



2012

National Study of Employers

Kenneth Matos and Ellen Galinsky



Funding from The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, we give special thanks to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for supporting this report. We are deeply grateful to Kathleen Christensen from the Sloan Foundation for her deep commitment to the issues of workplace flexibility and to employees, especially those who are least advantaged. Her wise counsel has affected our work and this report in countless and invaluable ways.

Next we thank the representative group of employers who responded to questions in the National Study of Employers. We also want to thank the management and staff of Harris Interactive Inc. for their extraordinary efforts in carrying out the interviews for this study.

We also want to thank Mark J. Schmit, Ph.D., SPHR, Vice President, Research, SHRM and S. Evren Esen, Manager, Survey Research Center, SHRM and Kelly Sakai, Program Manager, Families and Work Institute (FWI) for their knowledgeable and wise review of the questionnaire.

Finally, our thanks to James T. Bond, Research Advisor, FWI for his insights into the findings; John Boose, Art Director, FWI for his design of the report and Philip Galinsky, Director, Samba New York for his proof reading.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ...	1
INTRODUCTION ...	2
REPORT OVERVIEW ...	4
KEY FINDINGS ...	6
CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THE SAMPLE ...	9
TO WHAT EXTENT DO EMPLOYERS PROVIDE IMPORTANT SUPPORTS TO EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND HOW DO THESE DIFFER BY EMPLOYER SIZE AND OVER TIME? ...	12
Flexibility ...	12
Caregiving Leaves ...	17
Replacement Pay During Caregiving Leaves ...	20
Child Care Assistance ...	21
Elder Care Assistance ...	23
Helping Employees Resolve Personal and Family Problems ...	25
Culture of Flexibility and Support ...	27
Employer Efforts to Foster Supportive Supervisors ...	29
Health Care Benefits ...	31
Benefits to Enhance Economic Security ...	34
Company Involvement in Community Life ...	36
MAIN REASONS AND OBSTACLES FOR IMPLEMENTING WORK LIFE INITIATIVES ...	37
Main Reasons ...	37
Main Obstacles ...	38
PREDICTING FLEXIBILITY, CAREGIVING LEAVES, CHILD AND ELDER CARE ASSISTANCE, AND HEALTH CARE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY ...	40
Predicting Flexibility ...	41
Predicting Caregiving Leaves ...	44
Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance ...	44
Predicting Health Care and Economic Security ...	46
CONCLUSION ...	48
ENDNOTES ...	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Employer Size in 2012 ...	9
Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2012 ...	9
Table 3: Flexibility ...	14
Table 4: Provision of Flexibility from 2005 to 2012 ...	16
Table 5: Maximum Length of Caregiving Leaves ...	18
Table 6: Caregiving Leaves from 2005 to 2012 ...	19
Table 7: Replacement Pay During Parental Leave Among Employer Providing Some Parental Leave ...	20
Table 8: Replacement Pay During Caregiving Leaves from 2005 to 2012 ...	21
Table 9: Child Care Assistance ...	22
Table 10: Child Care Assistance from 2005 to 2012 ...	23
Table 11: Elder Care Assistance ...	24
Table 12: Elder Care Assistance from 2005 to 2012 ...	25
Table 13: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems ...	26
Table 14: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems (from 2005 to 2012) ...	26
Table 15: Culture of Flexibility and Supportiveness ...	28
Table 16: Culture of Flexibility and Supportiveness (Percentage Reporting Very True from 2005 to 2012) ...	29
Table 17: Programs for Supervisors and Career Development ...	30
Table 18: Programs for Supervisors and Career Development (from 2005 to 2012) ...	30
Table 19: Health Care Benefits ...	32
Table 20: Health Care Benefits from 2005 to 2012 ...	33
Table 21: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security ...	35
Table 22: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security from 2005 to 2012 ...	36
Table 23: Reasons for Implementing Work Life Initiatives Among Employers with at Least Eight Family Friendly Policies ...	37
Table 24: Obstacles to Implementing Work Life Policies ...	39
Table 25: Predicting Flexibility ...	42
Table 26: Predicting Caregiving Leaves ...	44
Table 27: Predicting Child and Elder Care Assistance ...	45
Table 28: Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits ...	46

INTRODUCTION

Families and Work Institute's **2012 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. The NSE is based on the Institute's landmark **1998 Business Work-Life Study (BWLS)**¹ and has been conducted three additional times since the BWLS survey was completed (2005, 2008 and 2012).

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 U.S. that comprehensively assesses a broad array of programs, policies and benefits designed to address the changing need of employees among a nationally representative group of employers. The 2012 NSE sample includes 1,126 employers with 50 or more employees—75% are for-profit employers and 25% are nonprofit organizations; 18% operate at only one location, while 82% percent have operations at more than one location. Families and Work Institute (FWI) designed the questionnaire, and Harris Interactive, Inc. conducted the interviews on behalf of FWI.² The results of the survey are being released with the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) as an integral part of the FWI-SHRM *When Work Works* initiative.

The BWLS and NSE questionnaires were developed to complement FWI's ongoing *National Study of the Changing Workforce* (NSCW), which surveys large representative samples of employees in the U.S. labor force. Specifically, in the 2002 and the 2008 NSCWs, we identified the components of **effective and flexible workplaces** as consisting of job challenge and learning; job autonomy; supervisor task support; climate of respect and trust; economic security; and work-life fit including workplace flexibility. We then found that, among other things, employees in more effective and flexible workplaces are more likely than other employees 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.

The 2008 NSCW expanded these findings and showed that employees in more effective and flexible workplaces are also more likely than other employees to indicate:

- being in excellent physical health;
- a low frequency of minor health problems and sleep problems;
- no indicators of depression; and
- a low general stress level.

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 2012 NSE enables us to assess the extent to which businesses are providing a number of the factors we have identified as components of effective and flexible workplaces and predictive of workers' productivity and well-being.

Overall, when we look at the workplace flexibility landscape for the nation, we see two broad trends emerging. Flexibility that enhances an employee's ability to decide when and where they accomplish their work tasks is on the rise with increases in the proportion of employers allowing at least some employees access to flex time and place and choices in managing time since 2005. On the other hand, flexibility around reduced time, caregiving leaves and flex careers has declined since 2005.

These trends present two strategic considerations for organizations. First, as flexible scheduling and workplaces become more common, organizations that fail to adopt these options run the risk of being outperformed by competitors who benefit from lower operating costs³ and better adaptation to a global knowledge- and service-based economy. Second, organizations that can offer more flexibility around reduced time, caregiving leaves and flex careers will have a competitive edge in recruiting and retaining employees as the aging workforce and dual focus on personal and professional lives among younger employees become increasingly important drivers in the labor market.

REPORT OVERVIEW

In the 2012 report, we address the following 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, some employers, especially those that are smaller, may be 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. Since the NSE and the NSCW are designed to complement each other by asking many of the same questions, we ask employees about their access to the same programs and benefits in the NSCW, providing a more complete picture of the changing nature of the economy and the workforce.

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. Our research indicates 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 times ($p < .01$).

Trends from 2005 to 2012

To what extent have employers changed over the past seven years (between 2005 and 2012) 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 times ($p < .01$). This assures that reported differences are very likely to be real and meaningful.

