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Interest in work-life policies and flexible working arrangements has dramatically increased over the last two decades, in large part due to the rise in dual career families with children and the increasing number of workers with career responsibilities.

This report includes a summary of research from seven meta-analyses and 10 reports prepared by government and industry that examine the impacts of work-life policies on work-family conflict levels and on a range of individual and organisational outcomes including job satisfaction, attendance, retention and productivity. A series of case studies that include evaluations of the impacts of programs are also provided.

The evidence is clear that a large proportion of workers want flexible work arrangements and that flexible working can have a wide range of benefits, if the programs are implemented well. It is surmised that the lack of acceptance of flexible working and the negative attitudes of peers towards those who work flexibly may be a product of poor implementation.

We recommend that:

- The introduction of any flexible working arrangements be based on a diagnosis of the suitability of the particular arrangements for the work setting, as well as the preferences of the individual workers.
- That peers be involved in the diagnosis and design of flexible work arrangements.
- That implementation of flexible work arrangements include pilot testing, training, review and follow up plus a set of guidelines regarding control, appraisal, security, technology, OH&S and other considerations.
INTRODUCTION

Work-life policies, including workplace flexibility, include a wide range of policies and strategies (see Figure 1) designed to enable employees to more effectively balance work and personal concerns and with the potential to enable organisations to recruit, retain and better utilise staff. Work-life policies have received increasing attention both nationally and internationally\(^1\)\(^2\) over the past decade, largely as a result of the rising number of dual-earner couples with children, single working parents and workers with caring responsibilities for elders \(^3\)\(^4\)\(^5\), and the increasing demand and decreasing supply of experienced workers in many industries. Such policies have become increasingly prevalent and are widespread practice in many organisations \(^6\)\(^7\)\(^8\). Surveys of employees in the US and UK show that between 30% and 80% report actively seeking flexibility when choosing a workplace \(^9\)\(^10\)\(^11\)\(^12\)

Work-life policies, when implemented effectively, can play a vital role in reducing work-family conflict for employees and in increasing individual work performance and other organisational outcomes. Work-family conflict is defined as inter-role conflict in which the responsibilities in the work and family domains are mutually incompatible\(^13\). Simply put, participation in the family role is made more difficult by participation in the work role, and vice versa. In this report, both categories are referred to as work-family conflict. Since work-family conflict has a negative impact on the organisation and the individual\(^14\)\(^15\), work-life policies are important as they improve individual and organisational outcomes, both directly and via reducing work-family conflict\(^16\)\(^17\)\(^18\).

This report presents a summary of the latest evidence from both meta-analytic academic research and industry and government reports about the impact of work-life policies on individuals and organisational outcomes. It also examines the different mechanisms that could explain the effectiveness of these policies. Recommendations for the implementation of work-life policies in organisations and areas for further research are provided.
Work-life policies cover a wide range of activities relating to when, where and how employees complete their assigned work and the numbers of hours or days they work in a given period. As shown in Figure 1, work-life policies can be grouped into two broad categories based on whether they provide support specifically for employees with family duties and responsibilities (family-friendly policies) or whether they represent flexible work practices that apply to all employees, irrespective of their personal arrangements outside of work (flexible work arrangement policies). Family-friendly initiatives provide support in the form of financial, time or service benefits to aid care of family and dependents, and are therefore beneficial only for those with dependents. Conversely, flexible work arrangement policies are those that give employees the right to vary the timing, location and methods of work around personal needs, and are potentially beneficial for all employees.

