

Families and Work Institute
National Study of the Changing Workforce

nscw

WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY IN THE HOSPITALITY, RESTAURANT AND TOURISM INDUSTRY

Kenneth Matos
Ellen Galinsky



Families and Work Institute

Funding from
the **Alfred P. Sloan Foundation**
and the **Ford Foundation**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

Heartfelt thanks to the incomparable Sara Manzano-Diaz, Director of the Women's Bureau, and to her talented and committed staff for offering us the opportunity to share this research at the National Dialogue on Workplace Flexibility.

Next, we thank the many researchers who have used previous National Study of the Changing Workforce public-use files (1992, 1997 and 2002) in their own research for providing helpful feedback and creative suggestions for improving this study. A special thanks to Marcie Pitt-Catsoupes of Boston College, Shelley MacDermid Wadsworth of Purdue University, Chiung Ya Tang of Penn State Shenango, Chai Feldblum of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Katie Corrigan of Workplace Flexibility 2010 at Georgetown Law for their very helpful feedback on the questions we asked about flexibility. In addition, we thank the many employers involved in When Work Works for their feedback on 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 the National Study of the Changing Workforce. Year by year, telephone research becomes increasingly challenging for those requiring scientifically valid samples. To ensure high quality data, the Harris staff went above and beyond the call of duty and their contract terms. In particular, we want to acknowledge the outstanding efforts of David Krane, Vice President, Public Affairs and Policy Research; Kaylan Orkis, Senior Project Researcher; and Humphrey Taylor, Chairman of The Harris Poll.

We also thank Harris Interactive Inc. for conducting the interviews for the National Study of Employers, especially Linda Crane, Research Manager, who directed this very complex project with expertise. And as always, our thanks to Dana Markow, Vice President.

Finally, our thanks to the staff members of Families and Work Institute (FWI) who have supported this work in so many ways. We thank Lois Backon, Senior Vice President, for her leadership at FWI; Kenneth Matos, Senior Research Associate, Kerstin Aumann, Senior Research Associate, Tyler Wigton, Program Manager and Kelly Sakai, Program Manager, for their brilliant guidance; John Boose for his stunning design of the report and Barbara Norcia-Broms for her exemplary proof reading. We also thank Carol Bryce-Buchanan and Marline Griffith for their support throughout the entire process and guidance for the dissemination of the findings. Special thanks as well to Morra Aarons-Mele of Women Online for working with us on the dissemination of our research with such great knowledge and skill.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
Introduction	1
The Need for Workplace Flexibility	2
How Do the Demographic Backgrounds of Employees in the Hospitality, Restaurant and Tourism (HRT) Industry and Those in Other Industries Differ?	2
How do HRT Employees Compare with Other Employees in Their Access to Workplace Flexibility?	5
How Do HRT Employees Feel About Their Work Arrangements?	7
Culture of Flexibility at Work	8
Do HRT Employees Have Different Job Outcomes than Employees in Other Industries?	9
Do Employers Benefit from Offering Flexible Work Options?	11
Conclusion	13
Endnotes	14

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1	Basic Demographic Characteristics of Employees in HRT and Other Industries.....	4
Table 2	Access to Workplace Flexibility.....	6
Table 3	Opinions Toward Job and Workplace Flexibility.....	7
Table 4	Culture of Flexibility.....	8
Table 5	Job Outcomes.....	10
Table 6	Effects of Offering Flexible Work Options.....	12

INTRODUCTION

Workplace flexibility allows employees to influence when, where and how much they work so they can better accomplish their professional and personal goals. Flexible jobs provide adjustable schedules and workplaces as well as opportunities for employees to enter, exit and re-enter the workforce over the course of their careers. These options help employees manage their busy lives on and off the job. In addition, flexibility helps employers manage work flow as well as recruit, develop, engage and retain talent for their businesses to thrive.

Workplace flexibility is, however, not a one-size-fits-all tool. Not all employers can provide all flexibility options to all of their employees all of the time. Some jobs require an employee's physical presence at the worksite for them to effectively perform their work duties (e.g., preparing and serving food). Other jobs, while technically possible via electronic communication methods, take their value from face to face interaction (e.g., sales). In other cases, the times when work can be conducted are affected by the needs of clients and customers.