When data from 2005 are compared with data from 2012, 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 2005 versus 2012 are quite conservative and robust—particularly since we only report differences as significant when they

reach $p < .01$. Note that although we began this study in 1998, we are using 2005 as the benchmark year for this report because the questions and the sample characteristics are much more comparable. For example, in 1998, we asked about fewer types of work life assistance and only included employers with 100 or more employees. The 2005 NSE set a new standard for a more expanded group of questions and for a sample that includes employers with 50 or more employees.

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 racial and ethnic minorities, of unionized employees, of hourly employees, of part-time employees, of women and racial and ethnic minorities in top positions or reporting to people in top positions;
- **the financial health of the employer**—how well the organization reports it 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 hard-working 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 three groups 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 times ($p < .01$).

KEY FINDINGS

TRENDS FROM 2005 TO 2012

The past seven years have been marked by economic instability—beginning with the worst recession since the Great Depression followed by a slow recovery and continuing high unemployment to this day. During this period of economic instability, employers’ practices, policies, programs and benefits have changed significantly.

We have observed two broad trends in the provision of flexible work options from 2005 to 2012 (Table 4). First, employers have *increased* their provision of options that allow employees to better manage the times and places in which they work. These include flex time (from 66% to 77%); flex place (from 34% to 63%); choices in managing time (from 78% to 93%); and daily time off when important needs arise (from 77% to 87%). Second, employers have *reduced* their provision of options that involve employees spending significant amounts of time away from full-time work. These include moving from part-time to full-time and back again (from 54% to 41%); and flex career options such as career breaks for personal or family responsibilities (from 73% to 52%).

The maximum length of caregiving leaves offered to new fathers following childbirth, new adoptive parents and employees caring for seriously ill family members has declined since 2005 (Table 6). Among those employers that provide *any* pay for disability related to childbirth (58%), far fewer provide full pay, now at 9%, down from 17% in 2005.

The large majority of employers in our 2012 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 in our sample that have only *one* location (and are most likely covered by the federal FMLA since we are investigating employers with 50 or more employees) with small employers that have multiple locations (and may be much less likely to be covered by the FMLA), we find no significant difference—between 67% and 69% of both groups offer full FMLA coverage. Even some large employers with more than 1,000 employees (about 21%), however, also appear to fail to fully comply with the FMLA at this time. Thus, we find that 26% of employers overall (of any size) appear to be out of compliance with FMLA; a percentage that has not changed from 2005.⁴

We find that more employers are offering Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) to help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars (Table 10). However, fewer employers are providing back-up, emergency care or sick care options.

On the other hand, more employers today (41%) than in 2005 (29%) provide access to information about services for elderly family members as well as DCAPs for elder care and access to respite care (Table 12), perhaps in response to the aging workforce.

Given the increase in demanding jobs that we find in the NSCW, it is not surprising to find that larger percentages of employers are providing Employee Assistance Programs to help employees deal with problems and pressures—74% now, up from 46% in 2005 (Table 14). There has also been an increase in wellness programs, with 63% providing these programs today compared with 47% in 2005 (Table 20). In addition, more employers are providing women with private space for breastfeeding in 2012 (79%) than in 2005 (71%).

Although there have been increases in the percentages of employers that provide health care coverage for employees and their families (4% increase for personal health insurance and a 9% increase for family health insurance), employers are asking employees to pick up a larger share of the premiums (Table 20). Among employers offering personal health insurance, 41% increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months. Similarly, among employers offering family health insurance, 42% increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months (Table 19).

Only 4% pay all of the premiums for family members today, compared with 9% in 2005. On the other hand, employers are more likely to provide health insurance for unmarried partners of employees—38% in 2012, compared with 23% seven years ago (Table 20).

Employers offering defined-benefit pension plans have declined from 34% in 2005 to 22% in 2012 (Table 22). However, employers are now more likely to contribute to employees' retirement plans (up to 83% in 2012 from 74% in 2005).

PREDICTING 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 moderately to highly flexible are employers that:

- are nonprofits;
- are larger;
- have more women in their workforces;
- have fewer racial or ethnic minorities in their workforces;
- have fewer union members;
- have fewer hourly employees;
- have more part-timers; and
- have more women and racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions.

Predicting Caregiving Leaves

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

- are larger;
- have more hourly employees; and
- have experienced downsizing in the past 12 months.

The relative lack of differences in caregiving leaves may be a result of FMLA creating a standard all employers with 50 or more employees seek to meet, though as reported above, compliance is uneven.

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 more than one location;
- have been in business longer;
- have more women in their workforces; and
- have more women and racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions.

Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits

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

- are larger;
- are nonprofits;
- have been in business longer;
- have more women and racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions;
- are doing better than their competitors; and
- have experienced upsizing or downsizing.

In sum, nonprofits offer more programs, policies and benefits than for-profits do, making them an interesting choice for employees who want employer support in managing their work and personal lives. Furthermore, employers with more diversity in top/senior 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 higher level of support.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THE SAMPLE

The percentage of employers by organizational size is presented in Table 1. Overall, 53% of employers are small organizations (employing 50 to 99 employees nationwide) while only 9% of employers are large organizations (1,000 or more employees nationwide).⁵

Table 1: Employer Size in 2012

Characteristic	Total Sample	Sample Sizes
Number of employees in U.S.		
50 to 99	53%	597
100 to 249	22%	252
250 to 999	16%	178
1,000 or more	9%	99

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Total sample size =1,126.

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 racial or ethnic minorities, union members, work hourly or part-time schedules and are older. Large organizations are more likely to have women in top/senior positions, on the board of directors and reporting to people in top positions. Similarly, large employers have more racially/ethnically diverse people in top/senior positions, on the boards of directors and reporting to people in top positions.

Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2012

Characteristic	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Industry				
Goods producing	27%	24%	ns	32%
Professional services	18	19		12
Wholesale and retail trade	33	37		29
Finance, insurance, real estate	1	1		1
Other services	21	19		26
Employer Type				
For-profit	75%	74%	ns	79%
Nonprofit ⁶	25	26		21
Number of Operating Locations				
Only one location	18%	23%	***	7%
Two to six locations	54	63		12
More than six locations	27	14		80

Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2012 (continued)

Percentage of employees who are ...	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Women				
1 - 24%	24%	25%		12%
25 - 50%	34	31	ns	44
51 - 75%	26	26		34
More than 75%	16	19		10
Racial or ethnic minorities				
0%	3%	5%		0%
1 - 24%	53	59	**	39
25 - 50%	29	24		48
51 - 75%	12	9		12
More than 75%	4	3		1
Union members				
0%	87%	94%		53%
1 - 24%	4	1	***	27
25 - 50%	4	2		12
51 - 75%	2	1		5
More than 75%	2	3		3
Hourly (non-exempt)				
0%	1%	1%		0%
1 - 24%	19	24	***	10
25 - 50%	22	22		18
51 - 75%	36	34		42
More than 75%	23	19		30
Work part time				
0%	18%	18%		9%
1 - 24%	68	72	***	64
25 - 50%	9	7		17
51 - 75%	3	2		6
More than 75%	1	1		3

Table 2: Organization Characteristics in 2012 (continued)

Percentage of employees who are ...	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Under the age of 30				
0%	1%	2%		0%
1 - 24%	52	57	**	42
25 - 50%	42	38		49
51 - 75%	5	4		7
More than 75%	<1	0		1
30 to 49 years old				
0%	0%	0%		0%
1 - 24%	5	4	**	8
25 - 50%	65	64		71
51 - 75%	26	27		19
More than 75%	3	5		1
Age 50 and older				
0%	<1%	0%		0%
1 - 24%	38	38	ns	34
25 - 50%	54	53		60
51 - 75%	7	8		6
More than 75%	1	1		0
Percentage of organizations with ...	Total Sample	Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Women in top/senior positions ⁷	79%	77%	**	90%
Women who are in top positions ⁸	44%	46%	ns	36%
Women who report directly to those in top positions	61%	57%	**	75%
Women on board of directors	49%	48%	**	64%
Racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions ⁹	47%	40%	***	72%
Racial or ethnic minorities in top positions ¹⁰	17%	14%	ns	21%
Racial or ethnic minorities who report directly to those in top positions	28%	23%	***	47%
Racial or ethnic minorities on board of directors	30%	22%	***	54%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes for the total sample column range from 965-1,126. Sample sizes for comparisons of small and large employers ranged from 518-597 for small employers and 81-99 for large employers.

