

1 Kaminsky, J. (2021). "Who Are We Talking To? Situating Construction Engineering and Management
2 Knowledge." 147(2). Journal of Construction Engineering and Management.
3 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001977](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001977)

4

5 **WHO ARE WE TALKING TO? SITUATING CONSTRUCTION**
6 **ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE**

7 *Dr. Jessica Kaminsky, M. ASCE¹*

8 ¹Corresponding Author, jkaminsk@uw.edu, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental
9 Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle

10 **ABSTRACT**

11 Gathering knowledge from expert practitioners is a hallmark of construction engineering and management
12 research. However, the knowledge gathered is dependent on the knowledge of the people we talk to.
13 Accordingly, this paper uses a content analysis of 12 months' recent technical article and case study publications
14 in the Journal of Construction Engineering and Management to explore characteristics of research respondents
15 that authors publishing in this journal feel are important to document. Authors report some subset of research
16 respondents' job type or role, years experience, subject matter expertise, geography or nationality, organization
17 and sector details, project type, professional qualifications, sex, race and ethnicity, ability, and language.
18 Accordingly, this paper recommends that researchers should report at least these categories, and also that
19 researchers should also discuss research limitations that may result from the types of people they collect
20 knowledge from. This change will make visible voices that are dominant or underrepresented in construction
21 engineering and management research. In addition, by eliminating an otherwise unstated limitation, this change
22 will result in improved construction engineering and management science.

23

24

25 **INTRODUCTION**

26 Upon learning that I am a civil engineer, a friend's 5-year-old child asked me, "How strong is a bridge?" The
27 answer, of course, is *it depends*. It depends on (for example) what the bridge is made of, and how much of those
28 materials were used. It depends on how the bridge is supported, how old it is, if any maintenance has been done
29 since it was built, on the surrounding climate and physical geography, and on the quality of construction.

30 Similarly, when researchers talk to people to discover new knowledge of construction engineering and
31 management, the answers they get are contingent upon the knowledge and experiences of those individuals. In
32 both cases, different compositions bring about different conclusions.

33 Acknowledging the importance of context does not mean that there is no way to measure the strength of a bridge,
34 and it also does not mean that we cannot gain useful knowledge by talking to expert practitioners. Indeed, and as
35 described in this paper, learning from expert practitioners is a hallmark of construction, engineering, and
36 management (CEM) research. It does, however, mean that answers to our research questions must come
37 embedded in relevant contextual factors. Otherwise, the answers may be just as problematic as the 5-year-old's
38 question.

39 In this paper, I make two claims. First, I claim that the CEM knowledge we gain from research respondents is
40 *situated* (Haraway 1988). In other words, different people know different things, and accordingly we can learn
41 different things from them. For example, a steel worker knows things about jobsite safety that a site safety
42 manager doesn't, and vice versa. My second claim is that this attention to situated knowledge is already well
43 established in our research community. However, despite the (as I will show) near-universal nature of this
44 recognition, our past work lacks both the theoretical underpinning that would help us develop guidelines for

45 situating CEM knowledge, and the needed methodological guidelines themselves. This paper contributes to
46 filling this gap.

47 To do so, and inspired by Pawley (2017), in this paper I outline best methodological practice for making visible
48 and considering the diverse characteristics of the people we either describe or draw knowledge from in CEM
49 research. Practically, and because of the current demographics of our industry, by doing so we will typically
50 show that our knowledge is drawn from people whose sociodemographic profiles fit the dominant majority. This
51 is an uncomfortable truth. However, by acknowledging this or any limitation of our work, we take a step towards
52 better science.

53 Importantly, and as I will show through a content analysis of recent JCEM publications, our research community
54 is already on board with the idea of situating CEM knowledge. Accordingly I would emphasize that this paper is
55 not in the least intended to imply that the CEM community has avoided engaging with the (lack of) diversity of
56 our research subjects, and even less that any malicious intention is or has been at work when we have fallen short
57 of the methodological ideals described here. Indeed, and in the interest of transparency, it is worth noting that my
58 own past JCEM papers have not met all the criteria I propose here.

59 What I do intend in this paper is to amplify the already-ongoing commitment JCEM authors have towards
60 avoiding the assumption that people are homogenous. Put more simply, we must describe relevant characteristics
61 of our research respondents, because it matters for the knowledge we will discover. In doing so we improve the
62 rigor of our science and of the knowledge we produce (Barad 2007). In contrast, failing to do so is an
63 unacceptable and readily avoided unstated research limitation.

