13 *earlier. The employee would have liked to work more hours during the*
14
15 *week when he did not have his child, to work more than 40 hours and to*
16
17 *put the extra hours in the bank to use during the week when his salary*
18
19 *was lower. But the collective agreement does not offer flexibility*
20
21 *(managers' survey, open response).*
22
23
24
25

26
27 Finally, many managers cited administrative burdens as impediments to the support
28
29 offered employees and their flexibility in accommodating them, particularly in small
30
31 businesses.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *I have been out of the construction business since November because it*
4 *is impossible to balance work and family. I went back to school to get a*
5 *job that will allow me to put my family first. (workers' survey, open*
6 *response)*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Some exhausted managers, small company owners, also considered leaving the industry
15
16 but decided to reduce their work hours instead.
17
18

19
20 *Two years ago, I considered selling everything and starting a career in*
21 *real estate because it was unbearable (interview, manager, civil*
22 *engineering and roads)*
23
24
25
26
27

28 *4.5.1 Resources at the interpersonal level*

29

30
31 On the manager's side, the survey revealed openness and willingness to offer measures
32
33 to promote work and family balance and, therefore, a more supportive attitude on the part
34
35 of managers. Both managers and workers emphasized that a healthy relationship
36
37 between managers and employees, based on good faith on both sides, is a win-win
38
39 situation.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *There is a way to satisfy both parties; there is a need for transparency,*
4
5 *goodwill and flexibility (worker survey, open response).*
6
7

8
9 *Work-family balance is a team effort between the employer and the*
10
11 *family. Everyone has to do their part, spouses, workers, bosses and*
12
13 *even customers (managers' survey, open response).*
14
15

16
17 Several testimonies emphasize that the bosses' understanding and benevolent attitude
18
19 towards requests for the family made all the difference in workers' WFB experience, and
20
21 further, for this female trade worker to perceive she belonged in this male-dominated
22
23 industry.
24
25

26
27
28 *After 6 years in the industry, I am working for the first time for a humane*
29
30 *boss; with all my previous bosses, I never had that feeling of being a full*
31
32 *person and a mother; I was only allowed to be a carpenter. (workers'*
33
34 *survey, open response).*
35
36

37 38 39 **4.5.2 Resources at the organizational level** 40

41
42 At the organizational level, managers identified measures they would be willing to
43
44 implement. Overall, as seen in Table II (frequencies), it appears that measures that
45
46 directly supported family issues were receiving the most consideration from managers.
47
48

49 *Insert Table IV here*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is worth noting that means' comparison analyses show that no differences were
4
5 observed between sectors or geographic regions. As for company size, managers in
6
7 companies with 5 employees or less seem more willing to implement flexible vacations
8
9 (compared to companies with 6 to 10 employees) as well as flexible work schedules
10
11 (compared to companies with 11 employees or more) ($F=37.72$, d.f. 441, $p<.05$; $F=40.26$,
12
13 d.f. 407, $p<.01$). On one hand, many workers spoke about the challenges faced due to
14
15 the lack of measures or support in their workplaces, reporting that some measures exist
16
17 but not all managers apply them. Yet, managers and workers shared good practices in
18
19 their workplaces to reduce WFC directly or indirectly, through the general improvement of
20
21 working conditions. In fact, several people emphasized that they had nothing to suggest
22
23 because everything was fine.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *[I wouldn't change] Nothing, it's already very easy to reconcile. Our boss*
31
32 *is very humane and helpful. (workers' survey, open response).*
33
34

35
36 *I personally chose to work in this company because it was easy for me*
37
38 *to reconcile work and family. There is a high level of sensitivity in this*
39
40 *respect for both the office staff and the site workers. In our case, it*
41
42 *makes a big difference to the performance of employees when they are*
43
44 *happy (workers' survey, open response).*
45
46
47
48

49 Good practices reported included flexible working hours, ease of leave-taking following
50
51 childbirth (maternity/paternity/parental) and no mandatory overtime. It was also possible
52
53 to pick assignments (workers) or contracts (employers), either based on their distance
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from home/office or the quality of working conditions (cordial relations with the client,
4
5 flexible work schedule, management of clients' expectations, etc.).
6
7

8
9 *I already do enough work-life balance. I have had the same employees*
10
11 *for a long time; they are loyal and dedicated to me, I in turn give*
12
13 *everything I can to help them even if it means losing jobs and money*
14
15
16 *(managers' survey, open response).*
17
18

19
20 Along with these proposals, many managers outline how the industry would require
21
22 profound transformations, namely a culture change where managers would engage in
23
24 sustainable WF measures.
25
26

27
28 *We are already accommodating but it is the construction industry that is*
29
30 *blocking work-family balance (managers' survey, open response).*
31
32