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

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

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 *flex time*—allowing employees to change their arrival and departure times on a periodic basis—or *flex place*—allowing employees to work at home or offsite. These may have been relevant definitions in the late 20th Century, but they are 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 flex time, 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 17 options for working flexibly we consider in this report (Table 3), employers with 50 or more employees most frequently allow at least some groups¹¹ of workers to have control over when they take breaks (93%), take time off for important family and personal needs without loss of pay (87%) and periodically change their starting and quitting times within some range of hours (77%). They are next most likely to allow at least some groups of employees to return to work gradually after leaves for childbirth and adoption (73%) and work some of their regular paid hours at home occasionally (63%).

The proportion of employers offering these same options for working flexibly to all or most workers is significantly lower, ranging from 2% to 62%. On average, the proportion of employers offering

flexible work options to all or most employees is 30 percentage points lower than the proportion who offer the same options to some employees. Again, control over when employees take breaks (62%) and a gradual return to work after childbirth or adoption (44%) are the most prevalent options offered to all or most employees, while work-at-home (6% offer occasional work-at-home and 2% offer work-at-home on a regular basis) and reduced time (6% offer switching between full and part-time work without a change in position or level and 2% offer part-year work) options are the least likely to be offered to all or most employees.

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 through 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*¹² of their employees. Tests of statistical significance for the comparisons are reported in the center column, between the percentages for the two groups.

In 2012, there are four statistically significant differences between small and large employers. Small employers are more likely to allow employees to change starting and quitting times within some range of hours, have control over when to take breaks, return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption and take time off during the workday to attend to important family or personal needs without loss of pay.

In 2005, small employers were more likely to provide flexibility than large employers in about half of the types of flexibility investigated. Between 2005 and 2008, large employers increased some types of flexibility (e.g., periodic flextime, control over breaks, phased retirement) and smaller employers 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 all but disappeared in that time period. Thus in 2008, there was only one significant difference between small and large employers. Small employers were 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.

As time has passed since the start of the recession in December of 2007, this situation may be reversing itself with smaller organizations once again emerging as leaders in workplace flexibility in the 2012 survey, as shown in Table 3. Note that statistically significant differences are shaded in green.

Table 3: Flexibility

Type of Flexibility	Organization allows at least some employees to ...	Organization allows 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	77%	27%	32%	**	16%
Change starting and quitting times on a daily basis	39%	9%	10%	ns	3%
Compress workweek by working longer hours on fewer days for at least part of the year	36%	7%	9%	ns	5%
Work some regular paid hours at home occasionally	63%	6%	10%	ns	3%
Work some regular paid hours at home on a regular basis	33%	2%	3%	ns	0%
Choices in Managing Time					
Have control over when to take breaks	93%	62%	70%	***	42%
Have choices about and control over which shifts to work	36%	7%	8%	ns	11%
Have control over paid and unpaid overtime hours	44%	20%	20%	ns	16%
Reduced Time					
Move from full-time to part-time work and back again while remaining in the same position or level	41%	6%	7%	ns	7%
Work part year i.e., work reduced time on an annual basis	18%	2%	2%	ns	2%

Table 3: Flexibility (continued)

Type of Flexibility	Organization allows at least some employees to ...	Organization allows all or most employees to ...	Employer Size		
			Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Caregiving Leaves					
Return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption	73%	44%	48%	***	29%
Time Off					
Take time off during the workday to attend to important family or personal needs without loss of pay	87%	55%	62%	***	38%
Do volunteer work during regular work hours	49%	20%	21%	ns	20%
Flex Careers					
Phase into retirement by working reduced hours over a period of time prior to full retirement	53%	17%	21%	ns	10%
Take sabbaticals i.e., leaves (paid or unpaid of six months or more) and return to a comparable job	29%	9%	11%	ns	6%
Take extended career breaks for caregiving or other personal or family responsibilities	52%	30%	33%	ns	20%
Receive special consideration when returning to the organization after an extended career break	21%	11%	12%	ns	7%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample size for percentages of employers “allowing at least some employees ...” ranged between 729 and 1,126. Sample sizes for percentages of employers allowing all or most employees ranged between 198-1,044. Sample sizes for comparisons of small and large employers ranged from 97-554 for small employers and 19-94 for large employers. Percentages do not add to 100% because some response categories are omitted. Percentages of employers offering all or most are of the total sample of employers, not just those who offer at least some employees a type of flexibility. Statistical significance: *** = $p < .001$; ** = $p < .01$; ns = not significant.

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Sixteen of the 17 questions about working flexibly asked in 2012 were also asked in 2005.¹³ Since 2005, employers have become less likely to provide reduced time, caregiving leaves and flex careers. On the other hand, employers are more likely to provide flexibility around flex time and place, choices in managing time and time during the workday to attend to important family or personal needs without loss of pay. The forms of flexibility that have increased allow employees to work longer hours or adjust their work times to take care of daily concerns while still getting their work done. The forms of flexibility that have declined all represent time that an employee is not actively working for the organization or has reduced his or her overall work hours (moving to part-time). Considering that these changes have occurred over the course of the recession, they may be a result of employers attempting to make the most of smaller workforces and a reduced focus on long-term retention of employees interested in periods away from work.

Table 4: Provision of Flexibility from 2005 to 2012

Flexibility Options	2005	Sig.	2012
Flex Time and Place			
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to periodically change starting and quitting times within some range of hours	68%	***	77%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to change starting and starting and quitting times on a daily basis	34%	ns	39%
Percent allowing (at least some) employees to compress their workweek by working longer hours on fewer days for at least part of the year	39%	ns	36%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to work some of their regular paid hours at home on an occasional basis	34%	***	63%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to work some of their regular paid hours at home on a regular basis	31%	ns	33%
Choices in Managing Time			
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to have control over when they take breaks	78%	***	93%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to have choice and control over which shifts they work	39%	ns	36%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to have control over their paid/unpaid overtime hours	28%	***	44%
Reduced Time			
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	54%	***	41%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to work part year on an annual basis	38%	***	18%

Table 4: Provision of Flexibility from 2005 to 2012 (continued)

Flexibility Options	2005	Sig.	2012
Caregiving Leaves			
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption	86%	***	73%
Time Off			
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to take time off during the workday to attend to important family or personal needs without loss of pay	77%	***	87%
Flex Careers			
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to phase into retirement	50%	ns	53%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to take sabbaticals	49%	***	29%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to take a career break for personal/family responsibilities	73%	***	52%
Percentage allowing (at least some) employees to receive special consideration after a career break for personal/family responsibilities	43%	***	21%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 738-875 for 2005 and 588-988 for 2012.

