

2 0 0 8

N A T I O N A L

S T U D Y O F

E M P L O Y E R S

Funded by  
the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

Ellen Galinsky  
James T. Bond  
Kelly Sakai

with

Stacy S. Kim  
Nicole Giuntoli



**Families** and **Work** Institute

W H E N  
W O R K  
W O R K S

**Families and Work Institute's**

**Corporate Leadership Circle**



**As of May 2008**

**Corporate Benefactors**

*(\$15,000 or more)*

Deloitte & Touche, LLP  
 Eli Lilly and Company  
 Goldman, Sachs & Co.  
 IBM Corporation  
 Johnson & Johnson

JPMorgan Chase  
 KPMG LLP  
 Merck & Co., Inc.  
 Pfizer Inc

**Corporate Patrons**

*(\$10,000 - \$14,999)*

Ceridian  
 Chevron Corporation  
 Citigroup Inc.

Marriott International  
 Northrop Grumman Corporation

**Corporate Sponsors**

*(\$5,000 - \$9,999)*

Alcoa Inc.  
 Allstate Insurance Company  
 Baxter Healthcare Corporation  
 Bright Horizons Family Solutions  
 CIGNA Corporation  
 CIT Group Inc.  
 Discovery Communications, Inc.  
 Ernst & Young LLP  
 GlaxoSmithKline  
 Harris, Rothenberg International, LLC  
 Hilton Hotels Corporation

Knowledge Learning Corporation  
 Kraft Foods, Inc.  
 Lehman Brothers Inc.  
 MetLife  
 Pearson Education  
 PricewaterhouseCoopers  
 Prudential Financial  
 Time Warner  
 United Technologies Corporation  
 Viacom Inc.

**Corporate Friends**

*(\$3,000 - \$4,999)*

Accenture  
 Aetna Inc.  
 Cisco Systems, Inc.  
 Eileen Fisher, Inc.  
 First Horizon National Corporation  
 Lowe's Companies Inc.  
 The McGraw-Hill Companies

RBC Financial Group  
 RSM McGladrey, Inc.  
 Texas Instruments  
 Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.  
 WFD Consulting  
 Xerox Corporation

## INTRODUCTION

Families and Work Institute's **2008 National Study of Employers** (NSE) is the most comprehensive and far-reaching study of the practices, policies, programs and benefits provided by U.S. employers to address the changing needs of today's workforce and workplace. Because this study was designed to build on the Institute's landmark **1998 Business Work-Life Study (BWLS)**, it is, therefore, able to provide trend data on changes that have occurred over the past ten years.

The 1998 BWLS surveyed a nationally representative group of employers with 100 or more employees.<sup>i</sup> In the 2000s, The **Alfred P. Sloan Foundation** began funding the *National Study of Employers* to provide ongoing measurements of employer benefits, policies and practices. At that time, the study was redesigned to increase the number of employer initiatives assessed and to include even smaller employers, those with 50 or more employees. Families and Work Institute released the findings from the second study in this series in 2005 and the third, the present study, in 2008. Although there are similar surveys by employer membership organizations, consulting firms and government agencies, the NSE is notable in that it is the only study of employers in the United States that comprehensively assesses a broad array of programs, policies and benefits for a nationally representative group of employers. The 2008 NSE sample includes 1,100 employers with 50 or more employees—77 percent are for profit employers and 23 percent are nonprofit organizations; 40 percent operate at only one location, while 60 percent have operations at more than one location. Interviews were conducted on behalf of Families and Work Institute by Harris Interactive, Inc.<sup>ii</sup>

The 1998 BWLS and both the 2005 and the 2008 NSE were developed to complement Families and Work Institute's ongoing *National Study of the Changing Workforce* (NSCW) which surveys large representative samples of employees in the U.S. labor force. In the 2002 NSCW, we found that, among other things, employees in more effective and flexible workplaces are more likely than other workers to have:

- greater engagement in their jobs;
- higher levels of job satisfaction;
- stronger intentions to remain with their employers;
- less negative and stressful spillover from job to home;
- less negative spillover from home to job; and
- better mental health.

These findings reveal that both employers and employees can benefit from effective and flexible workplaces. Employees benefit from having higher quality jobs and more supportive workplaces that are less likely to negatively affect their personal and family lives, while employers benefit from having more engaged employees, higher retention and potentially lower health care costs.

The 2008 NSE enables us to assess the extent to which businesses are addressing a number of the factors we have identified as predictive of workers' productivity and well-being. In the 2008 report, we address the following four questions.

### Prevalence

What practices, policies, programs and benefits do employers provide to address the personal and family needs of employees? It is important to note that this study does not ask employers to report on whether they have "written policies," but rather whether their organization "allows employees to

... or “provides the following benefits or programs ...” This wording is used for two reasons. First, employers may have written policies, but not “allow” employees to use them. Second, smaller employers are less likely to have written policies than larger ones. Thus, this wording enables the NSE to obtain the most realistic picture of how employers are addressing the needs of the changing workforce and workplace today.

### Small versus Large Employers

How do small employers (those with 50 to 99 employees nationwide) compare with large employers (those with 1,000 or more employees nationwide) in providing these benefits, policies and practices? To simplify the presentation and interpretation of employer-size comparisons, we exclude medium-size employers (100 to 999 employees nationwide) from the comparisons reported below. Supplemental analyses indicate that, in almost every case, the responses of medium-size employers fall between those of small and large employers (indicating that relationships with size are linear). In these comparisons, differences are only reported as statistically significant when the probability that they occurred by chance is less than 1 in 100 ( $p < .01$ ).

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

To what extent have employers changed over the past ten years (between 1998 and 2008) in the provision of select practices, policies, programs and benefits?

In these comparisons as well all other comparisons in this report, differences are only reported as statistically significant when the probability that they occurred by chance is less than 1 in 100 ( $p < .01$ ). This assures that reported differences are very likely to be real and meaningful.

It is extremely important to note that comparisons of data from 1998 with data from 2008 involve reducing the 2008 sample from employers with 50 or more employees to employers with 100 or more employees in order to parallel the 1998 sample. This substantially reduces the total sample size. In addition, when data from 1998 are compared with data from 2008, special sample weights must be applied. The ordinary weights used in this report adjust for employer size; that is, the sample is weighted to represent the distribution of employers of different sizes in the U.S. The special weights used in cross-year comparisons adjust for “design effects” that take into account effects of the sampling design. The design-effect weighting reduces the “effective sample sizes” of those samples being compared as well as the “likelihood of finding statistically significant differences” between those samples. Thus, the statistically significant effects reported here for 1998 versus 2008 are quite conservative and robust—particularly since we only report differences as significant when they reach  $p < .01$ .

### Predicting Programs, Policies and Benefits

In this study, we asked employers that provided at least eight initiatives in flexibility, caregiving leaves, and child and elder care to tell us, in their own words, the main reasons that they did so. We also asked *all* employers to tell us the main obstacles to providing these programs, policies and benefits. To go beyond why employers say that they do or don't provide these initiatives in flexibility, caregiving leaves, child and elder care assistance, and health/economic security, we investigated which employers are more likely to provide these, using an extensive list of predictors. The predictors we investigated are:

- **the demographics of the workplace**—industry, profit/nonprofit status, employer size, number of years in business and number of operating locations;

- **the demographics of the workforce**—percentage of women, of ethnic minorities, of unionized employees, of hourly employees, of part-time employees, of women and people of color in top positions or reporting to people in top positions;
- **the financial health of the employer**—how well the organization is doing in comparison with competitors, downsized or upsized; and
- **human resource issues**—difficulty or ease of filling high-skilled job vacancies, filling entry-level/hourly positions, finding and hiring employees with basic skills, finding and hiring hardworking self-starters, dealing with the retirement of highly-valued employees, finding and hiring honest and reliable employees, finding and hiring employees who communicate effectively, developing potential of employees to assume greater responsibility, managing the performance of employees, retaining employees with basic skills and covering costs of fringe benefits to be competitive.

To conduct these analyses, we divided employers into quartiles that grouped them into the following levels for each of the outcomes: Low Level (Bottom Quartile), Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3) and High Level (Top Quartile). Differences are only reported as statistically significant when the probability that they occurred by chance is less than 1 in 100 ( $p < .01$ ).

## KEY FINDINGS

### TRENDS FROM 1998 TO 2008

The past ten years have been marked by economic volatility, by ups and downs in the labor market leading into the current downturn or recession. Despite this economic instability, the Families and Work Institute's **2008 National Study of Employers** (NSE) reveals that there has been surprising stability in the practices, policies, programs and benefits provided by a nationally representative group of U.S. employers with 50 or more employees that are designed to address the needs of the changing workforce. Most of the 80 plus options we examined neither show increases nor decreases over the past ten years. The major and very important exception to this trend is that employees are being asked to contribute larger co-pays for their health care premiums and retirement funds.

There are two changes in the provision of flexibility between 2008 and 1998: 79 percent of employers now allow at least some employees to periodically change their arrival and departure time, up from 68 percent. In addition, 47 percent of employers allow at least some employees to move from full-time to part-time work and back again while remaining in the same position or level, down from 57 percent.

While there are no changes in the maximum length of caregiving leaves offered to new mothers and fathers following childbirth, new adoptive parents and employees caring for seriously ill family members, far fewer employers provide full pay during the period of maternity-related disability, now at 16 percent, down from 27 percent in 1998.