The hospitality, restaurant and tourism (HRT) industry is a prime example of a collection of jobs where workplace flexibility options need to be tailored to the unique considerations of the business model. Unlike jobs with digital products or long-term deadlines, many HRT jobs provide value to their customers at specific places and/or fixed moments in time defined by the customer's availability to personally receive desired services. Additionally, the HRT industry provides services that are generally accessed during customers' free time from their own job responsibilities. Other considerations, such as food safety and the need to operate on holidays or weekends, present potential restrictions on the flexibility that HRT employers can offer.

Yet, flexibility is necessary and possible within the HRT industry. It is important, as always, to note that not all employees have the same needs at the same time, and flexibility options that substantially improve the lives of some employees may have less impact on others. For example, an employee with dependent care responsibilities may need only a little time off, but at unpredictable intervals, while an employee returning to school would need much more time off but on a fairly predictable schedule. Understanding the unique characteristics and perceptions of employees in this sector can provide important insights into how flexibility efforts can be tailored to meet both the needs of the employer and the employee.

This report compares the workplace flexibility options available to employees in the HRT industry to employees in the rest of the U.S. workforce. It also examines how HRT employees evaluate their workplace flexibility options and highlights differences in demographics and job structures that may account for the way in which HRT employees view and use their workplace flexibility options.

The research findings presented here are drawn from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW)¹ conducted by the Families and Work Institute. The survey sample is representative of the entire workforce in the United States.² This report looks only at wage and salaried employees (N=2,769); 195 of those employees work in the following industries that together constitute the HRT industry group:

- transportation (including rail, air or water transportation, bus and urban transit, taxi and limousine services);
- restaurants and other food/drinking establishments;
- gift, novelty and souvenir shops;

- traveler accommodation (including recreational vehicle parks and camps, and rooming and boarding houses); and
- artists, performing arts, spectator sports and related industries/other amusement.

The questionnaire used to collect data in the National Study of the Changing Workforce was designed to capture information about the practices of supervisors and managers, whether they are formalized in policy or not. These practices determine what flexibility is actually available to employees and whether there is any jeopardy associated with utilizing available flexibility. In addition, we provide promising practices of flexibility in the HRT industry, drawn from winners of the Sloan Awards for Business Excellence in Workplace Flexibility from When Work Works, a project of the Families and Work Institute (FWI) and Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM).

THE NEED FOR WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY

We find that the majority of American employees in the HRT industry feel deprived of time for themselves and for important people in their lives:

- The majority (69%) of employed parents in the HRT industry feel they don't have enough time to spend with their children.
- Likewise, 63% of HRT employees in couple relationships feel they don't have enough time with their husbands, wives or partners.
- And 63% of all employees feel they don't have enough time for themselves.

If, as it appears, the majority of employees experience what has been called a "time famine," the desire for workplace flexibility must be widespread. And indeed, *a large majority of employees—90% of employees in the HRT industry and 88% of employees in other industries—report that having the flexibility they need to manage work and personal or family life would be "extremely" or "very" important if they were looking for a new job.*

HOW DO THE DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUNDS OF EMPLOYEES IN THE HRT INDUSTRY AND THOSE IN OTHER INDUSTRIES DIFFER?

The demographic backgrounds of employees in the HRT and other industries differ in several ways. For example, HRT employees tend to be younger than employees in other industries with a lower likelihood of being married or having children. As a result, HRT employees may have fewer family responsibilities and health concerns to generate work life conflicts (Table 1).