64 **POINT OF DEPARTURE: Improving CEM Science with Situated
65 Knowledge**

66 We value scientific knowledge because we typically think of it as universal knowledge; in other words, it is the
67 same no matter who discovered it or who knows it. For example, gravity does not change depending on who is
68 measuring it. Still, many scholars have noted the ways in which people's involvement in science shapes the truths
69 we find (Latour 1988). For example, Pickering (1999) shows how the theoretical traditions physicists adhere to
70 shape the experiments they undertake and the observations they make. These two reinforce each other, making it
71 more difficult for differing theories or data points to be noticed. The empirically validated theory that emerges
72 does so because it appears superior to all others, and is then thought of as scientific truth. Still, social forces (the
73 pre-existing theoretical preferences of scientists) have shaped that truth.

74 The extremes of these two theoretical positions suggest a dichotomy that appears even in physics, that purest of
75 the pure sciences. On one hand, we have a universalist position where only one truth is possible (gravity); on the
76 other, we have a relativist position where truths are instead socially constructed (Pickering's *Constructing the*
77 *Quark*). But extreme versions of either of these positions are absurd and less than helpful if our goal is the pursuit
78 of useful knowledge and technique (or, engineering). A project schedule, for example, is not a singular reflection
79 of reality. Instead, its structure is dependent on the experience and motivations of the people who build it, the
80 software tools they use, the social power implied in getting the needed permits in a certain timeframe, etc etc. In
81 other words, there are multiple ways to represent a given project's reality, and furthermore that project reality is
82 itself socially shaped. But acknowledging this does not mean that a reasonably created project schedule could
83 look like anything at all (as the opposite extreme, relativism, might suggest).

84 In another CEM example, this tension between universal and relative positions is also built into the CEM practice
85 in the bidding process. Here, different organizations are given the same information about a client's engineering
86 problem, and are invited to propose a solution. If there were only one possible best answer (a universalist
87 position), every bidder would submit the same thing. Instead, many different viable solutions are typically
88 proposed. But this does not mean that every proposed solution is a viable one (a relativist position); accordingly,
89 we require bids to be responsive and responsible before they can be considered.

90 Haraway solves this dilemma of dichotomy with the concept of *situated knowledge*, suggesting that “only partial
91 perspective promises objective vision” (Haraway 1988 p. 583). This is a middle ground between relativism and
92 universalism, and is a particularly useful frame for CEM knowledge. Rather than seeking the universal, it seeks
93 to translate knowledges between and across different communities, in ways that recognize both differences and
94 commonalities between those communities. The dual goals of this translation in our context is better CEM
95 projects and better CEM project outcomes. We need the power implicit in theoretical knowledges of the ways in
96 which the built environment gets built, in order to build a better built environment for all those who live in it (that
97 is, everyone). And – and this is the key point of this paper – the knowledges we need are heterogeneous
98 multiplicities, neither infinite/relative nor yet singular/universal. That is, the knowledges we need to solve
99 problems come from different sources, and can direct us toward more than one solution simultaneously. In
100 Haraway’s words, “objectivity turns out to be about particular and specific embodiment and definitely not about
101 the false vision promising transcendence of all limits and responsibility...*it allows us to become answerable for*
102 *what we learn how to see* (Haraway 1988 pp. 582–583, emphasis added).”

103 In this section, I have argued that the structure of CEM practice reflects the principles underlying the theory of
104 situated knowledge. As CEM researchers, then, adopting this theoretical position means that we are better
105 matching our science to reality; said differently, it means that we are doing better science.

106 Having accepted that CEM knowledge is neither perfectly relative nor perfectly universal, the next difficulty is
107 operationalizing the insight of situated knowledge in CEM research practice. This is a larger project than can be
108 accomplished with a single paper or methodological recommendation. Still, as a first step in this project, in this
109 paper I make recommendations for the ways in which CEM researchers describe the people they draw knowledge
110 from. By providing these descriptions, CEM researchers are situating the knowledge they gather, and are making
111 claims regarding the generalizability and limitations of their conclusions. This is an important methodological
112 project, because as the content analysis below shows, more than half the papers published in this journal depend
113 on expert knowledge of some kind. Phrased as a formal research question, I ask *which identity and expertise*
114 *categories CEM researchers feel are relevant to their research*. I answer this question using a content analysis of

115 a year's publications in JCEM, and use the answer to develop recommendations for situating future CEM
116 research.