The large majority of employers in our study are mandated to comply with the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993 at some or all sites. This law requires that at least 12 weeks of unpaid, job-guaranteed leave for childbirth, adoption, foster care placement, a serious personal medical condition or care of a child or spouse with a serious medical condition be granted to employees who have worked at least 1,250 hours during the preceding year. This law, however, exempts employers if they have fewer than 50 employees within a 75-mile radius of all worksites. When we compare small employers that have only *one* location (and are most likely covered by the federal FMLA) with small employers that have multiple locations (and are much less likely to be covered by the FMLA), we find no difference—79 percent in both groups offer full FMLA coverage. Even some large employers with more than 1,000 employees (about 18%), however, do not appear to fully comply with the FMLA at this time. Thus, we find that between 18 to 21 percent of employers (small and large) appear to be out of compliance with FMLA.

We find no changes in the ten ways we investigated in which employers provide child care assistance. On the other hand, more employers today (39%) than in 1998 (23%) provide access to information about services for elderly family members. This change possibly reflects the increased number of employees who provide elder care.

Given the increase in demanding jobs, it is not surprising to find that larger percentages are providing Employee Assistance Programs to help employees deal with problems and pressures—65 percent now, up from 56 percent in 1998. There has also been an increase in wellness programs, with 60 percent providing these programs today compared with 51 percent in 1998. In addition, more employers are providing women with private space for breastfeeding in 2008 (53%) than in 1998 (37%).

Although there have been no cutbacks in the percentages of employers who provide health care coverage for employees and their families, employers are asking employees to pick up a larger

share of the premiums. Among employers offering personal health insurance, 34 percent increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months. Similarly, among employers offering family health insurance, 34 percent increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months. Only 4 percent pay all of the premiums for family members today, compared with 13 percent in 1998. On the other hand, employers are more likely to provide health insurance for unmarried partners of employees—31 percent in 2008, compared with 14 percent ten years ago.

There has been a steep decline in offering defined pension plans—29 percent in 2008 compared with 48 percent in 1998. Employers are also less likely to contribute to employees' retirement plans.

## PREDICTING PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND BENEFITS

Although there has been relative stability in the provision of programs, policies and benefits, some employers offer a great deal more than others. We, therefore, decided to investigate which employers provide high, mid and low levels of flexibility, caregiving leaves, child and elder care assistance, and health/economic security.

### Predicting Flexibility

Those most likely to be flexible are employers that:

- are nonprofits;
- are in the finance and in professional services sectors;
- operate in more than one location;
- have fewer union members;
- have fewer hourly employees;
- have more women and more minorities in top positions or who report directly to those in top positions; and
- have more part-timers.

Interestingly, more flexible employers report less difficulty hiring hardworking self-starters and less difficulty dealing with the retirement of highly valued employees. It is impossible to separate the cause and effect here. Does seeing one's employees in a positive light (as hardworking, self-starters) and managing human resource issues well (such as the retirement of key staff) lead to or result from providing greater flexibility?

### Predicting Caregiving Leaves

Those most likely to offer generous caregiving leave benefits are employers that:

- are larger;
- are nonprofits;
- have more union members; and
- have more racial and ethnic minorities in top positions or who report directly to those in top positions.

These employers are also having less difficulty finding and hiring employees who are honest, reliable and hardworking self-starters.

## Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance

Those most likely to provide child and elder care assistance are employers that:

- are larger;
- are nonprofits;
- are in finance and in professional services sectors;
- are in more than one location;
- have been in business longer;
- have more women in their workforces;
- have more employees likely to retire in the next five years;
- have more women and minorities in top positions or who report directly to those in top positions; and
- are upsizing.

Again, employers that report having less difficulty hiring hardworking self-starters, honest and reliable employees and managing the performance of employees are more likely to provide child and elder care assistance. Again, cause and effect cannot be separated here. Are employers more likely to have honest, reliable, hardworking, self-starting employees who are easy to manage when they provide dependent care assistance or does providing assistance leads to more positive behavior among employees?

## Predicting Health Care and Economic Security

Those employers most likely to provide health care and economic security benefits:

- are larger;
- are nonprofits;
- have been in business longer;
- have more unionized employees;
- have more employees likely to retire in the next five years;
- have more racial and ethnic minorities in top positions or who report directly to those in top positions; and
- are doing better than their competitors.

In addition, employers are more likely to provide these benefits when they report having less difficulty retaining employees with basic skills, abilities and personal characteristics that are needed; and report having less difficulty dealing with the retirement of high-valued employees.

In sum, nonprofits offer more programs, policies and benefits than for profits do, making them an interesting choice for employees who want both meaningful work and employer support in managing their work and personal lives. Furthermore, employers with more diversity in top positions and among those who report directly to those in top positions provide more support. When these initiatives cost money (caregiving leaves, child and elder care assistance, and health and economic security), employers that are larger also are more likely to provide a high level of support.



## CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THE SAMPLE

The percentage of employees in organizations of different sizes is presented in Table 1. Overall, 53 percent of employees work in small organizations (those with 50 to 99 employees nationwide) while only 9 percent work in large organizations (1,000 or more employees nationwide).<sup>iii</sup>

**Table 1: Employer Size in 2008**

Characteristic	Total Sample
Number of employees in U.S.	
50 to 99	53%
100 to 249	22
250 to 999	16
1,000 or more	9

(Sample size = 1,100)

Differences between the characteristics of small and large organizations are presented in Table 2. Large organizations tend to have greater proportions of employees who are women, union members and older. Large organizations are more likely to have women who report to those in top positions while women in small organizations are more likely to hold those top positions themselves. On the other hand, large employers have more racially diverse people in top positions, reporting to people in top positions and on their boards of directors.

**Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2008**

Characteristic	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Industry				
Goods producing	25%	25%		23%
Professional services	35	32	ns	36
Wholesale and retail trade	18	19		18
Finance, insurance, real estate	7	9		7
Other services	15	15		15
Employer Type				
For profit	77%	80%	ns	76%
Nonprofit <sup>1</sup>	23	20		24
Number of Operating Locations				
Only one	40%	54%	***	6%
More than one	60	46		94

<sup>1</sup> Nonprofit organizations exclude federal, state and local government agencies as well as publicly-funded educational institutions. Privately-funded educational institutions and all organizations classified as nonprofit by the IRS, however, are included in our nonprofit sample.

**Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2008 (continued)**

Characteristic	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Percentage of employees who are women				
1 to 24%	27%	34%	**	9%
25 to 50%	29	27		39
51 to 75%	27	22		39
More than 75%	17	18		14
Percentage of employees who are racial or ethnic minorities				
0%	3%	5%	ns	0%
1 to 24%	45	51		33
25 to 50%	29	26		45
51 to 75%	14	10		16
More than 75%	9	8		6
Percentage of employees who are union members				
0%	87%	93%	***	61%
1 to 24%	4	1		23
25 to 50%	3	1		9
51 to 75%	2	<1		5
More than 75%	3	4		2
Percentage of employees who are hourly (non-exempt)				
0%	2%	3%	ns	1%
1 to 24%	12	15		7
25 to 50%	16	14		22
51 to 75%	24	20		40
More than 75%	46	48		30
Percentage of employees who are part time				
0%	17%	22%	ns	7%
1 to 24%	53	50		53
25 to 50%	19	18		29
51 to 75%	6	5		7
More than 75%	4	5		3
Percentage of employees who are under the age of 30				
0%	1%	1%	ns	1%
1 to 24%	33	39		29
25 to 50%	51	45		58
51 to 75%	12	11		11
More than 75%	3	4		1

**Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2008 (continued)**

Characteristic	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Percentage of employees who are 30 to 49 years old				
0%	1%	1%		1%
1 to 24%	15	17	ns	17
25 to 50%	61	54		68
51 to 75%	19	22		13
>75%	3	6		1
Percentage of employees who are age 50 and older				
0%	3%	4%		2%
1 to 24%	53	57	**	37
25 to 50%	40	33		57
51 to 75%	4	5		3
>75%	1	1		0
Organizations with women in top/senior positions <sup>2</sup>	72%	71%	ns	82%
Organizations with women who are in top positions	54%	56%	ns	48%
Organizations with women who report directly to those in top positions	53%	49%	***	76%
Organizations with women on board of directors	50%	49%	ns	63%
Organizations with racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions <sup>3</sup>	31%	28%	***	51%
Organization with racial or ethnic minorities in top positions	20%	18%	ns	25%
Organizations with racial minorities who report directly to those in top positions	26%	21%	***	49%
Organizations with racial minorities on board of directors	25%	21%	***	42%

(Sample size = 1,100.)

Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

<sup>2</sup> “Women in top/senior positions” is defined as having women in any one of the following top positions: CEO, Managing Partner, President, Chair or Vice Chair of the Board; COO (Chief Operating Officer) or CFO (Chief Financial Officer), or those who report directly to those in top positions—the Chair, President, CEO or COO, such as executive or senior vice-presidents or senior partners.

<sup>3</sup> “Racial and ethnic minorities in top/senior positions” is defined as having racial or ethnic minorities in any one of the following top positions: CEO, Managing Partner, President, Chair or Vice Chair of the Board; COO (Chief Operating Officer) or CFO (Chief Financial Officer), or those who report directly to those in top positions—the Chair, President, CEO or COO, such as executive or senior vice-presidents or senior partners.

## TO WHAT EXTENT DO EMPLOYERS PROVIDE IMPORTANT SUPPORTS TO EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND HOW DO THESE DIFFER BY EMPLOYER SIZE AND OVER TIME?