33
34 As well, a shift is needed to offer greater support to managers for them to provide flexibility
35
36 measures while maintaining their organization economically. For example, replacing
37
38 absences due to labour shortages and the costs associated with delays in work when
39
40 work is done with fewer people are real challenges to managers.
41
42

43
44 Others suggest that financial incentives could encourage long-term changes, and support
45
46 small businesses that may have more difficulty implementing flexible measures.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Banking hours for commercial workers. When workdays are lost, for all*
4 *kinds of reasons, workers are disappointed not to be able to move that*
5 *day in a week where we could have them work more, at straight time.*
6
7
8
9
10 *Otherwise, we have to pay double for all hours beyond 40h/week, It's*
11 *often impossible within pre-established forfeit contracts or, some other*
12 *times, when you have an hourly pay, the client doesn't want to pay*
13 *double for overtime. So, we stay home (managers' survey, open-ended*
14 *question).*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 At a broader level, managers emphasize the need for clearer standards and training
24 regarding various laws and measures since managers who do not comply with collective
25 agreements to gain business leverage affect other managers playing "by-the-book."
26
27
28
29
30

31 *A strict legislative framework, as the construction industry is very*
32 *competitive. Collective agreement provisions are not respected*
33 *(managers' survey, open response).*
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 As for childcare support, family public policies encouraging the implementation of support
44 services for parents with atypical schedules would be helpful, notably childcare services
45 with schedules compatible with the construction industry. Managers also reported this as
46 a major component of the accommodation requests.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *As I said "Can I start at 6am and I want to finish at 2.30 p.m., and I'll be*
4 *able to avoid the traffic, I'll be able to pick up my son at the daycare;" it's*
5 *all about the daycare. Everything is based around that; it's not anything*
6 *else but that (interview, manager, residential).*
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 In addition to collective agreements that better support WF issues and the desire for more
15 responsive family public policies, managers and workers reported how some structural
16 barriers could not be easily changed. A preliminary barrier, challenging for many working
17 parents, was transportation time between home and work site. Aware of the systemic
18 problem of traffic between suburbs and urban areas, their proposals involved encouraging
19 companies to bid on nearby work sites, improving scheduling flexibility or financially
20 compensating for kilometres travelled to distant work sites. A second structural barrier
21 came from municipal noise bylaws, which compromised the ability to modify work
22 schedules to accommodate them. Third, solutions to the labour shortage, mentioned
23 earlier, were among the demands of managers, who noted that, without support at this
24 level, they could do little for their employees' WFB needs.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *[One solution would be to] Have more skilled labour. This year, when I*
4 *needed workers, there was no one in the labour pools and you*
5 *[addressing the CCQ] still wouldn't open them. Even if it gives me a*
6 *long-term exemption card, it closes the door to having new employees*
7 *trained and available. There are very few journeymen available, and it*
8 *will get worse. I would like to be even more accommodating but, if I*
9 *don't have anyone, it's more difficult and it causes me problems with my*
10 *clients (managers' survey, open response).*
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Finally, subcontracting is also reported as a source of WF difficulties, particularly because
24 "hired/loaned" workers are less able to request accommodations from the company
25 subcontracting their services for a specific, one-time need. Similarly, some respondents
26 pointed out the more difficult working conditions for agency workers, who are often
27 immigrants.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **5. Discussion**

39
40

41 This study contributes to the literature on WFC by characterizing issues construction
42 industry managers face. This contribution is twofold. First, it contributes to knowledge
43 about WFC in understudied male-dominated workplaces. Second, and most importantly,
44 it portrays WF issues for a type of job that has been neglected in the WFC literature. In
45 that sense, results show that managers deal with WF issues at least as intense as those
46 of workers. According to available knowledge, very few studies have examined managers'
47 or supervisors' WF situation, and when studied, the focus is primarily on the cross-over
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effect where the managers' WF issues affect how they interact with workers (Carlson et
4 al., 2009; O'Neil et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2020). These results also contribute to the
5
6 literature on WFC in the construction industry by shedding light on the reality of those
7
8 representing the majority of the workforce, namely, those with atypical working conditions.
9
10 This adds notably to studies that focused on engineers, office employees or other
11
12 professionals within this industry (Adah et al., 2023; Aghimien et al., 2022; Chan et al.,
13
14 2020; Lingard & Francis, 2005; Lingard & Francis, 2007; Lingard et al., 2010a; Lingard et
15
16 al., 2010b; Lingard et al. 2012; Soundarya Priya et al., 2023; Tijani et al., 2022). Hence,
17
18 this study offers a fresh perspective on managers' WFC by considering this a factor
19
20 depleting their resources available to support employees.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Results on WFC determinants also contribute to the literature by showing that the
28
29 antecedents of managers' WFC are similar to those generally presented in the literature
30
31 (e.g., workers), namely workload and family-supportive culture (Eby et al., 2005; Michel
32
33 et al., 2011). Also affecting managers' WFC is schedule predictability which is another
34
35 important antecedent of WFC for workers with atypical schedules who have little to no
36
37 control over such schedules (Henly & Lambert, 2014). Interestingly, although managers
38
39 theoretically have more control over their working time, their workload dictates how many
40
41 hours they will have to put in without always being able to foresee when peaks will occur.
42
43 Especially in small enterprises, managers/owners need to ensure the "survival" of their
44
45 company by covering for everything that needs to be accomplished. This relates to the
46
47 observed higher levels of work-to-family conflict than family-to-work conflict experienced
48
49 by managers. It may also be a possible explanation of why WF difficulties are perpetuated
50
51 in organizations: managers themselves struggle with WF issues, therefore having fewer
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

