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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the recent evolution in types of work and employment, as well as the factors likely to influence work and employment in the future. The questions I want to address are straightforward: How is work changing and for whom? Is work getting better or worse? What are the forces of change? To what degree can these forces be shaped or controlled?

Section I attempts to situate globalization and technology as two factors among many influencing the nature of work.

Section II examines changes in work from the perspective of job content and the employment relationship. Contemporary management texts are replete with references to autonomy, commitment, responsibility and teamwork, yet for most employees evidence that the nature of work has changed to reflect these notions is mixed.

Section III reviews the different kinds of work being performed in terms of job status, hours of work and variations in work arrangements (full time, part time, split shift and so on) so as to better understand the qualitative shifts currently being experienced by workers.

Section IV examines the balance between work and family life with a view to understanding more fully the consequences on individuals and families of the factors discussed in the earlier sections. I also explore possible solutions.

Section I: Factors in Shaping Employment Systems: A Non-deterministic View

In recent years it has become a commonplace that globalization is the dominant force shaping financial markets, the nature of employment, the structure of domestic labour markets and the ability of governments to respond to globalizing influences. Another factor often said to be predominant in shaping work and employment is technology. According to this view, it is the nature of the technology at the level of the firm that determines the actual outcomes in terms of employment numbers, the qualification (or disqualification of workers), task organization and so on.

While the impact of these factors cannot be discounted, I believe their role in determining the nature of employment and work is overstated. Other important factors are also at play and governments retain considerable powers to shape employment systems.

What are these other factors? First, the choice of business strategy, for example between cost minimization or quality and innovation approaches, inevitably helps determine the work content of the employment generated and the nature of the employment relationship.

Second, a firm’s choice of human resource strategies: within a single economic sector, employing identical production systems, producing similar products, two firms embracing radically different management approaches will end up with quite different work environments simply on the basis of organizational choice.

Third, national government policies also shape the nature of work primarily by influencing the level of employment using fiscal and monetary levers, job training and direct job creation. The relative level of unemployment in turn influences how firms manage
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workers. Where unemployment is chronically high – as has been the case for many decades in some parts of Canada – there is less incentive for firms to adopt “human centered” management systems or offer higher wage and benefits in order to attract workers. By the same token, a tight labour market translates directly into companies’ raising salaries and benefits and developing better employment relationships in order to attract workers and keep them.

Instead of a deterministic view where globalization and technological change are overriding, I would argue for a clearly non-deterministic and open vision of change in employment (Tremblay, 1989,1992). Specifically, I regard the human resources and management strategies of organizations discussed above as choices or intermediate variables that are the result of a series of factors (worker characteristics, workplace and labour market contexts, technologies, business strategies, legal and societal norms), that all contribute to shaping individual, organizational and social outcomes.1

Changes in numbers of jobs, modes of employment and job content can thus be traced simultaneously to multiple sources: technological and organizational changes occurring in business firms (possibly but not necessarily linked to globalization), government policies relating to workers or to the unemployed (policies on training or support for job creation) as well as business and government attention (or lack of attention) to the balance between work and family life.

Choice at the Level of the Firm

Taking up first the issue of how these factors interact at the level of the firm, we should consider the following: In regions with a long history of industrialization where labour costs are higher, globalization is apparently forcing many business firms to alter their competitive strategies either by exporting employment to other countries where labour costs are lower, or by changing the nature of employment for workers at home (for example, cutting working hours and reducing employment status and wages).

Alternatively, some firms have adopted a more aggressive stance (an “offensive” rather than “defensive” strategy see Boyer, Lipietz, et al), in which the firm’s ability to create added value rests on delivering high quality products through techniques such as total quality management, zero defect, and just-in-time (Tremblay and Rolland, 1998).

Each of these approaches has impacts on employment status and working conditions that vary according to gender, (Tremblay, 1995, Tremblay and De Sève, 1996), age and ethnic group – although in the case of the last two attributes there have been few attempts to quantify them. With respect to differentiation by gender, one of our own studies (Tremblay and De Sève, 1996) was conducted in collaboration with ten unionized firms with a view to establishing the extent to which new types of work organization – autonomy, "high performance work practices" and so on – applied to female and male workers respectively.