### FLEXIBILITY

In many other surveys, flexibility is defined primarily as flextime: allowing employees to change their arrival and departure times on a periodic basis. That may have been a relevant definition in the late 20th Century, but it is not in the 21st Century. Our definition of flexibility (in the following section and throughout this report) is much broader and includes the following types of flexibility:

- **Flex Time and Place** includes various forms of flexibility that affect when and/or where employees do their job, such as flextime, telecommuting and compressed workweeks.
- **Choices in Managing Time** reflects the degree to which employees can exercise some choice about *when* they work—from scheduling hours and overtime to deciding when to take breaks—and about *how* their time at work is spent.
- **Reduced Time** includes options such as access to part-time or part-year schedules.
- **Caregiving Leaves** looks at whether the organization offers leaves for birth, adoption or caregiving to ill family members, and whether any of this leave is paid.
- **Time Off** includes policies and practices that apply when employees take time away from work, including scheduled absences (such as vacations and time for training) as well as formal policies for taking sick days and planned sabbaticals. It also includes informal access to time off for unanticipated or unplanned events.
- **Flex Careers** refers to flexibility over the course of an employee's career or working life, including provisions that enable employees to enter, exit and re-enter the workforce and to increase and decrease their workload or pace.
- **Culture of Flexibility** reflects whether supervisors are knowledgeable about flexible practices and promote and communicate them effectively.

### Prevalence

Of the 20 options for working flexibly we consider in this report (Table 3), employers with 50 or more employees most frequently allow at least some groups of workers to have control over when they take breaks (84%) and change their starting and quitting times within some range of hours (79%). They are next most likely to allow at least some groups of employees to return to work gradually after leaves for childbirth and adoption (77%), take time off for education or training to improve job skills (74%) and take time off for important family and personal needs without loss of pay (73%).

The proportion of employers offering these same options for working flexibly to all or most workers is significantly lower, ranging from 57 to 1 percent. On average, the proportion of employers offering flexible work options to all or most employees is 25 percentage points lower than the proportion who offer the same options to some employees. Again, a gradual return to work after childbirth or adoption is the most prevalent option offered to all or most employees (57%), while work-at-home options are least likely to be offered to all or most workers (3% and 1%).

## Small versus Large Employers

As stated earlier, we define small employers as those with 50 to 99 employees nationwide and large employers as those with 1,000 or more employees nationwide. Medium-size employers with 100 to 999 employees nationwide are excluded from these analyses (as discussed on the second page of the Introduction to this report). The rightmost columns in Table 3 show the percentages of small and large employers that offer various ways of working flexibly to *all or most* of their employees. Tests of statistical significance for the comparisons are reported in the center column, between the percentages for the two groups.

In 2008, there is only one statistically significant difference between smaller and large employers. Small employers are more likely to offer a compensatory time off program—in other words, salaried employees who work overtime are allowed to receive compensation in the form of extra time off rather than monetary compensation.

In the previous administration of the NSE (2005), small employers were more likely to provide flexibility than large employers in about half of the types of flexibility investigated. What has happened in the past three years is that large employers have increased some types of flexibility (e.g., periodic flextime, control over breaks, phased retirement) and smaller employers have reduced other types (e.g., part-time positions, time off for education or training). As a result, the differences between employers of small and large sizes have all but disappeared.

**Table 3: Flexibility**

Type of Flexibility	Does organization allow some employees to ...	Does organization allow all or most employees to ...	Employer Size		
			Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Flex Time and Place					
Periodically change starting and quitting times within some range of hours	79%	37%	40%	ns	37%
Change starting and quitting times on a daily basis	32%	10%	11%	ns	7%
Compress workweek by working longer hours on fewer days for at least part of the year	38%	8%	10%	ns	5%
Work some regular paid hours at home occasionally	50%	3%	3%	ns	2%
Work some regular paid hours at home on a regular basis	23%	1%	1%	ns	1%

**Table 3: Flexibility (continued)**

Type of Flexibility	Does organization allow some employees to ...	Does organization allow all or most employees to ...	Employer Size		
			Does company allow all or most employees to ...		
			Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
<b>Choices in Managing Time</b>					
Have control over when to take breaks	84%	55%	54%	ns	51%
Have choices about and control over which shifts to work	38%	16%	16%	ns	16%
Have control over paid and unpaid overtime hours	27%	13%	14%	ns	15%
<b>Reduced Time</b>					
Move from full time to part time and back again while remaining in the same position or level	41%	13%	12%	ns	12%
Share jobs	29%	8%	9%	ns	5%
Work part year i.e., work reduced time on an annual basis	27%	11%	10%	ns	11%
<b>Caregiving Leaves</b>					
Return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption	77%	57%	56%	ns	54%
<b>Time Off</b>					
Take time off during the workday to attend to important family or personal needs without loss of pay	73%	45%	46%	ns	47%
Use a compensatory time-off program	36%	18%	21%	**	9%
Do volunteer work during regular work hours	47%	21%	24%	ns	20%

**Table 3: Flexibility (continued)**

Type of Flexibility	Does organization allow some employees to ...	Does organization allow all or most employees to ...	Employer Size		
			Does company allow all or most employees to ...		
			Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Flex Careers					
Phase into retirement by working reduced hours over a period of time prior to full retirement	53%	25%	25%	ns	20%
Take sabbaticals i.e., leaves (paid or unpaid of six months or more) and return to a comparable job	38%	21%	24%	ns	14%
Take paid or unpaid time away from work for education or training to improve job skills	74%	40%	41%	ns	33%
Take extended career breaks for caregiving or other personal or family responsibilities	64%	47%	48%	ns	44%
Receive special consideration when returning to the organization after an extended career break	45%	28%	29%	ns	21%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)  
 Percentages do not add to 100% because some response categories are omitted.  
 Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

Eight of the 20 questions about working flexibly asked in 2008 were also asked in 1998. In order to compare data from 1998 and 2008, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample.

Of the eight comparisons made in Table 4, only two reached statistical significance. One indicates that employers in 2008 are more likely to provide traditional flextime (from 68% to 79%), while the other indicates that employers are less likely to provide flexible part-time work (from 57% to 47%). We call it flexible part-time work because this policy allows employees to move back and forth from full time to part time while remaining at the same level (rather than losing status). Otherwise, the provision of flexibility has not changed significantly. It is not clear why flexible part-time jobs are less available than they were ten years ago, but perhaps this reflects the current recession, where employers may be more wary of providing good-quality, part-time work (perhaps with benefits) and where employees may be more likely to want full-time work with higher compensation and benefits.

**Table 4: Provision of Flexibility from 1998 to 2008**

Flexibility Options	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to periodically change quitting times within some range of hours	(554) 68%	***	(382) 79%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to change starting and quitting times on a daily basis	(552) 24%	ns	(382) 31%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to move from full-time to part-time work and back again while remaining in the same position or level	(544) 57%	**	(381) 47%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to share jobs	(547) 38%	ns	(382) 31%
Percent allowing (at least some) employees to compress their workweek by working longer hours on fewer days for at least part of the year	(554) 37%	ns	(383) 41%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to work some of their regular paid hours at home on an occasional basis	(553) 56%	ns	(382) 52%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to work some of their regular paid hours at home on a regular basis	(555) 33%	ns	(382) 26%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption	(548) 81%	ns	(380) 82%

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.

## CAREGIVING LEAVES

### Prevalence

Except for employers meeting the legal exemption of having fewer than 50 employees within a 75-mile radius of all worksites, employers interviewed are mandated to comply with the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993 at some or all sites. This law requires that at least 12 weeks of unpaid, job-guaranteed leave for childbirth, adoption, foster care placement, a serious personal medical condition or care of a child or spouse with a serious medical condition be granted to employees who have worked at least 1,250 hours during the preceding year.

Between 15 and 24 percent of employers with 50 or more employees provide fewer than 12 weeks of leave of different types, while 13 to 22 percent provide more than 12 weeks (Table 5). When we exclude employers who did not provide information for all 4 types of leave ( $n = 332$ ), 81 percent of employers with 50 or more employees provide full Family and Medical Leave coverage—12 or more weeks of all four types of leave listed in Table 5—while 19 percent do not.



**Table 5: Caregiving Leaves for Total 2008 Sample of 1,100**

Leave Policies	Fewer than 12 Weeks	12 Weeks	More than 12 Weeks
Maternity leave	15%	63	22
Paternity leave	24%	63	13
Adoption or foster care leave	19%	67	14
Care of seriously ill family members	16%	69	15

(Sample size=1,100.)

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors. The percentages in this Table are not equivalent to those in Table 6. Table 5 reports the percentage distributions for the entire 2008 sample of 1,100, while Table 6 reports distributions only for employers with 100 or more employees to parallel 1998 data.

### Small versus Large Employers

There is no statistically significant difference between the proportion of small employers (50 to 99 employees) and large employers (over 1,000 employees) that offer at least 12 weeks of caregiving leaves; that is, they offer full Family and Medical Leave coverage—79 percent and 82 percent, respectively.

We further investigated the extent to which employers are in compliance with the law. When we compare small employers that have only *one* location (and are most likely covered by the federal FMLA) with small employers that have multiple locations (and are much less likely to be covered by the FMLA), we find no difference—79% in both groups offer full FMLA coverage. This strongly suggests that FMLA policies have become the norm among U.S. employers. Even some large employers with more than 1,000 employees (about 18%), however, do not appear to fully comply with the FMLA at this time. Thus, we find that between 18 to 21 percent of employers (small and large) appear to be out of compliance with FMLA.