117 DESCIBING PEOPLE IN THE JOURNAL OF CONSTRUCTION

118 ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT

119 The full text of every technical article or case study published in JCEM between July 2018 and June 2019 was
120 reviewed to identify papers that either collected data from or about people. JCEM published 157 technical articles
121 and case studies during this timeframe. Excluded papers (those that did not collect data from or about people)
122 were theoretical or mathematical models, or analyzed secondary data that was available from an existing database.
123 Papers that asked experts to validate results as part of a larger undertaking were included, as were more empirical
124 papers based on data describing or drawn from research participants. For example, the data set included papers
125 that used a case study or expert interviews to validate a mathematical model, papers that used sensors to promote
126 worker safety, and papers that issued surveys to gather knowledge from practitioners. While looking at a single
127 year limits our description of the ways in which JCEM papers describe people, there is no reason to believe this
128 year was unusual, or that it would not adequately represent recent practice in the research community.

129 A full 61% (95 papers) of this set of papers collected data from or about people. Of these, 76 drew knowledge
130 from respondents about a construction technology or technique, and 19 attempted to generate knowledge about a
131 group of people affiliated with construction. In an example of the former, Siebelink et al. (2018) interviewed
132 construction practitioners to build knowledge about BIM maturity in the Dutch construction industry. In an
133 example of the latter, Hwang et al. (2018) used wearable sensors to study workers' emotional states during
134 construction tasks.

135 From each paper, text that described the various research populations that data were drawn from was extracted for
136 analysis. This was iteratively and qualitatively coded (Miles et al. 2013; Saldaña 2009) into categories that
137 emerged from the papers' text. These categories represented different ways in which authors described their

138 respondents. Many papers listed multiple characteristics of respondents. Table 1 shows counts and relative
139 frequencies of papers that reported different identity characteristics for respondent selection, description, or
140 analysis.

141 Table 1 About Here

142

143 Of these 95 papers, eight indicated their respondents were subject matter experts without providing further
144 descriptions of expertise; two more papers only indicated that respondents possessed expertise but provided no
145 additional details whatsoever. Only four contained no details regarding expert qualifications. In other words,
146 virtually all (96%) authors publishing papers in JCEM between July 2018 and June 2019 that drew knowledge
147 from people felt that it was important to situate the data and knowledge they were presenting.

148 No single category from Table 1 was used by all authors. However, three quarters of authors felt it was important
149 to report the job type or role (such as engineer, architect, construction manager, or owner) of research
150 respondents. Nearly half reported the years of experience respondents had, and 40% indicated that the
151 respondents had particular subject matter expertise. For example, this could include expertise on PPP or BIM, or
152 knowledge of particular case study projects. The few authors that provided information on ability were reporting
153 characteristics of people being studied (students, construction workers, etc.) rather than people being surveyed for
154 subject matter expertise. Details on professional experience were provided much more often than were personal
155 identity descriptors of respondents.

156 Most commonly, construction researchers report the characteristics of respondents but do not use them as analytic
157 categories. However, in a few cases identity categories were used in analysis. For example Simmons et al.
158 (2018) considered gender as an analytic category, Pereira et al. (2018) find worker age to be a significant safety
159 indicator, and Nguyen (2019) used job role as an analytic category in research considering team behavior in
160 construction projects. Taken together, these studies indicate the rich possibilities of future research that not only
161 reports these descriptors but uses them during analysis.

162 THE METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATION

163 In sum, while CEM researchers virtually always report some details on research respondents, there is not a
164 standard profile of characteristics that researchers report on. Partially, this is because papers report on
165 characteristics of direct interest to their research questions. For example, a study on PPP naturally solicited input
166 from experts with PPP experience (Mazher et al. 2018), and a paper on the construction reword in Singapore
167 naturally solicited inputs from experts from Singapore (Hwang et al. 2019). Still, every research project has a
168 subject matter of interest and relevant geography, and it is reasonable enough to suggest that if these categories
169 are worth reporting for some research, they are likely worth reporting for all research. At the very least, this will
170 enable future metaanalyses that can identify the respondent identity categories that matter to results, and thereby
171 identify gaps in our knowledge. The first part of the methodological recommendation made here, then, is to
172 *require CEM researchers to describe any and all people they draw knowledge from, and to reflect on how these*
173 *categories of respondents may improve and limit research results.*

174 It may sometimes be the case that researchers are not able to provide this information. This could be, for
175 example, because they are drawing information from an existing dataset that did not record the needed details on
176 the respondents, or because respondents declined to provide this information. While this lack of information
177 should be seen as a serious research limitation, it does not mean that this research should not be carried out.
178 Instead, this leads to the second part of the methodological recommendation made here, which is simply that *if it*
179 *is not possible or appropriate to describe identity categories for any particular paper, the authors should be*
180 *prepared to justify and discuss this limitation in the manuscript.* For example, this might include a description of
181 the demographics of the industry segment that respondents were selected from, or a statement describing the
182 limitations of a secondary dataset that was used in analysis.

