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SUMMARY

The ONE service is a joint policy initiative of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), Department of Social Security (DSS), Employment Service (ES) and Benefits Agency (BA).

ONE is a new way of delivering social security benefits to people of working age. It brings together the Employment Service, Benefits Agency and Local Authorities to provide a single point of entry to the benefits system and put facilitating a return to the labour market at the centre of the claim making process. The aim of ONE is to increase economic activity, encourage people (back) into work where possible and to provide claimants with a more integrated service that is tailored to their personal circumstances.

The ONE service was introduced between June and November 1999 in 12 pilot areas in Great Britain. Three different service models are being trialled: a basic model, a call centre model and a private/voluntary sector model.

A major programme of research to evaluate the effectiveness of ONE was set up by the Department of Social Security (DSS) on behalf of itself and the other agencies involved.

IFF Research Ltd was commissioned to undertake the research amongst employers. The main objective of this work was to examine how we can secure employers’ commitment to help a wider range of people with limited capacity to get jobs. It has not sought to evaluate ONE from the employers’ perspective, but to help inform broader policy development on engaging employers further in tackling these issues.

The research focused on three groups:

• lone parents - single parents who are entering or returning to the workforce after a period looking after their children;
• long term unemployed - people who have been unemployed for at least 12 months;
• people with physical disabilities or mental health problems.

More specifically, the research:

• examined employers’ attitudes and recruitment behaviour towards these groups;
• identified ways to help minimise the perceived ‘risks’ of employing these groups;
• identified ways to encourage employers to use the ONE service.
The research was conducted in three stages:

- Creative Events;
- main quantitative survey;
- qualitative research.

This report covers the findings of the main quantitative survey.

The main purpose of the Creative Events was to generate ideas for new and more effective ways of encouraging employers to take on people from groups who find it more difficult to obtain work.

The main quantitative survey consisted of 1201 telephone interviews with employers who employed five or more staff and had recruited in the last three years.

The third stage of this research will be qualitative in nature and involve follow-up interviews with a small sample of employers (30) who have recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last year. Interviews will be conducted face to face and explore in more detail their experiences of recruiting and integrating people from ONE relevant groups into their workforce and their views of the new ideas tested in the main quantitative survey.

Recruitment activity

Recruitment activity over the last 12 months was high, with most employers (90 per cent) having recruited one or more people in the last 12 months. On average, employers had recruited six people in the last 12 months. This number was significantly higher amongst large employers (100+ employees), 70 per cent of whom had recruited 20 or more people in the last 12 months. This high level of recruitment activity has resulted in a tight labour market for employers (low unemployment means there are fewer people looking for work). Almost half of all employers (47 per cent) said they had experienced recruitment difficulties over the last 12 months.

Use of Jobcentres

Just under half (47 per cent) of employers had recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years. A further 19 per cent had also approached the Jobcentre in the last three years, but not actually recruited through this channel. Recruitment through Jobcentres was highest amongst large employers (68 per cent of large employers had recruited through the Jobcentre) and employers in the production sector (53 per cent).

Seventeen per cent of employers who recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years were using it for the first time. (They represented eight per cent of all employers).

Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of employers said they would be likely to use the Jobcentre in the next two to three years, including 39 per cent who said they would be definitely or very likely to use the Jobcentre.
This proportion was significantly higher amongst those who had used the Jobcentre in the last three years, 67 per cent said they would definitely use the Jobcentre again or be very likely to. Along with existing users (notably larger businesses and those in the production sector), employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector would also be more likely to use the Jobcentre in future, (69 per cent said they would definitely or be very likely to use this channel in future).

Very few employers (seven per cent) completely rejected the possible use of the Jobcentre in future. Even amongst those who had not used the Jobcentre before, only 14 per cent would definitely not use the Jobcentre in future.

Two-fifths of employers (41 per cent) claimed to have definitely recruited one or more people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years. A further six per cent of employers thought they had possibly done so. Large employers and those in the public sector were most likely to have definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups and to have taken on more than one person in the last three years. Seventy per cent of large employers and 59 per cent of employers in the public sector had definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups. Seventy-nine per cent and 64 per cent respectively, of employers in these groups who had taken on any ONE relevant groups, had taken on more than one recruit.

Those employers who had definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups were also more likely to have the following types of human resources (HR) practices at their establishment:

- an equal opportunities policy;
- staff representation, eg union, staff association or works council;
- participated in a Government employment scheme, eg New Deal.

However, it should be noted that large employers who were more likely to have recruited ONE relevant groups, were also more likely to have these HR practices at their establishments.

The Jobcentre was the main recruitment channel for ONE relevant groups. Fifty-one per cent of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups had recruited via the Jobcentre. The other more frequently mentioned channels were advertisements (19 per cent) and word of mouth (18 per cent).

A fifth (22 per cent) of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups (nine per cent of employers overall) had recruited them for the first time in the last 12 months. The main reason given by these employers for starting to recruit people from ONE relevant groups was that they were ‘the best person for the job’. Only one per cent of employers said
they had decided to recruit ONE relevant groups because the Government or a charity had approached them.

Three-quarters of employers who had taken on people from ONE relevant groups in the last year were satisfied with their performance (40 per cent were very satisfied and 35 per cent quite satisfied). Less than one in ten employers (eight per cent) were dissatisfied with the recruits they had taken on from ONE relevant groups.

Employers were most likely to have recruited lone parents, who were (re)entering the workforce after a period of caring for their children, (27 per cent of all employers had recruited any lone parents) and the long term unemployed (20 per cent). The proportion of employers who had recruited people with physical disabilities and, in particular, mental health problems was much lower (eight per cent and five per cent respectively). It was only amongst the very largest employers (200 + employees) that a significant proportion of employers had taken on these groups (30 per cent and 11 per cent respectively).

Six out of ten employers who had taken on people from ONE relevant groups had made some changes to their building or working arrangements to accommodate these people. The most common adjustments made were to be more flexible about the working hours or to provide additional or different training. However fewer than one in ten (eight per cent) of these employers had altered the job specification to accommodate these groups and only one per cent had made any physical changes to their building.

Most employers (90 per cent) stated that they would be likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in the next two to three years, with a third (32 per cent) saying they would be very likely. Willingness to take on people from ONE relevant groups was highest amongst large employers and those in the public sector, who were most likely to have recruited these groups in the past, and the retail distribution and leisure sector. Half (51 per cent) of all large employers and two-fifths (41 per cent) of employers in the retail distribution and leisure and public sectors would be very likely to take on ONE relevant groups in future. Encouragingly even a fifth of employers who had not taken on people from ONE relevant groups before said they would be very likely to do so in future.

However there was a significant difference in willingness to take on the different ONE relevant groups. The pattern was similar to recruitment over the last three years, with employers being significantly more willing to employ lone parents and the long term unemployed than people with physical and mental health problems. Again it was only the largest employers who showed a significant likelihood to take on people with physical disabilities and mental health problems in future (22 per cent and 17 per cent of employers with 200 + employees would be very likely to take on these groups in future).
Most employers who would be willing to take on ONE relevant groups, would also be prepared to make any necessary adjustment to the building or working arrangements to accommodate these people. Eighty-three per cent of employers said they would definitely or probably make any necessary changes, with over a third (37 per cent) saying they would definitely make these changes.

**Attitudes to recruiting ONE relevant groups**

Employers had some general concerns about employing people from ONE relevant groups. A fifth (22 per cent) of employers felt they would ‘be concerned about employing people from ONE relevant groups in case they inadvertently had problems with equal opportunities legislation’. This was more of a concern for small employers, 23 per cent of small employers agreed with this statement compared with only six per cent of the largest employers. Some employers were also concerned about the impact of employing these groups on themselves and other staff. Twenty-three per cent of employers were of this view, particularly employers in the production sector (30 per cent).

**Attitudes to recruiting lone parents**

Reflecting the high proportion of employers who had or would recruit lone parents, employers did not have any significant concerns about taking on this group. Whilst childcare issues were a concern, employers felt ‘the problems of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally’. Seventy three per cent of employers agreed with this statement, 45 per cent strongly agreed. Employers also did not agree that lone parents entering or returning to the workforce after a period looking after their children ‘would have less skills or skills which are less up to date than other recruits’. Most employers disagreed with this statement (83 per cent) and 54 per cent disagreed strongly.

**Attitudes to recruiting the long-term unemployed**

Again reflecting the relatively high proportion of employers who had or would take on people who had been unemployed for a year or more, almost three-quarters of employers (72 per cent) disagreed with the statement that ‘people who have been unemployed for more than 12 months are not interested in working’.

A high proportion of employers (63 per cent) also agreed with the statement that ‘I’d be just as likely to take on someone who has been unemployed for more than 2 years as more than 12 months’. Less than a fifth of employers (19 per cent) disagreed with the statement at all. We consider that this may be because the gap between one year and two years was not that great. Employers might make a distinction between people unemployed for relatively short amounts of time, i.e. up to three to six months, and those unemployed for two years or more. The onus would be on the individual to show that the reason they had not worked for two years was not because they did not want to work and/or they had used the time constructively, for example to gain new skills.
Views about whether ‘people who have been unemployed for more than 12 months will put in more effort and be more enthusiastic at work as they haven’t had a job for a long time’ were more mixed, with 34 per cent of employers agreeing with this statement and 42 per cent disagreeing. This result suggests employers felt it was down to the individual, with some responding in this way and others not.

