

NEW ZEALAND DIVERSITY SURVEY

2016 Bi-Annual Report – October



1. Respondent characteristics

This report was commissioned by Diversity Works New Zealand, formerly known as The Equal Employment Opportunities Trust, and was produced by Associate Professor Gail Pacheco and Isabelle Bouchard of the NZ Work Research Institute AUT.

The survey took place in October 2016 and 909 responses were received.

2. Demographic information

Compared to the previous iteration of this survey, there was a greater proportion of respondents from small organisations (relative to medium and large) – such that responses in that category made up half of the responses. The respondents that worked for organisations that were large and medium were almost evenly split, across the other half of the sample.

Table 2: Organisation size

Organisation size category	Oct 2016 Number of respondents	April 2016 Number of respondents	Oct 2015 Number of respondents	April 2015: Number of respondents
Large (≥200 employees)	26%	31%	31%	25%
Medium (20-199 employees)	24%	30%	25%	23%
Small (0-19 employees)	50%	39%	44%	52%
Total	909	708	522	762

Organisations were distributed across a range of industry sectors (Table 3), in a broadly similar fashion to that of the April 2016 survey. The minor differences between the previous and current survey were a 2.7% point increase in the number of respondents from Manufacturing, a 2.1% point drop in the number of respondents from Education and training, and a 3.1% point drop in the number of respondents from Health care and Social Assistance.

Table 3: Industry sector

Industry sector	Number of respondents	Oct 2016 %
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	131	14.4%
Financial and Insurance Services	98	10.8%
Manufacturing	84	9.2%
Education and Training	69	7.6%
Health Care and Social Assistance	50	5.5%
Retail Trade	49	5.4%
Information Media and Telecommunications	41	4.5%
Public Administration and Safety	39	4.3%
Construction	36	4.0%
Wholesale Trade	32	3.5%
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	25	2.8%
Electricity, Gas, Water and Waste Services	25	2.8%
Administrative and Support Services	23	2.5%
Arts and Recreation Services	18	2.0%
Transport, Postal and Warehousing	18	2.0%
Accommodation and Food Services	17	1.9%
Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services	15	1.7%
Mining	2	0.2%
Other Services	137	15.1%
Total	909	100%

3. Which diversity issues are considered to be important?

The diversity issues most commonly selected by respondents as important are wellbeing/wellness, flexibility and aging (Table 4). Other issues of concern were bias, gender, employment transition for younger staff, ethnicity, and bullying and harassment. Only a small proportion of the respondents surveyed were concerned with issues of sexuality and religion.

Table 4: Diversity issues

Diversity issues considered to be important (%)	Oct 2016	April 2016	Oct 2015
Wellbeing/wellness	62.3%	63.3%	65.9%
Flexibility	53.1%	55.4%	59.2%
Aging	43.8%	46.2%	46.9%
Bias*	30.1%	34.7%	37.2%
Gender	28.9%	31.5%	33.9%
Employment transition for younger staff	27.6%	26.1%	33.5%
Ethnicity	27.0%	28.1%	37.5%
Bullying and harassment	25.6%	30.6%	32.4%
Disability	16.2%	16.2%	19.3%
Sexuality	11.0%	12.3%	13.4%
Religion	7.7%	6.9%	9.0%

* Conscious and unconscious bias that can influence decision making around issues such as hiring and promotion.

** The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

*** Respondents could list multiple diversity issues as important.

The results from Table 4 are relatively consistent with previous surveys in terms of the perceived ranking of importance of most issues. However, there is a general decreasing trend for all issues compared to the April 2016 Survey, with an average decrease of 1.6% points per diversity item (this follows an average decrease of 3.4% points in the previous survey). The issue exhibiting the largest decline is ‘bullying and harassment’ with a 5% point decrease between previous and current survey.

Wellbeing/wellness, flexibility and aging were the three most important diversity issues for organisations, regardless of size (see Table 5). One difference apparent in terms of organisation size is that gender and bias appear to be of much greater concern for large organisations compared to small and medium organisations.