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. When we make comparisons of the provision of caregiving leaves by employers with 100 or more employees in 1998 and 2008, we find no statistically significant differences (Table 6). In light of the growing attention paid to the importance of Family and Medical Leave benefits in public discourse, we were somewhat surprised that we didn't find longer leaves in 2008 than in 1998. The greater economic uncertainty experienced by many employers today, however, may militate against increases in caregiving leaves.

**Table 6: Caregiving Leaves from 1998 to 2008**

Leave Policy/Benefit	1998	Sig.	2008
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for women following the birth of a child	(522)		(350)
Fewer than 12 weeks	13%	<i>ns</i>	11%
12 weeks	55		65
More than 12 weeks	31		24
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for women following the birth of a child	(522) 16.1 weeks	<i>ns</i>	(350) 15.2 weeks
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for men following the birth of their child	(487)		(335)
Fewer than 12 weeks	15%	<i>ns</i>	20%
12 weeks	69		67
More than 12 weeks	15		13
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for men following the birth of their child	(487) 13.1 weeks	<i>ns</i>	(335) 12.6 weeks
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees following the adoption of a child	(494)		(332)
Fewer than 12 weeks	13%	<i>ns</i>	16%
12 weeks	72		71
More than 12 weeks	15		13
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for following the adoption of a child	(494) 13.4 weeks	<i>ns</i>	(332) 13.0 weeks
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees to care for seriously ill family members	(501)		(340)
Fewer than 12 weeks	14%	<i>ns</i>	11%
12 weeks	73		76
More than 12 weeks	13		13
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees to care for seriously ill family members	(502) 13.5 weeks	<i>ns</i>	(340) 13.4 weeks

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; *ns* = not significant.

Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.

## REPLACEMENT PAY DURING CAREGIVING LEAVES

### Prevalence

Women on maternity leave (52%) are much more likely than men on paternity leave (16%) to receive some replacement pay during leave (Table 7).

### Small versus Large Employers

Although small employers are equally likely (or “unlikely” if you will) to offer any replacement pay to men during paternity leave, they are significantly less likely (48%) than large employers (76%) to offer any replacement pay to women during maternity leave. Of employers providing at least some pay to women during maternity leave, most (80%) fund this pay through a general temporary disability insurance (TDI) plan, which typically provides partial wage replacement during the period of maternity-related disability. Only 73 percent of small employers, versus 85 percent of large employers offer TDI coverage.

**Table 7: Replacement Pay During Leave**

Some Replacement Pay During Leaves	At Least Some Replacement Pay	“Some Pay” by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Maternity leave	52%	48%	***	76%
Paternity leave	16%	17%	ns	17%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,092; small employers = 552; large employers = 93.)

Only the % responding “Yes” is reported for each option.

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

Although paid time off to care for *mildly* ill children is not required by law, 49 percent of employers with 50 or more employees allow employees to take some time for this purpose without having to use vacation days or losing pay. This policy or practice is also considered an aspect of the flexible workplace.

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. Employers have become significantly less likely to provide full pay during leave for maternity-related disability, decreasing from 27% in 1998 to 16% in 2008 (Table 8). This parallels the pattern of cutbacks in employers’ contributions to health care premiums that is discussed later in this report.

**Table 8: Replacement Pay during Caregiving Leaves from 1998 to 2008**

Practice, Policy or Benefit	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage offering (most) employees a few days off to care for mildly ill children without losing pay or having to use vacation days	(554) 49%	ns	(378) 47%
Do female employees who give birth receive any pay from any source during the period of their disability?	(512)	ns	(345)
Yes	53%		56%
No	47		44
Do employees who receive at least some pay during the period of maternity-related disability receive full or part pay?	(256)	**	(189)
Full pay	27%		16%
Part pay	60		67
Depends on situation	13		17
Is Disability Pay Provided as Part of a Temporary Disability Insurance benefit?	(269)	ns	(190)
Yes	81%		85%
No	19		15
Do Men Receive Any Paid Time Off Following the Birth of Their Child?	(476)	ns	(319)
Yes	13%		16%
No	87		84

*Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant. Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.*

## CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

### Prevalence

Employers are most likely to provide Dependent Care Assistance Plans (46%) and Child Care Resource and Referral (35%). These options are less costly than options such as child care at or near the worksite, provided by only 9%. (See Table 9.)

### Small versus Large Employers

Large employers are significantly more likely to offer four of the ten child care options considered: Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R), on- or near-site child care, Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) and vouchers or other subsidies for child care. These differences are not only statistically significant, but are also fairly large. For example, 21 percent of large employers provide on- or near-site child care compared with 7 percent of small employers; and 76 percent of large employers offer DCAPs compared with 37 percent of small employers. All of the initiatives where there are differences cost employers time and expertise to administer (such as DCAPs) or money (on- or near-site child care, vouchers and CCR&R), so it is no surprise that large employers are more likely

to provide them. In the case of other forms of child care assistance that cost money—such as reimbursement of child care costs for travel or for working late—the provision is so low for both large and small employers that it is not surprising that there are no significant differences.

**Table 9: Child Care Assistance**

Does your organization provide ...	Yes	“Yes” by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Access to information to help locate child care in the community (Child Care Resource and Referral)	35%	30%	***	57%
Child care at or near the worksite	9%	7%	***	21%
Payment for child care with vouchers or other subsidies that have direct costs to the company	5%	5%	**	13%
Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) that help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars	46%	37%	***	76%
Reimbursement of child care costs when employees work late	3%	2%	ns	4%
Reimbursement of child care costs when employees travel for business	6%	6%	ns	5%
Child care for school-age children on vacation	5%	4%	ns	7%
Back-up or emergency care for employees when their regular child care arrangements fall apart	6%	6%	ns	10%
Sick care for the children of employees	6%	5%	ns	10%
Financial support of local child care through a fund or corporate contributions beyond United Way	8%	6%	ns	13%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Only the % responding “Yes” is reported for each option.

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

All ten child care option questions asked in 2008 were also asked in 1998. In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample.

No statistically significant differences were found between 1998 and 2008, suggesting that at the very least employers did not cut back on child care assistance during the recent economic downturn.

## PROGRAMS FOR THE PARENTS OF TEENAGE CHILDREN

### Prevalence

In 2008, only 6 percent of employers with 50 or more employees offer some type of program for the parents of teenage children (Table 10). Among the small proportion of employers offering such programs, most frequently offered are Employee Assistance Programs (48 percent) and counseling (15 percent).

Interestingly, data from FWI's 2002 *National Study of the Changing Workforce* indicate that parents of teenage children are less satisfied with their marital relationship and with their family life than parents of younger children. Perhaps most important, they feel much less successful as parents than employees who have younger children. In addition, FWI's 2004 *Overwork in America* study found that among parents, the parents of teens were the most likely to be overworked. These findings strongly suggest that parents of teenagers might really benefit from programs addressing their specific needs and these might also affect their effectiveness at work.

**Table 10: Programs for Parents of Teenagers**

Does your company provide:	Yes	No
Any program for parents of teenagers	6%	94%
<b>Of employers offering any program, what percentage offer:</b>		
Employee Assistance Programs (EAP)	48%	52%
Counseling	15%	85%
After-school programs	13%	87%
Scholarship programs/educational assistance	6%	94%
Financial support for community programs	1%	99%
Summer programs	10%	90%
Parenting programs	4%	96%
Seminars/workshops	5%	95%
Internships	<1%	100%
Referral information services/800 Hotline	3%	97%
Help with finding jobs	1%	99%
Help with college applications	3%	97%

(Sample sizes total = 1,100.) Only the % responding "Yes" is reported for each option. Read percentages left to right. Because of rounding errors, do not always add to 100%.

### Employer Size and Trends

We found few differences for employers of different sizes and no differences from 1998 to 2008. The main finding, overall, is that very few employers in 1998 or 2008 offer any programs to parents of teenage children.

## ELDER CARE ASSISTANCE

### Prevalence

Interestingly and perhaps surprisingly, 75 percent of employers say that they provide paid or unpaid time off for employees to provide elder care without jeopardizing their jobs (Table 11). Elder care leave is not specifically required by the federal Family and Medical Leave Act—though “family leave for seriously ill family members” is. This high prevalence of elder care leave is perhaps indicative of the fact that decision makers in organizations are typically older and more likely to experience elder care issues than those not in decision-making positions and thus may be more sensitive to providing help to others who have similar needs. Another 31 percent provide employees with information about elder care services or Elder Care Resource and Referral and 23 percent offer DCAPs for elder care. Only 1 percent offer vouchers/subsidies for elder care or provide reimbursements for elder care costs when employees have to work late.

### Small versus Large Employers

Small and large employers are equally likely to allow employees time off to provide elder care without jeopardizing their jobs, and this is likely to be the single most important policy for employees who have pressing elder care responsibilities (Table 11). As was true for the provision of Child Care Resource and Referral services, small employers are significantly less likely (24%) than large employers (53%) to provide Elder Care Resource and Referral services. Interestingly, however, 30 percent of small employers provide access to this information for child care compared with 24 percent for elder care. Sometimes the same community agencies or vendors provide both Child Care and Elder Care Resource and Referral. Small employers, however, may not even be aware of the existence of such community or government services (such as area agencies on aging) or they are less likely to use national vendors to purchase these services where they could be packaged together.