The results of this study and others (Purcell et al, 1999; Betcherman et al, 1994Lowe and Shellenberg, 2000; Purcell, 1999; Tremblay, 1997; OECD, 1986) all speak to the diversity of situations and variations in trends observed in labour markets in Canada and

1 Our view is based on Beer et al.’s model (1984; cited in Tremblay and Rolland, 1998). Lowe and Shellenberg (2000) present a similar model in their figure 2.2., but it is, in our view, a little less complete than Beer et al. (1984).
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elsewhere – diversity directly attributable to choices and strategies pursued at the level of the firm.

Choice in Public Policies

Businesses’ strategic choices are obviously significant in determining the work environment, however, I believe public policies have important influence on the choices firms make. Government policies can encourage innovation and quality both in products and services being delivered and in the quality of the employee relationships firms rely on to stay in business – though clearly the impacts of these policies too are contingent on a host of other factors.

The role of government in labour markets is of particular importance because of the many ways in which labour markets are not actually “markets” at all. It is for this reason that globalization and other overriding economic trends have only sporadic and scattered impacts on the nature of work. Labour markets are in fact a set of hierarchical and segmented structures governed by rules and conventions where the free play of supply and demand plays a diminished role in determining prices (wages). The result is that there are significant barriers to mobility across the many categories of employees – women, youth and ethnic minorities do not have equal access to all available jobs, and employment in more desirable jobs is highly dependent on location.

A major contribution of institutional economists has been to identify these processes of segregation and selection; effects that tend to be reinforced when job opportunities are scarce and in which embedded social values play an on-going part. As a consequence, jobs of greatly varying quality continue to coexist within the same market and sometimes within the same firm. Analyzing these issues, some researchers refer to the notion of “bad jobs” (Betcherman, 1995), others to non-standard or flexible working arrangements (Purcell et al, 1999), and still others’ concerns are focused on weak employment relationships (Lowe and Schellenberg, 2000).

The implication is clear: the notion of a labour market comprised only of well paid “good jobs” characterized by individual responsibility, intellectual challenge, open communication and trusting relations flies in the face of evidence that shows that youth, women and visible minorities are not in such jobs and actually do not have fair access to such jobs.

An important consideration for the discussion that follows is understanding that because it is impossible to identify any single dominant force (such as globalization or technology) shaping work and employment, it is equally difficult to see with any certainty what the future of work will be. Unlike those who speak of the spread of the “high performance” organization or who project the end of the division of labour and the advent of enriching employment for all, I believe the reality is much more complex. A diversity of employment situations – good, bad and indifferent – will continue to prevail. The role of the state arises because of the evident inability of the free market to correct these problems on its own (Bellemare, Dussault, Poulin et Tremblay, 1996).
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Section II: How Work is Changing and for Whom

Recent years have seen a great deal of expert writing on the subject of new types of employment relationships, the disappearance of the classical division of labour in some work sectors, the “high performance organization” and other similar employment models. A feature common to all is a critique of “Tayloristic” employment practices, currently very common, where work is segmented and “parcelized”; some authors consider that these practices are presently being questioned and that work is less divided (see inter alia Horst Kern, Michael Schumann).

The first question to be asked about such theses is the extent to which organizations and their employment practices have actually changed along the lines put forward by their various advocates. In brief, the answer is that in selected industries for selected categories of workers a great deal, for many other employees in other sectors, not very much. The available evidence bears out this conclusion. The new models for work and employment have not only failed to bring about a revolution in the Canadian labour market generally, they have had little impact in either the public sector or in sectors that are labour intensive – areas where women predominate as employees.²

Choices Among Management Models

Among the few Canadian studies of the evolution of autonomous work and the division of labour are those by Betcherman et al (1994), and the SQDM-HRDC (Société québécoise de développement de la main-d’oeuvre, 1996). They showed that organizational changes and new types of job autonomy were much less common than certain writings in the field of management had suggested and that the penetration of new forms of work and employment relationship were highly variable by sector.

These conclusions support the view expressed earlier that human resource strategies are firm specific choices only partially driven by external conditions. Firms continue to make choices based on the belief that their business objectives can best be achieved and target markets optimally served by adopting low-cost, traditional mass production techniques, even while other firms move in the direction of product and employment innovation.