Table 5: Important diversity issues by organisation size

Small organisations (0-19 employees) (n=450)	Medium organisations (20-199 employees) (n=223)	Large organisations (≥200 employees) (n=236)
Wellbeing/wellness (60.7%)	Wellbeing/wellness (58.7%)	Wellbeing/wellness (68.2%)
Flexibility (51.8%)	Flexibility (52.5%)	Flexibility (56.4%)
Aging (42.9%)	Aging (43.0%)	Aging (45.8%)
Employment transition for younger staff (28%)	Bias* (29.1%)	Gender (42.8%)
Bias* (24.0%)	Employment transition for younger staff (26.9%)	Bias* (42.8%)
Gender (23.8%)	Gender (24.7%)	Ethnicity (35.2%)
Ethnicity (23.6%)	Ethnicity (24.7%)	Bullying and harassment (34.7%)
Bullying and harassment (22.0%)	Bullying and harassment (23.3%)	Employment transition for younger staff (27.1%)
Disability (13.8%)	Disability (16.1%)	Disability (20.8%)
Sexuality (8.4%)	Sexuality (8.5%)	Sexuality (17.8%)
Religion (7.1%)	Religion (5.8%)	Religion (10.6%)

* Conscious and unconscious bias that can influence decision making around issues such as hiring and promotion.

** The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

*** Respondents could list multiple diversity issues as important.

The findings presented in Table 5 are reasonably consistent with those obtained in the April 2016 survey in terms of the groupings shown for each organisation size. There are two exceptions to this. The first of these is for small organisations where gender, ethnicity, and bullying and harassment issues moved from the non-highlighted group (i.e. below 20%) to the brown highlighted group (i.e. between 20% and 40%). The second exception is for large organisations, where there was a 10% point drop for both the issues of gender, and bullying and harassment.

It is also interesting to notice that for medium organisations, the percentage of respondents reporting diversity issues as important has decreased by an average of 4% points per item, between April 2016 and this survey.

4. Policies and programmes to address diversity issues

The prevalence of formal policies and programmes for diversity issues are illustrated in Table 6. Of note is the issue of bullying and harassment, where 56% of respondents' organisations have a formal policy in place. A similar observation was made for the prior diversity survey where the comparable proportion in October 2015 was 59.1%.

Wellbeing/wellness and flexibility were the two diversity issues with the highest percentage of respondents reporting that their organisation either had a formal policy or programme or initiative in place to address these issues (69% and 62% respectively). This was a little lower than the April 2016 results, where the comparative proportions were 72% and 67%.

As was found in prior diversity surveys, a substantial proportion of respondents' organisations have neither a policy nor a programme in place for aging, gender, bias (conscious and unconscious), ethnicity, employment transition for younger staff, religion and sexuality. For all these issues the proportion of organisations with no policy or programme in place was more than 40%. Furthermore, the proportion of issues having neither a policy nor a programme in place increased by an average of 3.5% (since the April 2016 survey).

Table 6: Policies and programmes for diversity issues

Diversity issue	N	Formal policy in place	Programme or initiative in place	Neither policy nor programme in place
Wellbeing/wellness	656	29.9%	38.9%	31.3%
Flexibility	578	27.5%	34.1%	38.4%
Aging	534	8.8%	24.3%	66.9%
Bullying and harassment	468	56.0%	20.1%	23.9%
Gender	448	27.2%	22.8%	50.0%
Bias*	434	17.7%	25.6%	56.7%
Ethnicity	434	26.3%	23.3%	50.5%
Employment transition for younger staff	449	12.5%	35.0%	52.6%
Disability	394	31.5%	26.9%	41.6%
Sexuality	358	26.3%	17.3%	56.4%
Religion	337	21.4%	13.4%	65.3%

* Conscious and unconscious bias that can influence decision making around issues such as hiring and promotion.

** The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

For each of the diversity issues, we evaluated whether the existence of a formal policy, programme or initiative is related to organisational size (see Table 7). For all issues, as organisation size increases, the likelihood of organisations having a policy or programme in place rises. As shown in Table 7, more than half of medium and large organisations have a policy or programme in place for wellbeing. Additionally, approximately half of large organisations also have a policy or programme in place for bullying and harassment, flexibility and gender.