The survey results indicated that most employers were aware that the term ‘people with disabilities’ covered a range of different conditions. Most employers (85 per cent) disagreed, 61 per cent strongly, with the statement ‘When I think of people with disabilities, I think of wheelchairs, not people with less severe physical disabilities or mental health problems’.

Most employers (81 per cent) agreed with the statement ‘Coping with their physical disabilities or mental health problems gives many of these people a strong will to succeed’. However, those employers who had recruited people with physical disabilities over the last three years were more likely to have agreed with this statement than those who had recruited people with mental health problems, 89 per cent compared with 74 per cent.

About half (51 per cent) of employers also agreed with the statement ‘I would be less concerned about employing someone with a physical disability than those with mental health problems’. However, less than a fifth of employers (18 per cent) strongly agreed with this statement suggesting that employers were not confident that they fully understood the nature of physical or mental health problems and were concerned about the ability of these people to undertake the required work, as evidenced by the relatively low proportion of employers who had or would be likely to recruit either group.

Six of the ideas generated in the Creative Events were tested in the main quantitative survey to determine if they were of interest and relevance to employers and would impact on their likelihood to use Jobcentre type services and/or recruit people from ONE relevant groups. It should be noted that we were testing idea concepts, not fully developed models, and that some of the ideas exist, at least to some extent, already.

Of the six ideas tested, two were aimed at encouraging employers to use Jobcentre type services. The other four were aimed more specifically at encouraging employers to take on people from ONE relevant groups. The six ideas tested were as follows:

- **Employment information** – Providing information and advice for employers on all aspects of human resource management.
- **Account manager** – All employers using the Jobcentre would have an account manager with specialist knowledge of their business sector.
- **Specialist advisers** – Personal Advisers specialising in assisting people with particular types of difficulty. They would provide support to both clients and employers during recruitment and for up to six months after recruitment.
• **More information on recruits** – Providing additional ‘softer’ information about potential recruits’ wider achievements and interests to demonstrate key attributes such as commitment, good timekeeping, etc.

• **Specialist advice on employing ONE relevant groups** – Providing more specialist advice and information on employing these groups including extra support available.

• **Childcare facilitator** – Centralised information service for lone parents requiring emergency childcare support.

Interest in the new ideas

Almost all employers (97 per cent) expressed interest in at least one idea. The main reasons why employers were not interested in any of the ideas were because they did not feel the Jobcentre was a suitable recruitment channel for them, they did not have suitable positions for people from ONE relevant groups, or they had had a poor experience when using the Jobcentre before.

All the new ideas generated a high level of interest, with over half of employers saying they were quite/very interested in each idea. The two ideas that generated most interest were the account manager and being given more information on potential recruits.

The majority (85 per cent) of employers were interested in the idea of the account manager with half saying they were very interested. This reflected wider business behaviour and preferences, with most business people having a named individual who manages their relationship with their key suppliers. It was also supported by the findings from other research, that showed that employers felt that lack of knowledge of the labour market and their more specific business and skills requirements was the major weakness of the service provided by the Jobcentre and the key area where they would like to see improvement.

The majority of employers were also interested in being given more information about potential recruits. Overall 87 per cent of employers expressed interest in this idea with just under half (47 per cent) saying they were very interested. The results of other evaluation work on ONE amongst claimants suggests that they would also welcome this idea. Some people, particularly those claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance did not feel that employers were given sufficient information about them to demonstrate their skills and aptitude.

There was also substantial interest in the ideas of the specialist adviser and providing more specialist advice for employers on employing people from ONE relevant groups. Sixty-nine per cent and 79 per cent of employers respectively expressed interest in these ideas with about a fifth claiming to be very interested. Interest was slightly higher amongst large employers with 77 per cent and 86 per cent respectively expressing interest in these ideas. Other research on New Deal supports these findings that employers
would welcome more support in recruiting and integrating these groups into their workforce. Research from other parts of the ONE evaluation also supports this idea; finding that Personal Advisers’ lack of specialist knowledge and expertise was a significant limiting factor on the effectiveness of ONE.

Three-quarters of employers (75 per cent) expressed interest in the idea that the Jobcentre provide more information on employment issues, with almost a quarter (24 per cent) saying they would be very interested. Small-medium sized employers were slightly more likely to be interested in this idea (76 per cent compared with 71 per cent of large employers).

The idea that generated the least interest was the childcare facilitator. Under two-thirds of employers (62 per cent) expressed any interest in this idea, with over a third (35 per cent) rejecting it. Interest was slightly higher amongst large employers (74 per cent) and employers in the public sector (70 per cent).

Overall about half (51 per cent) of all employers would be more likely (definitely or much more likely) to use the Jobcentre if one or more of these new ideas were introduced. Small to medium sized employers were slightly more likely to be persuaded to use Jobcentre type services as a result of introducing one or more of these ideas (52 per cent compared with 46 per cent of large employers) as were employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector (59 per cent).

Again all the ideas would have an impact on recruitment. The introduction of account managers would have the greatest impact, reflecting that it is one of the initiatives specifically designed to increase usage of Jobcentre type services. Over a third of employers said they would definitely use or be much more likely to use the Jobcentre as a result of the introduction of account managers. The proportion of employers who said they would definitely/be much more likely to use the Jobcentre if the other ideas were introduced were as follows:

- the provision of more information on recruits (27 per cent);
- information on employment issues (18 per cent);
- specialist advisers (18 per cent);
- specialist information on employing ONE relevant groups (17 per cent);
- childcare facilitator (16 per cent).

The survey results also indicated that the introduction of these new ideas could encourage significant additional usage of Jobcentre type services. Of the 51 per cent of employers who said they would definitely/be
much more likely to use the Jobcentre if these ideas were introduced:

- almost one-third (31 per cent) had not used the Jobcentre in the last three years. They represented over a sixth (16 per cent) of all employers. A further 23 per cent of these employers had approached the Jobcentre within the last three years, but had not actually recruited anyone. They represented a further 12 per cent of all employers;

- over three-fifths (62 per cent) said they would only be quite likely to use the Jobcentre in future (29 per cent) or would be unlikely to use it (33 per cent), in response to an earlier question before the new ideas were introduced. They represented almost a third of all employers (32 per cent, of whom 17 per cent said they would be unlikely to use the Jobcentre in future).

Just over a third (35 per cent) of employers said they would be much more likely/more likely to recruit people from ONE relevant groups if one or more of the four ideas aimed specifically at increasing ONE recruitment were introduced. These were more likely to be small employers (36 per cent compared with 30 per cent of employers with more than 25 staff) and employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector (43 per cent).

Again each of the ideas would have some impact, with the pattern of responses being similar to that described for levels of interest and impact on usage of Jobcentre type services. The provision of more information on recruits would have a slightly greater impact than the other three ideas. Just over a fifth of employers (21 per cent) said they would be much more/more likely to recruit ONE relevant groups if this idea was introduced compared with just over a sixth of employers for the other three ideas.

Again the survey results indicated that the introduction of these ideas could encourage a significantly greater proportion of employers to recruit people from ONE relevant groups. Of the 35 per cent of employers who said they would be much more/more likely to recruit ONE relevant groups if one or more of these ideas were introduced:

- over half (58 per cent) had not recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years. They represented 20 per cent of all employers;

- over a half (59 per cent) said they would only be quite likely and a further six per cent would have been unlikely to have taken on anyone from these groups, in response to an earlier question before the new ideas were introduced. They represented 21 per cent of all employers.

Conclusions

The high level of recruitment activity over the last 12 months has resulted in a tight labour market for employers. This in turn has led to an increase in the use of Jobcentres and recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups.
The survey findings confirmed our hypothesis that increasing use of Jobcentre type services among employers was critical to increasing employment opportunities for ONE relevant groups.

The survey findings also indicated that most employers would use Jobcentre type services and would be willing to take on people from ONE relevant groups. This includes not just employers who have done so already, but also a significant proportion of those who have not. Relatively few employers would definitely not recruit through Jobcentres or reject the idea of recruiting people from ONE relevant groups. However the recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups would be a rational business decision, not one based on charity or favour.

Employers who had or would take on people from ONE relevant groups also showed a general willingness to make any necessary changes to accommodate the needs of these recruits. However, behaviour to date suggested they would be much more willing to adjust the hours and provide additional training and support, than to alter the job specification, indicating that employers would only recruit someone who could do the job.

Employers’ current behaviour, attitudes and stated future intentions indicated that they would be much more likely to take on lone parents and the long-term unemployed than people with physical disabilities and particularly mental health problems. It is predominantly the largest employers (200 + employees) who offer significant potential for employing people with mental health problems.

All the ideas tested in the research were of interest and relevance to employers and would be likely to have a positive impact on their likelihood to use Jobcentres and recruit people from ONE relevant groups.