For workers the likely results of the first choice are bad jobs at low wages with little business investment in training. In contrast, the second approach has a much better chance of creating goods jobs, at higher pay, with both greater worker participation and higher investment in training. Moreover, there is considerable evidence (Betcherman et al, 1994; Tremblay and Rolland, 1996 among others) that organizations tend to chose fairly consistent sets of practices across the range of decisions they must make. Firms that offer choice in work schedule, also have generous parental leave packages, encourage teamwork, invest in employee training and so on.

Betcherman et al (1994) attempted to assess how far Canadian firms has gone in implementing new models of human resource management. They identified three distinct patterns:
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- 70 percent of firms included in the sample followed the traditional pattern in which saw the adoption of few new management practices.
- 18 percent of firms followed a “participation” based model of human resource management.
- 12 percent of firms used some form of “compensation” based model to manage their employees.

These results are comparable to data collected by HRDC and SQDM on the distribution of HRM practices in Québec, as well as to our own studies conducted in 1996 (Tremblay and Rolland, 1996, 1996a).2

Other research on the evolution of types of work organization and employment relationships in Canadian business firms highlights the diversity both of human resource practices and of outcomes in terms of impacts on workers. Research with specific focus on Japanese-style management practices (“just-in-time”, Kaizen, teamwork) revealed for example that even those firms assumed to perform at the highest level did not necessarily adopt the new management practices and employment arrangements. (Tremblay, 2001; Tremblay, Rolland, Davel, 2000).

The same analyses indicate that workers appreciate management practices that involve participation in continuous improvement or quality committees, great worker commitment and responsibility (even though higher levels of stress are sometimes involved) and more frequent employer-employee communication (Tremblay, Rolland, Davel, 2000). Other results point to most workers looking for changes that will create healthier, safer and more supportive work environments, where work relationships are more committed and trusting (Lowe and Schellenberg, 2000).

What we can take from these results generally is that the way work is organized and managed – the content of tasks and the availability of resources appropriate to the job – is important to workers. Individual and organizational performance is thus linked to commitment, trust, communication and responsibility in the workplace, although this sometimes implies more stress for workers.

**Impacts of New Management Models**

The other conclusion is that good employment relationships are not currently available to all. The impact of the new management and human resources practices on female workers, and in business sectors where women workers predominate is very mixed. One of the few studies to directly address the issue of gendered division of labour and new work patterns (Schneider, 1991) indicates that in its initial stages, changes in work practices (for example, increased worker responsibility and control of tasks) may be positive for women because it introduces the opportunity to learn new skills – maintenance, troubleshooting, manipulating software and so on.

However, according to Schneider this early phase is often transitory. As the new practices mature, the tendency is for male workers to be assigned responsibility for the new operations (for example, automated manufacturing systems) and the jobs with greater responsibility and autonomy, while women are given ancillary and operational tasks or find themselves in manufacturing positions in less automated firms.
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In these and other ways it appears that the effects of adopting new management practices can be rapidly eroded for women by the resurgence of the traditional models. These tend to select skilled male workers for the preferred jobs and direct female workers into the least skilled and lowest level jobs. Irrespective of the details of the process, it is an inescapable fact that it is in the labour intensive and service sectors of the economy that the new models of employment are less developed, and where female workers predominate.

Some researchers are very skeptical about the impact of new management practices. Kergoat (1992) describes autonomy, commitment and other new work organization models as “myths,” and asserts that it is primarily male workers who are allowed to participate fully in the new types of cooperative autonomy. Female employees tend to have access only to training directly associated with an existing job, and are subject to frequent transfers or placed on short-term contracts.

Our own research tends to reinforce these findings. "New skills" for the majority of women workers often involve additional skills only at the same level, and are generally not accompanied by new responsibilities, significant wage increases or increased potential for promotion. Despite implementation of new management policies and types of work organization, the processes generating discrimination are still operational in many working environments. (Tremblay, 1995; Tremblay and De Sève, 1996). Human resources management strategies continue to generate decisions regarding selection, training and supervision that discriminate against women, especially when age or family situation are taken into account. The result is that jobs that are part-time, temporary or low-skill – which usually translates into weak employment relationships and job commitment – are disproportionately occupied by women, certain categories of immigrants, and poorly educated youth.

While there is also evidence that in some respects gendered division of labour is declining, often through the increased entry of men into traditionally female job sectors, the overall pattern remains much as it was. Betcherman et al concluded in 1994 that traditional employment and management models predominated despite much talk of new types of work organization and worker-management relationships. I believe little has changed since then.