HRT employees:

- are more likely (54%) to be female than employees in other industries (48%);
- are much younger on average—48% are under 30-years-old versus only 22% of employees in other industries;
- tend to have less education (63% with a high school diploma or less) than employees in other industries (38%);

- are more likely (12%) to consider Spanish to be their first language than employees in other industries (6%), though there is no difference in the percentage of Hispanics in the HRT industry and other industries (both 14%);
- are more likely (43%) to be single with no prior marriages than employees in other industries (19%);
- are less likely (52%) to be parents with children under 18 at home than employees in other industries (64%);
- are more likely (91%) to have hourly jobs, part-time schedules (33%), or to work on a night shift (54%) than employees in other industries (67% hourly, 17% part time and 24% night shift);
- who work part time earn less on average (hourly wage of \$10.78) than employees in other industries (\$17.44); this may be due in part to the restaurant employees in the sample who are paid less by their employer because they are expected to make up the difference in tips (would not be included in estimates of hourly wages); and
- have an average tenure (4 years) about half as long as employees in other industries (8 years), though this may be related to HRT employees tending to be younger than employees in other industries.

Table 1: Basic Demographic Characteristics of Employees in HRT and Other Industries³

Basic Demographics	Industrial Group		Sig.
	HRT Employee (max n=114)	Other Industries (max n=1510)	
Gender			
Male	46%	52%	ns
Female	54%	48%	
Race/ethnicity:			
White, non-Hispanic	62%	69%	ns
Black, non-Hispanic	14%	11%	
Hispanic	14%	14%	
Other	10%	6%	
Age:			
Under 30 years old	48%	22%	***
30-39 years old	21%	23%	
40-49 years old	13%	26%	
50 or more years old	19%	29%	
Highest level of education completed:			
High school or less	63%	38%	***
Some post-secondary	26%	30%	
4-year college degree or more	11%	33%	
First language:			
English	83%	91%	***
Spanish	12%	6%	
Other	5%	3%	
% single and never married or living with someone as a couple	43%	19%	***
% with any children under 18 at home	52%	64%	***
% with regular daytime schedule/shift	46%	76%	***
% with part-time jobs	33%	17%	***
% paid by the hour	91%	67%	***
Average hourly wage:			
Overall	\$16.73	\$26.10	***
Full time	\$30.19	\$31.59	ns
Part time	\$10.78	\$17.44	**
Average years tenure with current employer	4	8	***

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute.
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant

HOW DO HRT EMPLOYEES COMPARE WITH OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THEIR ACCESS TO WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY?

Overall, employees in the HRT industry seem to have comparable levels of workplace flexibility (Table 2), though they differ in the types of flexibility they have available. While HRT employees have less access to paid time off they seem to have a greater ability to make changes to their overall work schedules.

Employees in the HRT industry are less likely than employees in other industries to have access to:

- paid vacation days (52% versus 85%);
- paid holidays (42% versus 80%);⁴
- five or more personal days (29% versus 65%);
- the ability to work some regular paid hours at home (6% versus 17%); and
- the ability to engage in volunteer work during regular work hours without loss of pay (26% versus 35%).

On the other hand, HRT employees are more likely than employees in other industries to indicate they:

- have a lot of control over their scheduled work hours (32% versus 21%)
- can switch between full- and part-time work if they so desire (75% versus 45%); and
- can arrange to switch to part-year work (53% versus 20%).

TABLE 2: ACCESS TO WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY

Workplace Flexibility Options	Industrial Group		Sig.
	HRT Employee (max n=114)	Other Industries (max n=1,509)	
Receive vacation days	52%	85%	***
Receive paid holidays	42%	82%	***
Receive five or more personal days	29%	65%	***
% of parents allowed at least five days off per year to care for a sick child without losing pay or having to use vacation time	38%	47%	ns
Control in scheduling work hours:			***
Complete	19%	14%	
A lot	32%	21%	
Some	31%	25%	
Very little or none	18%	40%	
% able to make schedule changes on short notice	83%	84%	ns
Difficulty taking time during regular work day for personal/family matters:			ns
Very hard	14%	14%	
Somewhat hard	20%	21%	
Not too hard	33%	30%	
Not at all hard	34%	36%	
% allowed to work a compressed workweek at least some of the time	41%	35%	ns
Traditional flex time: % able to choose own starting and quitting times within a range of hours periodically	48%	44%	ns
Can switch between full- and part-time work if desired	75%	45%	***
% not currently working part-year who could arrange to work for less than 12 months per year in their current position	53%	20%	***
% allowed to work some of regular paid hours at home	6%	17%	***
% allowed to engage in some volunteer work in the community during regular work hours without loss of pay	26%	35%	*
Overall workplace flexibility:			ns
Low	19%	25%	
Moderate	55%	53%	
High	27%	23%	

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant.

