

**Final Draft Report**

**Workplace Productivity and Work-Life Balance  
Employers Survey  
Department of Labour**

October 2005

# **Final Draft Report**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

## **Workplace Productivity and Work-Life Balance Employers Survey Department of Labour**

October 2005

Prepared for: Dr Rose Ryan and Lyndy Fursman,  
Department of Labour

Prepared by: Mark Johnson and Dimitry Kazakov,  
BRC Marketing & Social Research

For further information Mark Johnson  
please contact: BRC Marketing & Social Research  
Phone 04 499 3088

27 October 2005 BRC #3198

# Executive Summary

---

## Introduction and background

### Workplace productivity

In December 2003, Cabinet Business Committee agreed to the establishment of the Workplace Productivity Working Group (WPWG), to advise the Government on practical ways to improve New Zealand's productivity performance. Subsequent to recommendations made by the WPWG, a Reference Group to support implementation of the Government's Workplace Productivity Agenda (the Agenda) was established.

The report of the WPWG identified a number of issues relating to information and access to information, which limit: *The extent to which employers and employees in workplaces in New Zealand are able to take action to lift workplace productivity.*

Information costs, in particular, have been identified as a major barrier to improving productivity.

In order to address the issues identified by the WPWG, a strategic communications programme, intended to engage all of the key stakeholders, is currently being implemented by the Department of Labour in conjunction with Business NZ, Chambers of Commerce and NZCTU (New Zealand Council of Trade Unions):

1. To continue to raise the profile of workplace productivity,
2. To keep the Workplace Productivity Agenda 'alive', by promoting the benefits and opportunities of productivity improvements.

### Work-life balance

In August 2003, the Government established the Work-Life Balance Project, to develop policies and practices aimed at promoting a better balance between paid work and life outside of work. Public consultation and contracted research with employers about work-life balance issues were undertaken by the Department, resulting in the July 2004 report *Achieving Balanced Lives and Employment: What New Zealanders are saying about work-life balance.*

### Purpose of research

BRC Marketing & Social Research (BRC) was commissioned in June 2005 by the Department to conduct a series of quantitative research studies with both employers and employees. The findings from the benchmark employers survey are covered by this report, and the employees survey is expected to commence in early October 2005.

## Objectives

The main objectives of the employers research were to:

1. Examine attitudes to employment-related workplace practices, as a means of lifting workplace productivity (including work organisation, management and leadership practices, and training and development).
2. Identify the relevance and significance of various types of employment related practices, used to lift workplace productivity.

With these research objectives in mind, the information objectives of the employers survey were to identify:

- The practices employers believe will improve productivity.
- The actions being put in place in workplaces to improve productivity and work-life balance.
- Employers' perceived barriers to improving productivity and work-life balance.
- Where employers go for information on lifting productivity.
- How these answers vary according to workplace size and industry.

## Methodology

### Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was designed in consultation with the Department of Labour. Once a preliminary version had been agreed to, it was then subjected to a pilot survey with a sample of n=30 randomly selected employers.

Following the pilot, minor changes to the wording of some questions were made.

### Sample and sampling error

For this survey, a sample of n=1,100 employers (with 5 or more employees) from business with telephones were interviewed.

The sample was acquired from APN Iris Data (formerly UBD) and drawn from the APN InfoMedia database of New Zealand businesses.

In order to maximise the opportunities for drawing conclusions about the extent of differences amongst different industry types, a stratified, random sampling approach (based primarily on the ratio of enterprises across 9 different ANZISC Industry Groupings) was used, wherein BRC over-sampled certain industry groups to ensure minimum sub-samples of at least n=100 employers (with 5 or more employees) were interviewed in each Group.

This approach ensures that statistically robust sub-samples were achieved within each of the different industry classifications selected, allowing for confident comparative analysis within and between industry groups, while also providing statistically robust and representative findings at the national level.

### **Weighting of employers' sample and sampling error**

As a result of over-sampling employers from certain industry groups to achieve robust sub-sample sizes, certain industry groups were slightly over or under represented beyond their normal proportions. To account for any potential impact this may have had on the overall results during the analysis and reporting stages, the achieved survey sample was weighted to reflect the true proportions of the number of enterprises represented across the 9 ANZSIC categories.