183 Practically speaking, there are an enormous number of ways in which we might reasonably describe our research
184 respondents. Furthermore, as described above, there is still a paucity of research that uses sociodemographics as
185 analytic categories and that could thereby provide empirical evidence of which categories matter in which

186 situations. Until this important and much needed literature can be expanded, I instead propose that we depend on
187 the judgment of recent JCEM authors who have, after all, made their best effort in reporting the respondent
188 characteristics that they felt were important for qualifying experts. From the content analysis presented here,
189 Table 1 lists identity categories that recent JCEM authors felt were important to report. As such, and as the third
190 part of this paper's methodological recommendation, it would seem reasonable that *it is best practice for our*
191 *papers to collect and report all categories of descriptive data identified in Table 1 in all our papers. As described*
192 *there, these include job type or role, years experience, subject matter expertise, geography or nationality,*
193 *organization and sector details, project type, professional qualifications, sex, race and ethnicity, ability, and*
194 *language.* Of course, depending on the research question, particular papers may need to report on additional
195 relevant categories.

196 Finally, an immediately apparent identity category that did not appear in our dataset is gender (as distinct from
197 sex (Poleacovschi and Javernick-Will 2014), which was reported by 15 papers in the dataset); it would seem
198 reasonable to add this category to the list. There are doubtless other categories that would be useful to document.
199 The community should watch for these and add them to this list as they become apparent. For example, questions
200 that identify respondent age/generation, urban vs. rural context, household income, first-generation college
201 students, political views, or religious affiliation may also be needed. As such, the fourth and final part of this
202 methodological recommendation is that *the categories listed in Table 1 should not be seen as a final set, but*
203 *rather as a starting point that should be updated and revisited as we continue our efforts towards improved CEM*
204 *science.*

205 More detailed recommendations for how to efficiently report on each of the identified category are provided
206 below, following a discussion of possible objections to this methodological practice.

207 POTENTIAL CRITICISMS & REBUTTALS

208 IT MAY BE UNNECESSARY

209 A potential criticism of providing more categorical information on respondents is that it may be unnecessary.
210 From this perspective, it might be argued that the various descriptors of respondents presented in Table 1 do not
211 impact results enough to matter. Even those who acknowledge that identity may influence some parts of life may
212 not feel that these identity categories impact perspectives on CEM topics. Indeed, very little existing research has
213 sought to unpack how much respondent identity matters in CEM research. This is an important gap in our
214 literature. After all, we simply do not know how gender impacts the way construction managers secure private
215 financing, or how scheduler race influences project scheduling practices, or etc. It may indeed be true that race
216 and gender do not predetermine such things. However, what limited evidence we do have in this space suggests
217 that some combination of forces – whatever they may be – does act to make identity differences relevant to CEM
218 knowledge. For example, research has shown that Hispanic construction workers in the US are more likely to
219 accept dangerous work, and are less likely to ask for safety assistance (Hallowell and Yugar-Arias 2016).

220 Regardless of the findings of this much needed future research, and as shown in the content analysis presented
221 here, existing CEM research that involves people already tends to report respondent characteristics like years of
222 experience, job title, geography, or industry. While it is rare that any of these categories are the focus of analysis,
223 they are virtually required by researchers and reviewers because the CEM community feels these details tell us
224 something important about the research respondents. In combination with the (still limited) evidence on the
225 importance of identity in construction, this strongly supports the importance of providing these details. And on a
226 final practical note, even if in the future some identity categories were proven to not be relevant to CEM
227 knowledge, adding these few details to papers in the meantime does not take much space and would seem to be
228 the conservative way forward.

229 IT MAY RAISE UNWARRANTED VALIDITY CONCERNS

230 Given the demographics of construction, if we describe our respondents in more detail we will typically find that
231 (for example) the vast majority of research respondents from the United States are white, non-disabled, English
232 speaking, cis-gendered, American males. Indeed, this is an accurate demographic portrayal of the industry as it
233 currently is (BLS 2019a; b; Chan 2013; Comu et al. 2011). But – and related to the previous criticism – if identity

234 categories do not matter, by showing them we may raise unwarranted validity concerns. For example, we do not
235 report on the color shirt that respondents were wearing, either, and even if no one happened to be wearing a blue
236 shirt when we collected data, we would not be concerned that there is bias in our data. Still, someone new to the
237 research community might be misled regarding the non-importance of blue shirts if we report this detail.