HOW DO HRT EMPLOYEES FEEL ABOUT THEIR WORK ARRANGEMENTS?

Despite a relative lack of standard paid time off and other workplace flexibility options, HRT employees are not significantly more likely to indicate that they have insufficient time to attend to personal matters (Table 3).

As noted above, HRT employees tend to be younger with fewer family responsibilities (Table 1). This may contribute to their feeling that they have sufficient time to address their personal needs, since they may have fewer unplanned disruptions to their work schedules (e.g. personal or family illnesses). This is consistent with HRT employees being less likely than other employees to indicate that they experience a lot or some interference between their job and personal life (28% versus 44%).

In addition, employees in the HRT industry may place greater value on the ability to address personal responsibilities by adjusting their regular work schedules and switching between part-time/year and full-time/year work as needed. For example, employees with an interest in travel, unpaid internships or careers in the arts (which often include periods of unemployment between projects) would benefit from this kind of flexibility over the more common system of paid time off.

It is important to note that part-time/year options may not meet all of an employee’s flexibility needs since working fewer hours would also reduce earnings. Employees without other sources of income (such as relatives, scholarships/student loans or wages from a job in another industry) may experience some hardship when taking advantage of this form of flexibility.

Table 3: Opinions Toward Job and Workplace Flexibility

Workplace Flexibility Attitudes	Industrial Group		Sig.
	HRT Employee (max n=114)	Other Industries (max n=1,507)	
Current work schedule meets needs:			
Very true	66%	62%	ns
Somewhat true	26%	29%	
A little true or not at all true	8%	9%	
Enough paid time off for personal illness	91%	89%	ns
Can choose starting quitting times to meet personal needs	80%	79%	ns
Interference between job and family life:			
A lot	9%	14%	**
Somewhat	19%	30%	
Not too much	47%	34%	
Not at all	24%	22%	

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant.

CULTURE OF FLEXIBILITY AT WORK

Employees will not reap many benefits from workplace flexibility if they feel that they will be penalized for making use of these options. HRT employees are more likely than other employees to feel that using flexibility to meet personal or family needs means they are less likely to get ahead in their jobs or careers (48% versus 39%). HRT employees, however, are no more or less likely than other employees to feel that:

- they must choose between job advancement and devoting attention to family or personal life; and
- their immediate supervisor is responsive to their needs when they have personal or family business.

Table 4: Culture of Flexibility

Culture of Flexibility	Industrial Group		Sig.
	HRT Employee (max n=114)	Other Industries (max n=1,507)	
Must choose between job advancement and devoting attention to family or personal life:			
Strongly agree	20%	13%	ns
Somewhat agree	22%	29%	
Somewhat disagree	29%	29%	
Strongly disagree	29%	29%	
Employees who use flexibility to meet personal or family needs are less likely to get ahead in their jobs or careers:			
Strongly agree	17%	16%	*
Somewhat agree	31%	23%	
Somewhat disagree	18%	27%	
Strongly disagree	35%	35%	
Immediate supervisor is responsive to my needs when I have personal or family business:			
Strongly agree	76%	70%	ns
Somewhat agree	20%	24%	
Somewhat disagree	1%	3%	
Strongly disagree	3%	4%	

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant.

DO HRT EMPLOYEES HAVE DIFFERENT JOB OUTCOMES THAN EMPLOYEES IN OTHER INDUSTRIES?

Even though employees in the HRT industry are no less satisfied with their jobs or the time to attend to personal responsibilities (Table 3), HRT employees seem more inclined to look for new jobs (Table 5).