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, the 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 10 and 25% of employers with 50 or more employees provide fewer than 12 weeks of leave of different types, while 15% to 30% provide more than 12 weeks (Table 5). Seventy four 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 26% do not (that is 26% fail to provide 12 or more weeks of *at least one type* of leave).¹⁴ It is important to note that almost all employers who do not provide full family and medical leave do not provide at least 12 weeks of paternity leave (25% out of 26%). These values are unchanged from 2005 when 74% of employers offered full FMLA leave and 26% did not.

Table 5: Maximum Length of Caregiving Leaves

Leave Policies	Fewer than 12 Weeks	12 Weeks	More than 12 Weeks
Maternity leave	10%	61	30
Paternity leave	25%	60	15
Adoption or foster care leave	15%	65	19
Care of seriously ill family members	13%	67	19

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample size = 1,100. The remaining 26 employers were excluded from the analyses for missing data.

Read percentages left to right. Percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding errors.

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 as required by the FMLA (68% and 79%).

We further investigated the extent to which employers are in compliance with the law. When we compare small employers (50-99 employees) that have only *one* location (and thus are most likely covered by the federal FMLA which requires employers with 50 or more employees within a 75 mile radius to provide FMLA leave) with small employers that have multiple locations (and may be much less likely to be covered by the FMLA), we find no difference in the proportions offering full FMLA coverage (67% and 69% respectively). This strongly suggests that FMLA policies are becoming more of a norm among U.S. employers. On the other hand, even some large employers with more than 1,000 employees (about 21%) do not appear to fully comply with the FMLA at this time.

Trends from 2005 to 2012

When we compare the provision of caregiving leaves in 2005 and 2012 (Table 6), we find that more employers are now offering at least 12 weeks of leave for women following the birth of a child (79% in 2005 compared with 91% in 2012) and for employees caring for seriously ill family members (78% in 2005 compared with 86% in 2012).

On the other hand, we find that the average job-guaranteed leaves for the spouses/partners¹⁵ of women following the birth of their child, for employees who have adopted a child and for employees caring for seriously ill family members have all declined between 2005 and 2012.

Considering that employers have reduced the availability of flexibility associated with time away from work (Table 6), the fact that three out of four types of caregiving leave have lower average maximums than in the past appears to reflect a similar trend.

Table 6: Caregiving Leaves from 2005 to 2012

Leave Policy/Benefit	2005	Sig.	2012
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for women following the birth of a child			
Fewer than 12 weeks	22%	***	10%
12 weeks	50		61
More than 12 weeks	29		30
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for women following the birth of a child	15.2	ns	14.2
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for spouses/partners of women who give birth following the birth of their child			
Fewer than 12 weeks	29%	ns	25%
12 weeks	52		60
More than 12 weeks	19		15
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for spouses/partners of women who give birth following the birth of their child	12.7	***	10.6
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees following the adoption of a child			
Fewer than 12 weeks	22%	ns	15%
12 weeks	58		65
More than 12 weeks	19		19
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave following the adoption of a child	13.5	***	11.9
Maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees to care for seriously ill family members			
Fewer than 12 weeks	21%	**	13%
12 weeks	59		67
More than 12 weeks	19		19
Average maximum job-guaranteed leave for employees to care for seriously ill family members	13.6	**	12.2

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 650-720 in 2005 and 886-887 in 2012.

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 (58%) are much more likely than men on paternity leave (14%) to receive some replacement pay during leave (Table 7).

Small versus Large Employers

Although small employers are equally likely (or “unlikely” to be more precise) to offer any replacement pay to men during paternity leave, they are significantly less likely (54%) than large employers (68%) to offer any replacement pay to women during maternity leave. Of employers providing at least some pay to women during maternity leave, most (78%) fund this pay through a general temporary disability insurance (TDI) plan, which typically provides partial wage replacement during the period of maternity-related disability. Seventy eight percent of small employers versus 66% of large employers offer TDI coverage.

Table 7: Replacement Pay During Parental Leave Among Employer Providing Some Parental Leave

Type of Leave	Total Sample at Least Some Replacement Pay	Some Pay by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Maternity leave	58%	54%	**	68%
Paternity leave	14%	14%	ns	15%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample size for percentages of employers providing at least some replacement pay ranged between 1,038 and 1,091. Sample sizes for comparisons of small and large employers ranged from 534- 575 for small employers and 92-97 for large employers. 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 (with some local exceptions), 45% of employers allow employees to take at least five days for this purpose without having to use vacation days or losing pay.

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Though employees who give birth are more likely to receive some form of pay during leave for maternity-related disability (from 46% in 2005 to 58% in 2012), employers have become significantly less likely to provide full pay during leave for maternity-related disability (Table 8). Among employers that provide any disability pay (58% of the 2012 sample and 35% of the 2005 sample), only 9% provided full pay in 2012 (5% of the total sample of employers), a decrease from 17% in 2005 (6% of the total sample of employers). This parallels the pattern of cutbacks in employers’ contributions to health care premiums that is discussed later in this report (Table 19).

Table 8: Replacement Pay During Caregiving Leaves from 2005 to 2012

Practice, Policy or Benefit	2005	Sig.	2012
Do female employees who give birth receive any pay from any source during the period of their disability?		***	
Yes	46%		58%
No	54		42
Do employees who receive at least some pay during the period of maternity-related disability receive full or part pay?		***	
Full pay	17%		9%
Part pay	65		63
Depends on situation	18		28
Is disability pay provided as part of a temporary disability insurance benefit?		ns	
Yes	75%		78%
No	25		22
Do spouses/partners of women who give birth receive any paid time off following the birth of their child?		ns	
Yes	13%		14%
No	87		86

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 308-689 in 2005 and 502-880 in 2012. 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 (62%) and Child Care Resource and Referral (38%). These options are less costly than other options such as child care at or near the worksite, provided by only 7%. (See Table 9.)

Small versus Large Employers

Large employers are significantly more likely to offer six of the seven child care options considered:

- Access to information to help locate child care in the community (Child Care Resource and Referral)
- Child care at or near the worksite
- Payment for child care with vouchers or other subsidies that have direct costs to the company

- Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) that help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars
- Child care for school-age children on vacation
- Sick care for the children of employees

These differences are not only statistically significant but also generally fairly large. For example, 61% of large employers provide Child Care Resource and Referral compared with 29% of small employers; and 84% of large employers offer DCAPs compared with 53% of small employers. All of the initiatives for which 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.

Table 9: Child Care Assistance

Does your organization provide ...	Total Sample 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)	38%	29%	***	61%
Child care at or near the worksite	7%	5%	***	18%
Payment for child care with vouchers or other subsidies that have direct costs to the company	2%	1%	***	8%
Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) that help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars	62%	53%	***	84%
Child care for school-age children on vacation	2%	2%	**	6%
Back-up or emergency care for employees when their regular child care arrangements fall apart	3%	2%	ns	7%
Sick care for the children of employees	3%	2%	**	6%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes for employers overall ranged between 1,116 and 1,121. Sample sizes for comparisons of small and large employers ranged from 589- 595 for small employers and 97-98 for large employers. Only the % responding "Yes" is reported for each option. Statistical significance: *** = $p < .001$; ** = $p < .01$; ns = not significant.

