Families and Work Institute

National Study of the Changing Workforce

NSCW

WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY IN MANUFACTURING COMPANIES

James T. Bond
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- Catsouphes 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

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

INTRODUCTION

We define "workplace flexibility" as enabling employees to exercise some measure of control over when, where and how much they work. In addition, flexibility includes opportunities for entry, exit and re-entry to work over the course of employees' careers. Ultimately to be effective, workplace flexibility must "work" for both the employee and the employer, rather than just one or the other. In our fast-paced 24/7 world, flexibility can help employees manage their busy lives on and off the job *and* help employers manage work flow and recruit employees, as well as develop, engage and retain the talent they have.

When one thinks of the manufacturing industry, machine operators and assembly line workers come to mind—jobs that are typically seen as antithetical to flexibility. Production lines require that all "hands be on deck," so that tasks can be performed sequentially. Sicknesses occur, however, and family emergencies happen. Co-workers (sometimes with the consent and help of their supervisors) tend to resolve these situations "under the table," so that employees have the flexibility they need and production schedules are met. What is now happening is that some manufacturing companies are thinking of creative ways to meet schedules and to provide flexibility.

In addition, it is important to note that less than half of employees in the manufacturing industry are employed in production jobs, meaning that opportunities to provide workplace flexibility for manufacturing employees in other occupations (e.g., managers, office workers, technical staff) are considerable.

This report explores the extent to which employees in manufacturing companies have the same access to and desire for workplace flexibility as their peers in other industries, as well as the degree to which they actually use the flexibility they have. Lastly, it considers whether employers that provide greater workplace flexibility to manufacturing employees actually benefit from doing so. In addition, we share promising practices from manufacturing companies that are using flexibility effectively.

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] The report looks only at wage and salaried workers (N=2,769) who are employed by someone else; 317 of these employees work in manufacturing. 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—for it is these practices that determine what flexibility is actually available to employees and whether there is any jeopardy associated with utilizing available flexibility. The examples of promising practices come from the Sloan Award winners from When Work Works, a project of the Families and Work Institute and the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM).

THE NEED FOR WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY

We find that the majority of American employees feel deprived of time for themselves and for important people in their lives, and that time deprivation has increased significantly since 1992:

- of four employed parents (75%) feel they don't have enough time to spend with their children, up from 66% in 1992.

- Likewise, 64% of employees in couple relationships feel they don't have enough time with their husbands, wives or partners, compared with 50% in 1992.
- And 61% of all employees feel they don't have enough time for themselves, up from 55% in 2002, the first year we asked this question.

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—85% of employees in manufacturing companies 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 MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY AND THOSE IN OTHER INDUSTRIES DIFFER?

The demographic backgrounds of employees in manufacturing and other industries are described in (Table 1):

- Manufacturing employees are less likely (33%) than other employees (50%) to be female, but are just as likely to belong to minority groups.
- Manufacturing employees are older on average—86% are over 30 years old versus 75% of other employees.
- Manufacturing employees have less education on average—47% have a high school education or less versus 39% of other employees, while 26% have college degree versus 32% of other employees.
- In keeping with their older age, more manufacturing employees (74%) than other employees (65%) are married or living with a partner, but they are just as likely to have a child at home or to have elder care responsibilities.
- Manufacturing employees are somewhat more likely (79%) to work regular daytime schedules than other employees (73%), but they are much less likely (4%) to have part-time jobs than others (20%).
- Employees in manufacturing companies are just as likely as employees in other industries to be hourly (non-exempt) workers.
- Perhaps surprisingly, given historical patterns, manufacturing employees are somewhat less likely (13%) than other employees (19%) to belong to a union.
- Lastly, manufacturing employees have significantly more tenure with their current employers than other employees.