The maximum margin of error, at the 95% confidence level, for the overall results is  $\pm 3.1\%$ .

### **Interviewing processes**

The interviewing for this research was conducted by telephone from BRC's purpose-built call centre in downtown Wellington between 30 June and 2 August 2005.

Pre-notification letters were sent to the most senior executives on the APN InfoMedia record to all workplaces in the sample, to advise that a BRC interviewer might contact them.

Eight attempts to contact each selected workplace were made before the attempt to obtain an interview was abandoned, and a different workplace from the sample was substituted in its place. The average length of each interview was 20 minutes.

The overall response rate for this survey was 23%<sup>1</sup>.

### **Limitations of the survey**

It should be noted that this survey was conducted with businesses with five or more employees in 9 specific ANZSIC Groupings:

- Manufacturing.
- Retail Trade.
- Property and Business Services.
- Health and Community Services.
- Education.
- Wholesale Trade.
- Accommodation, Cafes and Restaurants.
- Construction.
- Transport and Storage.

Therefore the survey results do not necessarily represent the views and practices of New Zealand employers in the Government Administration and Defence sector, the Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing sector, the Mining Sector or Electricity, Gas and Water Supply sector. Nor do they necessarily represent the views and practices of employers of 4 or less employees in the 9 ANZSIC Groupings listed above<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The response rates by Industry Groupings can be found in Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup> Due to budgetary limitations, and the likely significant different issues facing small employers (with 4 or less employees) or employers within the omitted ANZSIC Groupings, during the scoping and design phase

While a response rate of 23% for a telephone survey of employers is not atypical, it should be noted that it is on the low side of average and there may be an inherent response bias in the results as detailed in this report, (i.e. given that employers were pre-notified about the survey and it was disclosed that the focus would be on workplace productivity and work-life balance issues, it is not an unlikely hypothesis that those employers who did respond might be more amenable to the concepts of lifting productivity and improving work-life balance than those employers who did not respond, and thus are more likely to have implemented such practices).

As the effects of non-response upon the results can not be estimated for the purposes of analysis and reporting because the characteristics of those who did not respond are unknown, the reader should exercise some degree in caution in interpreting the results, as they may over-estimate the true degree of awareness and implementation of certain practices among the industries covered.

## Summary findings

### What the term workplace productivity means to employers

All employers surveyed were asked what the term 'workplace productivity' meant to them. As detailed below, the most frequently mentioned responses were:

- The volume of output/sales/number of hours worked (29%).
- Getting the most/best out of employees (28%).
- Working efficiently/effectively (26%).
- The ratio of input to output (11%).

For the most part, there were no significant differences in employers' perceptions of what workplace productivity meant to them, when viewed by Industry Grouping or size of the workplace, with the following exceptions of:

- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report workplace productivity meant getting the work done/achieving the goals/purpose of the business.
- Education Services employers were significantly less likely to report workplace productivity meant working efficiently/effectively.
- Employers of workplaces with 100 or more employees were significantly more likely to report workplace productivity meant working efficiently/effectively.

---

of the project it was decided in consultation with the Department, to focus on the specified 9 ANZSIC Groups covered. It should be noted, however, that these 9 Groupings currently represent 87% of the total number of New Zealand enterprises (with 5 or more employees) and 82% of the employed workforce (excluding those employees working for employers having 4 or less employees, and the self-employed).

## **Agreement with the Department's definition of improving workplace productivity**

83% of employers surveyed agreed with the following definition of what improving productivity means.

*The Department of Labour defines improving workplace productivity as creating a workplace that produces high value products and services through changes in workplace practices.*

Of note, there were no significant differences in agreement with the Department's definition of improving workplace productivity by ANZSIC Grouping (with the exception of employers in the Health and Community Services Sector, who were significantly more likely to agree).

Those who disagreed generally had issues with the emphasis on 'high value products and services', as many reported dealing in 'low value, but high volume' activities. Other reasons included not viewing the making of changes to workplace practices to improve productivity as being in line with the goals or principles of the type of work their workplaces were involved in, such as health, education, sales or property and business services.