**Figure 1**
Two categories for work-life policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Work Arrangement Policies</th>
<th>Family-Friendly Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flexi-time: employees choose the time they arrive and leave from work within limits set by management. Typically employers set core hours when all employees must be present</td>
<td>on-site child care or voucher schemes: for local child care places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compressed work schedule: employees work fewer than five days per week by increasing the hours they work each day</td>
<td>information and referral services: to local child care providers and/or local elder care assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annualised hours: employees work a set number of hours per year instead of per day or per week</td>
<td>financial assistance: for dependent care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telework: employees may work at home all or part of the time and are often linked electronically to the office, for instance via computers or telephones</td>
<td>paid family leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job sharing: two part-time employees voluntarily share a single full-time position</td>
<td>term-time working: working only during the school term to allow parents to spend time with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary reduced time: employees voluntarily reduce their work hours with a corresponding salary reduction for a set time period. Benefits are generally maintained</td>
<td>phased return: a gradual return to work after childbirth or adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career break: authorised time away from work either paid or unpaid, with no loss of employment rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time: voluntarily working fewer than 40 hours per week with salary and job benefits pro-rated for the actual number of hours worked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data were obtained from two sources. First, from the academic research literature we identified seven meta-analyses of studies of work-life policies and their effects. A meta-analysis is a statistical procedure in which the sample is comprised of existing studies and the results are a summary of the current state of knowledge about the relationship being studied. The seven meta-analyses contained 154,222 participants from 475 independent studies. This large number of studies and participants makes the results reported particularly robust. The meta-analyses reported on one or more of the following relationships: (a) the relationship between work-life policies and individual and organisational outcomes, (b) the relationship between work-family conflict and outcomes, and (c) the relationship between work-life policies and work-family conflict.

The second source of information was 10 recent industry and government reports from five different countries (Australia, UK, North America, Singapore, and New Zealand) covering 11,221 employees and employers. The industry and government reports clearly show that the number and type of policies offered by organisations varies greatly, as displayed in Figures 2 and 3. There was also a disparity between the number of policies employers reported offering their employees, and the number of policies that employees reported utilising.
Figure 2
Percentage of specific work-life policies offered by employers from North America (NA), the United Kingdom (UK), Singapore (SG) and New Zealand (NZ) in industry and government reports.

Figure 3
Percentage of specific work-life policies being utilised by employees from New Zealand (NZ), the United Kingdom (UK), or Australia (AU) in the industry and government reports.

OTFC = Occasional time off for family commitments, TTV = Time off to volunteer, TBPF = Transitions between part-time and full-time
RESULTS

Meta-analyses have shown that reducing work-family conflict is a key mechanism through which work-life policies have a positive impact on both individuals and organisations. The negative impact of work-family conflict on individual and organisational outcomes is pervasive; work-family conflict has a damaging effect on the organisation, leading to increased absenteeism and turnover, and decreased job performance and involvement 19, 20. Moreover, work-family conflict is detrimental to the individual, with risks to physical and mental health (e.g. depression, psychological strain), poor parental and job performance, low morale, and low job, family and life satisfaction 17, 21, 22, 23, 24.

Whilst many specific outcomes have been investigated within both academic research and industry reports, these outcomes can be collapsed into four key outcome areas:

**Performance**

Performance includes outcomes such as employee productivity, organisation and employee performance, organisational citizen behaviour, customer service quality, and customer retention.

**Hiring and retention**

Hiring and Retention comprises both eponymous outcomes, as well as organisational attractiveness within the labour market, workplace diversity, absenteeism, and hiring and retention cost reduction.

**Health and Well-being**

Health and Well-being includes both physical and psychological health.

**Satisfaction**

Satisfaction consists of employee satisfaction, life satisfaction, family satisfaction, satisfaction with work-life balance, and schedule satisfaction.

---

**Figure 4**

The relationship between work-family conflict and the four key outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well implemented</th>
<th>Will reduce</th>
<th>Which increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Work-family conflict</td>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-friendly policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work and family performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Health and Wellbeing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the academic research and industry reports showed flexible work arrangements and family-friendly policies improved the four key outcome areas. Where information about the effects of specific work-life policies is available, the academic research indicates that flex-time and teleworking improve productivity, satisfaction, and retention. Additionally, productivity and satisfaction are also improved by compressed work schedules. Only one industry report investigates the effect of any specific work-life policy and this report indicates that teleworking improves productivity, retention and health.

Deloitte found that 88% of its staff who made use of work-life policies either matched or outperformed their counterparts on customer service quality, and saved an estimated $41.5 million in a single year directly as a result of staff retention. First Tennessee Bank trialled a number of work-life policies and found that employee retention increased by 50%. Additionally, customer retention was 10% higher than the industry average, to which they attributed an additional $106 million profit over two years.