Table 7: Organisations with a policy or programme by organisation size

	Small organisations (0-19 employees)	Medium organisations (20-199 employees)	Large organisations (200+ employees)
Wellbeing/wellness	33.1%	56.8%	74.3%
Flexibility	30.2%	42.3%	53.2%
Aging	13.6%	20.7%	29.5%
Bullying and harassment	23.6%	47.3%	61.2%
Gender	13.3%	23.0%	47.7%
Bias*	12.4%	18.9%	38.0%
Ethnicity	13.1%	24.3%	43.0%
Employment transition for younger staff	18.2%	32.4%	24.9%
Disability	15.3%	25.7%	43.9%
Sexuality	8.9%	17.1%	32.9%
Religion	7.6%	14.0%	21.9%

* Conscious and unconscious bias that can influence decision making around issues such as hiring and promotion.

** The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

5. Methods for addressing diversity

Organisations are using a range of different methods for addressing diversity (Table 8). ‘Top management commitment to and involvement in diversity issues’ (37.3%) and ‘Consideration of diversity in relevant HR policies’ (36%) and are the most commonly reported methods. While these are still the top two methods – they did decline in importance, by 5.8% points and 8.4% points respectively.

When asked about how diversity is addressed in their organisation, 5.2% of respondents selected the option ‘other’. Of those respondents who selected other, more than 50% believed that diversity was not addressed in their organisation, while a further 17% indicated that their organisation was too small for such tasks. Another 5% revealed that there was no formal methods but that they select the best person for the job rather than recruiting based on diversity related criteria. Also, 11% of these respondents acknowledged that organisational values and culture minimized diversity issues, while another 8% stated that diversity was managed through strategies, projects and initiatives.

Table 8: Methods for addressing diversity

How diversity is addressed	October 2016 %	April 2016 %
Top management commitment to and involvement in diversity issues	37.3%	43.1%
Consideration of diversity in relevant HR policies (e.g. recruitment, staff development)	36.0%	44.4%
Communication and promotion of diversity to internal stakeholders	20.8%	23.7%
Diversity strategy or plan	19.8%	22.5%
Diversity education and training for existing employees	14.6%	15.4%
Diversity education and training for line managers	13.9%	13.8%
Diversity support networks	13.6%	17.4%
Monitoring and reporting diversity performance	12.7%	15.1%
System or mechanisms for reporting diversity-related concerns	12.1%	13.7%
Diversity education and training for new employees	11.6%	11.2%
Diversity council, committee, team or taskforce	9.9%	13.3%
Communication about diversity-related issues to external stakeholders	9.8%	10.2%
Diversity-related employment benefits	6.5%	7.9%
Other	5.2%	6.9%
Diversity-related managerial incentives	3.6%	4.7%

* The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

** Some of the respondents listed more than one mechanism.

*** Respondents could list multiple methods for addressing diversity.

6. Measuring the effectiveness of diversity programmes

Some 16% (120 of 738) of respondents' organisations measure the effectiveness of their diversity programmes. Also, it is worth noting that as organisation size increases, the likelihood of this taking place increases. In fact, more than twice as many large organisations measured the effectiveness of their programmes (38%) compared to medium-sized organisations (14%). In small organisations, only 5% measured the effectiveness of their programmes.

Of the 120 respondents whose organisations formally measure or evaluate the effectiveness of their diversity initiatives, 78 provided usable data, in terms of what mechanisms are used (see Table 9). Note that some respondents listed more than one mechanism. The top two most commonly used methods were metrics and reporting. Since the last survey, the use of surveys to measure the effectiveness of diversity programmes declined amongst all organisations (falling from 21.4% to 15.4%).