## **Staff related practices to improve productivity**

### **Perceived impact of staff related practices**

All employers surveyed were read a list of staff related practices and asked to identify those they thought would have a positive/very positive impact on productivity in their workplace. Between 67% and 97% of employers identified all of the practices as having either a positive or very positive impact:

- *Increasing workers' skills through training (97% positive/very positive).*
- *Developing a workplace culture where people work together better (95%).*
- *Encouraging workers to be innovative (93%).*
- *Developing and training better managers (91%).*
- *Encouraging workers to use new technology (89%).*
- *Conducting team building activities (79%).*
- *Increasing workers pay rates (67%).*

### **Variance by Industry**

As might be expected, certain practices were more, or less likely to be seen as having a very positive impact in employers' workplaces, depending upon the Industry type:

- Manufacturing Services employers were significantly more likely to report encouraging workers to use new technology would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplaces. Conversely they were significantly more likely to report increasing workers pay rates would have no effect at all.
- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report increasing workers' pay rates would have a very positive effect.

- Education Services employers were significantly more likely to report the following staff related practices would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplaces:
  - *Developing a workplace culture where people work together better.*
  - *Encouraging workers to be innovative.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*
  - *Increasing workers' pay rates.*
- Wholesale Trade Services employers were significantly less likely to report *increasing workers' skills through training* or *conducting team building activities* would have a very positive effect.
- Hospitality/Accommodation/Travel Services employers were significantly more likely to report *encouraging workers to use new technology* would have no effect at all on workplace productivity in their workplaces.

### **Variance by size**

As might be expected, certain practices were more, or less likely to be seen as having a very positive impact in employers' workplaces, depending upon the size of the workplace:

- Employers of between 5 and 10 employees were significantly less likely to report *developing and training better managers* would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplace.
- Employers of between 51 and 100 employees were significantly more likely to report *developing and training better managers* would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity.
- Employers of 100 or more employees were significantly more likely to report *developing and training better managers* and *increasing workers' skills through training* would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplace.

### **Implementation of staff related practices**

All employers surveyed were asked which of the various staff related practices had been discussed and/or implemented in their workplace in the last twelve months.

On average, those surveyed reported that roughly five out of seven of the staff related practices had been implemented in their workplaces (i.e. a mean score of  $M=4.9$ ), with the most frequently identified practices being:

- *Increasing workers' skills through training* (86%).
- *Increasing worker's pay* (81%).
- *Encouraging workers to use new technology* (74%).
- *Developing a workplace culture where people work together better* (73%).

Conversely, 33% of employers reported *conducting team building activities* and 33% reported *developing and training better managers* were practices that were neither discussed nor implemented in their workplace.

### **Variance by Industry**

Depending upon the industry, certain practices were more or less likely to have been implemented:

- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report the following staff related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Developing and training better managers.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*
  - *Conducting team building activities.*
- Education Services employers were significantly more likely to report the following staff related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Developing and training better managers.*
  - *Encouraging workers to be innovative.*
  - *Encouraging workers to use new technology.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*
  - *Conducting team building activities.*
- Wholesale Trade Services employers were significantly less likely to report the following staff related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Encouraging workers to be innovative.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*
- Hospitality/Accommodation/Travel Services employers were significantly less likely to report the following staff related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Encouraging workers to use new technology.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*

### **Variance by size**

Staff related practices more, or less likely to have been implemented, depending upon the size of the workplace, included:

- Employers of between 5 and 10 employees were significantly less likely to report *developing and training better managers* had been implemented in their workplace.
- Employers of between 21 and 50 employees were significantly more likely to report *increasing workers' skills through training* had been implemented in their workplace.

- Employers of between 51 and 100 employees were significantly more likely to report *developing and training better managers* and *increasing workers' skills through training* had been implemented in their workplace.
- Employers of 100 or more employees were significantly more likely to report the following staff related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Developing and training better managers.*
  - *Developing a workplace culture where people work together better.*
  - *Increasing workers' skills through training.*

## **Business related practices to improve productivity**

### **Perceived impact of business related practices**

All employers surveyed were read a list of business related practices and asked to identify those they thought would have a positive/very positive impact on productivity in their workplace.