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Seven child care option questions were included in both the 2005 and 2012 questionnaires. More employers offer DCAPs in 2012 (62%) than in 2005 (45%). On the other hand, fewer employers offer back-up emergency care and sick care in 2012 (both 3%) than in 2005 (both 6%).

Table 10: Child Care Assistance from 2005 to 2012

Practice, Policy or Benefit	2005	Sig.	2012
Access to information to help locate child care in the community (Child Care Resource and Referral)	34%	ns	38%
Dependent Care Assistance Plans (DCAPs) that help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars	45%	***	62%
Payment for child care with vouchers or other subsidies that have direct costs to the company	3%	ns	2%
Child care at or near the worksite	7%	ns	7%
Child care for school-age children on vacation	3%	ns	2%
Back-up or emergency care for employees when their regular child care arrangements fall apart	6%	**	3%
Sick care for the children of employees	6%	**	3%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 860-875 in 2005 and 900-905 in 2012.

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

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

ELDER CARE ASSISTANCE

Prevalence

Interestingly and perhaps surprisingly, 75% 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 the former may be more sensitive to providing help to others who have similar needs. It may also be a response to the aging workforce and the high prevalence of elder care needs. Families and Work Institute research released in 2010 found that 42% of employees provided elder assistance in the past five years and 49% expected to provide this care in the coming five years.

Overall, 41% of employers provide employees with information about elder care services or Elder Care Resource and Referral, and 42% offer DCAPs for elder care. Only 8% offer access to respite care (short-term care given to a family member by another caregiver) so that the primary caregiver can rest or take time off.

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 employ-

ees 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 (33%) than large employers (58%) to provide Elder Care Resource and Referral services. Interestingly, however, 29% of small employers provide access to this information for child care compared with 33% 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 ...	Total Sample 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)	41%	33%	***	58%
Time off for employees to provide elder care without jeopardizing their jobs	75%	76%	ns	68%
DCAPs for elder care	42%	35%	***	58%
Access to respite care	8%	6%	**	14%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total = 1,101-1,116; small employers = 579-591; large employers = 95-98.

Only the % responding "Yes" is reported for each option.

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

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Four elder care questions were included in both 2005 and 2012 questionnaires. Of these four comparable questions, employers in 2012 were more likely (41%) to report that they offered Elder Care Resource and Referral than employers in 2005 (29%). (See Table 12.) Similarly, more employers offered DCAPs for elder care (42%) and access to respite care (8%) in 2012 than in 2005 (24% and 3% respectively).

Table 12: Elder Care Assistance from 2005 to 2012

Benefits, Policies and Practices	2005	Sig.	2012
Percentage providing access to information about needed services for elderly family members (Elder Care Resource and Referral)	29%	***	41%
Time off for employees to provide elder care without jeopardizing their jobs	79%	ns	75%
DCAPs for elder care	24%	***	42%
Access to respite care	3%	***	8%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 853-871 in 2005 and 889-900 in 2012.

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

HELPING EMPLOYEES RESOLVE PERSONAL AND FAMILY PROBLEMS

Prevalence

Almost three quarters (74%) 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 (20%) 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 or seminars on work life issues. EAPs involve direct costs to employers that are more difficult for small employers to afford. 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. Additionally, large employers are more likely to have employee resource groups, perhaps because they have enough employees in specific identity groups to reach a critical mass to sustain interest in and productivity from such groups.

Table 13: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems

Does your company provide ...	Total Sample 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	74%	66%	***	93%
Workshops or seminars on parenting, child development, care of the elderly or work family problems	20%	15%	***	40%
Financial support to community programs that support families in the community, that is, programs not aimed specifically at your employees	42%	40%	ns	51%
Special supports to employees to help them manage their own financial situations	37%	33%	ns	46%
Employee resource groups for employees with similar backgrounds or interests to network <u>and</u> to help build business results for the organization	11%	11%	**	22%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total = 1,111-1,123; small employers = 587-595; large employers = 97-99.

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

Trends from 2005 to 2012

There has been a dramatic increase in the number of employers providing assistance to help employees resolve personal and family problems over the past seven years, from 46% in 2005 to 74% in 2012 (Table 14). Clearly, EAPs have become more universal.

Table 14: Assistance in Resolving Personal and Family Problems (from 2005 to 2012)

Benefits, Policies and Practices	2005	Sig.	2012
Percentage providing an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) designed to help employees deal with problems that may affect work or personal life	46%	***	74%
Percentage providing workshops or seminars on parenting, child development, care of the elderly or work family problems	21%	ns	20%
Provide financial support to community programs that support families in the community, that is, programs not aimed specifically at your employees	36%	ns	42%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 853-873 in 2005 and 896-906 in 2012.

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

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 have more positive impressions of their organizations’ cultures than employees do.

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” (69%) 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 (58%). Far fewer employers, however, responded “very true” to statements asking whether management rewards those within the organization who support flexible work arrangements (12%) and whether their organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of the availability of work life assistance (25%).

Small versus Large Employers

In 2005, we found that smaller employers were more likely to report being supportive than larger employers were, 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).

When we consider 2012 (Table 15), it is important to note that although the percentage differences between small and large organizations are sometimes rather large, our test for significance is quite stringent so these differences are not statistically significant. However, we do see a greater proportion of large organizations than small organizations making a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of available assistance for managing work and family responsibilities. This may be because large organizations have more resources and infrastructure to sustain a coordinated communications campaign than a small organization.

A new item on the 2012 survey shows that while few organizations overall (12%) say it is very true that their other policies interfere with their ability to provide workplace flexibility, 45% indicate that it is very or somewhat true. We also find that large organizations (16%) are more likely than small organizations (11%) to say it is very true that their other policies interfere with their ability to provide workplace flexibility.

Table 15: Culture of Flexibility and Supportiveness

Organizational Representatives' Statements About Culture of Flexibility	Total Sample "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 by finding solutions that work for both employees and the organization	58%	62%	ns	49%
The organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of available assistance for managing work and family responsibilities	25%	24%	**	32%
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	69%	72%	ns	69%
Management rewards those within the organization who support effective flexible work arrangements	12%	15%	ns	10%
Our organization's personnel policies and practices (such as penalties for unscheduled absences, on-site time requirements, strict headcount policies, etc.) sometimes stand in the way of providing workplace flexibility	12%	11%	***	16%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total=1,102-1116; small employers=546-590; large employers=94-98.

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.

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Though most measures of the culture of flexibility and supportiveness have not changed significantly between 2005 and 2012, we do find that fewer employers report that management rewards those within the organization who support effective flexible work arrangements in 2012 (12%) than in 2005 (31%).

Table 16: Culture of Flexibility and Supportiveness (Percentage Reporting Very True from 2005 to 2012)

Benefits, Policies and Practices	2005	Sig.	2012
Supervisors are encouraged to be supportive of employees with family needs by finding solutions that work for both employees and the organization	63%	ns	58%
The organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of available assistance for managing work and family responsibilities	27%	ns	25%
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	72%	ns	69%
Management rewards those within the organization who support effective flexible work arrangements ¹⁶	31%	***	12%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 828-870 in 2005 and 849-899 in 2012.

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—63% versus 14%, a striking difference of 49 percentage points (Table 17). Similarly, 51% of employers report considering how well supervisors manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions, while 44% 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 diversity and management and leadership roles for women. In 2005, large organizations were more likely to implement formal training on work and family needs than small employers. This difference is not present in 2012, suggesting that work life fit is an issue facing employees in companies of all sizes.