Table 9: Measuring the effectiveness of diversity programmes

Mechanisms used to measure the effectiveness of diversity programmes	Number of respondents (n=78)	October 2016 %
Metrics	23	29.5%
Reporting (including in regular meetings)	17	21.8%
Surveys	12	15.4%
Board and global strategy	12	15.4%
Employer submissions and awards	6	7.7%
Annual report	4	5.1%
Through training, mentoring & staff development	2	2.6%
Informal observation	2	2.6%

* The brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

** Some of the respondents listed more than one mechanism.

7. Specific diversity issues

7.1 Wellbeing/wellness: When respondents were asked what the major wellbeing/wellness challenges were for their organisation, 906 respondents answered this question, of whom 7.5% believed that their organisation had no major wellbeing/challenges. The remaining respondents listed a range of issues (see Table 10). ‘Employee health’ was the most common issue (25.3%), followed by ‘stress’ and ‘work-life balance’ (21.6% and 12.8% respectively). These findings are similar to the April 2016 survey, where the same three factors were the most commonly reported wellbeing challenges for organisations.

Table 10: Wellbeing/wellness challenges for organisations

Wellbeing/Wellness Issue	Number of respondents (n=906)	October 2016 (%)
Employee Health	229	25.3%
- Fitness	(40)	(4.4%)
- Physical	(26)	(2.9%)
- Mental	(26)	(2.9%)
- Nutrition	(12)	(1.3%)
- Smoking	(6)	(0.7%)
- Obesity	(5)	(0.6%)
Stress	196	21.6%
Work-life balance	116	12.8%
Employee satisfaction	55	6.1%
Aging	53	5.8%
Work environment hazard/safety	47	5.2%
Flexibility	33	3.6%
Illness and absenteeism	30	3.3%
Sedentary work	27	3.0%
Family pressures	22	2.4%
Bullying	12	1.3%
Diversity	11	1.2%
Disability	7	0.8%
None	68	7.5%

* The brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%. ** Respondents could list multiple challenges.

As Table 10 shows employee satisfaction was a concern for 6.1% of the respondents who raised issues around employee motivation, engagement, interaction and communication. Other commonly reported issues included the aging workforce (5.8%) and concerns around work-related hazard (5.2%). Flexibility including glide-time, working remotely and part-time work was seen as a challenge for 3.6% of the respondents. Also, sedentary work was reported as a concern by 3.1% of the respondents, while 2.9% raised the issue of family and external pressures, and 1.7% indicated bullying and harassment as a concern. The order of prevalence of the concerns shown in Table 10 is very similar with the April 2016 survey.

7.2 Aging: Over half (54.6%) of the respondents' organisations encourage the recruitment of workers over the age of 55 years old. This was similar to the prior diversity surveys – with comparable proportions being 54%, 57% and 54% for the April 2016, October 2015 and April 2015 surveys respectively.

Table 11 shows how respondents perceive their organisation's strategy regarding engagement with workers over the age of 55 years. It is noticeable that numerous respondents listed more than one form of engagement, while 7.1% of respondents either did not know how the organisation engaged with older workers or felt that it was not applicable. Analysis of the qualitative data indicated that a significant majority of organisations (73.3%) are perceived as treating workers over the age of 55 in the same manner as they treat younger employees, and that recruitment of workers is based on ability rather than age.

Table 11: Forms of engagement with workers over the age of 55 years

Form of engagement with workers of 55 years of age	Number of respondents (n=547)	October 2016 %
No specific strategies/processes (treated equally)	401	73.3%
Value experience	32	5.9%
Flexibility	23	4.2%
Communication with management	17	3.1%
Retirement planning/seminar	11	2.0%
Training	8	1.5%
Employee action groups	6	1.1%
Tailor type of work	5	0.9%
Benefits (incl. insurance, health, saving plan)	4	0.7%
Celebration of tenure	1	0.2%
Don't know	39	7.1%

* The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

** Some of the respondents listed more than one mechanism.

Some 5.9% of the respondents acknowledged that workers 55 years of age or older are valued for their experience. In fact, many of these respondents acknowledged that older workers in their organisation were often in leadership or mentoring positions where their

experience and wisdom could be shared with younger employees. Also, 4.2% acknowledged that flexibility was used as a form of engagement with older workers, including reduced or part-time hours, glide-time and working from home. Other forms of engagement including age-related benefits, training, employee action groups, and celebration of tenure (mentioned by a handful of respondents). One form of engagement that did not feature in the April 2016 survey was 'communication with management', which was the form of engagement signalled by 17 respondents in this survey.