Providing employers with an account manager and more information on potential recruits were the improvements to the ONE service that would be likely to have the greatest impact.

The provision of specialist advisers and more information and advice for employers on employing people from ONE relevant groups would also be likely to impact positively on recruitment of these groups, in particular people with physical disabilities and mental health problems who will find it hardest to obtain employment.

Based on the findings of this research, we have made a number of recommendations as to how the findings could be taken forward and employers encouraged to take on more people from ONE relevant groups.

Our over-arching recommendation is that to increase employment opportunities for ONE relevant groups, the ONE service must place greater emphasis on employers and establish them as a (new) client group.
Increased marketing to, and support for, employers in particular through the introduction of the account manager concept. The provision of employment information would also improve the quality of service offered to employers, but its impact is likely to be more limited and therefore to only be worth pursuing if it can be provided cost effectively.

The sectors that offer greatest potential to increase use of Jobcentre type services and should therefore be targeted are:

- existing users who are most likely to be large employers (100+ employees) and employers in the production and retail distribution and leisure sectors. It is important to capitalise on the recent increase in use of Jobcentres in particular amongst employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector and small–medium sized employers to encourage them to become regular users of the service;
- non users – medium sized employers (25-99 employees) are the group of non users who offer most potential for increasing usage of Jobcentres.

The key messages to promote to employers about Jobcentre type services are:

- the quality of the account management– their relationship would be managed by a single contact who would be knowledgeable about their sector and skills requirements;
- that it has a large pool of (local) recruits immediately available;
- that it offers another (free) recruitment channel for them to use.

However it would be necessary to continue to address employers’ misconceptions about the (limited) range of recruits available through the Jobcentre.

Increased marketing of ONE relevant groups to, and support for, employers by:

- providing more information on potential recruits, in particular ‘softer’ information which helps to demonstrate their broader skills and attributes;
- having more specialist advisers assist people from ONE relevant groups to obtain employment and support both the client and employer during the recruitment process and early stages of employment;
- providing more information and advice to employers about employing people from these groups and the range of assistance available to them.
The sectors which offer greatest potential to recruit people from ONE relevant groups and therefore should be targeted are:

- employers who have recruited these groups in the past, to capitalise on the generally good experiences they have had. These are most likely to be larger employers and those in the public sector;
- employers who have not recruited these groups in the past, but would be willing to do so, in particular employers in the retail distribution and leisure sectors. However the largest employers (200 + employees) offer the greatest scope for recruiting people with mental health problems.

People with physical disabilities and in particular those with mental health problems will require a significantly greater share of staff resources, to reflect the greater difficulty for these groups in obtaining sustained employment.
1.1 The ONE service

The ONE service is a joint policy initiative of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), Department of Social Security (DSS), Employment Service (ES) and Benefits Agency (BA). ONE is a new way of delivering social security benefits to people of working age. It brings together the Employment Service, Benefits Agency and Local Authorities to provide a single point of entry to the benefits system and to place work, and the steps required to facilitate a return to the labour market, at the centre of the claim making process. The aim of ONE is to increase economic activity, encourage people (back) into work where possible and to provide claimants with a more integrated service that is tailored to their personal circumstances.

More specifically the objectives of ONE are to:

- put more benefit recipients in touch with the labour market through the intervention of their Personal Adviser;
- increase sustainable levels of employment by getting more benefit recipients into work;
- ensure that more clients experience an effective, efficient service that is tailored to their personal needs;
- change the culture of the benefits system and the general public towards independence and work rather than payments and financial dependence.

The ONE service was introduced between June and November 1999 in 12 pilot areas in Great Britain. Three different service models are being trialled: a basic model, a call centre model and a private/voluntary sector model1.

1.2 The ONE evaluation

A major programme of research to evaluate ONE was set up by the Department of Social Security on behalf of itself, the Department for Education and Employment, the Benefits Agency and the Employment Service. The main aims of the evaluation were to assess:

- the feasibility of delivering ONE in the different models;
- the effectiveness of the different models in improving the quantity and quality of labour market participation.

---

1 Under the basic model the Employment Service, Benefits Agency and Local Authorities work together to provide a work focused integrated claim-taking service to all those making claims to benefit in the area. Under the call centre model similar arrangements apply but clients are encouraged to make initial contact with the service by telephone, testing the latest call centre technology. Under the PVS model the private and voluntary sector organisations work with and manage the other agencies in developing innovative and flexible ways of delivering a work focused and integrated service.
The project has involved research amongst clients, staff and employers, operational research, cost-benefit analyses and a database of administrative records and statistics.

1.3 Research amongst employers

IFF Research Ltd was commissioned to undertake the research amongst employers. The main objective of this work was to examine how we can secure employers’ commitment to help a wider range of people with limited capacity to get jobs. It has not sought to evaluate ONE from the employers’ perspective, but to help inform broader policy development on engaging employers further in tackling these issues.

The research focused on three groups:

- lone parents - single parents who are entering or returning to the workforce after a period looking after their children;
- long term unemployed - people who have been unemployed for at least 12 months;
- people with physical disabilities or mental health problems.

More specifically, the research:

- examined employers’ attitudes towards and recruitment behaviour in respect of these groups;
- identified ways to help minimise the perceived ‘risks’ of employing these groups;
- identified ways to encourage employers to use the ONE service.

1.4 Methodology

The research has three component parts:

- Creative Events;
- main quantitative survey;
- qualitative research.

1.5 Creative Events

The main purpose of the Creative Events was to identify new and more effective ways of encouraging employers to take on people from groups which find it more difficult to obtain work. Given that Jobcentres are a key channel to the labour market for these groups, this work also examined ways of encouraging employers to use the ONE service (more) when recruiting.

Two Creative Events were conducted. The Creative Events used structured brainstorming and lateral thinking techniques to help participants think more broadly and creatively about the issues. Each event lasted a day and involved about 20 people from a variety of different but relevant backgrounds. Participants included small to medium sized

---

2 These groups were not defined strictly in terms of benefit status, but were chosen to represent some of the key barriers faced by ONE claimants.

3 The period of 12 months was used for research purposes only. The DfEE definition of long term unemployed is people unemployed for six months or more. Six months was not always viewed by employers as a significant period of time, so the definition was extended to 12 months.
employers, ONE staff, marketing consultants, recruitment agencies, charities/special needs advisers and DSS staff involved in ONE policy and evaluation.

1.6 Main quantitative survey

The main quantitative survey consisted of 1201 telephone interviews with employers who employed five or more staff and had recruited in the last three years. This was done to concentrate interviewing resources on the key target market, i.e. employers with some recruitment activity.

Interviews were conducted in eight of the pilot areas; two operating the basic model, two operating the call centre model and the four areas being run by private/voluntary organisations. The eight areas were selected to cover each of the model types, areas with higher and lower unemployment levels and urban and rural characteristics. In the event no significant differences by model type were found. This was to be expected as ONE was not set up to offer a significantly different service to employers.

To ensure we spoke to a cross section of employers in each area, quotas were set by size and type of employer. A quota was also set by whether or not employers had recruited from a Jobcentre in the last three years in order to examine any differences in responses between the two groups.

Results have been weighted and projected to the total business population in each of the eight areas. The results presented in this report are based on weighted data. The structure of the population across the eight pilot areas is broadly similar to the national business population.

Fieldwork took place between 1 November – 8 December 2000. The overall response rate for the survey was good, with 64 per cent of those employers with whom IFF Research had contact agreeing to be interviewed. Interviews lasted around 20 minutes on average. The main topics covered were:

- recruitment activity, including recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups and use of Jobcentres;
- attitudes toward recruiting people from ONE relevant groups;
- views of six new ideas generated from the Creative Events and whether they would have any impact on their likelihood to use the Jobcentre and/or recruit people from ONE relevant groups in future.

More detailed information on the survey methodology, response rates and sample structure are contained in Appendix A. A copy of the questionnaire is also appended.

1.7 Qualitative research

The third stage of this work will involve follow-up interviews with a small sample of employers (30) who have recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last year. Interviews will be conducted face to face and will explore in more detail experiences of recruiting and integrating
people from ONE relevant groups into the workforce and views of the new ideas tested in the main quantitative survey.

1.8 Structure of the report

This report covers the findings of the main quantitative survey. These findings are presented in the following chapters. Chapter 2 examines current recruitment activity and behaviour including the use of Jobcentres. Chapter 3 examines recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups and discusses employers’ attitudes to recruiting these types of people. Chapter 4 looks at employers’ interest in some of the new ideas generated from the Creative Events and the likely impact of these ideas on recruitment of ONE relevant groups and use of Jobcentres in future. The final chapter draws together our overall conclusions from the research and makes some recommendations about how the findings could be taken forward.