resources to provide employees the necessary support. Yet this support is shown to be important in reducing WFC in the construction industry (Galardo & Trottier, 2022).

Another contribution of this study to the literature on WF balance practices is showing that WF measures are not unidimensional. In this case, a discrepancy was noted between workers' and managers' perceptions regarding available WF measures. It should not be assumed that availability of measures guarantees better WFB. Results demonstrate that some measures are considerably underutilized. This demonstrates the inadequacy of one-size-fits-all measures that fail to consider various occupations' specific needs. For instance, shift-swapping is recognized as facilitating WFB, notably with rotating or variable schedules (Clawson & Gerstel, 2014), but that can be difficult on a site where all workers are assigned the same shifts. Similarly, it should be noted that not everyone has equal access to the information circulated if certain modes of communication are favoured to disseminate such information (e.g. emails to employees who do not use a computer on a daily basis) (Ollier-Malaterre & Andrade, 2015), thus potentially creating inequities between office and site workers in their access to WF accommodations. This leads to two important considerations especially in the male-dominated construction industry. First, female construction workers, as traditional primary caregivers, may be faced with the dilemma between taking on administrative jobs, with more predictable schedules and easier WF accommodations, and on-site occupations for which they have been trained but with increased WF constraints. This may contribute to the sex segregation of construction jobs perpetuates the challenges of attracting and retaining women in the industry. This reflection appears to also apply for young fathers who want to share equitably family and domestic responsibilities with their spouse. Second, both mothers

1
2
3 and fathers in the industry may hit a glass ceiling because of the excessively high
4 demands associated with management positions in the construction industry. It can lead
5 experienced working parents to self-exclude themselves for management positions in
6 order to protect their WFB, thus compromising the hand-over of leadership positions in
7 the construction industry.
8
9

10 These results also contribute to the literature on the construction industry by highlighting
11 the complexity of management in an organizational structure involving many actors
12 (workers, trade unions, employers' association, clients). The results outline the tension
13 faced by managers in this industry as they attempt to maintain a balance between work
14 and family, on the one hand, and to support this balance for their employees, on the other.
15 In doing so, they are faced with the dual logic of protecting themselves from the demands
16 of their jobs while at the same time becoming a resource or a conduit for resources for
17 their employees, thus adding to their own workload. While the literature discusses the
18 importance of the WF supportive role of managers vis-a-vis their workers (Hammer et al.,
19 2007), this study draws attention to the individual, organizational, and contextual
20 constraints they face. Indeed, many managers described very limited leeway to
21 accommodate their workers in terms of schedules or leave, given the constraints of the
22 current regulatory framework, economic barriers due to the size of the company and other
23 structural barriers related to the very nature of construction work (seasonal, outside work,
24 heavy work, remote sites, etc.). However, the lack of resources and contextual constraints
25 to accommodate WF needs should not make WFC a topic to avoid in the workplace. This
26 study revealed many managers' considerable openness to establishing more effective WF
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measures and, consequently, calls for more efforts to find ways to provide managers
4
5 support and flexibility.
6
7