7.3 Flexibility: Respondents' organisations employ a range of forms of flexibility. Of all the respondents who answered the survey question relating to flexibility, only 4.2% stated that their organisation had no form of flexibility, while the remaining respondents listed numerous different forms of flexibility - as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Forms of flexibility employed in respondents' organisations

Forms of flexibility	October 2016 %	April 2016 %
Flexible hours	61.4%	64.2%
Working remotely	29.2%	32.0%
Consideration of family and personal responsibilities	20.1%	16.7%
Part time hours	11.9%	14.1%
Roster flexibility	11.4%	10.1%
Space flexibility	10.1%	8.9%
Flexible and/or extended leave	9.1%	20.5%
Job sharing	5.5%	6.6%
Autonomy	3.9%	3.2%
Workload flexibility	3.4%	3.6%
Down-time during work hours	2.0%	1.6%
Casual	1.8%	3.4%
Graduated return to work	1.2%	3.4%
Career leave	1.2%	1.2%
None	4.2%	6.4%

* The blue highlighted areas represent >40%, and the brown highlighted areas represent between 20% and 40%.

** Some of the respondents listed more than one mechanism.

Analysis of the qualitative data shows that offering flexible hours is the most common form of flexibility with over two thirds of respondents acknowledging that their organisation offers flexible hours to some of their employees. Working remotely (29.2%), consideration of family and personal responsibilities (20.1%), part-time hours (11.9%) and roster flexibility (11.4%) were other commonly employed forms of flexibility. These findings are similar to that of the April 2016 survey in which the most prevalent form of flexibility was flexible hours, followed by working remotely. The one type of flexibility that dropped the most between the last survey and current results was flexible and/or extended leave (down by 11.5% points from 20.5% to 9.1%).

7.4 Bullying and harassment: Approximately one quarter of respondents' organisations (26.7%) reported incidents of bullying or harassment in the past 12 months. The comparative proportions for the three previous iterations of this survey are 31.5%, 27% and 26%.

7.5 Gender: 77.4% of respondents' organisations have female representation at the governance level (compared with 83.5%, 76% and 77% for the April 2016, October 2015 and April 2015 surveys respectively). Also, 81% of respondents' organisations have female representation within their leadership or decision making team (compared with 88%, 82% and 80% for the April 2016, October 2015 and April 2015 surveys respectively).

In the current survey the average proportion of females at the governance level was 45.6% (it was 46.4% in April 2016), and the average proportion of females within the leadership or decision making team was 48.1% (relative to 48.4% in the previous survey). As with the prior surveys, female representation at both the governance level and within leadership roles was generally shown to decrease with increasing organisation size.

The most noticeable changes since the last survey appeared in medium organisations with a 5% point decrease in the average female representation at both the governance level, and the leadership team level.

Table 13: Female representation in governance and leadership

Organisation size	Gender balance at the governance level Average % female	Gender balance within leadership/decision making team Average % female
Small (0-19 employees)	54.5%	58.5%
Medium (20-199 employees)	39.0%	42.6%
Large (≥200 employees)	37.7%	36.0%
All organisations	45.9%	48.1%

7.6 Temporary, fixed-term or casual contracts: Of the 603 respondents who provided usable data on the proportion of staff in their organisation who work on temporary, fixed-term or casual contracts, 31.7% of the respondents reported that their organisations had no staff on such contracts (compared to 29.5% in the previous survey). The distribution of the percentage of temporary, fixed-term or casual contractors within respondents' organisations is shown in Figure 1. The average across the sample is 18.7%, and the median is 5% (compared to 18.7% and 7% respectively, in the previous survey).

While not shown in the figure below, it is useful to note that small organisations have a greater proportion of temporary, fixed term or casual contracts, with 22.1%, compared to 11.8% and 18.9% of medium and large organisations respectively.

Figure 1: Percentage of staff on temporary, fixed-term or casual contracts