Given the clear benefits of work-life policies, why are work-life policies underused and sometimes unavailable? One answer is that people may associate using work-life policies with negative outcomes, such as reducing career prospects and impairing relationships with supervisors or co-workers. Industry and government report findings, for example, suggest that around 32% of employees believed that those using work-life policies were less likely to be promoted, while 35% believed that these employees create additional work for their colleagues. The academic evidence for such claims is, however, both limited and equivocal. Although individual studies have shown employees who take parental leave are perceived as less committed to their job than those who did not take leave, a recent meta-analysis showed teleworkers often do not perceive reduced career prospects relative to those in traditional work arrangements.

Evidence for claims of work-life policies impairing workplace relationships is similarly limited and equivocal. Although some research shows flexible work arrangements weaken interpersonal bonds with co-workers, other research shows they have no effect on co-worker relationships, and in fact have been shown to improve relationships with supervisors. Indeed, the relationship with supervisors is reciprocal; a supportive supervisor is important as he or she can prevent negative repercussions of using work-life policies. Having an unsupportive supervisor can undermine a positive work-family culture. However, this research is limited in scope, with little assessment of the effect of family-friendly policies on supervisor relationships, and vice versa.

Thus it is clear that further research is necessary to provide robust assessments which address all factors relevant to work-life policies. Below we make recommendations both for further research, which we intend to carry out at the CEL, and for organisations regarding how best to implement and assess work-life policies.
The research reported here presents an unequivocal set of findings but these findings are at odds with the adoption of flexible work practices in many of our industry partner organisations. In summary, significant numbers of people report wanting access to flexible work arrangements in their current jobs. Workplace flexibility policies are often mentioned as a criterion that is taken into account when people are seeking jobs. Furthermore, workplace flexibility works. Meta-analyses and case studies provide strong evidence that any of a number of flexible work arrangements, including teleworking, compressed work weeks, flexible schedules and part-time work can all increase productivity and job satisfaction, reduce absenteeism and sick leave, aid in the retention of staff and improve customer service. So, why don’t more people do it? In many organisations, the utilisation of flexible work arrangements is viewed as an imposition by other staff, as evidence of a lack of commitment or of not being serious about one’s career. Some managers also do not understand how to organise and manage flexible workers.

Many of the problems with gaining acceptance and effective utilisation of flexible work practices seem to come down to poor implementation. We recommend an implementation strategy to include the following steps.

- Diagnosis of the work and related opportunities for using flexible work arrangements. This should include but not be limited to assessments of staff needs and preferences. Preferences may change with experience. Selection from the range of possible flexible work arrangements shown in the report should be based on the initial diagnosis of the work and the individual preferences.

- Implementation of flexible working may be best treated as a work restructure or as a cultural change program in order to capture the full benefits of working flexibly. A successful implementation plan should include:
  - selection of a pilot site for initial diagnosis and testing before full roll-out
  - training of supervisors and staff in the knowledge and skills to be used in negotiating and managing flexible work arrangements
  - involvement of all staff, including those who do not use flexible work arrangements, in discussions of the impacts on other staff, their attitudes and reactions and how conflicts and problems will be managed
  - agreement and documentation of the procedures to ensure effective control, appraisal, security and OH&S

- Development of procedures for maintaining the work-based social networks of staff who work flexibly
- Review and adjustment of the technology and other infrastructure required to work effectively in a flexible work arrangement

RECOMMENDATIONS
APPENDIX A

META-ANALYSIS SUMMARIES


This meta-analysis investigated whether five facets of family-friendly work environments (flexibility of work location and schedule, dependent care availability and satisfaction, work/family culture, supervisor support and co-worker support) reduced work-family conflict. The evidence suggested that facets of family-friendly work environment alone fail to explain much variance in work-family conflict. A family-friendly work culture seemed the most influential in reducing work-family conflict.