1.9 Conventions used

In this report we refer to the different sizes and types of employers as follows:

- small employers - 5-24 employees;
- medium sized employers - 25-99 employees;
- large employers - 100+ employees;
- largest employers - 200+ employees;
- production - covers employers involved in manufacturing and construction;
- retail distribution and leisure - cover employers involved in retail distribution (shops), hotels, restaurants, public houses and other catering establishments, businesses providing entertainment services such as theatres and cinemas and sports clubs and leisure centres;
- other commercial sector - all other private sector employers including those involved in wholesale distribution, communication and transport and finance and business services;
- public sector - including health, education and public administration.

The percentages in some tables may add to less than or more than 100 per cent. This is due to rounding. Tables can also add up to more than 100 per cent where respondents can give more than one answer.

The symbol * is used in tables to denote a percentage of less than 0.5 per cent.
This chapter looks at the current recruitment activities of employers interviewed in the main quantitative survey. This includes information on the number, type and occupational nature of recruits. The chapter also examines usage of the Jobcentre including how long it has been used as a method of recruitment, reasons for starting to use it and likelihood to use it in the future. The aim of this chapter is to illustrate the dynamics of the present employment market so that useful and realistic conclusions may be made about employers’ attitudes about helping a wider range of people with limited capacities to find employment.

2.1 Key findings

- Recruitment activity over the last 12 months was high, with most employers (90 per cent) having recruited one or more people in the last year.
- Just under half (47 per cent) of employers said that they had experienced difficulties in recruiting staff over the last 12 months.
- Just under half (47 per cent) of employers had recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years. A further 19 per cent had approached the Jobcentre but not actually recruited through this channel.
- Seventeen per cent of employers who recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years, used it for the first time.
- Almost two thirds (64 per cent) of employers stated they would be likely to use the Jobcentre (again) in the next two - three years. Few employers (seven per cent) completely rejected the possible use of the Jobcentre in the future.

2.2 Recruitment activity

Only those employers who had recruited in the last 3 years were interviewed. (Few employers contacted (6 per cent) failed to meet this recruitment criteria, indicating a generally healthy economy). As Table 2.1 illustrates the majority of employers interviewed (90 per cent) had recruited in the last 12 months. This proportion was higher amongst employers with 25 or more staff, almost all of whom (97 per cent) had recruited in the last 12 months. The proportion of small employers (5-24 employees) who had recruited in the same time period was significantly less, but still very high at 87 per cent.

As might be expected, the larger the employer the greater the number of people they had recruited in the last 12 months. Approaching three-quarters (70 per cent) of large employers (100+ employees) had recruited 20 or more people in the last 12 months, whilst three-quarters of small employers had recruited under 5 people in this period.

Recruitment activity also varied by sector, being highest in the retail distribution/leisure and public sectors and lower in the other commercial sector.
Table 2.1 Recruitment activity by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>5-24 (%)</th>
<th>25-99 (%)</th>
<th>100-199 (%)</th>
<th>200+ (%)</th>
<th>Production (%)</th>
<th>Retail distribution/leisure (%)</th>
<th>Other commercial (%)</th>
<th>Public sector (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recruited in last 12 months</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Recruitment difficulties

Employers were asked if they had had any difficulty in recruiting staff, ie difficulty finding people who fitted their specification or wanted to do this type of work. Overall, 47 per cent of employers had experienced recruitment difficulties over the last 12 months. As shown in Table 2.2 retail distribution and leisure and the public sectors, who were more likely to have recruited in the last 12 months, were also more likely to have experienced recruitment difficulties. Just under half (49 per cent) of employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector and just over half (54 per cent) of public sector employers felt that they had experienced recruitment difficulties, as compared with 43 per cent of employers in the other commercial sector.

These results indicate that the high demand for labour has resulted in a tight labour market for employers and skill shortages (i.e. low unemployment means there are less people looking for work).
Table 2.2  Recruitment difficulties by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any recruitment difficulties (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of establishment (no. of employees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail distribution/leisure</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Type of staff recruited

As Table 2.3 illustrates, just over half (52 per cent) of the employers across all sectors had recruited people for service based manual positions contrasting with just over a third (35 per cent) who had taken on clerical or secretarial staff. Within the sectors themselves distinct recruitment patterns could be seen.

Predictably, the production sector was most likely to have recruited skilled or unskilled manual staff (71 per cent) and the retail distribution/leisure sector service based manual staff (80 per cent). The public sector was most likely to have recruited professional, managerial or supervisory staff (57 per cent) and the other commercial sector clerical and secretarial staff (50 per cent).

Across all sectors, generally the bigger the company the more likely they were to have recruited a range of people from across different occupational groups.
Table 2.3  Type of staff recruited by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5-24 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-24 (%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99 (%)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199 (%)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+ (%)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employers recruited any staff to…

Professional, managerial or supervisory positions 41 36 49 63 73 38 31 48 57
Clerical or secretarial positions 35 31 38 63 74 37 23 50 32
Service based manual positions 52 51 56 53 69 42 80 28 40
Skilled or unskilled manual/operative positions 47 44 54 62 67 71 43 39 34

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas 1201 384 458 182 177 353 386 202 260

2.5 Use of Jobcentres

As shown in Figure 2.1, just under half (47 per cent) of all employers had recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years. A further 19 per cent of employers had also approached the Jobcentre in the last three years, but had not actually recruited anyone through this channel.

The larger the company, the more likely they were to have used and recruited from the Jobcentre. Four-fifths (80 per cent) of large employers had contacted the Jobcentre in the last three years, and 68 per cent had actually recruited through this channel. By comparison 63 per cent of small employers had contacted the Jobcentre (44 per cent had recruited through the Jobcentre and a further 19 per cent had used but not recruited through Jobcentres). The production sector was most likely to have recruited from the Jobcentre in the last three years, with just over half (53 per cent) having done so and a further 18 per cent having used but not recruited through this channel. The other commercial and public sectors were least likely to have used Jobcentres as a recruitment channel over the last three years (43 per cent and 37 per cent respectively).

Employers who had recruited any people from ONE relevant groups over the last 2-3 years were more likely to have recruited any staff into service based manual positions (58 per cent compared with 48 per cent who had not recruited people from ONE relevant groups) and skilled or unskilled manual positions (53 per cent compared with 43 per cent who had not recruited people from ONE relevant groups). As discussed more fully in Section 3.1, this reflects, at least in part, that large employers are more likely to employ these types of staff and people from ONE relevant groups.
Those employers who had experienced recruitment difficulties were also more likely to have used the Jobcentre in the last three years. Fifty-four per cent had recruited through the Jobcentre and a further 21 per cent had used but not recruited through this channel.

Of those who had recruited from the Jobcentre in the last three years, a total of 17 per cent had started to use it in the last 12 months, perhaps indicative of the increasing recruitment difficulties faced by employers (Figure 2.2). They represented eight per cent of all employers. This group were more likely to be small employers (5-24 employees), about one-fifth (20 per cent) of whom had started using it in the last year and businesses in the retail distribution and leisure sector (26 per cent).

Over a third (36) per cent of Jobcentre users had been using the service for between 2-5 years. Again they were more likely to be a small employer, 40 per cent as compared with 27 per cent of medium - large employers (25+ employees). Large employers (100+ employees) were most likely to have had the longest relationship with the Jobcentre, 62 per cent having used the Jobcentre for more than five years compared with 40 per cent of small employers.
2.7 Reasons for starting to use the Jobcentre

Employers who had first started using the Jobcentre in the last three years were asked why they had done so. The main reasons given as shown in Table 1.4 were:

- the Jobcentre was felt to be good for recruiting certain types of positions (17 per cent) or people (16 per cent). Employers in the public sector were particularly likely to feel the Jobcentre was good for recruiting for certain types of positions (31 per cent) and employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector that it was good for recruiting certain types of people (20 per cent). These reasons possibly reflect misconceptions about the (limited) range of recruits available through the Jobcentres;
- they needed to use new channels to meet their recruitment needs as other channels had proved disappointing and/or the Jobcentre was their last resort (26 per cent);
- the Jobcentre had a pool of people who were immediately available for work (23 per cent). This was particularly the case for large employers (37 per cent).
Table 2.4  Main reasons for starting to use Jobcentres in last 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reasons</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool of people immediately available</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre good for recruiting certain types of positions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre good for recruiting certain types of people</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels disappointing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last resort</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/convenient</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed to widen range of channels</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons, eg free service, used by other parts of organisation</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base = all started to recruit from Jobcentres in last 3 years</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responses add to more than 100% as some employers gave more than one reason.

2.8 Likelihood of using the Jobcentre in the next 2-3 years

As Table 2.5 shows, almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of employers said they would be likely to use the Jobcentre in the next two to three years, including 39 per cent who said they would be definitely or very likely to use the Jobcentre. This proportion was significantly higher amongst those who had used the Jobcentre in the last three years, 67 per cent said they would definitely use the Jobcentre again or be very likely to and very few (one per cent) would definitely not use it again.

Table 2.5  Likelihood of using Jobcentre in next 2-3 years by whether recruited from Jobcentre in past 3 years or experienced recruitment difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced recruitment difficulties in last 12 months</th>
<th>Recruited via Jobcentre in last 3 years</th>
<th>Not recruited via Jobcentre in last 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total likely</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas 1201 701 500 612

As shown in Table 2.6, likelihood of using the Jobcentre again in the next few years was also higher amongst large employers, employers in the production and retail distribution and leisure sectors and those experiencing recruitment difficulties. This reflects, at least in part, that
these were the groups who were most likely to have used the Jobcentre in the last three years.