The overriding problem continues to lie in the concentration of women and certain other categories of workers in economic sectors that have not evolved in the kinds employment relationships they offer. Additional studies focusing on regional and sectoral variations would certainly be useful for further defining the nature of the problem. However, the overall picture is clear: the new forms of work organization, and trends to commitment, trust relations and autonomy have bypassed many firms, sectors and regions, and even where implemented their effects have been distributed unequally depending on age, gender and ethnic origin.

---

3 Among the new types of labour management, “Japanese-type” management methods are relatively common; on this topic, see Tremblay and Rolland (1996, 1996a, 2000).
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The Paradox of “Autonomy”

The apparently large gap between expectations attached to the new models and the reality in work places across the country, gives rise to an interesting paradox. While trusting relationships, worker autonomy and responsibility are key to improved individual and organizational performance – and thought, therefore, generally to be desired – jobs with these attributes can also be source of stress if workers are accustomed to more passive ways of working, or resentment if the employee believes the employer is capturing a disproportionate amount of the innovation and productivity gains stemming from the new relationship (Workman and Bedford, 2000; Jackson, 1999; Davel, Rolland, Tremblay, 2000).

To what extent, then, should work models commonly associated with intelligent businesses and learning organizations in fact be regarded as new ways to exploit the initiative and intelligence of employees at relatively low cost to managers overall discretion? It would seem that labour unions in Canada and Québec have different attitudes towards this issue, probably reflecting societal differences in employment systems (Marsden, 1999; Tremblay, 1997). While Québec-based unions believe that their members benefit from working in the new employment contexts, unions in English Canada appear less sanguine about the new autonomy (Workman and Bedford, 2000).

In my own research work and in training sessions with workers, I have observed that many employees – mainly, though not exclusively, the younger and better educated ones – want to participate more in the decisions made in their firms and become more actively involved in production.4 A minority however seem to regard such “empowerment” as a new form of exploitation and would prefer to go on “leaving their brains at the factory gate.” There continue to be divergent expert opinions on the subject as well (Tremblay, Rolland and Davel, 2000).

Thus, the answer to the question – how has work changed and for whom – depends on where one looks and whose job is being examined. There is no doubt, however, that there are still many people working in highly-compartmentalized, poorly-rewarded, all-around “bad” jobs.

Section III: The Quality of Work – Better or Worse and How Do We Know?

Determining the quality of employment relationships on the basis of information collected about commitment, autonomy, exercise of responsibilities and initiative in the workplace is notoriously difficult, even though we do know that each of these attributes in important to the overall sense of people have about their works. Though diminishing in importance compared to these qualitative and psycho-social factors, there are other more traditional and often more quantitative measures such as status of work, work schedule and job security. In this section I want to explore the links between trends in work schedule, the rise in numbers of non-standard jobs and overall job quality.

---

4 Lowe and Schellenberg’s (2000) focus groups support this, while their survey data apparently do not.
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The Rise of the Non-standard Work Schedule

It is clear that we are witnessing the ongoing demise of the standard “9-to-5” work schedule, to be replaced by rotating, evening, graveyard, split-shift and all manner of irregular schedules. The rise in non-standard job schedules has been particularly evident since the 1970s with the rise in the number service jobs and the increasingly diverse business hours.

Women have been especially impacted by these developments because they represent the majority of employees in commerce, health and food services, where the non-standard schedules are increasingly common. Men working in the transportation service sector have been similarly affected.

While it is claimed in some quarters that the increase in non-standard work schedules is somehow linked to a desire on the part of employees for a better balance between work and family life, the evidence does not support this view. The move to irregular schedules has in fact been mainly at the initiative of employers – a conclusion reflected in data collected in a number of surveys (Lipsett and Reesor, 1997; Purcell et al, 1999). Among full-time employees, those who work non-standard schedules involuntarily are proportionally more numerous than those who, among part-time employees, are in the same situation. For both categories of employees, however, the imposition of nonstandard schedules has increased in recent years.

My own research on the balance between work and family life indicates that fewer than 20 percent of private sector firms in Québec offer flexible schedules at the discretion of the employee – this despite the fact that among parents seeking better ways to integrate job and family responsibilities it is the most commonly reported request (Tremblay and Amherdt, 2000; Tremblay and Vaillancourt-Laflamme, 2000).