This meta-analysis investigated the consequences of work-family conflict. Work-family conflict was consistently related to work-related outcomes, family-related outcomes and domain-unspecific outcomes (e.g. mental and physical health).


This meta-analysis investigated the relationship among stressors, involvement, and support in the work and family domains, and work-family conflict and satisfaction outside of those domains. The evidence suggested that work related variables explain a considerable amount of variability in family satisfaction, and family related variables explain a considerable amount of variability in job satisfaction. Job and family stress had the strongest influence on work-family conflict and cross-domain satisfaction.


This meta-analysis explored the positive and negative consequences of teleworking and how these consequences come about. The results of the meta-analysis showed that teleworking has mainly positive outcomes, improving perceived autonomy, job satisfaction and performance, and reducing work-family conflict, turnover intent and role stress. Further, teleworking had no generally detrimental effects on workplace relationships.


This meta-analysis assessed the effects of telework on organisational outcomes. Evidence suggested a positive relationship between telework and the organisational outcomes of productivity, retention, commitment, and performance. Further, the relationship between telework and organisational commitment was moderated by age.
Meta-analytic techniques were used to estimate the effects of flexible and compressed workweek schedules on work-related criteria (productivity, job satisfaction, absenteeism, and satisfaction with work schedule). Both flexible and compressed workweeks had positive effects on work-related criteria, although the pattern of positive effects was different across compressed versus flexible workweek schedules.

Meta-analytic techniques were used to investigate how the availability and use of family-friendly policies (e.g., on-site child care, financial support for those with dependents) influenced employee and organisational outcomes. The availability and use of family-friendly policies had positive relationships with job satisfaction, affective commitment, and intent to stay with the organisation, with policy availability having stronger positive relationships than policy use. Policy availability also influenced work attitudes via improving family-supportive organisation perceptions, and policy use improved work attitudes via reducing work-family conflict.
Background

PeopleScape is a Melbourne-based consulting firm whose client, a large global biopharmaceutical company, wanted to introduce flexible work arrangements into its Australian operations. The Australian business was doing well financially and employee engagement surveys showed above average levels of employee engagement. An ‘innovation workshop’ was run which showed there was a strong desire for flexible work arrangements in the company.

Strategies

Strategies were derived from information obtained through a four month consultation process and a ‘preferences survey’ which assessed technology, location and structure of work, hours and office layout.

Guidelines and Flexible Workplace Agreements were created, including information based on legal advice relating to various risks for the company.

Training was provided for all staff prior to a “kick-off” day to launch the new flexible work practises.

Over 4 months new flexible work practices were implemented.

New work practices included

- flexible schedules based on non-standard hours
- telecommuting (i.e. regularly working from home or a 3rd location)
- quiet spaces (i.e. creating designated quiet spaces in the office)
- connect days (i.e. an agreed one day per week where everyone comes in to the office and lunch is provided)
- project days (i.e. a dedicated day in the office where there are no meetings and people are allowed to work without unnecessary distractions).

Outcomes

Outcomes were measured at three months and twelve months after implementation of the flexible work arrangement policies, and were compared to baseline data gathered at the beginning of the project.

- Employees reported their work-life balance was being supported.
- Employees felt less stressed.
- Employees felt more engaged in their work.

Source - PeopleScape

www.peoplescape.com.au
Background

Kraft Foods is a large USA-based food and beverage company. The company created a flexible work arrangements program called “Fast Adapts” for hourly employees and supervisors in order to address employee dissatisfaction within its 24/7 manufacturing facilities.

Strategies

- Shift Swapping
- Single-day vacations
- Job Sharing
- Utilisation of retirees to cover shifts for absent employees

Outcomes

- Improved employee satisfaction with work-life integration, as reported in the following year’s Employee Satisfaction Survey

Source - Georgetown University Law Center

http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=legal
APPENDIX B

CASE STUDIES | FIRST TENNESSEE BANK

Background
First Tennessee Bank is a Memphis, Tennessee-based financial services company and one of the 30 largest banks in the USA. The National Association for Female Executives (NAFE) named the bank’s parent company, First Horizon National Corp., as one of the Top 50 Companies for Executive Women in 2009. The bank created a work/life program to address costs and customer complaints associated with employee turnover.