Table 1: Basic Demographic Characteristics of Manufacturing and Other Employees[3]

Basic Demographics	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	Other *(max n=2,416)*	
Gender:			
Male	68%	50%	***
Female	33	50	
Race/ethnicity:			
White, non-Hispanic	72%	68%	
Black, non-Hispanic	10	11	ns
Hispanic	15	14	
Other	4	6	
Age:			
Under 30 years old	14%	25%	
30-39 years old	27	22	**
40-49 years old	28	24	
50 or more years old	31	28	
Highest level of education completed:			
High school or less	47%	39%	**
Some post-secondary	28	29	
4-year college degree or more	26	32	
% living with spouse or partner	74%	65%	***
% with any child under 18 at home	42%	47%	ns
% has current elder care responsibilities	15%	17%	ns
% with regular daytime schedule/shift	79%	73%	*
% with part-time jobs	4%	20%	***
% paid by the hour	71%	69%	ns
% belonging to a union	13%	19%	*
Years tenure with current employer:			
Less than 1 year	14%	13%	**
1–5 years	30	44	
More than 5 years	57	43	

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

HOW DO MANUFACTURING EMPLOYEES COMPARE WITH OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THEIR ACCESS TO WORKPLACE FLEXIBILTY?

Satisfaction with Work Schedule or Shift (Table 2): Manufacturing employees are just as happy as other employees with the schedules or shifts they have.

Flex Time and Flex Place (Table 2): Although *flex time* is perhaps the most familiar flexible workplace option, *flex place* has become much more feasible for many employees in recent years because of technological innovation:

- Employees in manufacturing companies are less likely (38%) than other employees (46%) to be able to change their starting and quitting times within some range of hours periodically (38% versus 46%) or to be allowed to make schedule changes on short notice 80% versus 84%.
- Manufacturing employees are also less likely to be allowed to work a compressed workweek at least some of the time (29%) than employees in other industries (37%).
- Manufacturing and other employees are just as *unlikely* to be allowed to work some paid hours at home.

Since about half of employees in manufacturing companies have production jobs as machine operators and assembly line workers, it is not surprising that manufacturing employees *tend* to have somewhat less "time flexibility" than others on average. Later in this report, we compare the flexibility available to manufacturing employees who have production jobs with the flexibility available to employees in other occupations.

Table 2: Work Schedules and Place of Manufacturing and Other Employees

Work Schedule and Place	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	**Other** *(max n=2,416)*	
Current work schedule or shift meets needs:			
Very true	64%	62%	ns
Somewhat true	26	29	
A little true or not at all true	10	9	
Traditional flex time: % able to choose own starting and quitting times within a range of hours periodically	38%	46%	**
% able to make schedule changes on short notice	80%	84%	*
% allowed to work a compressed workweek at least some of the time	29%	37%	**
% allowed to work some of their regular paid hours at home	12%	16%	ns

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

Reduced Time (Table 3): A significant number of employees prefer to work less than full time each week, while some would like to work less than 12 months a year. Moreover, some employees with full-time jobs would like to work only part time:

- As noted above, only 4% of manufacturing employees compared with 20% of other employees work part time.
- During the period of economic recession and high under-employment when the survey was conducted, about two thirds (65%) of all part-time employees would rather have been working full time. This is to say, these employees were "involuntary part-time workers." Manufacturing employees who work part time are much more likely (71%) than other part-time employees (36%) to want full-time jobs.
- Manufacturing employees have fewer "reduced-time options"—being less likely to believe (24% versus 50%) that they could chose part-time work if currently working full time (or vice versa) and that they could work less than a full-year schedule (13% versus 24%) if they desired.

Time Off (Table 3): Being able to take limited amounts of time off work as necessary or desired for personal or family reasons is valued by both single employees and those with immediate family responsibilities:

- Manufacturing employees find it just as easy or difficult to take time off during the workday for personal or family matters.
- They are also just as likely to be allowed to engage in some volunteer work in their communities during work hours without losing pay.
- Manufacturing employees are much more likely (92%) than other employees (76%) to receive paid vacation days and paid holidays (93% versus 75%)
- In contrast, employees in manufacturing companies are less likely (53%) than others (64%) to be allowed at least five paid days off per year for personal illness.
- Employees in manufacturing who are parents are also somewhat less likely (40%) than those in other industries (49%) to be allowed at least five days off per year to care for a sick child without losing pay or having to use vacation time.
- Among the relatively small number in our sample who took a leave from work or reduced their work schedule to meet elder care responsibilities, 75% of manufacturing employees and 51% of other employees were able to do so without losing any pay—not a statistically significant difference due to the small sample size.[4]