Several paradoxes are immediately evident from this data. One is that while non-standard schedules often create problems in balancing work and family life, many women regard variable schedules (including four-day weeks and part-time employment) as offering a solution to these same problems. A second dilemma presents itself when an employee (is this situation most are women) is forced to choose between on the one hand a job with regular hours, and on the other reduced hours and a career that might be harmed because of systemic discrimination against female part-timers. Male employees also admit to being hesitant to ask for reduced working hours for fear of being put on the “mommy track” themselves.

It is evident from all the data that what largely determines whether a flexible schedule is a problem or a solution depends on whether it is voluntary or imposed (Tremblay and Villeneuve, 1998; Tremblay and Vaillancourt-Laflamme, 2000). The same can be said of self-employment. Many people choose to become self-employed, however, many others are effectively pushed into it because there are few regular jobs available or because of the recent tendency of firms to “outsource” certain tasks. Translation, accounting, public relations, webpage design are among the most frequently externalized activities (Tremblay, 2001a).

Information collected and analyzed by the Government of Québec’s Department of the Family show the extent to which non-standard jobs and schedules have permeated working life (Québec, 2000):
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- approximately 30 percent of men and women do not have a regular daytime schedule, though slightly more men than women are so affected.

- 79 percent of women with a spouse and children below age 16 have a regular daytime schedule, but only 62 percent of women who are single parents have a regular work schedule. (An interesting aside is that there seems to be a relationship between family situation and employment status or schedule, however, it is difficult to determine the causal direction.)

Since weekend work schedules are increasing and represent a special challenge when it comes to balancing work and family responsibilities, the analysis of weekend work holds special interest. In Québec 13.8 percent of workers normally work Saturdays compared to 16.4 percent for all of Canada; for Sunday the figure is 9.5 percent in Québec compared to 10.3 percent nationwide. Approximately 9 percent in both jurisdictions work both weekend days.

These figures are not negligible and represent a new trend in the development of the female labour market since women are strongly concentrated in the personal services and leisure activities sector – specifically food service, hotel, health and commerce. As firms in these sectors operate increasingly outside standard 9-to-5 hours, so will their employees.

**Links Between Work Schedules and Nonstandard Jobs**

Non-standard work schedules are much more common in atypical or non-standard jobs – defined for these purposes as part-time work, casual or temporary work or self employment – than in standard (regular full-time) jobs. Available data bears out the conclusion that job characteristics that are in any way non-standard in nature tend to cluster together:

- shift work is much more common among part-time workers (61 percent) than among full-time workers (23 percent);

- among those who work part time on shifts, 65 percent have irregular schedules, split schedules or are on call, whereas among full-time shift workers the figure is only 39 percent

- of men who hold a part-time job, only 29 percent work a regular daytime schedule, whereas 71 percent have a schedule involving shifts (57 percent for female workers) (Sunter, 1993).

- among persons holding a part-time job (fully three-quarters of whom are women), 1 in 4 works on weekends, compared with 1 in 13 among persons holding a full-time job (Winters, 1994).

The diversification of job types into ever more non-standard forms has been a trend underlying the North American labour market as a whole since the 1970s (Tremblay, 1997; Betcherman and Lowe, 1997). Between 1976 and 1995, the proportion of nonstandard jobs rose from 25 percent to 30 percent of total employment, and some studies suggest as many as 40 %; this depends on what is included in the definition of "non standard", and the frontiers are somewhat fuzzy. However, forty-four percent of overall employment growth occurred among non-standard employment types.
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Considered in aggregate, it appears that currently most jobs are still what is considered standard jobs (that is full time all year round) and that regular employment relationships continue to dominate. However, the trend is running against traditional job categories.\(^6\) The growth of atypical jobs is almost certain to continue since as noted earlier the non-standard job predominates in the service sector, one of the fastest growing parts of the economy (Tremblay, 1997). In addition, the increased diversity of job types has blurred the lines between different employment statuses, creating “gray areas” inside and between job types that bear greater scrutiny (Lowe and Schellenberg, 2000).

Diversification of types of jobs and of work schedules are two closely interrelated trends that continue apace. And as discussed earlier these trends have impacted on individual workers in diverse and sometimes paradoxical ways. The final section of this paper will focus on the balance workers attempt to maintain between work and family life, and the pressures to which they are subjected because of these trends in employment.