- HRT employees are less likely (45%) to indicate they are not at all likely to search for a new job within the coming year than employees in other industries (61%)

To better understand the reasons HRT employees might want to leave their current jobs, we examined the qualities of a new job that HRT and other employees would want. We focused on employees who are “very” or “somewhat likely” to search for a new job in the next year so we could target those reasons that should have the most impact on actual future turnover. While the top three reasons for wanting a job change among all employees are: 1) to earn more money, 2) return to school and 3) have more time for oneself, these reasons are not significantly more likely to be cited by HRT employees than by employees in other industries. HRT employees are more likely than other employees to want to leave their current employer to spend *all* their time with family (8% versus <1%) or just *more* time with their family (8% versus 1%).

Surprisingly, retirement was one of the top 10 reasons cited by HRT employees, despite 69% of HRT employees being under 40 years old. Though HRT employees tend to be younger than other employees, there is still a sizable population of older employees with almost one in five HRT employees being over 50 years old. These employees have flexibility needs that reflect their life stage in addition to those issues shared with their younger peers. When designing flexibility in the HRT industry, employers need to consider ways in which these efforts can be inclusive of both younger and more mature employees.

In addition, HRT employees are more likely (58%) to want to move to a job with more responsibility in the future than employees in other industries (39%).

Overall, our findings reveal that HRT employees as a group are primarily younger employees with less education and fewer family responsibilities. Thus, they may be more likely to view their current jobs as temporary. If HRT employees see their jobs as gateways to better opportunities, they still may be just as satisfied with them as other employees because they accept their constraints for the short term, while still planning to move to another position in the near future.

HRT employees are more likely (35%) to indicate they are in excellent physical health than other employees (29%). This finding is likely related to the relative youth of HRT employees.

On the other hand, HRT employees are more likely (37%) to indicate a poor mental health status than other employees (25%). Since HRT employees tend to be lower income (63% make \$11 or less an hour versus 25% of employees in other industries) and since employees with lower incomes tend to have more situations in their lives that can cause stress, we investigated the extent to which their income level explained this finding. Our analyses, however, reveal that low income alone does not fully explain the fact that these employees are more stressed. Whatever the causes, it is clear that HRT employees could benefit from greater access to mental health care services and insurance to deal with these stresses. Considering that a third of HRT employees work part time, many employees in this population may not have access to such benefits.

Table 5: Job Outcomes

Job Outcomes	Industrial Group		Sig.
	HRT Employee (max n=114)	Other Industries (max n=1,507)	
Satisfaction with job:			
Low	25%	25%	ns
Mid	29%	33%	
High	47%	43%	
Job engagement:			
Low	28%	25%	ns
Mid	46%	48%	
High	27%	27%	
Physical health status:			
Poor	4%	2%	**
Fair	21%	20%	
Good	39%	49%	
Excellent	35%	29%	
Mental health status:			
Poor	37%	26%	*
Fair	45%	50%	
Good/Excellent	17%	25%	
Job search w/in the next year:			
Very likely	22%	17%	**
Somewhat likely	33%	23%	
Not at all likely	45%	61%	
Top 10 reasons for an HRT worker would change jobs among those somewhat or very likely to job search w/in the next year:			
To earn more	16%	20%	ns
Return to school	14%	5%	ns
More time for self	9%	2%	ns
Spend all time with family	8%	<1%	**
Spend more time with family	8%	1%	*
More career opportunities	7%	11%	ns
Retirement	5%	4%	ns
Do something else for pay	5%	3%	ns
Better benefits	3%	8%	ns
To move to a new location	3%	5%	ns
Desire for:			
Less responsibility	4%	14%	***
Same responsibility	38%	47%	
More responsibility	58%	39%	

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant.

DO EMPLOYERS BENEFIT FROM OFFERING FLEXIBLE WORK OPTIONS?

To address this question, we examined the relationship between overall workplace flexibility and five employee outcomes of immediate interest to employers:

- 1) **Overall job satisfaction** (combination of responses to three questions)
- 2) **Degree of engagement with job** (combination of responses to five questions)
- 3) **Physical health status** (response to one question)
- 4) **Mental health status** (combination of responses to 10 questions)
- 5) **Likelihood of remaining with current employer** (response to one question)

Measurement of all five outcomes is based on employees' self-reports. Physical and mental health statuses are included among outcomes of importance to employers because poor health increases health care costs for employers and reduces productivity on the job.