Table 3: Reduced Time and Time-Off Options of Manufacturing and Other Employees

Reduced Time and Time-Off Options	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	Other *(max n=2,416)*	
% currently employed part time	4%	20%	***
% employed part time who prefer full-time hours (i.e., involuntary part time)	71%	36%	**
% who could switch from full time to part time, if currently full time, or from part time to full time, if currently part time, in the same position with their current employers	24%	50%	***
% not currently working part year who could arrange to work for less than 12 months per year in their current position	13%	24%	***
How difficult is taking time off during the workday for personal or family matters?			
Very hard	12%	14%	ns
Somewhat hard	19	21	
Not too hard	33	29	
Not hard at all	36	36	
% allow to engage in some volunteer work in the community during regular work hours without loss of pay	24%	33%	ns
% who receive paid vacation days	92%	76%	***
% who receive paid holidays	93%	75%	***
% allowed at least five paid days off per year for personal illness	53%	64%	***
% 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	40%	49%	*
Among those who took time off for elder care, % who were able to do so without loss of pay	75%	51%	ns

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

Overall Workplace Flexibility (Table 4): To summarize access to workplace flexibility we developed an overall measure based upon responses to 13 questions.[5]

Employees in non-manufacturing industries have access to significantly greater overall workplace flexibility than those in manufacturing, but less than 25% of employees in either group have access to high levels of flexibility. Since more than 80% of both groups indicate (above) that having the flexibility they need to manage work and personal life would be extremely or very important in choosing a new job, it seems likely that there is substantial pent-up

***demand* for greater flexibility among both groups. In addition, as the tables above reveal, there is a difference in the types of flexibility that these groups have. Manufacturing employees have more overall access to paid time off (vacation days and holidays) but less work schedule flexibility (traditional flex time, ability to make schedule changes on short notice, compressed workweek options, ability to switch from full time to part time or vice versa, option to work part-year).**

Table 4: Overall Workplace Flexibility

Overall Workplace Flexibility	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	**Other** *(max n=2,416)*	
Overall workplace flexibility:			
Low	26%	24%	**
Moderate	55	53	
High	19	24	

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

We previously noted that less than half (46.5%) of employees in manufacturing companies have production jobs, while somewhat more than half (53.5%) work in other occupations as managers, professionals, engineers, administrative support workers, and so forth. And we argued that production jobs tend to impose more constraints on flexibility than other jobs in manufacturing. The findings presented in Table 5 support this claim. Employees with production jobs have significantly less overall workplace flexibility than their peers—44% of production workers have low levels of flexibility versus 25% of other manufacturing employees, and only 6% have high levels of flexibility versus 22% of other manufacturing employees.

Table 5: Overall Workplace Flexibility by Occupation within Manufacturing

Overall Workplace Flexibility	Manufacturing		Sig.
	Production Jobs *(max n=147)*	**Other Occupations** *(max n=169)*	
Overall workplace flexibility:			
Low	44%	25%	***
Moderate	50	53	
High	6	22	

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

Examples from the *2011 Guide to Bold New Ideas for Making Work Work*

Thern Inc.
Crane and Winch Manufacturer
Sloan Award – Winning Site: Winona, Minnesota, 106 Employees

Thern is dedicated to providing its customers worldwide with the best-fit solutions for their lifting, pulling and tensioning applications with individual care and top quality winches and cranes. In order to create a flexible working environment in a manufacturing setting, Thern has developed a strategy of giving employees more detailed directions and projects with shorter, manageable deadlines. This increases the level of interaction between employee and manager that keeps both on task and in control of the time they have. To aid in projects they have also begun bringing retired employees back in to help out, taking special care to schedule around their needs. When possible, employees are allowed to use offsite network access in order to work from home or on the road. The company admits that the concept of telecommuting is still difficult to widely implement in the manufacturing setting, but they have taken steps forward to facilitate it for employees whose physical presence is not always required. Thern is committed to creating a flexible workplace environment to remain competitive with other employers.

Culture of Flexibility (Table 6): Of course, it really doesn't matter how much flexibility employees are offered at work if they are discouraged from using it:

- Manufacturing and other employees are just as likely (40-42%) to feel that they have to choose between job advancement and devoting attention to their families or personal life.
- Manufacturing employees are also just as likely as others (38-40%) to believe that they are less likely to get ahead in their jobs or careers if they use flexibility to meet personal or family needs.
- Manufacturing employee, however, are significantly *less* likely (63%) than other employees (71%) to *strongly* agree that their immediate supervisors or managers are responsive when they have to attend to personal or family business.