Section IV: Work Schedule, Work Location – The Issue of Job and Family Articulation

Evidence accumulated in studies conducted in both Québec and Canada\(^7\) reveals that many working parents are having increasing difficulty balancing the demands of work and family. Other analyses show that as work and family environments become ever more intertwined the consequences are falling on both employees and their employers (Tremblay and Villeneuve, 1998).

For employees, especially women, difficulties encountered balancing work and family life are reflected in health problems, problematic family and emotional relationships, and a decline in job satisfaction. In spite of the radical change in women’s role in the labour force, it appears that society’s expectations about gender specific work and family role responsibilities remain much as they were, an additional source of work-family conflict and stress (Duxbury and Higgins, 1991; Duxbury, Higgins and Lee, 1994, among others).

For employers the impacts take the form of economic costs caused by absenteeism, reduced worker motivation and performance, resistance to job mobility and promotion, high turnover of personnel and inadequate labour force training.\(^5\)

There are two main sources for these difficulties: first, the nature of work and task organization (discussed in some detail in earlier sections of this paper) and second, societal norms and expectations, especially with regards to the role of women as both workers and parents. (Duxbury and Higgins, 1991).

The Changing Nature of Work

As discussed above, firms increasing reliance on “total quality” and “just-in-time” practices creates ever greater demands on employees for flexibility. The result is the increasing de-standardization of jobs and work schedules. Approximately one third (some

\(^5\) See the three focus group videos we made for Télé-université Course RIN 2013, as well as a research project funded by the FCAR [FCAR: Fonds pour la formation de chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche—Fund for researcher training and research assistance]. See also Tremblay and Vaillancourt-Laflamme (2000) on impacts on employees, and Tremblay and Amherdt (2000) on employers’ perceptions of the impacts on them.
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studies suggest as many as 40 percent) of jobs fall into the "nonstandard" or irregular categories where evening, graveyard, weekend, holiday, on call, part-time and home-based work schedules are the norm (Tremblay, 1997). In addition, the hours of work are increasingly polarized with many employees working longer hours (40 to 50 hours or more) while others – mainly women – are working less, sometimes much less, than 30 hours per week (Tremblay and Villeneuve, 1998).

Women and Men, Family and Work

The key influences on women, family and work today have been the mass entry of women onto the labour market, the new sharing of responsibilities between men and women in families, the increasing diversity of family models, and the growing responsibilities many families are taking on in the care of the elderly, handicapped or otherwise dependent family members. Canada’s labour force now has more women in it than ever before, while at the same time the country has more two-income families, more women with young children, more single-parent families, more men wanting to participate in family responsibilities, and more employees simultaneously engaged in home care of the elderly or the disabled than ever before.

The data to support these statements is striking:

Female participation rate – The female participation rate in Canada is currently on the order of 57 percent; 62 percent for women who are married. The forecasts suggest that the overall female participation rate will rise to 63 percent by 2005. For mothers of pre-school age children, the participation rate has risen just as quickly. Over two-thirds of women whose youngest child is less than six years of age are engaged in full-time work. Furthermore, in 75 percent of two-parent families with young children both parents are employed. According to forecasts, the rise in the female participation rate will be greatest among women of childbearing age – those between 25 and 44 years – and will reach 91 percent in 2005.

Currently, two-thirds of Québec women aged 20 to 44 with children aged less than 16 are employed compared with 79 percent of those without children and of the same age (Institut de la statistique du Québec, 2000). The fact of this persistent difference in participation rates and the data available on work-family balancing measures in firms (little, as is shown in Tremblay and Amherdt, 2000) constitute proof that workplaces have not adequately adjusted to the radical new face of family life in Québec and elsewhere in Canada.

Single-parent families – Canada has witnessed a rapid increase in the numbers of single-parent families. In 1993, 13 percent of families were had only one parent, and than 60 percent of those parents were in the labour market. In 1991, 82 percent of single-parent families in Canada and in Québec were headed by women.

Evolving family roles and responsibilities – Traditionally women have assumed the lion’s share of family and household responsibilities, however, as I have noted elsewhere, a shift is evidently underway (Tremblay, 2001a,b), with increasing numbers of men wanting to assume greater family responsibilities and adjust their work hours accordingly. For example, a 1985 survey of 6000 employees of the US firm Du Pont found that 18 percent of male workers were interested in working on a part-time basis so that they could also take care of
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their children. A few years later, a similar study sponsored by the Conference Board of Canada (MacBride-King and Paris, 1989) revealed that 33 percent of men indicated an interest in part-time work for family reasons.