8 On a practical level, this study confirms managers' crucial role in WF issues. More
9
10 specifically, it shows that their own WFC, the culture they convey and their knowledge of
11
12 measures available affect WF issues in the construction industry, corroborating results in
13
14 this same industry (Galardo & Trottier, 2022; Lefrançois & Trottier, 2022). The
15
16 discrepancy observed regarding WF measures calls for further discussion, as well as
17
18 greater awareness raising and general WF communication in the industry. While one
19
20 usually thinks of elaborate interventions to improve WF balance in organizations as
21
22 complex as those in the construction industry, the first step may be simply sharing
23
24 information about existing measures. This sharing of information could take the form of
25
26 simple meetings with employees to inform them about those measures, through their
27
28 employer or through industry stakeholders such as labor unions. Given this industry's
29
30 many actors and intermediaries, it is important that all stakeholders engage in this
31
32 conversation to create a safe space where workers, men and women, are aware of
33
34 available WF measures and feel free to use them. Therefore, it is necessary to involve
35
36 policy makers, trade unions, employers' organizations, managers, and workers in this
37
38 conversation. Another practical contribution of this study is to highlight the specific
39
40 challenges experienced by small business owners and the lack of adapted resources,
41
42 thus resulting in greater WFC. Considering the prevalence of this type of company in the
43
44 construction industry and their role in the proper functioning of the entire sector, it is
45
46 important to unveil the challenges experienced to reflect on solutions adapted to their
47
48 realities. A first step in this direction would be to give a voice to these managers so that
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they can be heard whether it is through forums or industry associations. Also, any action
4
5 to connect these managers so that they feel supported (e.g. community of practice) could
6
7 be a step in this direction. Once appropriate support structures for managers are in place,
8
9
10 the second step would be to ensure that profound changes are implemented to provide
11
12 WF measures that are aligned with the needs of workers. This could include the ability to
13
14 modify one's work schedule (e.g., adjusting the start time of a shift to accommodate family
15
16 responsibilities e.g. taking the children to the daycare), the option to choose the worksite,
17
18 or the ability to decline overtime work. These modifications can only be achieved through
19
20 concerted efforts involving all stakeholders in the industry. One way to achieve that would
21
22 be by setting up consultative groups to bring together employees, managers, prime
23
24 contractors, clients, contracting authorities and even suppliers would help to identify the
25
26 issues faced by each party and devise ways of dealing with them while preserving the
27
28 well-being and work-life balance of the construction workforce.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **6. Limitations and future studies**

38
39 Among the study's limitations is the cross-sectional design, characterized by the collection
40
41 of all quantitative data at a single point in time. It is also important to note that the data
42
43 collected from managers and workers were not paired, which limits the extent of parallels
44
45 that can be drawn. Also, the results were collected before Covid-19. Although, based on
46
47 the project partners' insight, conducting the same study today would probably portray an
48
49 industry where workload and mental health issues have worsened with an increased
50
51 manpower shortage. In 2023, the study research partners organized two sessions to
52
53 disseminate the results with workers' and employers' associations and they validated that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the portrait is still accurate. Thus, future studies should go further with action research to
4
5 investigate the effectiveness of awareness-raising measures regarding WB practices and
6
7 looking at ways to promote a family-supportive culture to provide managers and
8
9 employees with tools to engage in this important conversation. Results also point to the
10
11 importance of greater attention to small business managers and their intention to leave
12
13 the industry given their significant proportion of the industry and the potential economic
14
15 impact this can engender. Finally, future research should also examine stakeholders with
16
17 a major influence in the industry, including employers' associations, major contract givers
18
19 and trade unions.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **7. Conclusion**

28
29
30 By characterizing managers' own WFC along with their role in their workers' WFC, this
31
32 study adds to knowledge of an industry where mental health is an important issue but still
33
34 taboo, due to strong gender norms (Lefrançois and Trottier, 2022). These results highlight
35
36 the importance of considering both managers and subordinates when thinking about
37
38 working conditions, as highlighted by St-Hilaire et al. (2019) in a study demonstrating that
39
40 managers' and subordinates' mental health are intertwined. The results suggest that
41
42 further research should be conducted to enhance the understanding of how actors in this
43
44 industry are interrelated.
45
46
47
48

49 This is the first study to specifically address WF issues in the Quebec construction industry
50
51 both from managers' and workers' perspectives. Considering the industry's challenges,
52
53 particularly the scarcity of labour and the difficulties of attracting and retaining women, it
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is vital to continue this work by multiplying awareness-raising efforts and encouraging
4
5 actions that promote greater openness to WF issues.
6
7
8
9

10 **References**

11
12 Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies : A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender*
13 & *Society*. Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 139-158. doi:10.1177/089124390004002002
14

15 Adah, C. A., Aghimien, D. O., & Oshodi, O. (2023). Work–life balance in the construction
16 industry: a bibliometric and narrative review. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural*
17 *Management*, (ahead-of-print).
18

19 Aghimien, D., Aigbavboa, C. O., Thwala, W. D., Chileshe, N., & Dlamini, B. J. (2022).
20 “Help, I am not coping with my job!–A work-life balance strategy for the Eswatini
21 construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, (ahead-
22 of-print).
23
24