HRT employees with more flexibility show greater job satisfaction and engagement, though the majority of the gains in both measures are attained in the switch between low and moderate flexibility suggesting that employers don't need to change very much to reap significant benefits (Table 6).

The power of moderate flexibility is especially pronounced when it comes to employee engagement—in this case, we find that high flexibility is associated with far fewer people who are not very engaged or who are highly engaged. The moderate engagement of HRT employees with high flexibility is clearly due to a variety of other factors. Take, for example, an employee who alternates between a HRT job (e.g., food service) and an arts career (e.g., acting). The employee is looking for a great deal of flexibility, so that he or she can work as an actor but isn't necessarily truly engaged in the HRT profession.

This split engagement explanation is consistent with the fact that HRT employees tend to work fewer hours on average as their flexibility increases (44 hours per week for those with low flexibility, 33 hours for moderate flexibility and 30 hours for high flexibility), a difference not found among other employees who tend to work between 40-42 hours per week regardless of the level of flexibility they receive. The higher flexibility in the HRT industry could provide the opportunity to split time between multiple interests, while equivalent flexibility at other jobs may be valued for its ability to reduce conflict between work and personal/professional lives.

HRT employees showed an improvement in their mental health as their flexibility increased. Increased flexibility, however, did not show significant effects on physical health. As stated earlier, this may be due to HRT employees' relative youth. Yet, it is important to remember that stress and health behaviors while employees are young will affect their health when they are older. The impact of flexibility may not be apparent while employees are young, but might still influence their health as they grow older.

HRT employees were more likely to choose to remain with employers that offered more flexibility than employers that did not offer as much flexibility. In an industry which commonly experiences significant turnover, flexibility appears to be a way to retain employees of all ages longer.

Table 6: Effects of Offering Flexible Work Options

Outcomes	HRT Employees				Other Employees			
	Overall Workplace Flexibility				Overall Workplace Flexibility			
	Low	Mid	High	Sig.	Low	Mid	High	Sig.
Job Satisfaction:								
Low	57%	14%	24%	***	42%	22%	12%	***
Mid	35%	32%	14%		36%	34%	27%	
High	8%	54%	62%		23%	44%	62%	
Job Engagement:								
Low	46%	29%	10%	***	36%	25%	14%	***
Mid	54%	32%	71%		47%	50%	46%	
High	0%	40%	18%		17%	26%	40%	
Physical Health Status:								
Poor	0%	4%	8%		3%	2%	1%	
Fair	32%	15%	26%	ns	29%	17%	17%	***
Good	35%	46%	28%		49%	52%	42%	
Excellent	32%	35%	38%		20%	30%	40%	
Mental Health Status:								
Poor	64%	37%	17%	***	40%	22%	18%	***
Fair	19%	48%	60%		44%	52%	50%	
Good/Excellent	18%	15%	23%		16%	26%	31%	
Likelihood of Remaining with Current Employer for Next Year:								
Low	19%	25%	14%	*	24%	16%	10%	***
Mid	54%	28%	33%		29%	22%	16%	
High	27%	48%	53%		46%	62%	74%	
Average hours per week worked	44	33	30	***	42	40	40	***

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
 Statistical significance: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$; ns = not statistically significant.

A number of HRT employers that have won the Sloan Award for Business Excellence in Workplace Flexibility have pointed out the value of offering flexibility to their employees in terms of increased productivity, lower turnover and absenteeism. In addition, these employers note that their employees are more likely to consider how their actions can improve business outcomes when the business first considers how it affects them.

Some of these award winners have presented innovative ideas about how they provide flexibility to their employees in the *2011 Guide to Bold New Ideas for Making Work Work*. For example:

- Delta Airlines maintains a generous shift-swapping policy that allows customer service agents to complete unlimited shift swaps with no minimum hours-worked requirements.
- Café Rio Mexican Grill helps support its employees' financial stability through scholarship programs, partnerships with local financial support agencies and short term loan programs that help employees face financial emergencies.
- Carlson, a hospitality and travel company, maintains a vacation donation program allowing employees to donate vacation days to others in need of more time off to attend to personal emergencies.
- Finally, Utah Food Services, a catering company in Salt Lake City, protected its employees jobs during the recession by engaging them in special projects, like developing and testing new recipes, or preparing foods to be frozen.