Very few employers (seven per cent) completely rejected the possible use of the Jobcentre in the next few years. Even amongst those who had not used the Jobcentre before only 12 per cent would definitely not use it in future (Table 2.5).

Table 2.6  Likelihood of using Jobcentres in next 2-3 years by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Retail distribution/leisure (%)</th>
<th>Other commercial (%)</th>
<th>Public sector (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total likely</td>
<td>Total 5-24 64 (%)</td>
<td>Total 25-99 (%)</td>
<td>Total 100-199 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>20 (%)</td>
<td>19 (%)</td>
<td>25 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>17 (%)</td>
<td>17 (%)</td>
<td>24 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>25 (%)</td>
<td>27 (%)</td>
<td>20 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>19 (%)</td>
<td>21 (%)</td>
<td>14 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>9 (%)</td>
<td>10 (%)</td>
<td>8 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not</td>
<td>7 (%)</td>
<td>6 (%)</td>
<td>8 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1 (%)</td>
<td>2 (%)</td>
<td>2 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas

Note: * denotes a percentage of less than 0.5 per cent
3 ATTITUDES AND RECRUITMENT BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS ONE RELEVANT GROUPS

This chapter looks at attitudes and recruitment behaviour towards ONE relevant groups. The key groups covered in this research were:

- lone parents - single parents who are entering or returning to the workforce after a period looking after their children;
- long term unemployed - people who have been unemployed for at least 12 months;
- people with physical disabilities or mental health problems.

These groups were not defined strictly in terms of benefit status, but were chosen to represent some of the key barriers faced by ONE claimants.

The first part of this chapter examines the recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups, the type of ONE recruits employed, how they were recruited, the positions and sectors they were recruited into, whether any adjustments were made to accommodate them and employers’ satisfaction with them. It also looks at whether ONE relevant groups were recruited for the first time in the last 12 months and if so, the reasons for doing so.

The second part of the chapter looks more broadly at employers’ attitudes to recruiting ONE relevant groups. This includes perceived barriers to employing ONE relevant groups and perceptions of characteristic traits of certain groups. The final part of the chapter deals with the likelihood of employers taking on people from ONE relevant groups in the future.

3.1 Key findings

- Two-fifths (41 per cent) of employers claimed to have definitely recruited one or more people from ONE relevant groups over the last three years. A further six per cent thought they had possibly done so.
- The Jobcentre was the main recruitment channel for ONE relevant groups. Fifty-one per cent of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups, had recruited via the Jobcentre.
- A fifth (22 per cent) of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups had done so for the first time in the last 12 months. They represented nine per cent of all employers.
- Most employers (90 per cent) stated that they would be willing to take on people from ONE relevant groups in the next two - three years.
- Employers had and would be significantly more likely to take on lone parents and the long-term unemployed than people with physical disabilities and mental health problems.
This behaviour was reflected in employers' attitudes to recruiting these particular groups of people. Employers had no significant concerns about employing lone parents or the long term unemployed. However, with people who had been unemployed for a long period of time, the onus would be on the individual to prove that the reason for this period of inactivity was not because they did not want to work and that they had used the time constructively, for example to gain new skills. Employers were conscious that the term 'people with disabilities' covered a range of different types and severity of conditions. However the results of this and other research suggested that their lack of understanding of the nature of these problems and support systems meant that they were concerned about the ability of these people to undertake the required work and to integrate successfully into their workforce.

Some employers were also concerned about employing people from ONE relevant groups more generally. A fifth of employers (22 per cent) were concerned about inadvertently having problems with equal opportunities legislation and a similar proportion (23 per cent) were concerned about the impact of employing these groups on themselves and other staff.

Two-fifths of employers (41 per cent) claimed to have definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years. A further six per cent of employers thought they had possibly recruited one or more people from ONE relevant groups. As shown in Table 3.1 large employers and those in the public sector were more likely to have definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups.

Table 3.1 Recruitment of ONE relevant groups by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no. of employees)</th>
<th>Any definitely recruited (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 99</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 – 199</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Any definitely recruited (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail distribution</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas

3.2 Recruitment of ONE relevant groups
Those employers who had definitely recruited people from ONE relevant groups were also more likely to have:

- an equal opportunities policy, 74 per cent compared with 64 per cent who had not recruited ONE relevant groups;
- staff representation e.g. union, staff association or works council at their establishment, 26 per cent compared with 18 per cent who had not recruited ONE relevant groups;
- participated in Government employment schemes e.g. New Deal, 30 per cent compared with 20 per cent who had not recruited ONE relevant groups.

However the above findings reflect the fact that large employers, who were more likely to have recruited ONE relevant groups, were also more likely to have these types of human resources practices at their establishment.

3.3 Number of people from ONE relevant groups recruited

Half (52 per cent) of those who had recruited ONE relevant groups in the last 12 months had recruited only one recruit. On the other hand, it can be viewed that half took more than one person from ONE relevant groups, with a fifth (21 per cent) taking on more than three, suggesting that employers were not simply taking on a ‘token’ ‘disadvantaged’ employee. Again the larger the establishment, the more ONE recruits they were likely to have taken on. Half (50 per cent) of the large employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups took on three or more recruits. Employers in the public sector were more likely than other sectors to take on more than one person from ONE relevant groups. Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of public sector employers who had recruited people from ONE relevant groups recruited two or more people. Employers in the production sector were the least likely to have taken on multiple recruits from ONE relevant groups, with 62 per cent taking on a single recruit from these groups.
Table 3.2 Number of people from ONE relevant groups recruited in last 3 years by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Retail distribution/Other</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * denotes % less than 0.5

3.4 When first recruited ONE relevant groups

A fifth (22 per cent) of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups (nine per cent of employers overall) had recruited them for the first time in the last 12 months. These were more likely to be small employers (28 per cent), employers in the other commercial sector (33 per cent) and those employers who had started using the Jobcentre for the first time in the last 12 months (39 per cent).

When asked why they had started to recruit people from ONE relevant groups, the main reason given, by 83 per cent of these employers, was that they were the best person for the job. A further eight per cent of employers said they were recommended by other staff. A sixth of employers (16 per cent) said they were starting or expanding their business and needed more staff immediately. However only one per cent of employers said they had decided to recruit ONE relevant groups because they were approached by the Government or a charity. These findings suggest that employers are making a rational business decision to take on these people not based on charity or favour. However given the tight labour market conditions it is possible that employers are having to compromise on their requirements to obtain new recruits.

3.5 Recruitment channels for ONE relevant groups

The Jobcentre was the main recruitment channel for ONE relevant groups. About half (51 per cent) of employers who had recruited people from ONE relevant groups had recruited through the Jobcentre. The other frequently mentioned channels were advertisements (19 per cent) and word of mouth (18 per cent). Other channels used included recruitment agencies (six per cent) and speculative enquiries (two per cent).

3.6 Positions ONE relevant groups have been recruited into

All employers who (definitely) recruited at least one person from ONE relevant groups were asked whether these recruits were replacements for other staff who had left or whether they were new/additional positions. As shown in Figure 3.1 the majority (52 per cent) of employers who
took on people from ONE relevant groups recruited them into replacement positions. This compares with a third (33 per cent) who recruited them into new or additional positions and 15 per cent who recruited ONE relevant groups into both new and replacement positions. Small employers and those in the production sector were most likely to have recruited ONE relevant groups into new/additional positions, (38 per cent and 49 per cent respectively). Large employers were also more likely to have recruited people from ONE relevant groups into both new/additional positions and replacement positions (33 per cent). The relatively high proportion of employers recruiting people from ONE relevant groups into new or additional positions is another indicator of healthy economic conditions and a tight labour market. As discussed above, about one in six employers (16 per cent) who had taken on people from ONE relevant groups in the last 12 months had done so because they were starting/expanding their business and needed new staff immediately.

Figure 3.1 Types of positions ONE relevant groups recruited into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New/additional</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All recruited ONE client groups (650)

3.7 Satisfaction with ONE relevant groups

Three-quarters of employers who had taken on people from ONE relevant groups in the last year were satisfied with their performance (40 per cent were very satisfied and 35 per cent quite satisfied). There were no significant differences in satisfaction between different types or sizes of employer. Fewer than one in ten employers (eight per cent) were dissatisfied with the recruits they had taken on from ONE relevant groups. The sample base was small (50 respondents) so results need to be treated as indicative only, but the main reasons for dissatisfaction with recruits from ONE relevant groups were:

- poor attendance;
- could not cope with job and left;
- not willing to work/lazy;
- childcare problems;
- difficulty settling in/adjusting.
As shown in Table 3.3, employers were most likely to have recruited lone parents (27 per cent) and a fifth had recruited long term unemployed people. However the proportion recruiting people with physical disabilities and in particular people with mental health problems was much lower (eight per cent and five per cent respectively). It was only the largest employers (200+ employees) who were likely to take on a significant number of recruits from these groups. Thirty per cent of the largest employers had taken on people with physical disabilities and 11 per cent people with mental health problems. These findings are confirmed in research on New Deal for the Disabled, which showed that larger employers had the systems and support in place to take on these groups and viewed it as a challenge. Smaller employers, although they claimed they would not discriminate against these groups, were much more wary of the risks involved in taking on these types of recruits.  