**Table 11: Elder Care Assistance**

Does your company provide ...	Yes	“Yes” by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Information about services for elder family members (Elder Care Resource and Referral)	31%	24%	***	53%
Time off for employees to provide elder care without jeopardizing their jobs	75%	75%	ns	72%
Direct financial support for local elder care programs	7%	6%	ns	11%
DCAPs for elder care	23%	17%	***	45%
Elder care vouchers/subsidies	1%	<1%	**	3%
Reimbursement for elder care costs when employees work late	1%	1%	ns	0%
Reimbursement for elder care costs when employees travel for business	4%	5%	ns	2%
Access to respite care	3%	3%	ns	6%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Only the % responding “Yes” is reported for each option.

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## Trends from 1998 to 2008

Only two of the eight elder care questions asked in 2008 were also asked in 1998. In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. Of the two comparable questions, employers in 2008 were more likely (39%) to report that they offered Elder Care Resource and Referral than employers in 1998 (23%). (See Table 12.)

**Table 12: Elder Care Assistance from 1998 to 2008**

Benefits, Policies, and Practices	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage providing access to information about needed services for elderly family members (Elder Care Resource and Referral)	(549) 23%	***	(379) 39%
Percentage providing financial support for local elder care services beyond United Way Contributions	(540) 5%	ns	(378) 7%

Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.

## HELPING EMPLOYEES RESOLVE PERSONAL AND FAMILY PROBLEMS

### Prevalence

More than half (58%) of employers provide Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) that help employees deal with personal problems that may negatively affect their work or personal lives. In addition, one in five (21%) provide work life seminars or workshops at the workplace addressing issues of parenting, child development, elder care and so forth (Table 13).

### Small versus Large Employers

Clearly, large employers are more likely than small employers to provide Employee Assistance Programs and workshops/seminars on work life issues. EAPs involve direct costs to employers that are more difficult for small employers to shoulder. In addition, small employers are less likely to have human resource personnel or departments (in-house or out-sourced) capable of identifying and developing contracts with EAP vendors. These same limitations affect offerings of work life seminars and workshops.

**Table 13: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems**

Does your company provide ...	Yes	"Yes" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
An Employee Assistance Program (EAP) designed to help employees deal with problems that may affect work or personal life	58%	51%	***	87%
Workshops or seminars on parenting, child development, care of the elderly or work family problems	21%	14%	***	46%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Read percentages left to right. Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.



## Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. There has been an increase in the number providing assistance to help employees resolve personal and family problems over the past ten years, from 56 percent in 1998 to 65 percent in 2008 (Table 14). Perhaps this increase reflects an employer response to the fact that jobs have become more demanding and hectic in this global 24/7 economy and the fact that one in three employees reports feeling overworked, as revealed in Families and Work Institute’s 2002 *National Study of the Changing Workforce* and 2004 *Overwork in America* studies. Clearly, EAPs have become more universal.

**Table 14: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems (from 1998 to 2008)**

Benefits, Policies and Practices	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage providing an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) designed to help employees deal with problems that may affect work or personal life	(554) 56%	**	(382) 65%
Percentage providing workshops or seminars on parenting, child development, care of the elderly or work family problems?	(554) 25%	ns	(382) 28%

*Statistical significance: \*\*\* = p < .001; \*\* = p < .01; ns = not significant.*

*Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.*

## CULTURE OF FLEXIBILITY AND SUPPORT

### Prevalence

Organizational representatives were asked to assess the supportiveness of their workplace cultures (Table 15). Although one can certainly question whether organizational representatives will accurately assess their own cultures, we present the findings with this caveat: we know from studies we have conducted—where employer representatives and employees are both answering the same questions—that employer representatives are more positive about their organizations’ cultures than employees are.

The majority of employers responded “very true” to statements assessing whether supervisors are encouraged to assess employees’ performance by what they accomplish rather than “face time” (71%) and whether supervisors are encouraged to be supportive of employees with family needs and by finding solutions that work for both employees and the organization (60%). Far fewer, however, responded “very true” to statements asking whether management rewards those within the organization who support flexible work arrangements (20%) and whether their organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of the availability of work life assistance (21%).

### Small versus Large Employers

In 2005, we found that smaller employers were more likely to report being supportive, but these differences disappeared in 2008, as did the differences in the provision of various types of flexibility by small and large organizations (reported in Table 4). This is another indication that the playing field between small and large organization when it comes to providing workplace flexibility has been leveled.

**Table 15: Culture of Flexibility and Supportiveness**

Organizational Representatives' Statements about Culture of Flexibility	Very True	"Very True" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Supervisors are encouraged to be supportive of employees with family needs and by finding solutions that work for both employees and the organization	60%	64%	**	47%
The organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of available assistance for managing work and family responsibilities	21%	20%	**	30%
Supervisors are encouraged to assess employees' performance by what they accomplish and not just by "face time"—that is the number of hours they spend at the workplace	71%	70%	ns	71%
Management rewards those within the organization who support effective flexible work arrangements	20%	23%	ns	13%

(Sample sizes: total=1,100; small employers=583; large employers=96.)  
 Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.  
 Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## EMPLOYER EFFORTS TO FOSTER SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISORS

### Prevalence

Employers are most likely to provide training for supervisors in managing diversity and least likely to have a career counseling or management/leadership program for women—68 percent versus 16 percent, a striking difference of 52 percentage points (Table 16). Similarly, 63 percent of employers report considering how well supervisors manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions, while 50 percent report training supervisors in responding to the work and family needs of employees.

### Small versus Large Employers

Not surprisingly, large employers that presumably have HR departments are more likely to implement formal training and counseling programs focused on work and family needs, diversity and management and leadership roles for women. Interestingly, however, there is no difference between small and large employers with respect to whether or not they “consider how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions.”

**Table 16: Programs for Supervisors and Career Development**

Program	Provide	"Provide" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Train supervisors in responding to work family needs of employees	50%	46%	ns	58%
Train supervisors in managing diversity	68%	62%	***	88%
Train supervisors in managing employees of different ages	59%	56%	ns	65%
Consider how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions	62%	65%	ns	53%
Career counseling program or a management/ leadership program for women	16%	12%	***	35%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Read percentages left to right. Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

### Prevalence

Health insurance coverage for oneself and one's family is the single most important benefit for U.S. workers and their families, who rely almost exclusively on employers for coverage. Ninety-five percent of employers with 50 or more employees offer personal health insurance coverage for full-time employees (Table 17). Among organizations offering personal health insurance, 23 percent pay all of the premiums, 76 percent pay some of the premiums, and 2 percent pay none of the premiums. Among employers offering personal health insurance, 34 percent increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months.

Ninety-one percent of employers that offer personal coverage also offer family coverage, with only 8 percent of these paying all of the premiums for family members, another 68 percent paying part of the premiums, and 25 percent paying none of the premiums. Among employers offering family health insurance, 34 percent increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months.

Overall, 29 percent of employers offer health insurance coverage for unmarried partners who live with the employee. Fifty-one percent of employers offer wellness programs for employees and their families, and 49 percent provide space and milk storage facilities for nursing mothers.

### Small versus Large Employers

Small employers with 50 to 99 employees are less likely (93%) to offer personal health insurance coverage than large employers (100%), but when they do, small employers are more likely (29%) than large employers (7%) to pay all of the premiums. This is an important finding, in our view. In recent years, as health care costs have risen dramatically, employers have begun to shift more of the costs of premiums to employees.

On the other hand, small employers are less likely (88%) than large employers (99%) to offer family health insurance coverage. Of those offering family coverage, small employers are more likely (31%) than large employers (7%) to pay none of the premium. Small employers are also less likely than large employers to provide wellness programs for employees and their families and to provide space and storage facilities at work to allow women who are nursing to continue doing so by expressing milk. Interestingly, and perhaps surprisingly, among employers that offer health coverage for employees' families, small employers are just as likely as large employers to offer health insurance coverage for unmarried partners living with employees.

**Table 17: Health Care Benefits**

Does your company provide ...	Yes	"Provide" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Personal health insurance for full-time employees	95%	(583) 93%	**	(96) 100%
Among organizations offering personal coverage: full or part payment of premiums for personal health insurance		(541)		(95)
Full	23%	29%	***	7%
Part	76	70		92
None	2	1		1
Over past 12 months, employees were asked to pay a larger proportion of personal health insurance premium	34%	(374) 33%	ns	(87) 44%
Health insurance that includes coverage for family members	91%	(577) 88%	**	(97) 99%
Among organizations offering family coverage: Full or part payment of premium for family members		(502)		(94)
Full	8%	11%	ns	2%
Part	68	59		90
None	25	31		7
Over past 12 months, employees asked to pay a larger proportion of family health insurance premium	34%	(347) 34%	ns	(87) 45%
Health insurance coverage for unmarried partners who live together	29%	(457) 27%	ns	(92) 36%
Wellness program for employees and their families	51%	(577) 42%	***	(96) 75%
Space and storage facilities at work that allow women who are nursing to continue to do so by expressing milk	49%	(551) 45%	***	(94) 66%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Read percentages left to right. Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. Six of the health care benefit questions asked in 2008 were also asked in 1998 (Table 18). In 2008, employers are less likely (4%) to pay the entire premium for family health insurance than they were in 1998 (13%). This finding parallels the finding that 34 percent increased employees’ premium co-pay during the preceding year. Interestingly, significantly more employers in 2008 (31%) than in 1998 (14%) offered health insurance coverage for the unmarried partners of employees—no doubt indicative of a gradual shift in values about the legitimacy of nontraditional relationships. Additionally, in keeping with the previous findings that employers are promoting health and attempting to reduce stress for employees, there have been increases in wellness programs (60% in 2008, up from 51% in 1988) and in the provision of space and equipment for new mothers to breastfeed (53% in 2008, up from 37% in 1998).