25 Arditi, D., Gluch, P., & Holmdahl, M. (2013). “Managerial competencies of female and
26 male managers in the Swedish construction industry”. *Construction management and*
27 *economics*, Vol. 31, no 9, pp.1979-990.
28

29 Brough, P. and O'Driscoll, MP. (2010). “Organizational interventions for balancing work
30 and home demands: An overview”. *Work and Stress*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.280-297.
31

32 Carlson, D.S. and Perrewe, P.L. (1999). “The role of social support in the stressor-strain
33 relationship: an examination of work-family conflict”. *Journal of management*, Vol. 25, No.
34 4, pp.513–540.
35
36

37 Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., Kacmar, K. M., Grzywacz, J. G., & Whitten, D. (2011). “Pay
38 it forward: The positive crossover effects of supervisor work–family enrichment.” *Journal*
39 *of Management*, Vol. 37, pp.770–789.
40

41 Chan, A. P. C., Chiang, Y. H., Wong, F. K. W., Liang, S., & Abidoye, F. A. (2020). Work–
42 life balance for construction manual workers. *Journal of Construction Engineering and*
43 *Management*, Vol. 146, Vo. 5, 04020031.
44
45

46 Clawson, D. and Gerstel, N. (2014). *Unequal time: Gender, class, and family in*
47 *employment schedules*. Russell Sage Foundation.
48

49 Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting*
50 *mixed methods research* (3rd edition. ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
51

52 Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). “Work and
53 family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002)”.
54 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp.124-197. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003
55
56
57
58
59
60

Galardo, L. and Trottier, M. (2022). "How supervisor, co-worker, and spousal social support influences the experience of workload and work-family conflict: results from a survey of construction workers in Québec". *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp.331-342.

Greenhaus, J. H. and Beutell, N. J. (1985). "Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles". *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p.76.

Haar, J. M., Roche, M. & ten Brummelhuis, L. (2018). A daily diary study of work-life balance in managers: utilizing a daily process model. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 29, no. 18, pp. 2659-2681, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2017.1314311

Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Zimmerman, K., & Daniels, R. (2007). "Clarifying the construct of family-supportive supervisory behaviors (FSSB): A multilevel perspective". In *Exploring the work and non-work interface* (Vol. 6, pp.165-204). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Hammer LB, Kossek EE, & Anger WK (2011) "Clarifying work-family intervention processes: the roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol., 96, No. 1, pp.134-150.

Henly, J. & Lambert, S. (2014). Unpredictable Work Timing in Retail Jobs: Implications for Employee Work-Life Conflict. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*. Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 986–1016. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/00197939145374

Heymann, O. (2016). "The disadvantage of a sex-segregated labor market: Sex segregation and the availability of work–family benefits". *Journal of Family Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp.218-239.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). "Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress". *American psychologist*, Vol. 44, No. 3, p.513.

Jull, J., Giles, A., & Graham, I. D. (2017). Community-based participatory research and integrated knowledge translation: advancing the co-creation of knowledge. *Implement. Sci.*, 12(1), 150. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0696-3

Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict : a meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general work-family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64, pp. 289-313.

Lefrançois, M. and Trottier, M. (2022). "Work–family balance in the construction industry: why gender analysis matters to develop sustainable interventions". *Ergonomics*, Vol. 65, No. 11, pp.1525-1536.

Lingard, H., Brown, K., Bradley, L., Bailey, C., & Townsend, K. (2007). "Improving employees' work-life balance in the construction industry: Project alliance case study". *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, Vol. 133, No. 10, pp.807-815.

1
2
3 Lingard, H. and Francis, V. (2005). "Does work–family conflict mediate the relationship
4 between job schedule demands and burnout in male construction professionals and
5 managers?". *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 23, No. 7, pp.733-745.

6
7 Lingard, H. and Francis, V. (2006). "Does a supportive work environment moderate the
8 relationship between work-family conflict and burnout among construction
9 professionals?". *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.185-196.

10
11 Lingard, H. and Francis, V. (2007). "Negative interference" between Australian
12 construction professionals' work and family roles. Evidence of an asymmetrical
13 relationship". *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, Vol. 14, No. 1,
14 pp.79-93. doi:10.108/09699980710716990

15
16
17 Lingard, H., Francis, V., & Turner, M. (2010a). "The rhythms of project life: a longitudinal
18 analysis of work hours and work–life experiences in construction". *Construction
19 Management and Economics*, Vol. 28, No. 10, pp.1085-1098.

20
21 Lingard, H., Francis, V., & Turner, M. (2010b). "Work-family conflict in construction: Case
22 for a finer-grained analysis". *Journal of construction engineering and management*, Vol.
23 136, No. 11, pp.1196-1206.