Table 3.3  Types of ONE relevant groups recruited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Retail distribution/leisure (%)</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other commercial (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>100-199 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td></td>
<td>200+ (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Production (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any definitely recruited in last 3 years</td>
<td>41 (41)</td>
<td>35 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parents</td>
<td>27 (27)</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term unemployed people with physical disabilities</td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term unemployed people with mental health problems</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with mental health problems</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas: 1201 384 458 182 177 353 386 202 260

Note: Table adds to more than 100 per cent as some employers had recruited people from more than one group.

Six out of ten respondents who had taken on ONE relevant groups had made some sort of adjustment to their working arrangements to accommodate these people. There were no significant differences between the size and type of employers who had made changes. The most common

3.9 Adjustments to accommodate ONE relevant groups

adjustments made to working arrangements were:

- adjusting the working hours (35 per cent allowed more flexible hours and 19 per cent changed the job from full time to part time);
- providing additional or different training (24 per cent) or support (11 per cent providing a mentor or introducing a mentoring system).

Other changes are shown in Table 3.4. Fewer than one in ten employers had changed the job specification to accommodate people from these groups. Few employers had purchased special equipment or adapted equipment or made physical changes to their building to accommodate people with physical disabilities.

**Table 3.4 Adjustments made to accommodate ONE relevant groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustments made</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers made any adjustments</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexible hours</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional / different training</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed hours from full to part time</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job sharing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to job specification</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced / allowed home working</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased special equipment / adapted equipment*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical changes to building*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base = all recruiting ONE relevant groups</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (i) Table adds to more than 100% as some employers made more than one type of change  
(ii) * only asked if recruited people with physical disabilities

Large employers and employers in the public sector were likely to have made the widest range of adjustments to accommodate people from ONE relevant groups. For example, these employers were more likely to have changed the working hours (63 per cent of the large employers had made these changes and 68 per cent of public sector employers) and to have provided mentoring (24 per cent of large employers and 20 per cent of public sector employers).

Those employers employing lone parents were also more likely to have made changes to the working hours (70 per cent).
Those employing people with physical disabilities and mental health problems were more likely to have:

- provided additional/different training (35 per cent of those taking on people with physical disabilities and 41 per cent of those taking on people with mental health problems);
- provided mentoring (15 per cent and 14 per cent respectively);
- made changes to the job specification (18 per cent and 15 per cent respectively).

However the above figures reflect the fact that the employers who were more likely to make these changes were the large employers, who were the most likely to take on people with physical disabilities and mental health problems.

The study also examined employers’ willingness to take on (more) people from ONE relevant groups in the future.

As shown in Table 3.5, most employers (90 per cent) stated that they would be very or quite likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in the next 2-3 years, with a third (32 per cent) saying they would be very likely.

This was significantly higher than the proportion of employers who have recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the past (41 per cent claimed to have (definitely) recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years). It suggests that employers would not discriminate against these groups, but would take them on if they were ‘the best person for the job’.

Willingness to take on people from ONE relevant groups was higher amongst large employers. Just over half (51 per cent) of large employers stated that they would be very likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in future, compared to under a third of small employers (29 per cent). Employers in the retail distribution and leisure and public sectors were also more willing to recruit these groups. About two-fifths of employers in each of these groups said they would be very likely to recruit these types of people in future.
Table 3.5  Likelihood of taking on ONE relevant groups in next 2-3 year by size and type of employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment size (no of employees)</th>
<th>Total very/ quite likely (%)</th>
<th>5-24 (%)</th>
<th>25-99 (%)</th>
<th>100-199 (%)</th>
<th>200+ (%)</th>
<th>Production (%)</th>
<th>Sector Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 shows that the proportion of employers likely to recruit people from ONE relevant groups in the future was also higher amongst those who had recruited through Jobcentres in the last three years. Thirty-nine per cent of these employers would be very likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in future compared with 24 per cent of employers who had not recruited through the Jobcentres in the last three years. These results suggest that encouraging employers to use the Jobcentres as a recruitment channel is an important first step to encouraging employers to take on more people from ONE relevant groups.

Almost all employers (96 per cent) who had taken on people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years would be likely to take on more people in future; half (49 per cent) would be very likely to take on more. This positive attitude is likely to reflect the high levels of satisfaction with ONE relevant groups recruited in the past. Encouragingly, even a fifth of employers who had not recruited people from ONE relevant groups before, said they would be very likely to start recruiting them in future.
Table 3.6 Likelihood to take on ONE relevant groups in next 2-3 year by use of Jobcentres and previous recruitment of ONE relevant groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Recruited via Jobcentre in last 3 years (%)</th>
<th>Not recruited via Jobcentre in last 3 years (%)</th>
<th>Recruited ONE relevant groups in last 3 years (%)</th>
<th>Not recruited ONE relevant groups in last 3 years (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total very/quite likely</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = all employers in 8 pilot areas
1201 701 500 650 551

Note: * denotes % less than 0.5

As shown in Figure 3.2 there was a significant difference in employers’ willingness to take on the different types of ONE relevant groups. The pattern was similar to recruitment of these groups over the last three years. Employers stated they would be most likely to recruit lone parents. Eighty-eight per cent of employers who would be willing to take on any people from ONE relevant groups would be willing to take on lone parents, 27 per cent would be very willing to recruit this group in future. Employers were least likely to recruit people with physical disabilities and mental health problems. Sixty-two per cent and 37 per cent of employers respectively would be likely to take on these groups in future, but only one in ten (nine per cent) would be very likely to take on people with physical disabilities and only four per cent people with mental health problems.

Figure 3.2 Likelihood of taking on ONE relevant groups in next 2-3 years
Again it was only the largest employers who showed a significant likelihood to take on people with physical disabilities and, in particular, people with mental health problems (22 per cent and 17 per cent of the largest employers respectively would be very likely to take on these groups). Employers who said they were likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in the next 2-3 years were asked how willing they would be to make changes to their building or working arrangements to accommodate these people.

As shown in Figure 3.3, most employers who said they would be likely to take on people from ONE relevant groups in future were willing to make changes to accommodate them (83 per cent). Over a third (37 per cent) of employers said they would definitely make any necessary changes. This proportion was highest amongst the largest employers (200+ employers), where almost half (47 per cent) would definitely make any necessary changes and the public sector (43 per cent) and retail distribution and leisure sectors (40 per cent).

**Figure 3.3 Likelihood of making adjustments to accommodate ONE relevant groups**

As illustrated in Figure 3.3 there was no statistically significant difference in employers’ willingness to make these changes amongst employers likely to recruit the different groups, with employers who were likely to take on people with mental health problems being as willing to make any necessary changes as those who would take on lone parents. These results reflect the fact that the employers most likely to take on people with physical disabilities and mental health problems were the largest employers, who were most likely to have the necessary systems and support structures to accommodate the extra demands that recruiting these groups might place on them.

The exception to this pattern was the long term unemployed. Only 61 per cent of employers likely to take on these recruits in future would be willing to make any changes necessary to accommodate them. However, we consider that this probably reflects a lack of awareness of what extra support this group might require rather than less willingness per se.
3.13 Attitudes to recruiting ONE relevant groups

Having discussed employers’ current and future recruitment behaviour with respect to people from ONE relevant groups, the remainder of this chapter examines their attitudes to employing these groups which underlie this behaviour. Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about employing people from ONE relevant groups generally and each of the groups specifically. These statements were mainly developed from comments made by participants in the Creative Events (Stage One of this study).

Figures 3.4 - 3.8 show the proportion of employers who agreed and disagreed slightly or strongly with each statement. Some employers did not express views either way or felt unable to answer some of the statements, so the percentages do not add up to 100 per cent. It is worth noting that employers’ responses to all these statements were generally ‘politically correct’. Therefore in interpreting these findings, we look most closely at the proportion of employers who expressed strong views either way.

3.13.1 Attitudes to recruiting ONE relevant groups generally

Only a fifth (22 per cent) of employers in the main quantitative survey (Figure 3.4) agreed with the statement ‘we would be concerned that employing people like this might mean we inadvertently have problems with equal opportunities legislation’ and only four per cent strongly agreed. However, only 30 per cent strongly disagreed with this statement, suggesting that it is a slight worry for many employers. It was also likely to be of more concern to small employers, 23 per cent agreed with this statement compared to only six per cent of the largest employers and only 27 per cent of small employers strongly disagreed with this statement compared to 39 per cent of the largest employers. This may be because they felt they were less aware of the legislation in this area.

Research on New Deal for Disabled People\(^5\) also supports the view that concerns about inadvertently having problems with equal opportunities legislation is a barrier to taking on people from ONE relevant groups.