**Table 18: Health Care Benefits from 1998 to 2008**

Benefits	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for full-time employees	(556) 97%	ns	(382) 98%
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for family members	(555) 95%	ns	(382) 94%
Percentage paying all, part or none of the premium for family members health insurance	(527)		(359)
All	13%	***	4%
Part	75		77
None	12		19
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for unmarried partners of employees	(513) 14%	***	(333) 31%
Percentage providing wellness program for employees and their families	(555) 51%	**	(381) 60%
Percentage providing private space for breastfeeding women	(546) 37%	***	(370) 53%

*Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.*

*Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.*

## BENEFITS TO ENHANCE ECONOMIC SECURITY

### Prevalence

Of the benefits most directly related to economic security considered in this study, employers with 50 or more employees are most likely (84%) to offer 401(k) or 403(b) retirement plans, with for profit employers using the former and nonprofits the latter (Table 19). Moreover, 76 percent of employers operating individual retirement plans also make contributions to them. Only 26 percent of employers offer defined-benefit pensions.

The second most popular fringe benefit (67%) is temporary disability insurance. Sixty-four percent of employers also offer some measure of financial assistance for employees to continue their education or training. The incidence of other benefit offerings is much lower. One in five employers (20%) also takes some steps to help employees obtain public benefits for which they are eligible. Among low-wage employees from low-income families, such benefits have the potential of enhancing family economic security.

### Small versus Large Employers

Small employers are less likely than large employers to offer benefits that enhance employees' economic security when those benefits have clear direct cost implications (Table 19). The costs of such benefits may be considerable and are more easily borne by large than small employers. Relatively few employers (14%) offer both phased retirement *and* defined-benefit pension plans. Among those that do, small employers are just as likely as large employers to allow employees to phase into retirement without reducing pension payouts. This is a very important benefit to older workers and to employers in retaining older workers and in developing knowledge transfer strategies.

**Table 19: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security**

Does your company provide ...	Yes	"Provide" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Temporary disability insurance (TDI)	67%	60%	***	85%
Defined/guaranteed benefit pension plan	26%	23%	**	38%
401(k) or 403(b) individual retirement plan	84%	78%	***	97%
Company contribution to retirement plan	76%	73%	***	92%
Financial assistance for employees to continue education/training	64%	59%	***	83%
Scholarships or other educational assistance for the children of employees	16%	10%	***	39%
A long-term care insurance plan	34%	29%	**	46%
Financial assistance for adoptive parents	8%	5%	***	27%
Assistance in obtaining public benefits for potentially eligible employees—e.g., tax credits, child care subsidies, food stamps, housing subsidies and transportation subsidies	20%	18%	ns	23%
Among employers allowing phased retirement <i>and</i> offering defined-benefit pension plans ( <i>only 14% of employers</i> ), what % allows employees to phase into retirement without reducing their pension payouts	78%	84%	ns	72%

(Sample sizes: total = 1,100; small employers = 583; large employers = 96.)

Read percentages left to right. Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. Five questions asked in 2008 were also asked in 1998. Two statistically significant differences were found. Employers in 2008 are much less likely (29%) than those in 1998 (48%) to provide defined-benefit pension plans. Second, employers in 2008 are less likely (81%) than employers in 1998 (91%) to make contributions to employees’ retirement plans (Table 20).

**Table 20: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security from 1998 to 2008**

Benefits	1998	Sig.	2008
Percentage providing short-term, non-occupational disability insurance	(550) 70%	<i>ns</i>	(380) 75%
Percentage providing defined-benefit pension plan	(550) 48%	***	(372) 29%
Percentage providing 401(k), 403(b) or other retirement plan	(556) 90%	<i>ns</i>	(380) 90%
Percentage contributing to employee retirement plans	(499) 91%	***	(382) 81%
Percentage providing scholarships or educational assistance to employees’ children	(552) 24%	<i>ns</i>	(381) 22%

*Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant. Because of rounding errors, when findings are presented as percentage distributions across several response categories, they do not always add to 100%. Fractional percentages are not reported in order to simplify presentation.*

## COMPANY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY LIFE

### Prevalence

Thirteen percent of employers with 50 or more employees are engaged in some type of partnership with local or state government to assist working families in the community meet their family and personal responsibilities. In addition to investigating whether employers allow all or most of their employees to do volunteer work during regular work hours (21%, Table 3), we also examine whether employers with 50 or more employees enable or encourage their employees to volunteer for programs that help families (50%). Among these employers, 53 percent provide no pay during volunteer hours, while 23 percent compensate employees for some number of hours up to a maximum of 19 hours per year, while 25 percent provide 20 or more hours of paid time for volunteer work annually.

### Trends from 1998 to 2008

In order to compare data from 2008 and 1998, it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. In 1998, we also asked whether employers enabled or encouraged their employees to volunteer for programs that help families. There has been a slight, but no statistically significant increase from 1998 (50%) to 2008 (53%).

## MAIN REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING WORK LIFE INITIATIVES

Employers with eight or more work life policies or programs (flexible time, caregiving leaves and dependent care) were asked the main reasons they have implemented these initiatives. It was an open-ended question where employers could say whatever they wanted and could include multiple reasons.

As shown in Table 21, the main reason cited by employers for developing workplace flexibility, caregiving leaves and dependent care initiatives is the retention of employees in general (37%), with fewer mentioning the retention of highly-skilled employees (5%). The second most important reason is helping employees manage work and family life (18%), followed by recruitment and improving morale (9% respectively) and it is the right thing to do (7%). It is clear that employers are motivated by a combination of business reasons—retention and recruitment, as well as the desire to help employees.

**Table 21: Reasons for Implementing Work Life Initiatives**

Retain employees in general	37%
Help employees manage work and family life	18%
Recruit employees in general	9%
Improve morale	9%
It is the right thing to do	7%
Mandated by law	6%
We are a caring organization	6%
Retain highly-skilled employees	5%
Increase employee commitment/engagement	5%
Increase productivity	4%
It is a family organization and it is the way we do things	4%
Support the community	3%
It is the nature of this business	3%
Meet business needs for flexible work schedules	2%
Compete with other employers	2%
Provide a better work environment	2%
Provide job satisfaction	2%
Recruit highly-skilled employees	2%
Respond to employees' requests/pressure	1%
Help employees	1%
Makes employees happy	1%
Ensure the workforce of tomorrow is of high quality	1%
Strategic planning	1%
Company policy	1%

*(Sample=1,100.) Respondents could mention as many factors as they want. Reasons mentioned by less than 1% are not tabled.*



## MAIN OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTING WORK LIFE INITIATIVES

All employers (whether they have implemented work life assistance or not) were asked for the main obstacles to implementing flexibility, caregiving leaves, child care or elder care assistance. It was an open-ended question where employers could say whatever they wanted and could include multiple obstacles (Table 22).

The main obstacle cited by employers is cost (30%). The second most frequently cited obstacle is the potential loss of productivity (11%). Interestingly, 7 percent state that there are no business obstacles. Also interesting is that some of the most frequently-discussed obstacles in the media (such as workers resenting each other) are not mentioned often by employers (1%). It is clear, however, that major roadblocks are the difficulty in implementation (cost, difficulty in supervision, administrative hassles, lack of staff to implement, etc.) as well as a concern about negatively affecting productivity.

**Table 22: Obstacles to Implementing Work Life Policies**

Costs too much/limited funds	30%
Potential loss of productivity	11%
There are no business obstacles	7%
Impractical, given the nature of our industry	7%
Hard to supervise employees	6%
Lack of staff to implement	5%
Administrative hassles	5%
Potential abuse (absenteeism)	5%
Time constraints	5%
Job requirements and workload don't allow these programs	4%
Not a cost-effective investment	4%
We are a small organization	3%
Haven't heard much about the need for these programs	3%
Need to treat all employees equally	3%
Inflexible work arrangements here	3%
Employees don't want these programs or policies	2%
Lack of information about these programs and policies	2%
We need to ensure that work gets done and satisfy the customer	2%
Not convinced there would be a productivity payoff	1%
Other more pressing business issues	1%
Could lead to worker resentment	1%
Manager resistance	1%
Mandated by law	1%
Need to be fair to all employees	1%

*(Sample=1,100.) Respondents could mention as many obstacles as they want. Obstacles mentioned by less than 1% are not tabled.*

# PREDICTING FLEXIBILITY, CAREGIVING LEAVE BENEFITS, CHILD AND ELDER CARE SUPPORT, HEALTH CARE/ECONOMIC SECURITY

## Predictors

To go beyond why employers say that do or don't provide the programs, policies and benefits described in this report, we investigated the relationships between numerous characteristics of employers and important outcomes. The predictors we examined are:

- **the demographics of the workplace**—industry, profit/nonprofit status, employer size, number of years in business and number of operating locations;
- **the demographics of the workforce**—percentage of women, ethnic minorities, unionized employees, hourly employees, part-time employees, women and people of color in top positions or reporting to people in top positions;
- **the financial health of the employer**—how well the organization is doing in comparison with competitors, downsized or upsized; and
- **human resource issues**—difficulty or ease of filling high-skilled job vacancies, filling entry-level/hourly positions, finding and hiring employees with basic skills, finding and hiring hardworking self-starters, dealing with the retirement of highly-valued employees, finding and hiring honest and reliable employees, finding and hiring employees who communicate effectively, developing potential of employees to assume greater responsibility, managing the performance of employees, retaining employees with basic skills, and covering costs of fringe benefits to be competitive.