These and other creative ideas can help make flexibility efforts meet the needs of both businesses and their employees in the HRT industry and beyond.

CONCLUSION

Though HRT employees tend to have fewer formal workplace flexibility options offered to them than employees in other industries, overall, they do not seem to be any less satisfied than other employees. When trying to understand this finding, it is important to remember that effective flexibility efforts match employee needs with job requirements. It may be that employees who choose to work in the HRT industry find the greater ability to shift between full- and part-time work and adjustable schedules a better match for their needs than paid time off options such as vacation days. This is not to say that HRT employees would not appreciate access to a wider range of flexibility options, but rather, that their most valued flexibility needs might be addressed by the part-time/year and adjustable schedule options common in the HRT industry.

Interestingly, HRT employees have a unique interaction with flexibility options, one unlike that of their peers in other industries who generally experience increasing benefits from more flexibility. Similar to other employees, HRT employees gain consistently increasing improvements in job satisfaction, mental health and the likelihood of remaining with their current employer when offered greater flexibility. Physical health, however, is unaffected by greater flexibility and more employees are highly engaged when flexibility is moderate.

Employers interested in improving the retention of HRT employees will find that offering more flexibility will encourage their employees to stay longer. In addition, with more than half (58%) of HRT employees indicating they would like to move to a job with more responsibility, providing employees the opportunity to enhance their resumes with developmental training and experiences may be particularly attractive. Diverse and self-directed job tasks matched with clear paths to promotion, as well as workplace flexibility, may help many of these employees see their HRT jobs as a good place to spend a significant amount of time gaining experience rather than just a short rest stop on the way to another, more satisfying position.

The implication for employers is clear. Providing more flexible workplaces for HRT employees is not only good for the employees, but also good for business.

ENDNOTES

¹ The 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) survey was conducted by Harris Interactive, Inc. (formerly Louis Harris and Associates) using a questionnaire developed by the Families and Work Institute. Coding of open-ended responses was done by interviewers, with the exception of occupation and industry, which were coded by the U.S. Bureau of the Census using 1990 three-digit occupation (SOC) and industry (SIC) classifications. Although interviewing began in 2007, 88% of interviews were completed in 2008. Thus, we refer to this survey as the 2008 NSCW. A total of 3,502 interviews were completed with a nationwide cross-section of employed adults between November 12, 2007 and April 20, 2008. Interviews, which averaged 50 minutes in length (47 minutes for substantive questions and 3 minutes for eligibility screening), were conducted by telephone using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. Calls were made to a regionally stratified unclustered random probability sample generated by random-digit-dial methods.

Up to 60 calls were made to each telephone number that appeared to represent a potentially eligible household—busy signal, answer by non-eligible with some indication of a potential eligible in household, or answer by a potential eligible who wanted a callback. When eligibles were identified and requested callbacks, additional calls were made. If 25 consecutive calls were made to numbers where there were no answers and no busy signals (and no other dialing outcome), these numbers were considered non-residential, non-working numbers or non-voice communication numbers. Three to five attempts were made to convert each initial refusal. Despite the fact that the level of effort of 2008 interviewers went substantially beyond the efforts made in 2002, 1997 and 1992, the overall response rate was only slightly higher, indicating that it has become significantly more difficult to complete telephone interviews in recent years.

Sample eligibility was limited to people who 1) worked at a paid job or operated an income-producing business, 2) were 18 years or older, 3) were in the civilian labor force, 4) resided in the contiguous 48 states and 5) lived in a non-institutional residence—i.e., household—with a telephone. In households with more than one eligible person, one was randomly selected to be interviewed. Interviewers initially offered cash honoraria of \$25 as incentives. In order to convert refusals, a higher amount (\$50) was offered.