238 To address this concern, authors can add a statement to explain how and why the respondent pool they have
239 talked to is and is not ideal for answering the research questions, and what it may mean for the research findings.
240 It is simple enough to add a few lines to a manuscript to address this issue. For example, this might include some
241 text comparing the demographics of the general population, of the wider construction community, and of the
242 research respondent sample. Encouraging the research community to reflect on the ways identity does and does
243 not influence our research can only make our findings more accurate. Indeed, these reflections may even inspire
244 new research questions that can help us better determine the influence of identity in construction.

245 IT IS TOO MUCH WORK

246 Preparing a journal manuscript is not a small undertaking. As such, adding requirements for more details
247 complicates an already arduous task. This is a fair criticism. However, the change I advocate for is a small one.
248 It only requires asking a handful of descriptive questions, reporting these answers in addition to the respondent
249 details it is already typical to include in a manuscript, and reflecting a bit on what this may mean for results and
250 future research directions. Especially as there is reason to believe that this additional information and reflection
251 may improve our research, the extra effort is quite worthwhile.

252 IT IS UNCOMFORTABLE

253 Researchers may be uncomfortable asking respondents questions about topics such as race, gender, and ability.
254 Demographics are usually asked at the end of data collection, in part to minimize this discomfort. These are
255 personal topics. Still, most people are used to answering demographic questions for surveys and other purposes.
256 If this part of data collection is framed as routine, respondents will act accordingly. In interviews, researchers
257 may prefer to give respondents a sheet of paper with a short list of demographic questions to answer. And of

258 course, respondents should always be given the option to not answer demographic questions. When this occurs,
259 researchers should never assume what the answers would have been, but instead should report a count of people
260 who declined to answer. Ultimately, the benefit to the research means any slight social discomfort of asking such
261 questions is worthwhile.

262 **IT IS DIFFERENT**

263 Finally, it is true that this recommendation is different than what our research community has done in the past,
264 and will require each of us to report more identity information on research respondents than we have done in the
265 past. However, and as described previously, all but 4% of JCEM papers that described or drew knowledge from
266 research respondents in our dataset already provided at least some descriptions of those respondents. Regardless,
267 any healthy research community can and should strive to continuously improve the rigor of its research. The
268 methodological change described here is a step in this direction.

269 **IT IS NOT ALWAYS POSSIBLE**

270 Sometimes it will not be feasible to discover respondent characteristics. Similarly, even if we seek a diverse pool
271 of research respondents it may not be possible to identify and speak to all the types of people we would like to.
272 And indeed, until much more research has been carried out, we may not even know all of the pertinent identity
273 and expertise categories we should consider! In the future, we will no doubt discover the answers to this latter
274 question. In the meantime, we can at least systematically report the types of identity and expertise characteristics
275 that JCEM authors already employ (see Table 1). Even if this undertaking merely emphasizes limitations in our
276 samples (for example, if we are only able to interview males, or if we are only able to speak to people with
277 experience on public projects, or only people from a single geography), at least we will move towards better
278 science through improved transparency. Simply by recognizing and reporting on these limitations, our research
279 improves. In other words, we may well not be able to achieve or even describe perfection, but we can certainly
280 take steps to move in the right direction (Sen 2009).

281 **HOW TO ASK THE QUESTIONS**

282 Table 2 below provides an example set of questions that can be modified and used to seek the knowledge
283 categories described in Table 1. It is important to note that there are many possible variants of these questions. A
284 particular tension of data collection is whether or not the researcher should provide a list of categories to the
285 respondent (for example, male and female) or simply leave an open space for respondents to fill in. While
286 providing pre-determined response options simplifies analysis, race and gender theorists (Hyde 2005; Omi 2014)
287 would suggest that leaving these questions open ended avoids forcing respondents into inappropriate categories.

288 An alternative to providing response options is to permit respondents to fill in answers. This will likely lead to
289 more answer categories, and to respondents who become confused about the names of the different categories
290 described below. As a compromise between these two approaches, providing an Other option can include a space
291 for respondents to describe themselves if the provided options are insufficient. Importantly, the questions below
292 provide a limited list of racial identities; as time passes, the most recent census or the National Science
293 Foundation may provide a good guide for updating these questions. It is also worth noting that non-US
294 populations will likely require different questions that better describe race and ethnicity as they are locally
295 understood. Finally, while it is not common, some respondents will prefer not to respond to some or all questions.
296 In this case, researchers should not guess the answer based on appearances, but should instead report these
297 individuals as a group that declined to answer.

298 Table 2 About Here

299 **HOW TO HANDLE MINORITY GROUPS IN DATA ANALYSIS &**
300 **WRITING**

301 As I have shown, CEM researchers recognize the importance of describing the people they collect research data
302 from. They report these details in order to establish the expertise of their respondents. But of course, respondent

303 identity and expertise is a complex thing. To take examples from the content analysis, if we believe that
304 geographic location, job type, and gender are important attributes to consider, then we may reasonably enough
305 come to believe that the intersections of these identity categories also matter (Collins 2015; Crenshaw 1990). As
306 an example, a female executive from China may not have the same knowledge as a male executive from China.