## Outcomes

Outcomes were measured by constructing multi-item scales representing the extent of:

- workplace flexibility;
- caregiving leaves;
- child and elder care assistance; and
- health care and economic security benefits.

The content of these scales and the methods for their construction are described briefly in an end-note to this report.<sup>iv</sup>

To simplify analysis and presentation, each outcome scale was broken into three levels, representing the extent or generosity of support offered. The low level classification represents the bottom quartile (Q1—the bottom 25%) of the distribution of scale scores; the mid level includes employers who fall into the middle two quartiles (Q2 and 3—the middle 50%) of scores; and the high level represents employers in the top quartile (Q4—top 25%) who offer the highest level of support. The degree to which predictors are related to outcomes was assessed using cross-tabulations with Chi-square tests. Only findings that reach statistical significance at  $p < .01$  are reported in the tables below. Following each table, we note some of the most striking findings. A few significant predictors that appear in all four tables are shaded in orange.

## PREDICTING FLEXIBILITY

### Some Significant Findings

- Employers in the finance, insurance and real estate industry are more likely to offer a high level of flexibility (41%), especially when compared with employers in the goods producing industry (9%).
- Organizations where women make up over 50% of the employees are more likely to have a high level of flexibility (35%) than organizations where women are less than 24 percent of the workforce (12%).
- Organizations with no union representation are more likely (27%) to provide a high level of flexibility, compared with 14 to 16 percent of those with unionized employees.

**Table 23: Predicting Flexibility**

	Extent of Flexibility in Work Arrangements				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
<b>Demographics of the Workplace</b>					
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	(n=250)	13%	56	31	***
For profit organization	(n=847)	27%	50	23	
Industry					
Goods producing	(n=276)	46%	46	9	***
Finance, insurance and real estate	(n=85)	9%	49	41	
Professional services	(n=369)	10%	54	36	
Wholesale and retail sale	(n=200)	26%	54	20	
Other services	(n=169)	22%	53	25	
Number of operating locations					
Only one	(n=442)	32%	43	25	**
More than one	(n=654)	18%	57	25	
<b>Demographics of the Workforce</b>					
Percentage of employees who are women					
1 to 24%	(n=294)	45%	44	12	***
25 to 50%	(n=321)	23%	55	22	
More than 50%	(n=475)	11%	53	35	
Percentage of employees who are union members					
0%	(n=952)	22%	51	27	***
1 to 24%	(n=46)	24%	61	15	
25 to 50%	(n=36)	28%	58	14	
More than 50%	(n=56)	43%	41	16	

**Table 23: Predicting Flexibility (continued)**

	Extent of Flexibility in Work Arrangements				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
Percentage of employees who are hourly (non-exempt)					
0%	(n=22)	14%	55	32	***
1 to 24%	(n=134)	10%	52	37	
25 to 50%	(n=176)	18%	60	22	
More than 50%	(n=765)	28%	49	23	
Percentage of employees who are part time					
0%	(n=191)	44%	43	14	***
1 to 24%	(n=584)	23%	53	24	
25 to 50%	(n=203)	15%	53	33	
More than 50%	(n=117)	11%	52	37	
Women in top/senior positions <sup>4</sup>					
No	(n=307)	34%	50	17	***
Yes	(n=793)	20%	52	28	
Racial/ethnic minorities in top/senior positions <sup>5</sup>					
No	(n=757)	26%	51	22	***
Yes	(n=343)	18%	51	31	
<b>Human Resource Issues</b>					
Difficulty in finding and hiring hardworking self-starters					
Not difficult at all	(n=49)	22%	55	22	**
Not very difficult	(n=174)	14%	58	28	
Somewhat difficult	(n=615)	25%	48	27	
Very difficult	(n=261)	28%	54	18	
Difficulty dealing with retirement of high-valued employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=297)	22%	51	27	***
Not very difficult	(n=335)	19%	51	30	
Somewhat difficult	(n=301)	31%	51	18	
Very difficult	(n=82)	28%	57	15	

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors. Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

<sup>4</sup> “Women in top/senior positions” is defined as having women in any one of the following *top* positions: CEO, Managing Partner, President, Chair or Vice Chair of the Board; COO (Chief Operating Officer) or CFO (Chief Financial Officer) or those who report directly to those in *top* positions—the Chair, President, CEO or COO, such as executive or senior vice-presidents or senior partners.

<sup>5</sup> “Racial and ethnic minorities in top/senior positions” is defined as having racial or ethnic minorities in any one of the following *top* positions: CEO, Managing Partner, President, Chair or Vice Chair of the Board; COO (Chief Operating Officer) or CFO (Chief Financial Officer) or those who report directly to those in *top* positions—the Chair, President, CEO or COO, such as executive or senior vice-presidents or senior partners.

## PREDICTING CAREGIVING LEAVES

### Some Significant Findings:

- Nonprofit organizations are more likely (30%) to offer generous caregiving leaves than for profit organizations (19%).
- Organizations with racial or ethnic minorities in top and senior positions are more likely (29%) to offer generous caregiving leaves than organizations that do not have racial or ethnic minorities in top and senior positions (18%).

**Table 24: Predicting Caregiving Leaves**

	Extent of Caregiving Leaves				
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	Sig.
<b>Demographics of the Workplace</b>					
Employer size in the U.S.					
50 to 99 employees	(n=459)	22%	56	21	***
100 to 249 employees	(n=208)	15%	66	19	
250 to 999 employees	(n=164)	7%	71	22	
Over 1,000 employees	(n=94)	6%	66	28	
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	(n=220)	11%	59	30	***
For profit organization	(n=704)	18%	63	19	
<b>Demographics of the Workforce</b>					
Percentage of employees who are union members					
0%	(n=802)	18%	63	20	***
1 to 24%	(n=40)	13%	58	30	
25 to 50%	(n=30)	10%	63	27	
More than 50%	(n=49)	8%	51	41	
Racial/ethnic minorities in top/senior positions					
No	(n=621)	18%	64	18	***
Yes	(n=304)	14%	57	29	
<b>Human Resource Issues</b>					
Difficulty finding and hiring honest and reliable employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=88)	10%	64	26	***
Not very difficult	(n=315)	14%	62	24	
Somewhat difficult	(n=436)	17%	64	19	
Very difficult	(n=86)	31%	51	17	

**Table 24: Predicting Caregiving Leaves (continued)**

	Extent of Caregiving Leaves				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
Difficulty in finding and hiring hardworking self-starters					
Not difficult at all	(n=33)	15%	61	24	**
Not very difficult	(n=149)	11%	60	29	
Somewhat difficult	(n=530)	16%	63	21	
Very difficult	(n=212)	23%	60	17	

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.  
 Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## PREDICTING CHILD AND ELDER CARE ASSISTANCE

### Some Significant Findings

- Large employers are more likely (44%) to provide a high level of child and elder care assistance than small employers (15%).
- Nonprofit organizations (35%) are more likely to offer a high level of child and elder care assistance than for profit organizations (17%).
- Professional service firms (30%) and organizations in finance, insurance and real estate (27%) are more likely to offer a high level of child and elder care assistance than those in wholesale and retail sales (14%) or in the good-producing sector (15%).

**Table 25: Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance**

	Extent of Programs and Policies Supporting Child and Elder Care				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
Demographics of the Workplace					
Employer size in the U.S.					
50 to 99 employees	(n=579)	42%	43	15	***
100 to 249 employees	(n=240)	34%	46	20	
250 to 999 employees	(n=179)	20%	50	30	
Over 1,000 employees	(n=97)	18%	38	44	
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	(n=249)	20%	45	35	***
For profit organization	(n=844)	39%	44	17	

**Table 25: Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance (continued)**

	Extent of Programs and Policies Supporting Child and Elder Care				
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	Sig.
<b>Industry</b>					
Goods producing	(n=276)	38%	47	15	***
Finance, insurance and real estate	(n=84)	25%	48	27	
Professional services	(n=367)	22%	49	30	
Wholesale and retail sale	(n=199)	54%	33	14	
Other services	(n=168)	38%	45	17	
<b>Number of operating locations</b>					
Only one	(n=438)	40%	42	18	***
More than one	(n=652)	30%	46	23	
<b>Number of years in business</b>					
10 or fewer years	(n=157)	39%	43	19	**
11 to 20 years	(n=202)	42%	40	18	
21 to 30 years	(n=244)	35%	45	20	
31 or more years	(n=489)	30%	47	24	
<b>Demographics of the Workforce</b>					
<b>Percentage of employees who are women</b>					
1 to 24%	(n=295)	46%	43	12	***
25 to 50%	(n=316)	37%	44	19	
More than 50%	(n=474)	26%	46	28	
<b>Percentage of employees likely to retire in next five years</b>					
Under 5%	(n=638)	39%	44	17	***
5 to 9%	(n=207)	29%	45	26	
10 to 19%	(n=169)	27%	45	28	
20% and over	(n=64)	25%	47	28	
<b>Women in top/senior positions</b>					
No	(n=304)	46%	41	13	***
Yes	(n=790)	30%	46	24	
<b>Racial/ethnic minorities in top/senior positions</b>					
No	(n=755)	38%	44	18	***
Yes	(n=340)	27%	45	28	

**Table 25: Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance (continued)**

	Extent of Programs and Policies Supporting Child and Elder Care				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
<b>Financial Health of the Employer</b>					
Experienced upsizing in the past 12 months					
No	(n=551)	39%	43	19	**
Yes	(n=543)	30%	46	23	
<b>Human Resource Issues</b>					
Difficulty finding and hiring honest and reliable employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=109)	37%	45	18	***
Not very difficult	(n=369)	26%	44	30	
Somewhat difficult	(n=504)	37%	46	18	
Very difficult	(n=113)	49%	41	11	
Difficulty in finding and hiring hardworking self-starters					
Not difficult at all	(n=48)	21%	56	23	***
Not very difficult	(n=172)	26%	51	24	
Somewhat difficult	(n=613)	35%	42	23	
Very difficult	(n=260)	41%	44	15	
Difficulty managing the performance of employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=139)	35%	42	23	**
Not very difficult	(n=418)	29%	48	23	
Somewhat difficult	(n=475)	38%	43	20	
Very difficult	(n=52)	48%	40	12	

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.  
 Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## PREDICTING HEALTH CARE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

### Some Significant Findings

- Organizations that have been in business for over 31 years are more likely to offer a high level of health care and economic security benefits (30%) than organizations that have only been in operation for 10 or fewer years (15%).
- Nonprofit organizations are more likely to offer a high level of health care and economic security benefits (36%) than for profit organizations (22%).
- Organizations with some employees who are unionized are more likely to offer a high level of health care and economic security benefits (34% to 46%) than those with no unionized employees (23%).