Between 62% and 77% of employers identified all of the practices as having either a positive or very positive impact on workplace productivity in their workplace:

- *Reorganising the way work is done in the business (77% positive/very positive).*
- *Improving the physical surroundings of the workplace (76%).*
- *Sharing ideas with other businesses (75%).*
- *Measuring and tracking productivity indicators (74%).*
- *Purchasing machinery and equipment (72%).*
- *Improving health and safety practices (71%).*
- *Conducting research and development (62%).*

### **Variance by Industry**

Certain practices were more, or less likely to be seen as having a very positive impact in employers' workplaces, depending upon the Industry:

- Manufacturing Services employers were significantly more likely to report *purchasing machinery or equipment* would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplaces, and significantly less likely to report *sharing ideas with other businesses* have a very positive effect.
- Retail Trade employers were significantly more likely to report *conducting research and development* would have no effect at all on workplace productivity in their workplaces.
- Property and Business Services employers were significantly more likely to report *purchasing machinery or equipment* and *improving health and safety practices* would have no effect at all on workplace productivity in their workplaces.

- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report *improving health and safety practices* and *sharing ideas with other businesses* would have a very positive effect.
- Education Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following business related practices would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplaces:
  - *Sharing ideas with other businesses.*
  - *Improving the physical surroundings of the workplace.*
  - *Conducting research and development.*
- Wholesale Trade Services employers were significantly less likely to report that the following business related practices would have a very positive effect on workplace productivity in their workplaces:
  - *Purchasing machinery or equipment.*
  - *Improving health and safety practices.*
  - *Measuring and tracking productivity.*
  - *Improving the physical surroundings of the workplace.*
  - *Reorganising the work is done in the business.*
- Hospitality/Accommodation/Travel Services employers were significantly more likely to report *purchasing machinery or equipment* would have no effect at all.
- Construction services employers were significantly less likely to report *improving the physical surroundings of the workplace* would have a very positive effect.
- Transport and Storage Services employers were significantly more likely to report *purchasing machinery or equipment* would have no effect at all.

### **Variance by size**

Certain practices were more, or less likely to be seen as having no effect at all in employers' workplaces, depending upon the size of the workplace.

- Employers of between 11 and 20 employees were significantly less likely to report *reorganising the way work is done in the business* would have no effect at all on workplace productivity in their workplace.
- Employers of 100 or more employees were significantly less likely to report *conducting research and development* would have no effect at all.

### **Implementation of business related practices**

All employers surveyed were asked which of the various business related practices had been discussed and/or implemented in their workplace in the last twelve months.

On average, the employers surveyed identified roughly four out of seven of the business related practices had been implemented in their workplaces (i.e. a mean score of  $M=4.3$ ), with the most frequently implemented business related practices reported by employers being:

- *Improving health and safety practices (73%).*
- *Purchasing machinery or equipment (73%).*
- *Reorganising the way work is done in the business (70%).*

### **Variance by industry**

Certain practices were more, or less likely to have been implemented, depending upon the Industry type.

- Retail Trade Services employers were significantly more likely to report *improving the physical surroundings of the workplace* had been implemented in their workplace.
- Property and Business Services employers were significantly less likely to report *improving health and safety* had been implemented in their workplace.
- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report *sharing ideas with other business* had been implemented in their workplace:
- Education Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following business related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Purchasing machinery or equipment.*
  - *Measuring and tracking productivity indicators.*
  - *Sharing ideas with other businesses.*
  - *Improving the physical surroundings of the workplace.*
  - *Conducting research and development.*
- Construction Services employers were significantly more likely to report *improving health and safety practices* had been implemented in their workplace, and significantly less likely to report *conducting research and development* had been implemented.

### **Variance by size**

Certain business related practices were more, or less likely to have been implemented, depending upon the size of the workplace:

- Employers of between 5 and 10 employees were significantly less likely to report that the following business related practices had been implemented in their workplace:
  - *Improving health and safety practices.*
  - *Measuring and tracking productivity indicators.*
  - *Conducting research and development.*
- Employers of between 51 and 100 employees were significantly more likely to report *measuring and tracking productivity indicators* and *conducting research and development* had been implemented in their workplace.

- Employers of 100 or more employees were significantly more likely to report *improving the physical surroundings of the workplace* had been implemented in their workplace.

## **Sources of information regarding improving workplace productivity**

All employers surveyed were read a series of sources they might go to, if they wanted information about improving workplace productivity.

Most frequently, employers would go to a colleague or friend for information (86% likely/very likely), followed by trade and industry organisations (65% likely/very likely), whereas those organisations that employers would be least likely to go to were the Ministry of Economic Development, a trade union, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise or the Department of Labour.