It is important to note that employees' immediate supervisors/managers are the gatekeepers to flexibility in the workplace.

Table 6: Culture of Flexibility at Work—Manufacturing Versus Other Employees

Culture of Flexibility at Work	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	Other *(max n=2,416)*	
Must choose between job advancement and devoting attention to family or personal life:			
Strongly agree	11%	14%	ns
Somewhat agree	29	28	
Somewhat disagree	36	29	
Strongly disagree	24	30	
Employees who use flexibility to meet personal or family needs are less likely to get ahead in their jobs or careers:			
Strongly agree	16%	15%	ns
Somewhat agree	27	23	
Somewhat disagree	27	26	
Strongly disagree	29	36	
Immediate supervisor is responsive to my needs when I have personal or family business:			
Strongly agree	63%	71%	**
Somewhat agree	29	23	
Somewhat disagree	3	3	
Strongly disagree	5	3	

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

TO WHAT EXTENT DO EMPLOYEES USE AVAILABLE WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY?

Table 7 examines the extent to which employees utilize the flexible work options available to them:

- Among employees who receive paid vacation days, those in manufacturing companies are more likely (72%) than others (58%) to have used all days that accrued in the past year.
- In addition, manufacturing employees used a larger number of vacation days than employees in other industries (15.0 versus 12.5 days).
- Among employees who receive paid time off for personal illness, manufacturing employees and other employees are just as likely (89%) to feel that they receive enough days.

- Among employees who can choose their own starting and quitting times within some range of hours, a large majority of both manufacturing (77%) and other employees (80%) do so—not a statistically significant difference.
- Among those allowed to work a compressed workweek sometimes, manufacturing employees are less likely (33%) than other employees (48%) to do so.
- Among those allowed to change starting and quitting times on short notice, there is no statistically significant difference in frequency of use by manufacturing and other employees.
- Among those allowed to work some of their regular paid work hours at home, there is no significance difference in use between manufacturing employees and others.
- Lastly, of the 84% of employees who are able to change their starting and quitting times on short notice, 72% of manufacturing employees and 68% of other employees change their starting or quitting times *less than once per month*.

Table 7: Utilization of Available Flexible Work Options

Utilization	Industry		Sig.
	Manufacturing *(max n=317)*	**Other** *(max n=2,416)*	
Among employees who received paid vacation days, % who used all accrued vacation days last year	72%	58%	***
Average number of vacation days used in the past year	15.0	12.5	***
% who say they receive enough paid time off for personal illness	89%	89%	ns
Among employees who are allowed to choose own starting and quitting times within some range of hours, % who chose to do so	77%	80%	ns
Among those allowed to work a compressed workweek sometimes, % who did so	33%	48%	**
Among those allowed to change starting and quitting times on short notice, how frequently they did so:			ns
More than once a month	10%	12%	
About once a month	21	19	
Less than once a month or never	69	69	
Among employees who are allowed to work some of their regular paid hours at home, % who do this sometimes	73%	63%	ns

SOURCE: 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce, Families and Work Institute
*Statistical significance: ** = p < .01; *** = 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 ten 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 physical or mental health increases health care costs for employers and reduces productivity on the job.

Although we found (Table 4, above) that manufacturing employees have less overall flexibility in their workplaces than other employees, Table 8 clearly shows that *all six outcomes examined here are significantly more positive for both manufacturing and other employees when their employers offer more workplace flexibility*. It is important to note that *other things being equal* employees in manufacturing companies tend to be less satisfied and less engaged with their jobs than other employees. *Having greater flexibility on the job, however, substantially reduces these differences between manufacturing and other employees* as is evident in Table 8.