Strategies
- Part-time work options
- Localised responsibility for decisions about attendance and scheduling to the employees and managers in individual branches
- A program which allowed parents to bring sick children to a local hospital where they would receive up to 12 hours of care subsidised by the company

Outcomes
- 60% of employees use some form of work-life policy
- $3 million in turnover costs was saved
- 85% less turnover of employees who would have left the bank if flexible work arrangements were not available
- Customer retention was 10% higher than the industry average
- 50% increase in customer quality responses
- The accounts-reconciliation department was able to shorten the time required to reconcile accounts from 8 days to 4 days by adopting compressed week schedules at the beginning of each month in lieu of time off

Source - Georgetown University Law Center

http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=legal
Background

Texas Instruments is a global semiconductor design and manufacturing company. The company created an “ad-hoc” work-life policy due to employee demand as revealed during needs assessments.

Strategies

- Flexi-time
- Compressed work schedules
- Occasional teleworking
- Job sharing

Exclusion of manufacturing employees from all but compressed work schedules due to job demands

Outcomes

- Improved employee retention
- Lower employee stress
- More effective workers
- Employee development of broader skillsets as a result of covering each other’s shifts
- Better coordination with overseas operations and business partners

Source - Georgetown University Law Center

http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=legal
APPENDIX B

CASE STUDIES | KPMG

Background
The company made all work-life policies available to all employees in order to increase employee retention and to be an employer of choice.

Strategies
- Job sharing
- Flexi-time
- Compressed work schedules
- Teleworking
- Requests primarily generated by the employees
- Managers trained to approach requests with a "how can we make this work" attitude

Outcomes
- 50% of employees use some sort of flexible work arrangement
- Retention of valuable staff who would have otherwise been lost

Source - Georgetown University Law Center

http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=legal
APPENDIX B

CASE STUDIES | KODAK

Background
To meet employee desire for improved work-life balance all regular and conditional full-time and part-time employees are able to request any available arrangement.

Strategies
- Part-time work
- Job sharing
- Compressed work schedules
- Flexi-time
- Teleworking

Employees are required to receive permission from their immediate supervisor, as well as demonstrate that the arrangement will not have an adverse impact on the business

Outcomes
- Kodak reports the only negative outcome being some co-workers are jealous of those using the arrangements, although these employees could have applied to use the same arrangements and have chosen not to.

Source - Georgetown University Law Center

http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=legal
Background

BT created the “Workstyle Project” which aimed to increase both their employees’ and the organisation’s flexibility. This is now a product/service available from BT.

Outcomes

- 70% of employees utilise some form of flexible working
- 10% of employees are home-based
- Flexible workers have a 63% lower absenteeism rate and 99% retention rate following maternity leave
- Home-based employees take 63% less sick leave
- Home-based call centre operators are 20% more productive than office-based ones
- €725 million a year saved on office real estate
- €7.4 million a year saved in recruitment costs

Source - British Telecom

http://www2.bt.com/static/i/media/pdf/flex_working_wp_07.pdf
APPENDIX B

CASE STUDIES | ADDLESHAW GODDARD

Background
A UK law firm that has rolled out flexible working practices throughout the firm following a successful pilot group trial that consisted of partners, associates, trainees, secretarial and support staff.

Strategies

- Teleworking to enable working from home and clients’ offices
- Support for managers when they assess formal flexible working applications
- Creation of a culture where flexible working is seen as a serious business tool

Outcomes

- Service standards have either been maintained or improved where flexible employees are involved.
- The proportion of female partners recruited externally has increased.

Source - Equality and Human Rights Commission

Background
A not-for-profit organisation that specialises in employment and training services for individuals who are disadvantaged in employment and community life. Interwork developed work-life policies to meet the needs of its employees and to reduce turnover.

Outcomes
- Improved quality of service and client satisfaction
- 99% rate of return from parental leave
- Decreased staff turnover to below the industry average
- 80% job satisfaction rate

Source - Government of South Australia
Background
An Australian-owned defence contractor. Work-life policies were developed to improve the recruitment and retention of female employees, as well as to increase employee career opportunities and development.