Survey findings were similar for the statement ‘line managers would be concerned about the impact on themselves and other staff if we were to employ people from these groups’. Again, whilst only about a fifth (23 per cent) of employers agreed with this statement, only just over a third strongly disagreed (37 per cent). It was particularly a concern amongst employers in the production sector, 30 per cent of whom agreed with the statement, whilst only about a quarter (27 per cent) strongly disagreed. Large employers were slightly, but significantly, more likely to agree with the statement (29 per cent compared with 22 per cent of employers with fewer than 100 staff), but the proportions who strongly disagreed with the statement were similar (36 per cent and 35 per cent respectively).

The interim findings from the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation similarly supports the view that employers were concerned about the reactions, of members of staff and customers, to employees who were disabled.

**Figure 3.4 Attitudes to recruiting ONE relevant groups**

Most employers were of the view that ‘the problems of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally’. As shown in Figure 3.5 almost three-quarters of employers (72 per cent) agreed with this statement and 45 per cent agreed strongly. The proportion was slightly higher amongst employers who had recruited lone parents (51 per cent of these employers strongly agreed with the statement).

Most employers disagreed that lone parents entering or returning to the workplace after a period looking after their children would have less skills or skills that were less up to date than other recruits. Eighty-three per cent of employers disagreed with this statement and over half (54 per cent) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 3.5 Attitudes to recruiting lone parents**

As shown in Figure 3.6, employers had mixed views about whether ‘people who had been unemployed for more than 12 months will put in more effort and be more enthusiastic about work as they have not had a job for a long time’. Relatively few employers expressed strong agreement (10 per cent)
or disagreement (15 per cent) with this statement. These results suggest employers felt it was down to the individual, with some responding in this way and others not.

However, most employers (72 per cent) disagreed that people who had been unemployed for 12 months or more were just not really interested in working, with just under half (46 per cent) strongly disagreeing with this view. Small employers (21 per cent) and those in the production sector (25 per cent) and retail distribution and leisure (22 per cent) were slightly more likely to agree with this statement.

Over two-thirds of employers (69 per cent) agreed with the statement that ‘I’d be just as likely to take on someone who has been unemployed for more than two years as more than 12 months’. Less than a fifth of employers (19 per cent) disagreed with the statement at all. We consider that this may be because the gap between one year and two years is not that great and that employers might make a distinction between people unemployed for relatively short amounts of time, ie up to three to six months, and those unemployed for two years or more. The onus would be on the individual to show that the reason they had not worked for two years was not because they did not want to work and they had used the time constructively, for example to gain new skills. Employers might also be concerned that it might take these people a while to readjust to working again.

**Figure 3.6 Attitudes to recruiting long term unemployed**

As shown in Figure 3.7, three-fifths (61 per cent) of employers strongly disagreed with the statement ‘When I think of people with disabilities, I think of wheelchairs, not people with less severe physical disabilities or mental health problems’. These results suggest that, where employers thought about it (and most respondents considered the statements carefully before responding), they were aware of the range of conditions covered by the term ‘people with disabilities’. These findings were also supported by the results of the study on New Deal for Disabled People⁶.

---

Most employers agreed (81 per cent) with the statement ‘Coping with their physical disabilities or mental health problems gives many of these people a strong will to succeed’. Over two-fifths of employers (43 per cent) strongly agreed with the statement, whilst few disagreed with it (six per cent). However, those employers who had recruited people with physical disabilities over the last three years were more likely to agree with this statement than those who recruited people with mental health problems, 89 per cent compared with 74 per cent.

Finally, about half (51 per cent) of employers agreed with the statement ‘I would be less concerned about employing someone with a physical disability than those with mental health problems’. Comments made by participants at the Creative Events suggested that employers felt they better understood the nature of physical disabilities and the impact this might have on these peoples’ ability to undertake the work would be more constant and predictable.

However, less than a fifth of employers (18 per cent) strongly agreed with this statement suggesting that employers are not confident that they fully understood the nature of physical or mental health problems and are concerned about the ability of these people to undertake the required work, as evidenced by the relatively low proportion of employers who have or would be likely to recruit either group.

Figure 3.7  Attitudes to recruiting people with physical disabilities or mental health problems

[Diagram showing percentage distribution of attitudes:]

- Think severe physical not less severe or mental: 61% (Disagree strongly), 24% (Agree slightly), 11% (Agree strongly), 2% (Disagree slightly).
- Strong will to succeed: 2% (Disagree strongly), 43% (Agree strongly).
- Prefer to employ physically disabled rather than mental health problems: 9% (Disagree strongly), 14% (Agree slightly), 33% (Agree strongly), 18% (Disagree slightly).

Base: All employers in 8 pilot areas (1201)
4 **INTEREST AND IMPACT OF NEW IDEAS FOR ENCOURAGING EMPLOYERS TO EMPLOY MORE PEOPLE FROM ONE RELEVANT GROUPS**

The Creative Events generated a number of new idea concepts. These ideas were aimed at both encouraging employers to use the ONE service as a recruitment channel and to take on (more) people from ONE relevant groups, by minimising some of the perceived risks involved in recruiting these types of people.\(^7\) As ONE focuses on encouraging benefit recipients (back) into work wherever possible, the service will need to develop ways to engage employers as the Jobcentre will be a key route for (re)entry into the workplace. Increasing the proportion of recruitment via a Jobcentre type service was therefore seen as an important step to increasing the opportunities for people from ONE relevant groups to obtain work.

It is worth noting that the ideas generated and tested in the research were idea concepts and not fully developed models. A number of the ideas generated also overlapped with each other or already existed, at least to some extent.

Six of the ideas generated were tested in the main quantitative survey to determine if they were of interest and relevance to employers and would impact on their likelihood to use a Jobcentre type service and/or recruit people from ONE relevant groups. These six ideas were selected for testing on the basis that they were:

- thought likely to have the greatest impact;
- in keeping with DSS/DfEE policy; and/or
- already available to some extent, which would reduce the work necessary to develop the concept and implement it across a broader range of clients.

Of the six ideas tested, two were aimed at encouraging employers to use Jobcentre type services (more). The other four were aimed more specifically at encouraging employers to take on people from ONE relevant

---

\(^7\) A number of these risk factors were explored in research on New Deal for Young People- New Deal for Young people: Striking a deal with employers: Findings from a Qualitative Study Amongst Employers, Report ESR36, January 2000.
The description of the six ideas given to respondents was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment information</td>
<td>Expanding the functions of the Jobcentre to provide more information and advice for employers on all aspects of human resource management and development, for example legislative requirements, health and safety, reward schemes, training. The information and advice would be made available through a variety of media such as telephone help lines, websites and seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account manager</td>
<td>All employers contacting the Jobcentre would be directed towards an adviser with specialist knowledge of business and staffing issues in the relevant business sector. This person could then become their first point of contact for all future discussions and contacts with the Jobcentre and aim to build up a good understanding of their business and staffing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist advisers</td>
<td>Introducing Personal Advisers specialising in assisting people with particular types of difficulty. These Personal Advisers would provide additional support to new recruits and their employers both before employment commenced and on an ongoing basis for up to six months. They would be able to advise employers thinking about employing certain groups of people and ensure that employees are well prepared for and knowledgeable about what they would be expected to do in their workplace. The Personal Advisers could also be on hand to help sort out any initial problems and provide additional support and training for new recruits in the early weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information on recruits</td>
<td>Employers would receive more detailed information about potential new recruits. As well as details about their qualifications and experience, it would include ‘softer’ information about their wider achievements and interests, to demonstrate key attributes they might have such as commitment, strong sense of responsibility, good timekeeping etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist advice on employing ONE relevant groups</td>
<td>Jobcentres would provide more information and advice for employers about employing harder to place groups. The emphasis here would be on the practicalities such as user friendly checklists for employers about what they need to know and do and information on the range of extra support and assistance including financial support that is available for employers who recruit these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare facilitator</td>
<td>This would be a centralised information service which would direct lone parents needing emergency, same day childcare support towards the provider who would best be able to assist them. It would aim to minimise disruption caused to employers by their employees having to miss work because of childcare problems. The service would be free, but lone parents or their employers would be expected to pay for the provision themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Key findings

All of the six ideas tested in the research were of interest to employers and likely to have a positive impact on use of Jobcentre type services and recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups.

- Almost all employers (97 per cent) were interested in at least one of the ideas, with over half of all employers saying they were quite/very interested in each of the ideas.
- Almost half (51 per cent) of employers stated they would be much more likely/definitely more likely to use Jobcentre type services if one or more of these new ideas were introduced.
- Over a third (35 per cent) of employers stated they would be much more likely/more likely to recruit people from ONE relevant groups if one or more of these new ideas were introduced.
- The ideas likely to have the most impact were the account manager and providing more information on recruits.
- Having specialist advisers and providing more specialist information on employing ONE relevant groups would also have a significant impact, particularly on recruitment of people with physical disabilities or mental health problems.
- Providing information on employment issues and the childcare facilitator were the ideas which would have least impact.