Of interest also, however, is the fact that male workers often do not follow through on such expressions of interest, apparently because of a lack of institutional support for such decisions (Tremblay, 2001b,c). Our own research (Tremblay and Vaillancourt-Laflamme, 2000 and Tremblay and Amherdt, 2000) showed while many parents wanted to move to a four-day week, and some were even willing to take a cut in pay, employers were not very receptive to having their male workers taking advantage of parental leave or other types of work-time reduction arrangements. Even co-workers tended to express the belief that it was primarily up to women, not men, to reduce work hours in favor of family duties (Tremblay, 2001b).

An additional obstacle is the nature of the four-day week itself. Many regard the schedule as a trap that tends to isolate them from the work environment while not providing much in the way of genuine work reduction. Many women working four-day weeks in the Québec public sector have indicated that they end up doing as much work as those working five days, often bringing tasks home to complete.

Aging population and home care – Between 1981 and 1991 in Canada, the number of persons aged 65 years or over rose by 33 percent – almost three times that of the population as a whole. By the year 2030, it is projected that there will be more people over 65 than children under 15. The greatest increase will be among people aged 80 or over – the group most likely to make regular use of long-term care and to depend on help from family members and the community (Tremblay and Villeneuve, 1998).

Coincident with this demographic shift has been the ongoing de-institutionalization of health services and the rise in home maintenance practices. Increasing numbers of workers will become directly responsible for elderly parents, with those who had children later in life finding themselves "sandwiched" between competing demands of their children and their live-in parents.14

The need to care for the disabled is also rising. In Canada in 1991 there were approximately four million people with disabilities, the vast majority of whom (more than 90 percent) lived with their families.15 A 1990 Conference Board of Canada survey of 7000 employees showed that 16 percent in one way or another took care of elderly or disabled relatives (MacBride-King, 1990).

Impacts on Employees

With influences as profound as these it is not surprising that employees are experiencing difficulties balancing work, family and personal lives. A survey of unionized employees working for large firms conducted by the Fédération des travailleurs et travailleuses du Québec16 between 1993 and 1996 showed that about half had mean "psychological distress"17 indicators twice as high as those observed in the general population. Worker responses indicated fairly poor levels of mental health and health overall. As the report stated, "the word 'fatigue' was constantly heard and in most cases the reference was to mental fatigue (the type of fatigue that leads to burnout)."18 Duxbury and Higgins (1991) as well as Duxbury, Higgins and Lee (1994) report similar findings related to stress among workers.
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Clearly, we are a very long way from the promised “leisure society” and in fact we seem further away from it than ever before. Particularly for workers with family responsibilities, free time has become a vanishing resource.

Impacts on Work and Productivity

The increasing strain on workers has negative impacts on firm productivity. In a large-scale survey of 385 Canadian employers in 1989 (unfortunately not repeated since) by the Conference Board of Canada, the corporate respondents attributed many problems in the area of human resources management to conflicts between family and job-related obligations experienced by their employees (Paris, 1989). Specifically, 42 percent of employers attributed more than one quarter of their productivity problems to the challenges inherent in harmonizing work and family. Almost 40 percent of respondents attributed performance difficulties to the same cause.

These findings are supported by others. The Canadian National Child Care Study (Lero et al, 1992 and 1993) found that for working parents who said they had problems finding or retaining adequate child care services during the previous year – which applied to almost half of those who said their children were normally cared for by someone other than a family member – the most commonly reported job-related consequences were, in declining order of importance:

- inability to work overtime on request or when they wished;
- concern over children's care while working;
- lower level of job commitment because of child care problems;
- fewer hours worked;
- job offers refused;
- work declined because of child care problems or concern over child care.

Mitigating the Impacts, Finding the Balance

In the US, where the unemployment rate has been very low for a number of years, a growing number of employers are accepting the notion that they must do more to assist employees reconcile family and work environments. Canadian companies are less advanced in this regard, with studies carried out in Québec providing hard evidence that Canadian businesses have a long way to go (St-Onge and Guérin, 1994; Tremblay and Amherdt, 2000).