307 When sample sizes are large, it is simple enough to use identity to create subsets of the data. In this case it is
308 reasonably straightforward to determine if identity categories have significant impacts on results. However, large
309 sample sizes can be difficult or impossible to achieve when dealing with minority populations. This research
310 design problem is compounded when considering intersectional identities. For example, it would be difficult to
311 impossible to identify several hundred disabled African American transgender construction managers with
312 experience on PPP projects. This difficulty does not mean that we cannot consider identity when using
313 quantitative methods. At a minimum, we can still report the characteristics of the people the data does represent.
314 We may also be able to investigate if the responses of minority individuals are outliers or not. If resources allow,
315 we may also target these individuals for qualitative research designs. For example, follow up interviews could
316 explore the experiences of these individuals and better capture minority experiences that statistics, by its nature,
317 may not represent well. Fortunately enough, a recent NSF project entitled Learning from Small Numbers (NSF
318 2015; Pawley 2019) has developed methodological guidance for exactly this situation. Researchers are referred
319 there for more guidance on this issue. Regardless of method, if identity is being used as an analytic category,
320 identities with compound minority statuses (or, intersectional identities) should not be ignored.

321 Finally, given the current demographics in construction, reporting details on each respondent may unintentionally
322 make underrepresented individuals identifiable. In this case, researchers may consider reporting the majority
323 demographics without providing specifics of minority respondents. This compromise allows us to maintain
324 confidentiality while still noting the limitations imposed upon the results by a lack of diversity in research
325 respondents.

326 CONCLUSIONS

327 Functionally, and given the current demographics of the US CEM profession, a diversity-blind (Bonilla-Silva
328 2006) perspective means that while our studies claim generalizability to people *in general*, or construction
329 managers *in general*, or construction workers *in general*, we are usually talking about white, non-disabled,
330 English speaking, cis-gendered, American males, which is not a representative category. And, we are often not
331 even recording details of professional experience that would better define their expertise. As a community, we
332 should shift away from pretending that insights from this population can be unthinkingly generalized to all people
333 just because we are not asking questions about identity and expertise categories. Instead, we should ask
334 researchers to more closely describe the population(s) they are working with. As Pawley (2017) suggests, this
335 may help us to better see places where diverse populations are being excluded, and will make it harder to ignore
336 and perpetuate the systematic disadvantaged experienced by some groups. And as argued here, this change will
337 also improve CEM science by eliminating an otherwise unspoken research limitation.

338 Adopting this methodological perspective does not mean that all CEM research should or even could be only
339 about diversity. Studies about PPP, construction safety, etc. are important and fundamental to our research
340 community. And given the current demographics of our industry, it is likely that white, non-disabled, English
341 speaking, cis-gendered, American males will remain the majority of the people we gather research data from for
342 some time. Still, if we are designing projects and technologies based on the insights and knowledge from a
343 particular segment of the population, we ought to make this limitation explicit, and reflect on how it may be
344 biasing our findings and recommendations.

345 Functionally, the recommendation for future CEM research is that researchers should consider each category
346 identified by authors of recent JCEM publications as they collect data and complete their analyses. From the
347 content review presented here, these categories are job type or role, years experience, subject matter expertise,
348 geography or nationality, organization and sector details, project type, professional qualifications, sex, race and
349 ethnicity, ability, and language. Examples of each of these categories are provided here in Table 1, and example
350 questions for each category, which may be modified to best suit each research project, are provided in Table 2.
351 When it is not possible to collect or report this data, it should be seen as a research limitation that requires

352 discussion in all publications. And finally, this list should be seen a starting point that should be updated as we
353 gain more knowledge; for example, respondent gender is an immediately apparent omission that should
354 reasonably be included.

355 This methodological recommendation does not mean that researchers should seek out token (Niemann 2016)
356 members of underepresented groups or irrelevant professional categories in the name of diversity. Instead,
357 researchers should consider what they might learn from different types of people, and what this means for
358 generalizability of their findings. Accordingly, the recommendation is not necessarily that researchers should
359 automatically collect all the types of information listed in Table 1, and nor yet do researchers have to diversify
360 their respondent pools. However, if they do not, authors should be prepared to justify this research design choice
361 in the manuscript and to reviewers. For example, a valid justification might include a description of the limited
362 diversity in the larger respondent pool of the construction community or wider research population, and comment
363 regarding how the research sample is similar or different to that larger pool. Finally, if we believe that the
364 identities and expertise of our respondents may influence our research, we should also recognize that our own
365 identities and expertise matter too. Many research communities are moving towards including reflexive
366 statements in articles; in the future, ours may wish to consider this, too.