Table 8: Benefits to Employers of Offering Flexible Work Options

Outcomes	Manufacturing Employees				Other Employees			
	Overall Workplace Flexibility				Overall Workplace Flexibility			
	Low	Mid	High	Sig.	Low	Mid	High	Sig.
Job Satisfaction:								
Low	43%	26%	20%	***	43%	21%	12%	***
Mid	40	30	24		34	35	66	
High	17	44	56		23	45	62	
Job Engagement:								
Low	48%	23%	11%	***	36%	25%	14%	***
Mid	47	58	57		47	47	48	
High	5	18	32		18	28	38	
Physical Health Status:								
Poor	8%	1%	0%		2%	2%	1%	
Fair	27	17	15	***	30	16	18	***
Good	49	51	37		48	52	41	
Excellent	16	30	48		21	30	40	
Mental Health Status:								
Poor	37%	18%	4%	***	45%	25%	18%	***
Fair	49	55	70		41	50	49	
Good/Excellent	15	28	26		14	25	33	
Likelihood of Remaining with Current Employer for Next Year:								
Low	19%	15%	9%	***	19%	10%	5%	***
Mid	35	21	15		25	21	16	
High	46	64	76		57	69	79	

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

Examples from the *2011 Guide to Bold New Ideas for Making Work Work*

Intel Corporation
Technology Company
Sloan Award – Winning Site: Chandler, Arizona, 9,700 Employees

Many believe the factory floor is no place for flexibility, and Intel's success hinges on big factories running 24 hours a day, with highly sophisticated and expensive equipment operating at full capacity. The organization nonetheless gives its people on the shop floor opportunities for flexibility—the ability to work four 10-hour days, for example, and then get three days off. Unexpected needs for time off can be harder to manage, but employees in a pinch can generally find colleagues to substitute. Intel sees its success tied to bold new ideas and gives all its people, including those involved directly in production, a paid two-month sabbatical every seven years to ignite their imagination. Employees also get time for education and community service, as well as options to telecommute, share and exchange jobs and adopt a flexible schedule. Intel says its workplace practices continually recharge its staff members, giving them not just room to grow, but to "soar." Intel's generous volunteer policies encourage employees to be engaged in and support their communities. Take, for instance, the company's matching program, which provides a $10 per hour match to organizations where employees volunteer—up to $10,000 for nonprofits and $25,000 for schools. In keeping with this focus, in 2008, Intel celebrated its 40th anniversary by challenging employees worldwide to volunteer one million hours in the community. Intel's people reached this lofty goal before the year end—more than 4,000 of its Arizona employees rose to the challenge by volunteering over 130,000 hours! Employees also enjoy a brand new high tech digital fitness center, as well as two fully staffed onsite medical facilities that provide travel medicine, preventative care, physical therapy and general practitioner services.

CONCLUSION

Manufacturing and other employees are equally pressed for time in their personal lives and place equal value on having a flexible workplace. Although manufacturing employees tend to have significantly less access to flexibility at work, when their employers provide this flexibility, they respond just as positively as employees in other industries. Specifically, we found that job satisfaction, job engagement, physical health status, mental health status and the likelihood of remaining with one's current employer are significantly higher for both manufacturing and other employees *when their employers offer more workplace flexibility.* Importantly, although manufacturing employees tend to be less satisfied and engaged with their jobs, we find that *having greater flexibility on the job substantially reduces these differences* between manufacturing and other employees.

The implication for employers is clear. Providing more flexible workplaces for manufacturing as well as other employees is not only good for 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, 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.]

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 workers who do not employ anyone else. In this report, we restrict analyses to those who are wage and salaried employees.

[2] The sample was weighted for analysis to correct for any biases that might be present. The March 2007 Current Population Survey (CPS) provided control totals for calculating sample weights—that is, sample proportions were adjusted to CPS proportions. The weighting algorithm included the following demographic factors: number of eligibles in household, gender, education level completed, race/ethnicity (White, non-Hispanic; Black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; other) and age. The maximum sampling error for the wage and salaried sample (n=2,769) is approximately +/- 1.6 percent after adjusting for the surveyís design effect.

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

[4] Although the absolute difference between manufacturing and other employees is quite large (24 percentage points), very few employees in either group actually took time off work to provide elder care, which explains the non-significant finding.

[5] The 13 types of flexibility included in the global measure are: traditional flex time, short-notice flex time, flex place, compressed workweek, lack of difficulty in taking time off, advance notice for overtime, at least five paid sick days for oneself, at least five paid sick days for oneís child, part-time work if full time or full-time work if part time, part- year work, overall schedule flexibility, a schedule or shift that meets oneís needs, and lack of career jeopardy for using flexibility.

Families and Work Institute's

Corporate Leadership Circle

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