Interestingly, however, there is no statistically significant difference between small and large employers with respect to training supervisors in responding to work and family needs. In addition, there is no significant difference in the proportions of small and large employers that consider how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions.

Table 17: Programs for Supervisors and Career Development

Programs Provided	Total Sample	“Provides” by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Training for supervisors in responding to work family needs of employees	44%	41%	ns	52%
Training for supervisors in managing diversity	63%	59%	**	74%
Training for supervisors in managing employees of different ages	50%	46%	***	66%
Consideration of how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions	51%	57%	ns	43%
Career counseling programs or management/ leadership programs for women	14%	11%	***	32%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total = 1,085-1,105; small employers = 573-582; large employers = 96-98.

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

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Employers have cut back on programs for supervisors and career development related to flexibility since 2005. Fewer employers consider how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions in 2012 (51%) than in 2005 (63%). Similarly, fewer employers provide career counseling programs or management/leadership programs for women in 2012 (14%) than in 2005 (22%).

Table 18: Programs for Supervisors and Career Development (from 2005 to 2012)

Benefits, Policies and Practices	2005	Sig.	2012
Train supervisors in responding to work family needs of employees	48%	ns	44%
Train supervisors in managing diversity	65%	ns	63%
Consider how well supervisors and managers manage flexible work arrangements when making job performance appraisals and compensation decisions	63%	***	51%
Career counseling program or a management/ leadership program for women	22%	***	14%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 820-859 in 2005 and 875-891 in 2012.

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-nine percent of employers with 50 or more employees offer personal health insurance coverage for full-time employees (Table 19). Among organizations offering personal health insurance, 17% pay all of the premiums, 83% pay some of the premiums, and <1% pay none of the premiums. Among employers offering personal health insurance, 41% increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months.

Ninety-seven percent of employers offer family coverage, with only 4% of these paying all of the premiums for family members, another 82% paying part of the premiums and 14% paying none of the premiums. Among employers offering family health insurance, 42% increased employees' premium co-pay during the preceding 12 months.

Overall, 38% of employers offer health insurance coverage for unmarried partners who live with the employee. Sixty-three percent of employers offer wellness programs for employees and their families, and 79% provide private space and milk storage facilities for nursing mothers.

Small versus Large Employers

Small employers with 50 to 99 employees and large employers are equally likely to offer personal health insurance coverage (99% and 100%), but when they do, small employers are more likely (21%) than large employers (4%) to pay all of the premiums.

Similarly, small employers and large employers are equally likely to offer family health insurance coverage (96% and 99%) and to pay the full family health insurance premiums.

Similarly, small employers are less likely than large employers to report having increased employees' premium co-pays during the preceding 12 months for both personal and family health insurance.

The fact that premium co-pays have generally increased for employees is an important finding, in our view. In recent years, as health care costs have risen dramatically, employers have gradually shifted more insurance premium costs to their employees.

Small employers are 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 19: Health Care Benefits

Does your company provide ...	Total Sample "Yes"	"Provides" by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Personal health insurance for full-time employees	99%	99%	ns	100%
Among organizations offering personal coverage: full or part payment of premiums for personal health insurance			***	
Full	17%	21%		4%
Part	83	79		96
None	<1	0		0
Over past 12 months, employees were asked to pay a larger proportion of personal health insurance premium	41%	36%	**	53%
Health insurance that includes coverage for family members	97%	96%	ns	99%
Among organizations offering family coverage: full or part payment of premium for family members			ns	
Full	4%	5%		3%
Part	82	77		92
None	14	18		5
Over past 12 months, employees asked to pay a larger proportion of family health insurance premium	42%	37%	**	55%
Health insurance coverage for unmarried partners (same or opposite sex) who live together	38%	36%	ns	46%
Wellness program for employees and their families	63%	55%	***	83%
Space and storage facilities at work that allow women who are nursing to continue to do so by expressing milk	79%	75%	**	89%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total = 921-1,124; small employers = 465-595; large employers = 94-99.

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

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Seven health care benefit questions were included in both the 2005 and 2012 questionnaires (Table 20). Though significantly more employers are providing health insurance coverage for full-time employees (99% in 2012 compared with 95% in 2005), fewer employers are paying all of employee's health insurance premiums (17% in 2012 compared with 24% in 2005).

Significantly more employers in 2012 (38%) than in 2005 (23%) offer 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 (63% in 2012, up from 47% in 2005) and in the provision of space and equipment for new mothers to breastfeed (79% in 2012, up from 71% in 2005).

Table 20: Health Care Benefits from 2005 to 2012

Benefits	2005	Sig.	2012
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for full-time employees	95%	***	99%
Percentage paying all, part or none of the premium for full-time employees' health insurance			
All	24%	**	17%
Part	74		83
None	2		<1
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for family members	88%	***	97%
Percentage paying all, part or none of the premium for family members health insurance			
All	9%	ns	4%
Part	68		82
None	23		14
Percentage providing health insurance coverage for unmarried partners of employees	23%	***	38%
Percentage providing wellness program for employees and their families	47%	***	63%
Percentage providing private space for breastfeeding women	71%	***	79%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 698-879 in 2005 and 844-906 in 2012.

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

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 (96%) to offer 401(k) or 403(b) retirement plans, with for-profit employers using the former and nonprofits the latter (Table 21). Moreover, 83% of employers made contributions to employee's individual retirement plans. Only 22% of employers offer defined-benefit pensions.

The second most popular fringe benefit (75%) is temporary disability insurance. Seventy 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. Fewer than one in five employers (15%) 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 21). The costs of such benefits may be considerable and are more easily borne by large than small employers. Relatively few employers (10%) 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 21: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security

Does your company provide ...	Total Sample “Yes”	“Provides” by Employer Size		
		Small (50 to 99 employees)	Sig.	Large (1,000 or more employees)
Temporary disability insurance (TDI)	75%	70%	***	90%
Defined/guaranteed-benefit pension plan	22%	22%	***	39%
401(k) or 403(b) individual retirement plan	96%	95%	ns	98%
Company contribution to retirement plan	83%	83%	ns	90%
Financial assistance for employees to continue education/training	70%	68%	**	81%
Scholarships or other educational assistance for the children of employees	11%	7%	***	37%
A long-term care insurance plan	34%	31%	***	50%
Financial assistance for adoptive parents	8%	5%	***	26%
Assistance in obtaining public benefits for potentially eligible employees—e.g., tax credits, child care subsidies, food stamps, housing subsidies and transportation subsidies	15%	13%	ns	17%
Among employers allowing phased retirement <u>and</u> offering defined-benefit pension plans (<u>only 10% of employers</u>), what % allows employees to phase into retirement without reducing their pension payouts	82%	88% N=51	ns	89% N=18

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes: total = 1,108-1,124; small employers = 589-595; large employers = 96-99.

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

Trends from 2005 to 2012

Nine questions were included in both 2012 and 2005 questionnaires. Employers in 2012 are less likely (22%) than those in 2005 (34%) to provide defined-benefit pension plans or assistance in obtaining public benefits (20% in 2005 compared with 15% in 2012). However, employers in 2012 are more likely (96%) than employers in 2005 (83%) to provide 401(k), 403(b) or other retirement plans. They are also more likely (83%) than employers in 2005 (74%) to make contributions to employees' retirement plans (Table 22).