367 Luckily, and as described in this paper, describing research respondents is a relatively simple way to make a real
368 change towards better research and a more just society. Researchers do not have to change the topics they are
369 interested in; we do not even have to try to collect additional data to achieve parity across the various and many
370 intersectional identity categories that may be relevant, nor yet consider identity categories as additional analytic
371 categories. These would, of course, be admirable and useful things to do! More researchers interested in topics
372 of diversity will bring new insights, and more diverse voices providing expert opinion will improve our
373 understanding of construction engineering, projects, and organizations. However, as a first and minimum step,
374 we can at least better describe the populations we are talking to and about, and (as is good research practice)
375 reflect upon ways that this limits or biases our results. Some tools for doing so can be found in this article.

376 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

377 The author thanks Dr. Regina Lee from the University of Washington for many conversations and insights
378 regarding this important topic. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation
379 under Grant No. 1763204.

380

381 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

382 Some or all data, models, or code that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding
383 author upon reasonable request.

384

385 **References**

386 Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and*
387 *Meaning*. Duke University Press, Durham & London.

388 BLS. (2019a). “Employed persons by detailed industry, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.”
389 <<https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat18.htm>> (May 19, 2020).

390 BLS. (2019b). “Persons with a Disability: Labor Force Characteristics News Release.”
391 <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/disabl_02262020.htm> (May 19, 2020).

392 Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without Racists*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Oxford.

393 Chan, P. W. (2013). “Queer eye on a ‘straight’ life: deconstructing masculinities in construction.” *Construction*
394 *Management and Economics*, Routledge, 31(8), 816–831.

395 Collins, P. H. (2015). “Intersectionality’s Definitional Dilemmas.” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1–20.

396 Comu, S., Unsal, H., and Taylor, J. E. (2011). “Dual Impact of Cultural and Linguistic Diversity on Project
397 Network Performance.” *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 27(3), 179–187.

398 Crenshaw, K. (1990). “Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of
399 color.” *Stan. L. Rev.*, HeinOnline, 43, 1241.

400 Hallowell, M. R., and Yugar-Arias, I. F. (2016). “Exploring fundamental causes of safety challenges faced by
401 Hispanic construction workers in the US using photovoice.” *Safety Science*, 82, 199–211.

402 Haraway, D. (1988). “Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial
403 perspective.” *Feminist studies*, 14(3), 575–599.

404 Hwang, B.-G., Zhao, X., and Yang, K. W. (2019). “Effect of BIM on rework in construction projects in
405 Singapore: status quo, magnitude, impact, and strategies.” *Journal of Construction Engineering and*
406 *Management*, American Society of Civil Engineers, 145(2), 04018125.

407 Hwang, S., Jebelli, H., Choi, B., Choi, M., and Lee, S. (2018). “Measuring Workers’ Emotional State during
408 Construction Tasks Using Wearable EEG.” *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*,
409 144(7), 04018050.

410 Hyde, J. S. (2005). "The gender similarities hypothesis." *American psychologist*, 60(6), 581.

411 Latour, B. (1988). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Harvard
412 University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

413 Mazher, K. M., Chan, A. P., Zahoor, H., Khan, M. I., and Ameyaw, E. E. (2018). "Fuzzy Integral-Based Risk-
414 Assessment Approach for Public-Private Partnership Infrastructure Projects." *Journal of Construction
415 engineering and Management*, American Society of Civil Engineers, 144(12), 04018111.

416 Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., and Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*.
417 SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, California.

418 Nguyen, L. H. (2019). "Relationships between Critical Factors Related to Team Behaviors and Client Satisfaction
419 in Construction Project Organizations." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 145(3),
420 04019002.

421 Niemann, Y. F. (2016). "Tokenism." *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies*, Wiley-
422 Blackwell, 1–2.

423 NSF. (2015). "NSF Award Search: Award#1055900 - PECASE: Learning from Small Numbers: Using personal
424 narratives by underrepresented undergraduate students to promote institutional change in engineering
425 education." <https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=1055900> (May 19, 2020).

426 Omi, M. (2014). *Racial Formation in the United States*. Routledge, New York.

427 Pawley, A. L. (2017). "Shifting the 'Default': The Case for Making Diversity the Expected Condition for
428 Engineering Education and Making Whiteness and Maleness Visible." *Journal of Engineering Education*,
429 106(4), 531–533.