Of the total 42,000 telephone numbers called, 24,115 were found to be non-residential or non-working numbers and 6,970 were determined to be ineligible residences (1,389 because no one spoke English or Spanish well enough to be interviewed). Of the remaining telephone numbers, 3,547 were determined to represent eligible households, and interviews were completed for 3,502 of these—a *completion rate of 99 percent*. Eligibility or ineligibility, however, could not be determined in the remaining 7,368 cases. Among those contacts for which eligibility could be determined, the eligibility ratio was 0.3886 [3547/(3547+5,581)]. Thus, we estimate that potentially 38.86 percent of the 7,368 cases for which eligibility could not be determined—2,863 cases in all—might have been eligible households. Dividing the number of completed interviews (3,502) by the number of known eligibles (3,547) plus the number of estimated eligibles (2,863) yields an *overall response rate of 54.6 percent for potentially eligible households*. [This method of response rate calculation follows the conservative CASRO and AAPOR recommendations.]

All sample weighting was done in relation to the U.S. population using data from the March 2007 Current Population Survey. The sample was first weighted by the number of eligibles in the respondents' households in relation to the percentage of households in the U.S. population with the same number of eligibles (i.e., number of employed persons 18 and older per household with any employed person 18 or older), eligible men and women in the U.S. population and eligibles with different educational levels in the U.S. population. [Other weights were also calculated and can be found in the public-use data files.] The average design effect for the weighted sample is estimated to be 1.359. Applying this Design Effect, the average sampling error for wage and salaried sample statistics (n=2,769) is approximately +/- 1.1 percent versus +/- 1 percent for the unweighted sample.

Of the total sample of 3,502 interviewed, 2,769 are wage and salaried employees who work for someone else, while 733 respondents work for themselves—255 business owners who employ others and 478 independent self-employed employees who do not employ anyone else. In this report, we restrict analyses to those who are wage and salaried employees.

² The sample is weighted on various demographic factors to the 2007 Current Population Survey conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census to correct for any biases that might be present. The response rate for the random-digit dial telephone survey is 54.6%. The maximum sampling error for the wage and salaried sample (n=2,769) is approximately +/- 1.6 percent after adjusting for the survey's design effect.

³ In Table 1 and elsewhere, column percentages do not always add to 100% because of rounding error.

⁴ As organizations that provide leisure and entertainment goods and services, HRT companies are generally open during times when employees in other industries would be off duty (e.g., weekends, holidays, tourist season).

Families and Work Institute's

Corporate Leadership



Corporate Benefactors

(\$15,000 or more)

Cardinal Health, Inc.
IBM Corporation
Johnson & Johnson

Merck
Verizon

Corporate Patrons

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

Bloomberg LP
Chevron Corporation
Citi

Deloitte & Touche
Northrop Grumman Corporation

Corporate Sponsors

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

Alcoa Inc.
Allstate Insurance Company
Baxter Healthcare Corporation
Bright Horizons Family Solutions
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
Credit Suisse
Deutsche Bank AG
DuPont
Ernst & Young LLP
GlaxoSmithKline
Goldman, Sachs & Co.

JPMorgan Chase & Co.
KPMG LLP
LifeCare, Inc.
Marriott International
MetLife
Pearson Education
PricewaterhouseCoopers
Prudential Financial
Saks Incorporated
Sara Lee Corporation
United Technologies Corporation

Corporate Friends

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

Ceridian
Columbia University
Discovery Communications, Inc.
Eileen Fisher, Inc.
Eli Lilly and Company
First Horizon National Corporation
Healthpoint/DFB Pharmaceuticals

The McGraw-Hill Companies
Solix Inc.
Southern California Edison
Texas Instruments
Viacom Inc.
Xerox Corporation

Introductory Corporate Leadership Circle Companies

American Express Company
Bon Secours Health System, Inc.
Campbell Soup Company
CCLC
Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA)
Delhaize America
Interpublic Group

Kraft Foods, Inc.
Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
PepsiCo
Society for the Human Resource Management (SHRM)
Time Warner Cable
UBS AG