Table 22: Benefits to Enhance Economic Security from 2005 to 2012

Benefits	2005	Sig.	2012
Percentage providing short-term, non-occupational disability insurance	64%	***	75%
Percentage providing defined-benefit pension plan	34%	***	22%
Percentage providing 401(k), 403(b) or other retirement plan	83%	***	96%
Percentage contributing to employee retirement plans	74%	***	83%
Percentage providing financial assistance for education/training	62%	***	70%
Percentage providing scholarships or educational assistance to employees' children	15%	ns	11%
Percentage offering a long-term insurance plan	32%	ns	34%
Percentage providing financial assistance for adoptive parents	7%	ns	8%
Percentage providing assistance in obtaining public benefits	20%	**	15%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample sizes range within survey year from 850-872 in 2005 and 894-906 in 2012.

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

COMPANY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY LIFE

Prevalence

In addition to investigating whether employers allow all or most of their employees to do volunteer work during regular work hours (20%, Table 3), we also examine whether employers with 50 or more employees provide pay during volunteer hours. Among these employers, 18% provide no pay during volunteer hours, while 51% compensate employees for some number of hours up to a maximum of 19 hours per year, and 31% compensate employees for 20 or more volunteer hours per year.

MAIN REASONS AND OBSTACLES FOR IMPLEMENTING WORK LIFE INITIATIVES

MAIN REASONS

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

As shown in Table 23, 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 (12%). Although a lot of the discussion in the work life field is around retaining highly skilled employees, employers appear motivated to retain employees in general. The second most important reason is helping employees manage work and family life (16%), followed by improving morale—important in a period of economic uncertainty—and legal mandates (both 12%), recruiting employees in general and “it is the right thing to do” (both 11%).

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 23: Reasons for Implementing Work Life Initiatives Among Employers with at Least Eight Family Friendly Policies

Retain employees in general	37%
Help employees manage work and family life	16%
Improve morale	12%
Mandated by law	12%
Retain highly-skilled employees	12%
Recruit employees in general	11%
It is the right thing to do	11%
Increase productivity	9%
We are a caring organization	8%
It is a family organization, and it is the way we do things	8%
Other reasons	8%
Provide job satisfaction	7%
Provide a better work environment	6%
Increase employee commitment/engagement	5%

Table 23: Reasons for Implementing Work Life Initiatives among Employers with at Least Eight Family Friendly Policies (continued)

Meet business needs for flexible work schedules	4%
Recruit highly-skilled employees	4%
Support the community	3%
Compete with other employers	3%
Respond to employees' requests/pressure	3%
Ensure the workforce of tomorrow is of high quality	3%
It is the nature of this business	2%
Reduce absenteeism	2%
Provide a return on investment to organizations	1%
Lower costs or save money	1%
Recruit and retain women	1%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample size=466. Respondents could mention as many factors as they want.

Reasons mentioned by less than 1% are not tabled.

MAIN OBSTACLES

We asked all employers (whether they have implemented work life assistance or not) for the main obstacles to implementing flexibility, caregiving leaves, child care or elder care assistance. It was an open-ended question for which employers could say whatever they wanted and could cite multiple obstacles (Table 24).

The main obstacle cited by employers is cost (25%). The second most frequently cited obstacle is that job requirements and workload don't allow these programs (12%) followed by a lack of staff to implement such programs (11%), a potential loss of productivity and difficulty supervising staff (both 10%).

Interestingly, 5% 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 (2%), though 7% mentioned the need to treat all employees equally. 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 24: Obstacles to Implementing Work Life Policies

Costs too much/limited funds	25%
Job requirements and workload don't allow these programs	12%
Lack of staff to implement	11%
Potential loss of productivity	10%
Hard to supervise employees	10%
Time constraints	8%
Potential abuse (absenteeism)	7%
Need to treat all employees equally	7%
Administrative hassles	6%
We are a small organization	6%
We need to ensure that work gets done and satisfy the customer	6%
There are no business obstacles	5%
Impractical, given the nature of our industry	5%
Inflexible work arrangements here	4%
Not a cost-effective investment	3%
Manager resistance	3%
Employees don't use these programs or policies	2%
Lack of information about these programs and policies	2%
Not convinced there would be a productivity payoff	2%
Other more pressing business issues	2%
Could lead to co-worker resentment	2%
Union considerations	2%
Haven't heard much about the need for these programs	1%
Mandated by law	1%
Liability	1%
Believe this goes beyond the role of the employer	1%

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. Sample=473. Respondents could mention as many obstacles as they want.

Obstacles mentioned by less than 1% are not tabled.

PREDICTING FLEXIBILITY, CAREGIVING LEAVES, CHILD AND ELDER CARE ASSISTANCE, AND HEALTH CARE AND 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, racial and 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.**

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.¹⁷

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. Given the number of analyses conducted and the lengthy tables that might have ensued, only findings that reach statistical significance at $p < .01$ are reported in the tables below. Preceding each table, we note some of the most striking findings.

PREDICTING FLEXIBILITY

Some Significant Findings

- Organizations where women make up less than 25% of the employees are more likely to have a low level of flexibility than organizations where women represent a larger share of the workforce.
- Organizations where racial and ethnic minorities make up more than 50% of the employees are more likely to have a low level of flexibility (33%) than organizations where racial and ethnic minorities represent a smaller share (0%-50%) of the workforce.
- Organizations where hourly employees make up 50% or more of the workforce are more likely to have a low level of flexibility (30%) to be in the low quartile. Interestingly, there is a positive correlation ($r=.13$; $p=.000$; $N=1111$) between the percentage of hourly employees and racial and ethnic minorities that may be responsible for the significant negative relationship between flexibility and the percentage of racial or ethnic minorities.
- Organizations with no union representation are more likely (26%) to provide a high level of flexibility, compared with 9% to 14% of those with unionized employees.

Table 25: Predicting Flexibility

	Extent of Flexibility in Work Arrangements				
	N	Low Level (Bottom Quartile)	Mid Level (Quartiles 2 and 3)	High Level (Top Quartile)	Sig.
Demographics of the Workplace					
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	256	16%	54	29	**
For-profit organization	792	26%	52	22	
Employer size in the U.S.					
50 - 99 employees	556	21%	51	28	
100 - 249 employees	234	26%	53	21	**
250 - 999 employees	166	28%	57	15	
Over 1,000 employees	94	23%	54	22	
Demographics of the Workforce					
Percentage of employees who are women					
1 - 24%	250	32%	44	24	**
25 - 50%	357	25%	53	22	
More than 50%	435	17%	58	25	
Percentage of employees who are racial or ethnic minorities					
0%	31	10%	71	19	***
1 - 24%	548	20%	53	27	
25 - 50%	302	25%	52	23	
More than 50%	156	33%	49	17	
Percentage of employees who are hourly (non-exempt)					
0%	8	25%	38	38	***
1 - 24%	199	13%	47	40	
25 - 50%	231	16%	56	29	
More than 50%	610	30%	53	17	

Table 25: 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 union members					
0%	909	22%	52	26	***
1 - 24%	47	23%	66	11	
25 - 50%	44	36%	50	14	
More than 50%	45	38%	53	9	
Percentage of employees who are part time					
0%	191	42%	44	14	***
1 - 24%	717	20%	55	26	
25 - 50%	96	17%	55	28	
More than 50%	43	16%	54	30	
Women in top/senior positions ¹⁸					
No	227	33%	48	19	***
Yes	815	21%	54	26	
Women in top positions ¹⁹					
No	591	27%	52	21	***
Yes	453	19%	53	29	
Racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions ²⁰					
No	493	27%	53	20	**
Yes	441	19%	54	27	

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. 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 CAREGIVING LEAVES

Some Significant Findings:

- Larger organizations are more likely (44%) to offer generous caregiving leaves (high level) than smaller organizations (34%).
- Employers that have experienced downsizing in the past 12 months (44%) are more likely to offer generous caregiving leaves than employers who have not experienced such events (37%).