430 Pawley, A. L. (2019). "Learning from small numbers: Studying ruling relations that gender and race the structure
431 of U.S. engineering education." *Journal of Engineering Education*, 108(1), 13–31.

432 Pereira, E., Hermann, U., Han, S., and AbouRizk, S. (2018). "Case-Based Reasoning Approach for Assessing
433 Safety Performance Using Safety-Related Measures." *Journal of Construction Engineering and
434 Management*, 144(9), 04018088.

435 Pickering, A. (1999). *Constructing Quarks*. University Of Chicago Press, Chicago ; London.

436 Poleacovschi, C., and Javernick-Will, A. (2014). "The Use and Misuse of" Gender" and" Sex" Terminologies in
437 Civil Engineer-ing Literature." *121st ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Indianapolis, IN: American*
438 *Society for Engineering Education.*

439 Saldaña, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage Publications Ltd, London.

440 Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. Allen Lane.

441 Siebelink, S., Voordijk, J., and Adriaanse, A. (2018). "Developing and Testing a Tool to Evaluate BIM Maturity:
442 Sectoral Analysis in the Dutch Construction Industry." *Journal of Construction Engineering and*
443 *Management*, 144(8), 05018007.

444 Simmons, D., Iorio, J., Taylor, J., and Li, D. (2018). "Work Values across Generations among Construction
445 Professionals in the United States." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 144(10),
446 04018096.

447

448

TABLE 1: JCEM PAPERS

Emergent Category	Examples from Papers	Paper Count	Relative Frequency
Job Type or Role	Engineer, Architect, Owner, CM, Trade, Contractor, Professor, Construction Professional	71	75%
Years Experience	Years Working Experience, Age, Jobsite Tenure	46	48%
Subject Matter Expertise	PPP, Safety, Case Knowledge, IPD, Demolition, BIM	38	40%
Geography/Nationality	Country, State, City	30	32%
Organization or Sector Details	Public, Private, Organizational Revenue, Organizational Size	20	21%
Project Type	Toll Roads, Heavy Civil, Industrial, Buildings, Project Size	18	19%
Institutional Qualifications	Degrees, Publications, ASCE Membership, Recommended by Agency, Union Membership	17	18%
Sex	Male, Female	15	16%
Race & Ethnicity	Caucasian, Hispanic	5	5%
Ability	Non-Vision Impaired, Healthy	3	3%
Language	Non-English, English as a Second Language	2	2%
No Respondent Details Provided	-	4	4%
Count of Papers that Gather Data from or about People in JCEM between July 2018 and June 2019	95		

TABLE 2: EXAMPLE QUESTIONS

Emergent Category from JCEM Content Analysis	Sample Questions	Sample Answer Options
Sex & Gender	What is your sex?	Female, Male, Other, Prefer not to respond
	With what gender do you identify?	Woman, Man, Other, Prefer not to respond
	Which best describes your sexual orientation?	Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Hetersexual, Asexual, Other, Prefer not to respond
Race & Ethnicity	What is your identified race (please choose all that apply)?	American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian (including Indian subcontinent and Philippines), Black or African American (including African and Caribbean), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White (including Middle Eastern), Prefer not to respond
	What is your identified ethnicity?	Hispanic or Latino, Not Hispanic or Latino, Prefer not to respond
Ability	Do you have a documented disability?	Yes, No, Prefer not to respond
Language	What is your first language?	Free response or options constrained by research question
	What language(s) are spoken in your home?	Free response or options constrained by research question
Job Type or Role	What is your current professional role?	Engineer, Architect, Owner, CM, Trade, Contractor, Professor, Construction Professional, etc.
Subject Matter Expertise	Questions that define the expertise required for research questions	
	How many <subject matter> projects have you worked on?	Free response or options constrained by research question
Years Experience	How many relevant years professional experience do you possess?	Free response or options constrained by research question
Institutional Qualifications	Qualifications that define the expertise required for research questions (Degrees, Memberships, Publications, etc.)	
Geography/ Nationality	Please list all the countries/states where you gained your construction experience.	Free response or options constrained by research question

	What is your nationality?	Free response or options constrained by research question
	Please list all the places you live or have lived that you feel are important to your identity.	Free response
	Where do you currently reside?	Free response or options constrained by research question
	Where is the project you are currently working on?	Free response or options constrained by research question
	Where is your primary office located?	Free response or options constrained by research question
Project Type	What types of projects have you worked on?	Toll Roads, Heavy Civil, Industrial, Buildings, Size, etc.
	What type of project are you currently working on?	
Organization or Sector Details	What kinds of organization have you worked for?	Public, Private, Revenue, Size, etc.
	What kind of organization do you currently work for?	

455

456