24
25 Lingard, H., Francis, V., & Turner, M. (2012). "Work time demands, work time control and
26 supervisor support in the Australian construction industry: An analysis of work-family
27 interaction". *Engineering, construction and architectural management*, Vol. 19, No. 6,
28 pp.647-665.

29
30
31 Lingard, H., Turner, M., & Charlesworth, S. (2015). "Growing pains: work-life impacts in
32 small-to-medium sized construction firms". *Engineering, Construction and Architectural
33 Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp.312-326. doi:10.1108/ECAM-07-2014-0100

34
35 Lippel, K., Messing, K., Vézina, S., & Prud'homme, P. (2011). Chapter 3 : Conciliation
36 travail et vie personnelle. In M. Vézina, E. Cloutier, S. Stock, K. Lippel, É. Fortin, A. Delisle,
37 M. St-Vincent, A. Funes, P. Duguay, S. Vézina, & P. Prud'homme (dir.), *Enquête
38 québécoise sur des conditions de travail, d'emploi et de santé et de sécurité du travail
39 (EQCOTESST)* (pp. 159-232). Montréal: Gouvernement du Québec, IRSST, INSPQ, ISQ.

40
41 Lyness, K. S., Thompson, C. A., Francesco, A. M., & Judiesch, M. K. (1999). "Work and
42 pregnancy: Individual and organizational factors influencing organizational commitment,
43 timing of maternity leave, and return to work". *Sex roles*, Vol. 41, No. 7-8, pp.485-508.

44
45 Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A. & Baltes, B. B. (2011).
46 "Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review". *Journal of Organizational
47 Behavior*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp.689-725. doi: 10.1002/job.695

48
49 Mihelic, K. K. and Tekavcic, M. (2014). "Work-family conflict: A review of antecedents and
50 outcomes". *International Journal of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS)*, Vol. 18,
51 No. 1, pp.11-26.

52
53
54 Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded
55 sourcebook (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

1
2
3 Minnotte, K. L., Cook, A., & Minnotte, M. C. (2010). Occupation and Industry Sex
4 Segregation, Gender, and Workplace Support: The Use of Flexible Scheduling Policies.
5 *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 656-680. doi:10.1177/0192513x09348593
6

7 Ministère de la Famille. (2016) *Recherche-action dans le secteur de la construction en*
8 *matière de conciliation travail-famille (CTF)*. Document d'appel d'offres sur invitation,
9 Contrat de gré-à-gré.
10

11 Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). "Development and validation of
12 work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.
13 81, No. 4, pp.400-410.
14

15 Ollier-Malaterre, A. and Andrade, C. (2015). "Not for everyone: intra-organisational divides
16 and the stratification of access to work-life policies". *Community, Work and Family* Vol.
17 19, No. 5, pp.2-19.
18

19 O'Neill, J. W., Harrison, M. M., Cleveland, J., Almeida, D., Stawski, R., & Crouter, A. C.
20 (2009). "Work-family climate, organizational commitment, and turnover: Multilevel
21 contagion effects of leaders". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 74, No. 1, pp.18-29.
22

23 Paillé, P. and Mucchielli, A. (2016). *L'analyse qualitative en sciences humaines et sociales*
24 (Quatrième ed.). Paris: Armand Colin.
25

26
27 Quebec Women Status Council (Conseil du statut de la femme du Québec) (2013). Avis
28 - Une mixité en chantier - les femmes dans les métiers de la construction. Retrieved on
29 January 23 2024. <[https://www.csf.gouv.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/avis-mixite-metiers-](https://www.csf.gouv.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/avis-mixite-metiers-construction.html#bookmark5-1)
30 [construction.html#bookmark5-1](https://www.csf.gouv.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/avis-mixite-metiers-construction.html#bookmark5-1)>
31

32 Quebec Construction Board (2023) Application of Act R-20. Online.
33 <<https://www.ccq.org/en/loi-r20>> (Accessed on April 4th 2023)
34

35 Seiger, C. P. and Wiese, B. S. (2009). "Social support from work and family domains as
36 an antecedent or moderator of work-family conflicts?" *Journal of vocational behavior*, Vol.
37 75, No. 1, pp.26-37.
38

39 Soundarya Priya, M. G., Anandh, K. S., Prasanna, K., Gunasekaran, K., Daniel, E. I.,
40 Szóstak, M., & Sunny, D. (2023). Exploring the Factors That Influence the Work-Family
41 Interface of Construction Professionals: An Indian Case Study. *Buildings*, Vol. 13, No. 6,
42 p. 1511.
43

44
45 Statistics Canada (2020). Family Matters: Sharing housework among couples in Canada:
46 Who does what?. Retrieved on January 24th 2024.
47 <<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/200219/dq200219e-eng.htm>>
48