Table 26: Predicting Caregiving Leaves

	Extent of Caregiving Leaves				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 - 99 employees	579	31%	35	34	**
100 - 249 employees	250	24%	32	44	
250 - 999 employees	173	21%	32	46	
Over 1,000 employees	97	24%	32	44	
Demographics of the Workforce					
Percentage of employees who are hourly					
0%	8	50%	50	0	**
1 - 24%	203	33%	33	35	
25 - 50%	239	32%	30	38	
More than 50%	648	23%	36	41	
Human Resource Issues					
Organization has experienced downsizing in the past 12 months					
Yes	327	21%	35	44	**
No	772	30%	33	37	

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. 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 (56%) to provide a high level of child and elder care assistance than small employers (25%).
- Nonprofit organizations (46%) are more likely to offer a high level of child and elder care assistance than for-profit organizations (29%).

Table 27: 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 - 99 employees	591	12%	63	25	
100 - 249 employees	251	8%	55	38	***
250 - 999 employees	178	3%	54	43	
Over 1,000 employees	98	6%	38	56	
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	276	9%	45	46	***
For-profit organization	840	9%	61	29	
Number of operating locations					
Only one	202	12%	56	31	**
Two to six	608	9%	60	31	
More than one	304	7%	53	40	
Number of years in business					
Ten or fewer years	56	16%	57	27	
11 - 20 years	160	12%	56	33	**
21 - 30 years	220	12%	61	28	
31 or more years	682	7%	57	36	
Percentage of employees who are women					
1 - 24%	267	14%	54	32	**
25 - 50%	373	10%	60	30	
More than 50%	471	6%	58	36	
Women in top/senior positions ²¹					
No	239	13%	66	21	***
Yes	874	8%	55	37	
Racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions ²²					
No	525	10%	65	25	***
Yes	469	8%	49	43	
Women in top positions ²³					
No	632	9%	62	29	**
Yes	483	9%	52	39	

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. 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 report doing better than their competitors are more likely to offer a high level of health care and economic security benefits (27%) than those that report doing worse than their competitors (19%).

Table 28: Predicting Health Care and Economic Security Benefits

	Extent of Health Coverage and Economic Security Benefits				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 - 99 employees	564	29%	51	21	***
100 - 249 employees	240	24%	55	21	
250 - 999 employees	175	15%	53	33	
Over 1,000 employees	98	12%	37	51	
Employer type					
Nonprofit organization	269	18%	53	29	**
For-profit organization	806	26%	50	24	
Number of years in business					
Ten or fewer years	55	22%	55	24	**
11 - 20 years	155	30%	50	20	
21 - 30 years	214	31%	50	19	
31 or more years	652	20%	51	29	
Demographics of the Workforce					
Women in top/senior positions ²⁴					
No	225	30%	50	20	**
Yes	845	22%	51	27	
Racial or ethnic minorities in top/senior positions ²⁵					
No	500	27%	51	22	**
Yes	465	20%	49	31	

Table 28: 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.
Financial Health of the Employer					
How the organization is doing financially versus competitors					
Better than competitors	490	20%	53	27	**
About the same	503	26%	49	25	
Worse than competitors	43	42%	40	19	
Human Resource Issues					
Organization has experienced downsizing					
No	755	21%	52	27	**
Yes	322	30%	47	23	
Organization has experienced upsizing					
No	565	27%	50	23	**
Yes	509	21%	51	28	

Source: Families and Work Institute, 2012 National Study of Employers. 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 seven years between 2005 and 2012, 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 (e.g., their contribution to health care and pension plans and leave options). On the other hand, we have found greater investment in options that allow employees flexibility in when and where they work, such as flex time, flex place and time off during the day to attend to important family and personal needs.

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

1 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.

2 The 2012 National Study of Employers (NSE) surveyed a representative national sample of 1,126 for-profit (75% of the sample) and nonprofit employers (25% of the sample) with 50 or more employees by telephone interviews and Web surveys with Human Resource directors. All respondents were offered the opportunity to complete the survey in their preferred mode (telephone interview or online survey). Representatives of Harris Interactive conducted the 45-minute phone interviews between August 15th, 2011 and January 23rd, 2012. Online interviews averaged about 37 minutes in length and were conducted during the same time period. Approximately 40% of the sample chose to respond via telephone interview and 60% chose to respond by online survey. Employers were selected from Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) 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 44 percent. The maximum sampling error (margin of error) for the study when describing the total sample is approximately 2.9 percent. (If the design effect is taken into account, the maximum sampling error for total sample estimates increases to about 3.5%.) 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 found in the D&B database, a close approximation of 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.

3 Companies can reduce operating costs by more than \$6,500 for every person who telecommutes just once a week. Lister, K. & Harnish, T. (2010). *Workshifting Benefits: The Bottom Line*. CA: Telework Research Network.

4 Out of the total sample of 1,126 employers, only 26 failed to provide an answer to all four care giving leave items used to determine compliance with FMLA. The respondents with missing data were excluded from the analysis.

5 Employers were sampled in each of four size categories: 50–99, 100–249, 250–999 and 1,000+ employees in proportions consistent with their representation in the universe of U.S. employers. Because only nine 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 the 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.

6 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.

7 “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.

8 “Women in top 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).

9 “Racial or 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.

10 “Racial or ethnic minorities in top 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).

11 Focusing on employers that offer flexible work to “at least some employees” provides an estimate of the prevalence of the flexibility concept across organizations. This percentage represents the proportion of employers who know about and use flexibility to some extent.

12 Focusing on employers that offer flexible work to “all or most employees” provides an estimate of the degree to which employers in each size group are using flexibility—in other words, the saturation of the flexibility concept within organizations.

13 Previous trend analyses compared the current National Study of Employers with the 1998 BWLS. In order to compare 2008 data with data from 1998 it was necessary to restrict the 2008 sample to employers with 100 or more employees—the minimum size included in the 1998 sample. Since both the 2005 and 2012 samples are of employers with 50 or more employees, no such restriction is necessary, and all analyses in this report are of employers with 50 or more employees.

14 The estimate was calculated after excluding the 26 respondents with missing data.

15 Although in most cases these are men, we have adopted more neutral language because some of these may be same-sex couples.

16 When calculated independently of any statistical comparisons the 2012 estimate for this item is 11.5%. When calculated as part of the trend comparison to 2005 this estimate is 11.4%. The difference is a result of rounding errors emerging during the additional statistical steps included in the trend comparison. FWI therefore presents the rounded estimate of 12% throughout the report to remove the inconsistency in estimates resulting from this rounding error.

17 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 four 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; and
- health care and economic security benefits—items listed in Tables 19 and 21.

Cronbach’s coefficient alphas for these outcome scales were .78, .68, .64 and .56, 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.

18 “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.

19 “Women in top 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).

20 “Racial or 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.

21 “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.

22 “Racial or 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.

23 “Women in top 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).

24 “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.

25 “Racial or 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.