**Table 26: Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits**

	Extent of Health Coverage and Economic Security Benefits				
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	Sig.
<b>Demographics of the Workplace</b>					
Employer size in the U.S.					
50 to 99 employees	(n=583)	32%	49	19	***
100 to 249 employees	(n=241)	25%	52	24	
250 to 999 employees	(n=180)	12%	54	34	
Over 1,000 employees	(n=96)	7%	45	48	
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	(n=251)	21%	43	36	***
For profit organization	(n=846)	26%	52	22	
Number of operating locations					
Only one	(n=442)	33%	46	21	***
More than one	(n=653)	20%	52	28	
Number of years in business					
10 or fewer years	(n=159)	41%	44	15	***
11 to 20 years	(n=201)	30%	48	22	
21 to 30 years	(n=244)	25%	50	24	
31 or more years	(n=492)	18%	52	30	
<b>Demographics of the Workforce</b>					
Percentage of employees who are union members					
0%	(n=952)	26%	51	23	***
1 to 24%	(n=46)	22%	39	39	
25 to 50%	(n=35)	11%	54	34	
More than 50%	(n=55)	11%	44	46	
Percentage of employees who are hourly (non-exempt)					
0%	(n=22)	9%	64	27	***
1 to 24%	(n=134)	13%	55	32	
25 to 50%	(n=175)	17%	51	33	
More than 50%	(n=766)	30%	48	22	
Percentage of employees who are part time					
0%	(n=191)	25%	52	23	***
1 to 24%	(n=584)	17%	54	30	
25 to 50%	(n=202)	37%	41	22	
More than 50%	(n=117)	45%	44	11	

**Table 26: Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits (continued)**

	Extent of Health Coverage and Economic Security Benefits				
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	Sig.
Percentage of employees likely to retire in next 5 years					
Under 5%	(n=641)	31%	51	19	***
5 to 9%	(n=206)	17%	52	32	
10 to 19%	(n=171)	15%	49	36	
20% and over	(n=64)	22%	44	34	
Racial/ethnic minorities in top/senior positions					
No	(n=756)	26%	52	22	**
Yes	(n=341)	22%	46	33	
<b>Financial Health of the Employer</b>					
How the organization is doing financially versus competitors					
Better than competitors	(n=435)	20%	51	29	**
About the same	(n=587)	27%	49	24	
Worse than competitors	(n=47)	34%	51	15	
<b>Human Resource Issues</b>					
Difficulty finding and hiring honest and reliable employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=108)	28%	50	22	**
Not very difficult	(n=370)	17%	52	30	
Somewhat difficult	(n=506)	27%	50	24	
Very difficult	(n=113)	39%	44	17	
Difficulty in finding and hiring hardworking self-starters					
Not difficult at all	(n=48)	19%	60	21	**
Not very difficult	(n=174)	20%	48	33	
Somewhat difficult	(n=615)	25%	49	26	
Very difficult	(n=261)	29%	52	19	
Difficulty in retaining employees with basic skills, abilities and personal characteristics you need					
Not difficult at all	(n=158)	22%	48	30	**
Not very difficult	(n=403)	23%	51	27	
Somewhat difficult	(n=476)	26%	52	23	
Very difficult	(n=62)	40%	39	21	

**Table 26: Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits (continued)**

	Extent of Health Coverage and Economic Security Benefits				Sig.
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	
Difficulty dealing with retirement of high-valued employees					
Not difficult at all	(n=297)	35%	45	20	**
Not very difficult	(n=335)	17%	56	27	
Somewhat difficult	(n=301)	22%	50	28	
Very difficult	(n=82)	24%	46	29	

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.  
 Statistical significance: \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$ ; ns = not significant.

## CONCLUSION

In the ten years since we began this study, the economy has been quite volatile and common wisdom would have it that employers would cut back on the work life assistance they offer employees. In fact, there are serious reductions in how much employers pay toward benefits that cost money (their contribution to health care, disability programs and pension plans), but beyond that we did not find cutbacks to be the case. Employers have largely maintained or increased the support they provide to employees in managing their personal and family lives. Interestingly, employers with more diverse leadership at the top and employers that are nonprofits turn out to provide the best support for making work “work” for both the employer and the employees.

## ENDNOTES

**i** The 1998 Business Work Life Study (BWLS) surveyed a representative national sample of 1,057 for profit (84% of the sample) and nonprofit employers (16% of the sample) with 100 or more employees by telephone interviews with Human Resource directors. Harris Interactive staff conducted the interviews. Employers were selected from Dun & Bradstreet lists using a stratified random sampling procedure in which selection was proportional to the number of people employed by each company to ensure a large enough sample of large organizations. When analyzing data to make generalizations about the universe of organizations with 100 or more employees in the U.S., the sample was weighted to the distribution of employers of different sizes in the U.S. The questionnaire was developed to complement the Families and Work Institute's 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW), which surveyed a representative national sample of employees in the U.S. labor force.

**ii** The 2008 National Study of Employers (NSE) surveyed a representative national sample of 1,100 for profit (77% of the sample) and nonprofit employers (23% of the sample) with 50 or more employees by telephone interviews with Human Resource directors. Representatives of Harris Interactive conducted the 30-minute interviews from April 19 through August 13, 2007. Employers were selected from Dun & Bradstreet lists using a stratified random sampling procedure in which selection was proportional to the number of people employed by each company to ensure a large enough sample of large organizations. The response rate for the study was 43 percent. The maximum sampling error (margin of error) for the study when describing the total sample is approximately 2 percent. (If the *design effect* is taken into account, the maximum sampling error for total sample estimates increases to about 2.8%.) When analyzing data to make generalizations about the universe of organizations with 50 or more employees in the U.S., the sample was weighted to the distribution of employers of different sizes in the U.S. The questionnaire was developed to complement the Families and Work Institute's ongoing National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW), which surveys representative national samples of employees in the U.S. labor force. Harris Interactive was responsible for the data collection; Families and Work Institute conducted the analysis of the data.

Because of unintended differences in the survey instruments for the National Study of Employers in 2005 and 2008, direct trending for questions about workplace flexibility listed in Table 3 was not available. Thus, a random sample of 300 respondents from the 2008 National Study of Employers was recontacted in February 2008. Respondents interviewed in the re-contact were asked the same questions about workplace flexibility asked in the 2005 National Study of Employers. Because not all 1,100 respondents from the 2008 National Study of Employers were re-contacted, it was necessary to use information collected in the original survey and the re-contact survey to impute responses for those who were not re-contacted. In order to impute the responses for those not re-contacted, a calibration model was constructed utilizing both the original data and the re-contact information. Linear regressions were constructed with the dependent variables being the questions about workplace flexibility. The independent variables consisted of responses to various questions in the original survey as well as various demographics and firmographics related to the outcomes. This technique comes from a field of statistics called missing data analysis. The key assumption of this modeling process is a concept called ignorability. Ignorability is the property in which the structure by which data that is missing can be ignored. By randomly selecting the respondents for the re-contact survey, this condition is met.

**iii** Roughly equal numbers of employers were sampled in each of 4 size categories: 50 – 99, 100 – 249, 250 – 999 and 1,000+ employees. This was done to obtain comparably reliable estimates of employer characteristics for employers of different sizes. Because only 9 percent of the universe of employers sampled had 1,000 or more employees (as shown in Table 1), however, it was necessary to weight the sample to the proportions of employers of different sizes in universe of employers for purposes of analysis. When weighted in this manner, analyses of the sample accurately reflect characteristics of the universe of all employers with 50 or more employees in the U.S.

**iv** Multi-item outcome scales were created to measure the extent to which employers offered the supportive policies and benefits examined in the study. The items included in the 4 scales are as follows:

- Flexible Workplace—items listed in Table 3;
- Caregiving Leaves—items listed in Tables 6 and 8;
- Child and Elder Care Assistance—items listed in Tables 9 and 11 plus the first (general) item in Table 10; and
- Health Care and Economic Security Benefits—items listed in Tables 17 and 19.

Cronbach's coefficient alphas for these outcome scales were .79, .74, .72 and .52, respectively.

Some items had to be rescaled and some had to be combined before including them in the outcome measures. Because responses were scaled differently for caregiving leave and health/economic security variables, these items had to be standardized (converted to z scores) before combination.