Of note, more than half of the employers surveyed (54%) would likely/very likely use between three and five sources, if they wanted to find information on ways to improve workplace productivity, while approximately one third would use more than five sources (31%).

### **Variance by Industry**

As might be expected, certain information sources are significantly more likely to be used by employers, depending upon their industry type:

- *A trade or industry organisation*, were more likely to be used by Hospitality Services and Retail Trade employers.
- *A business mentor* was more likely to be used by employers with workplaces having between 21 and 50 employees.
- *Private consultants* were more likely to be used by Education Services employers and employers with workplaces having 21 employees or more.
- *Accountants* were more likely to be used by Retail Trade and Construction Services employers.
- *Lawyers* were more likely to be used by Hospitality Services employers.
- *A trade union* was more likely to be used by Education Services and Health and Community Services employers.
- *The Department of Labour* was most likely to be used by Hospitality Services employers and Health and Community Services employers.
- *New Zealand Trade and Enterprise* was most likely to be used by Manufacturing Services employers.

## Barriers to improving workplace productivity

All respondents surveyed were read a series of statements that 'some employers' have said 'put them off' from trying to improve workplace productivity, and asked for each statement how much they agree or disagree it applies to their own workplace.

Depending upon the statement between 69% and 84% disagreed that these things had put them off, as detailed below:

- *Employees resist our efforts to improve productivity because they think it could affect their jobs* (69% disagree/strongly disagree).
- *Our competitors will get as much benefit from them as we do* (69% disagree/strongly disagree).
- *We are too busy to make changes* (77% disagree/strongly disagree).
- *It's risky to change the way we do things, and it might not pay off anyway* (82% disagree/strongly disagree).
- *It costs too much to improve productivity* (84% disagree/strongly disagree).
- *We wouldn't get any benefit for a long time* (83% disagree/strongly disagree).

## Other things that 'put-off' employers from improving productivity

When asked, if they could think of any other things that currently 'put them off' from trying to improve productivity in their workplace, more than half of all employers surveyed (56%) could think of no other things, while between 6% and 7% identified one or more of the following:

- It is too expensive/costs too much.
- Staff don't want to change, staff apathy/negative attitudes, resistance to change.
- Lack of time/takes too much time/timing issues.
- Lack of help from government/ laws/ legislation/ funding.
- Not having right staff/people to do it/hard to find the right staff.

## Work-life balance practices in workplaces

### Types of work-life balance working arrangements available in workplaces

All employers surveyed were read a series of working arrangements or options and asked if they were currently available to some or all employees in their workplace.

The most commonly available options (i.e. those that were **available to all employees at 50% or more of the workplaces** surveyed) were:

- *Being allowed to occasionally vary starting and finishing times to deal with problems outside of work*, such as childcare issues, going to the doctor, etc. (available to all employees at 92% of all workplaces surveyed).

- *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick*, e.g. children, parents or a partner (available to all employees at 86% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Having flexible break provisions*, e.g. taking longer breaks after long shifts or intensive work (available to all employees at 65% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Study leave* (available to all employees at 52% of all workplaces surveyed).

Whereas the least commonly available options (i.e. those that were **not available to any employees at 50% or more of the workplaces** surveyed) were:

- *Regularly working from home* (not available to any employees at 80% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Having additional leave in exchange for reduced pay* (not available to any employees at 63% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts* (not available to any employees at 61% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Occasionally working from home* (not available to any employees at 59% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Employees have flexibility in choosing when they work the number of hours they are contracted to do*, e.g. compressed or staggered hours, working only when schools are in term, etc. (not available to any employees at 55% of all workplaces surveyed).
- *Job sharing* (not available to any employees at 50% of all workplaces surveyed).

### **Types of working arrangements available vary by Industry Grouping**

As might be expected, certain types of working arrangements are more likely not to be available to any employees, while others more likely to be available to all employees in a workplace, depending upon the Industry type.