Strategies
- Flexi-time
- Additional parental leave for employees with at least 12 months of continuous service
- Part-time work arrangements for all employees
- Academic examination leave

Outcomes
- Increased customer service levels
- Improved employee retention and satisfaction
- Decreased absenteeism
- Improved employee health
- Greater ability for employees to manage their workload

Source - Government of South Australia
## APPENDIX C

### POLICIES COVERED IN EACH RESEARCH AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-life Policies</th>
<th>Meta-analyses</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexi-time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work schedule</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telework</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions between part- and full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift swapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary reduced time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over breaks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site child care</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care information &amp; referral services</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assistance for dependent care</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid family leave</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased return</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid parental leave</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Summary of policies covered in each of the research areas
REFERENCES


Flexible working best way to help employees? The Times. Retrieved from: http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/law/article3598882.ece


Distributed work in the virtual office: A national study of telework and work outcomes. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.


Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10, 76-88.

* Meta-analyses used to inform the report
REFERENCES


* Meta-analyses used to inform the report

A review of the evidence regarding work-life policies 27
REFERENCES


### Table 4
Industry and Government Report Employee and Employer Sample Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Reference</th>
<th>Employer Sample Size</th>
<th>Employee Sample Size</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2012)</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fursman and Zodgekar (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>692</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsey and Percival (2011)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matos and Galinsky (2012)</td>
<td>729</td>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporean Ministry of Manpower (2012)</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocock, Skinner, and Ichii (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipping, Chanfreau, Perry, and Tait (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldatWork (2005)</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldatWork (2011)</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2
Summary of industry and government report findings of policies offered by employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-life policy supported</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Countries*</th>
<th>Average of employers offering policy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work schedule</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5926</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over breaks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over overtime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexi-time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9426</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job sharing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8005</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional time off for family commitments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8005</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased retirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased return</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift flexibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleworking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9426</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time working</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4867</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time off to volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions between part-time and full-time schedules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA = North America, SG = Singapore, UK = United Kingdom, US = United States of America, AU = Australia, NZ = New Zealand
## APPENDIX G

### POLICIES EMPLOYEES REPORT UTILISING

Table 3
Summary of industry and government report findings of polices utilised by employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-life policy supported</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Countries*</th>
<th>Average of employees offering policy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work schedule</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4361</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over breaks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexi-time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4361</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time working</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3855</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time off to volunteer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleworking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4361</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA = North America, SG = Singapore, UK = United Kingdom, US = United States of America, AU = Australia, NZ = New Zealand
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### PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYERS OFFERING INDIVIDUAL WORK–LIFE POLICIES

#### Table 5

Percentage of employers who reported offering individual work-life policies by industry or government report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-life policy</th>
<th>Fursman and Zodgekar 09</th>
<th>Tipping, Chantreau, Perry, and Tait 12</th>
<th>Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development 12</th>
<th>Matos and Galinsky 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over breaks</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexi-time</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTFC</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleworking</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time working</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPF</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWS = Compressed work schedule, OTFC = Occasional time off for family commitments, TTV = Time off to volunteer, TBPF = Transitions between part-time and full-time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Singaporean Ministry of Manpower 12</th>
<th>Society for Human Resource Management 09</th>
<th>World at Work 05</th>
<th>World at Work 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX I

### PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES UTILISING INDIVIDUAL WORK–LIFE POLICIES

**Table 6**

Percentage of employers who reported utilising individual work-life policies by industry or government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work–life policy</th>
<th>Chartered Institute of Personnel &amp; Development 12</th>
<th>Tipping, Chantreau, Perry, and Tait 12</th>
<th>Fursman and Zodgekar 09</th>
<th>Pocock, Skinner, and Ichii 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annualised hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career breaks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexi-time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleworking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term-time working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWS = Compressed work schedule, OTFC = Occasional time off for family commitments, TTV = Time off to volunteer, TBPF = Transitions between part-time and full-time
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