49 St-Hilaire, F., Gilbert, M. H., & Brun, J. P. (2019). "What if subordinates took care of
50 managers' mental health at work?". *The International Journal of Human Resource*
51 *Management*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp.337-359.
52

53 Talukder, A., Vickers, M., & Khan, A. (2018). "Supervisor support and work-life balance:
54 impacts on job performance in the Australian financial sector". *Personnel Review*, Vol.
55 47, No. 3, pp.727-744.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thomas, L. and Ganster, D. (1995). "Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-
4 family conflict and strain: a control perspective". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 80,
5 No. 1, pp.6-15.
6

7 Tijani, B., Osei-Kyei, R., & Feng, Y. (2022). A review of work-life balance in the
8 construction industry. *International Journal of Construction Management*, Vol. 22, No. 14,
9 pp. 2671-2686.
10

11 Tremblay, D.-G. (2014). Quebec's Policies for Work-Family Balance: A Model for
12 Canada? In Fox, Bonnie (dir.), *Family Patterns, Gender Relations* (4th ed.) (chapter 29).
13 Toronto : Oxford University Press.
14

15 Turner, M. (2013). *The development of a work-life fit model: a demands and resources*
16 *approach*. PhD thesis, Construction and Project Management, RMIT University.
17

18 Turner, M., Lingard, H., & Francis, V. (2009). "Work-life balance: an exploratory study of
19 supports and barriers in a construction project". *International Journal of Managing Projects*
20 *in Business*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.94-111.
21
22

23 Turner, M. and Mariani, A. (2016). "Managing the work-family interface: Experience of
24 construction project managers". *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*,
25 Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.243-258.
26

27 Xie, L., Luo, Z., & Xia, B. (2022). "Influence of psychosocial safety climate on construction
28 workers' intent to stay, taking job satisfaction as the intermediary". *Engineering,*
29 *Construction and Architectural Management* (ahead-of-print).
30

31 Wallin, L., Pousette, A., & Dellve, L. (2014). Span of control and the significance for public
32 sector managers' job demands: A multilevel study. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*,
33 Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 455-481.
34

35 Wang, P., Wang, Z., & Luo, Z. (2020). "From supervisors' work-family conflict to
36 employees' work-family conflict: The moderating role of employees' organizational
37 tenure". *International Journal of Stress Management*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.273-280.
38

39 Williams, J. C., Blair-Loy, M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2013). Cultural Schemas, Social Class,
40 and the Flexibility Stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 69, No. 2, pp. 209-234.
41 doi:10.1111/josi.12012
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I Sociodemographic characteristics of managers – Survey and interviews

	<i>n</i>	%
Survey		
Gender		
Female	293	52.3
Male	267	47.7
Age		
Less than 25	4	0.7
25 - 34	86	15.4
35 - 44	158	28.3
45 - 54	161	28.8
55 or more	147	26.3
Prefer not to answer	3	0.5
Tenure (years)		
Less than 1	15	2.7
1 - 2	45	8.1
3 - 5	83	15.0
6 - 15	207	37.3
16 or more	205	36.9
Annual salary		
Less than 20,000	19	3.5
20,000\$ -39,999\$	104	19.2
40,000\$ - 59,999\$	182	33.5
60,000\$ - 79,999\$	119	21.9
80,000\$ - 99,999\$	69	12.7
100,000\$ - 119,999\$	27	5.0
120,000\$ or more	23	4.2
Organization size (nb employees)		
5 or less	283	40.9
6 - 10	160	23.1
11 - 25	126	18.2
26 or more	123	17.8
Activity sector		
Industrial	39	5.6
Institutional/commercial	278	40.2
Residential	313	45.2
Civil engineering and roads	62	9.0
Interviews		
Gender		
Female	3	17.7
Male	14	82.3
Activity sector		
Industrial	3	17.7
Institutional/commercial	5	29.4
Residential	4	23.5

1			
2			
3			
4	Civil engineering and	5	29.4
5	roads		
6	Organization size (nb		
7	employees) ¹		
8	5 or less	5	29.4
9	6 - 49	9	52.9
10	50 or more	3	17.7
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

¹ For the purpose of maintaining the anonymity of the participants, category groupings have been made.