- Manufacturing employers were significantly more likely to report that *being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts* and *job sharing* are not available to any employees and significantly less likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Job sharing.*
  - *Part-time work.*
  - *Occasionally working from home.*
- Retail trade employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are not available to any employees:
  - *Regularly working from home.*
  - *Occasionally working from home.*
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick.*

- While also being significantly less likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick.*
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Occasionally working from home.*
- Property and Business Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Occasionally working from home.*
- Health and Community Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick.*
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Part-time work.*
  - *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts.*
  - *Job sharing.*
  - *Flexibility in choosing when they work the number of hours they are contracted to do.*
- Education Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick.*
  - *Study leave.*
  - *Job sharing.*
  - *Occasionally working from home.*
- While also being significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are not available to any employees:
  - *Having flexible break provisions.*
  - *Being allowed to occasionally vary starting and finishing times to deal with problems outside of work.*
- Wholesale Trade employers were significantly less likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Part-time work.*
  - *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts.*
- Hospitality Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are available to all employees:
  - *Having flexible break provisions.*

- *Part-time work.*
- *Being allowed to regularly vary starting and finishing times for any reasons.*
- *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts.*
- *Job sharing.*
- *Flexibility in choosing when they work the number of hours they are contracted to do.*
- Construction Services employers were significantly more likely to report that the following working arrangements are not available to any employees:
  - *Regularly working from home.*
  - *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts.*
  - *Flexibility in choosing when they work the number of hours they are contracted to do.*
  - *Job sharing.*
- Transport and Storage Services employers were significantly more likely to report that *study leave* is not available to any employees.

### **Types of working arrangements available to some employees**

All those employers who mentioned these options were available to some employees, but not all employees in the workplace were asked which employees these options are available to:

- *Working Part-time* is most likely to be available to Part-time employees (51%) and Support staff (27%).
- *Being allowed to occasionally vary starting and finishing times to deal with problems outside of work* is more often offered to Full-time employees (39%) and Senior staff or Management (27%), although for 16% it is dealt on *Case by case*.
- *Being allowed to regularly vary starting and finishing times for any reasons* is most likely to be available to Senior staff or Management (34%), as well as Support staff and Full-time employees (20% and 19% respectively).
- *Being allowed to select their own rosters or shifts* is most likely offered to Part-time employees (24%), although it is also often offered to Senior staff or Management (22%).
- *Regularly working from home* is most likely to be available to Senior staff or Management (47%) and Support staff (22%), similar to *Occasionally working from home* with 51% and 15% for the two groups respectively.
- *Job sharing* is most likely to be available to Support staff (42%) and Part-time employees (19%).
- *Employees having flexibility in choosing when they work the number of hours they are contracted to do* is most likely to be available to Part-time and Full-time employees (24% and 21% respectively), as well as Senior staff or Management (21%) and Support staff (20%).

- *Having flexible break provisions* is most likely to be available to Senior staff or Management (25%), as well as Support staff and Full-time employees (18% each).
- *Study leave* is most likely to be offered to Apprentices/trainees (24%) and Full-time employees (23%).
- *Having additional leave in exchange for reduced pay* is more often offered to Senior staff or Management (26%) and Full-time employees (25%), although for 13% it is dealt on *Case by case*.
- *Using personal sick leave to care for other people who are sick* is often available to Full-time and Part-time employees (45% and 19% respectively).

## **Barriers to work-life balance working arrangements**

All employers surveyed were read a series of statements that employers have said 'put them off' from having the types of flexible working arrangements, discussed in the previous section, and asked for each statement how much they agree or disagree it applies to their own workplace.

Depending upon the statement between 17% and 40% of employers agreed these things 'put them off' from having the types of flexible working arrangements in their own workplace, whereas:

- About three in four employers (74%) disagree/strongly disagree that *It's too expensive to have these types of work arrangements*.
- While 62% disagree/strongly disagree that *It's too complicated to have these types of arrangements*.
- 54% disagree/strongly disagree that *The type of work in their company needs to have everyone in the workplace at the same time*.

## **Additional factors that can 'put off' employers from having these types of working arrangements in their workplace**

More than a half of all employers (55%) reported that there were no other things that could 'put them off' from having these types of working arrangements in their workplace, 45% mentioned some other factors (mostly just one). Of these, most mentioned include:

- Hard to do (manage/organise, control/monitor), communication (9% of the total sample).
- Unable to be flexible in our business (7%).
- Staff abusing the system, dishonesty, taking advantage of flexibility, and/or not appreciating the benefits (6%).