Within business firms several options present themselves: flexible working times chosen by workers, family assistance services (in the form of child care services, financial assistance for child care, information, education and referral services); time off work and additional benefits (e.g., wage supplements and time off for birth or adoption, time off for personal reasons), and career management adapted to family requirements.

Our own research has identified few Canadian business firms that have adopted such measures, but only one out of 5 offering some form of flexibility in working times, the measure most demanded by parents (Tremblay and Amherdt, 2000). However, if unemployment rates continue to decline and the labour market tighten further, Canada might
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see more developments along these lines. Sectors in Canada where the labour shortage is already acute appear more open to workers being able to chose their own employment patterns. The flexibility that results can be used not only to balance family needs, it could also encourage participation in other non-work activities such as sports, training, social and political activities. With the respect to the latter, I believe the exercise of “citizenship” is a long-neglected element in discussions about the competing demands of work and family life, though there have been some useful contributions along those line recently (Méda, 2000).

Employers currently hold most of the reins in the area of work schedules. While neither Canada nor Québec governments have adopted policies like those of France which has since the early 1980s successively reduced the normal working week from 40 to 35 hours (mainly to reduce unemployment, but contributing also to better balance between work and family), employers have not done much either to help parents.

In this context, mandatory overtime can create extra burdens mostly through the transferring of family obligations to the other spouse, usually the female. When it is open to working parents to refuse overtime, the reason most often cited is the loss of time spent with children, the second most often cited is fatigue, and the third is difficulty in obtaining child care.21 There are few legislative constraints on mandatory overtime so the practice continues.

“Flexibility” – A Double-edged Sword

As noted earlier, a significant paradox that underlies the entire discussion is that the apparent solution to some of the employees’ problems in balancing work and family life is also a source of additional, new stress. Parents need and want flexible work hours to help better organize family life. At the same time the evidence is clear that irregular work hours imposed upon parents and non-standard jobs come with their own set of difficulties.

At least part of the contradiction lies the different meaning “flexibility” has for employees as opposed to employers. Employees want flexible schedules selected by them and tailored to their needs with the hope of improving the work-family balance. Employers want flexibility in employment status and work hours in order to increase productivity and profitability.

The quest to reconcile these divergent interests will I believe form the core of a major social debate in the next decade – a debate not only between employers and employees, but also between parents and non parents. I believe these various interests are not irreconcilable and that compromises can be reached that serve both firm productivity as well as family and individual needs.

In attempting to reach solutions that benefit family life, special attention must be paid to the needs of female workers. To date, most measures to introduce flexibility into women’s work schedules have not been accompanied by the collateral measures necessary to make a genuine difference in women’s access to the labour market – these include appropriate child care, care for school-aged children, and encouragement of men to assume greater family responsibilities through access to flexible work regimes of their own. Indeed, the partial and individual approaches used to date may have perpetuated women’s economic and job-related inequality by forcing them to negotiate for flexible hours on a one-on-one basis with management.

Although it is true that women have greatly increased their representation on the labour market in recent decades, that social relations between men and women have changed
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greatly in recent years, and that more men than ever are assuming their share of family and domestic responsibilities, the fact remains that in most cases it is women not men who reduce their working hours to assume family responsibilities. There is still relatively little societal recognition of these responsibilities, and performing them often comes at a cost to career opportunities and promotion. Thus, the more work-family programs target participation by fathers, the more they will contribute to promoting the economic equality of women and quality of life of all workers.

The articulation of work-family programs and initiatives represents one of the most important challenge for future. In my view, the responsibility for restoring the balance between work and family responsibilities does not rest on individual workers or firms alone. Since the root causes of the problem are broadly social, the solutions are necessarily collective. Educational institutions, employers and all levels of government have primary roles to play.
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three model typology described above. It is often the case that HR practices do not fit neatly into one category.
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17. By the term "psychological distress," the study authors meant the following: [TRANSLATION] "psychological distress is measured on the basis of various symptoms associated with depressive conditions, conditions of anxiety, cognitive problems and irritability. These symptoms must have been observed during the previous seven days. Psychological distress was estimated in our population using a mental health scale validated by Santé Québec." (Ibid.: 11)

18. Ibid, p. 11.

19. The Canadian National Child Care Study is a research project by members of the National Day Care Research Network, Statistics Canada and Health and Welfare Canada. This study covered 12 percent of Canadian families and is based on data dating from 1988.