Table II Sociodemographic characteristics of workers – Survey

	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	122	15.7
Male	656	84.3
Age		
Less than 25	11	1.4
25 - 34	262	33.6
35 - 44	354	45.4
45 - 54	120	15.4
55 or more	31	4.0
Prefer not to answer	1	0.1
Tenure (years)		
Less than 1	115	15.3
1 - 2	114	15.2
3 - 5	121	16.1
6 - 15	279	37.2
16 or more	122	16.2
Annual salary		
Less than 20,000	8	1.0
20,000\$ -39,999\$	98	12.7
40,000\$ - 59,999\$	193	24.9
60,000\$ - 79,999\$	270	34.9
80,000\$ - 99,999\$	136	17.6
100,000\$ - 119,999\$	45	5.8
120,000\$ or more	24	3.1
Organization size (nb employees)		
5 or less	134	17.4
6 - 10	126	16.3
11 - 25	157	20.3
26 or more	355	46.0
Activity sector		
Industrial	88	10.9
Institutional/commercial	385	47.6
Residential	187	23.1
Civil engineering and roads	148	18.3

Table III Managers' and workers' perceptions regarding WF measures in their workplace

Measures	Use (according to workers) - %	Availability (according to managers) - %
Sick leave	24	44
Paternity/maternity leave	50	56
Possibility to receive urgent phone calls during work for family emergencies (spouse, school, daycare, etc.)	41	73
Group insurance program	40	57
Possibility to refuse overtime	35	54
Parental leave (shareable weeks with spouse)	30	59
Modification of work schedule for family reasons (accommodation)	29	58
Paid sick days	23	44
Choice of working site for family reasons (location, job type, etc.)	21	25
Reduced work week (fewer hours, fewer days)	15	-
Time bank	15	28
Leave early to care for a family member	13	34
Flexible vacation dates	11	37
Employee assistance program	10	24
Childcare leave for a seriously ill child	6	38
Exchange of shifts	4	15
None	7	4

Table IV Managers' willingness to implement WF measures

<i>Measures</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Childcare leave for a seriously ill child</i>	43
<i>Possibility to receive urgent phone calls regarding family emergencies (spouse, school, daycare, etc.) during work</i>	41
<i>Modification of work schedule for family reasons (accommodation)</i>	40
<i>Parental leave (birth)</i>	38
<i>Paternity/maternity leave</i>	34
<i>Possibility to refuse overtime</i>	34
<i>Leave to care for a family member</i>	33
<i>Reduced work week (fewer hours, fewer days)</i>	32
<i>Paid sick days</i>	31
<i>Time bank</i>	30
<i>Flexible vacation dates</i>	29
<i>Choice of working site for family reasons (location, job type, etc.)</i>	24
<i>Exchange of shifts</i>	17
<i>Replacement list</i>	10
<i>None</i>	9

1
2
3 **Appendix A – Survey (managers and workers)**
4
5
6

7 **Work-family culture (from Lyness et al., 1999)**

8
9 Scale: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree
10
11

12 *Managerial support*

13
14 In this organization, employees can easily combine career and family.

15
16 The management of this organization is generally quite accommodating of family-related needs.

17
18 In this organization, it is generally acceptable to talk about one's family at work.
19
20

21 *Time demands and expectations*

22
23 Employees are often expected to take work home at night and on weekends, if necessary.

24
25 Employees are expected to put their jobs before their families.

26
27 To get ahead, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week.
28
29

30
31 **Work overload**

32
33 Scale: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral; Agree; Strongly Agree
34
35

- 36 1. I feel like I work too hard at work.
37
38
39

40 **Work-family conflict (from Netemeyer et al. (1996)**

41
42 Scale: Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Often; Always
43

44 *In my everyday life... (work-to-family)*

- 45 1. The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life
46 2. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities
47 3. Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me
48 4. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties
49 5. Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities
50
51
52
53

54 Scale : Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Often; Always
55

56 *In my everyday life... (family-to-work)*

- 57 1. The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities
58 2. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 3. Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or
- 4 spouse/partners
- 5
- 6 4. My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time,
- 7 accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime
- 8
- 9 5. Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties
- 10
- 11

12 **Work-family measures**

- 13 1. Paid sick days
- 14 2. Preventive withdrawal for pregnant workers
- 15 3. Paternity/maternity leave
- 16 4. Parental leave (shareable weeks with spouse)
- 17 5. Child care leave for a seriously ill child
- 18 6. Leave to care for a family member
- 19 7. Reduced work week (less hours, less days)
- 20 8. Modification of work schedule for family reasons (accommodation)
- 21 9. Choice of working site for family reasons (location, job type, etc.)
- 22 10. Flexible vacation dates
- 23 11. Exchange of shifts
- 24 12. Possibility to refuse overtime
- 25 13. Possibility to receive urgent phone calls during work for family emergencies (spouse, school,
- 26 daycare, etc.)
- 27 14. Group insurance program (including MEDIC construction)
- 28 15. Employee assistance program (eg. « Construire en santé »)
- 29 16. Time bank
- 30 17. None
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60