4.2 Interest in the new ideas

Employers were first asked whether they would be interested in each of the ideas. Figure 4.1 shows the proportion of employers who were very or quite interested in each of the ideas and those who were not interested. (This latter group includes employers who said they were either not very interested or not at all interested in each of the ideas).

![Figure 4.1 Interest in new ideas](image)

Almost all employers (97 per cent) expressed interest in at least one idea. The small minority of employers who were not interested in any of the ideas attributed this to the fact that they did not feel the Jobcentre was a suitable recruitment channel for them and/or they did not have suitable positions for people from ONE relevant groups or that they had had a poor experience when using the Jobcentre in the past.
All the new ideas generated a high level of interest with over half of employers saying they were quite/very interested in each idea. The ideas which generated most interest were the account manager and being given more information on potential recruits.

The majority (85 per cent) of employers were interested in the idea of the account manager with half saying they were very interested. This reflects wider business behaviour and preferences, with most business people having a named individual who manages their relationship with their key suppliers. This finding is also supported by the results of a study entitled Employers as Customers conducted by the Employment Service, which showed that employers felt that lack of knowledge of the labour market and their more specific business and skills requirements was the major weakness of the service provided by the Jobcentre and the key area where they would like to see improvement.

The majority of employers were also interested in being given more information about potential recruits. Overall 87 per cent of employers expressed interest in this idea with just under half (47 per cent) saying they were very interested. The results of other evaluation work on ONE amongst claimants suggested that they would also welcome this idea. Some people, particularly those claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance did not feel that employers were given sufficient information about them to demonstrate their skills and aptitude.

There was also significant interest in the ideas of the specialist adviser and providing more specialist advice for employers on employing people from ONE relevant groups. Sixty-nine per cent and 79 per cent of employers respectively expressed interest in these ideas with about a fifth claiming to be very interested. Interest was slightly higher amongst large employers, with 77 per cent and 86 per cent respectively expressing interest.

Other research on New Deal supports these findings. Research amongst employers on New Deal for Young People found that follow-up information and support for employers was very variable. A key conclusion of this research was that ‘no employer centred equivalent to the Personal Adviser exists to ensure employer needs are consistently met and more work is needed to establish an effective partnership with employers’. The research on New Deal for Disabled People found that the support that employers expected from the Personal Adviser Service included good matching of the individual to the post, guidance on what particular help and support

---

10 New Deal for Young People: Striking a deal with Employers, Findings from a Qualitative Study Amongst Employers, Report ESR36, January 2000.
this person required and access to support for specialist equipment and training. The level of service provided did not always match employers’ expectations with some complaining that Personal Advisers were not sufficiently informed or proactive in these areas.

Research from other parts of the ONE evaluation also supports this idea. The work on the Delivery Evaluation conducted to date by the Tavistock Institute\(^\text{11}\) found that the Personal Advisers lacked the specialist knowledge and expertise to help the more difficult cases and were not always aware or making sufficient use of the extended networks/partnerships and other support mechanisms available. They concluded that this was a significant limiting factor on the effectiveness of ONE.

Three-quarters of employers (75 per cent) expressed interest in the idea that the Jobcentre provide more information on employment issues, with almost a quarter (24 per cent) saying they would be very interested. Small-medium sized employers were slightly more likely to be interested in this idea (76 per cent compared with 71 per cent of large employers).

The idea that generated the least interest was the childcare facilitator. Under two-thirds of employers (62 per cent) expressed any interest in this idea, with over a third (35 per cent) rejecting it. Interest was slightly higher amongst large employers (74 per cent) and employers in the public sector (70 per cent). As discussed earlier in Chapter 3, employers did not consider childcare issues to be a significantly greater problem for lone parents than parents with young children generally. These results suggested that employers felt childcare issues were largely the employees’ problem and that this measure might therefore be of greater benefit to lone parents directly.

Respondents who expressed interest in each of the ideas were then asked if it would have any impact on their likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment channel. Figure 4.2 shows the proportion of all employers who said they would definitely or be much more likely to use the Jobcentre if this new service was introduced, those who would be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre and those for whom it would make no difference.

\(^{11}\) ONE in Action: Interim findings from the case studies and staff research, DSS In-house research report, forthcoming, July 2001.
Overall about half (51 per cent) of all employers would be more likely (definitely or much more likely) to use the Jobcentre if one or more of these new ideas were introduced. Small to medium sized employers were slightly more likely to be persuaded to use a Jobcentre type service as a result of introducing one or more of these ideas (52 per cent compared with 46 per cent of large employers) as were employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector (59 per cent).

Again all the ideas would have an impact on recruitment. The introduction of account managers would have the greatest impact, reflecting that it is one of the initiatives specifically designed to increase usage of a Jobcentre type service. Over a third of employers said they would definitely use or be much more likely to use a Jobcentre type service as result of the introduction of account managers.

The provision of more information on recruits will also have a significant impact on usage of Jobcentre type services with over a quarter of employers (27 per cent) saying they would definitely/be more likely to use the Jobcentre if this idea were introduced.

Just under a fifth of employers claimed they would definitely or be much more likely to use the Jobcentre if specialist advisers were introduced or more specialist information was made available on ONE recruits. This proportion was higher amongst employers in the retail distribution and leisure and public sectors. Amongst employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector 27 per cent would definitely/be more likely to use the Jobcentre if specialist advisers were introduced and 37 per cent if more specialist information was available. Amongst public sector employers the proportions were 23 per cent and 30 per cent respectively.

The provision of information on employment issues and the childcare facilitator would have least impact on usage of Jobcentre type services.
As discussed above about half (51 per cent) of employers said they would definitely/be much more likely to use the Jobcentre as a result of the introduction of one or more of these ideas. However it was also important to examine the extent to which these employers were already using the Jobcentre and whether the new services would encourage more employers to use Jobcentre type services.

The results of this analysis suggested that the introduction of these new ideas could encourage significant additional usage of Jobcentre type services. Of the 51 per cent of employers who said they would definitely/be much more likely to use the Jobcentre if these ideas were introduced:

- almost one-third (31 per cent) had not used the Jobcentre in the last three years. They represent over a sixth (16 per cent) of all employers.
  A further 23 per cent of these employers had approached the Jobcentre in the last three years, but not actually recruited anyone. They represented a further 12 per cent of all employers;
- thirty-eight per cent had already said they would definitely or be very likely to use the Jobcentre in future (in response to an earlier question before the new ideas were introduced). However over three-fifths (62 per cent) of these employers said they would only be quite likely to use the Jobcentre in future (29 per cent) or would be unlikely to use it (33 per cent). They represented almost a third of all employers (32 per cent, of whom 17 per cent said they would be unlikely to use the Jobcentre in future).

Those employers who expressed interest in the four ideas (specialist adviser, more information on recruits, specialist advice on employing ONE clients and childcare facilitator) aimed specifically at encouraging employers to recruit ONE relevant groups were also asked if the introduction of these ideas would make them more likely to take on people from these groups. Figure 4.3 shows the proportion of employers who claimed they would be much more likely/more likely to do so, those who would be a little more likely and those for whom it would make no difference.

Just over a third (35 per cent) of employers said they would be much more likely/more likely to recruit people from ONE relevant groups if one or more of these ideas were introduced. These were more likely to be small employers (36 per cent compared with 30 per cent of employers with more than 25 staff) and employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector (43 per cent).
Again each of the ideas would have some impact with the pattern of responses being similar to that described for levels of interest and impact on Jobcentre usage. The provision of more information on recruits would have a slightly greater impact than the other three ideas. Just over a fifth of employers (21 per cent) said they would be much more/more likely to recruit ONE relevant groups if this idea was introduced compared with just over a sixth of employers for the other three ideas.

More detailed analysis of the results has shown that the introduction of these ideas could encourage a significantly greater proportion of employers to recruit people from ONE relevant groups. Of the 35 per cent of employers who said they would be much more/more likely to recruit ONE relevant groups if one or more of these ideas were introduced:

- over half (58 per cent) had not recruited people from ONE relevant groups in the last three years. They represented 20 per cent of all employers;
- about two-fifths (38 per cent) had already said they would be very likely to take them on in future (in response to an earlier question before the new ideas were introduced). However over a half (53 per cent) only said they would be quite likely and a further six per cent would have been unlikely to have taken on anyone from these groups. They represented 21 per cent of all employers.
In this chapter we set out our main conclusions from the research and recommendations for how these findings could be taken forward.

5.1 Current recruitment activity

The majority of employers (90 per cent) had recruited one or more people in the last 12 months. This high level of recruitment activity has resulted in a tight labour market for employers with 47 per cent reporting that they had experienced recruitment difficulties in the last 12 months. (Low unemployment means there are fewer people looking for work). This has led to increased use of Jobcentres (with eight per cent of employers having used this recruitment channel for the first time in the last 12 months) and recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups (nine per cent of employers had recruited people from ONE relevant groups for the first time in the last two-three years. It will be important for the ONE service to capitalise on this recent increase in the number of employers using Jobcentres and recruiting from ONE relevant groups for the first time, by actively encouraging them to do so again.

The survey findings also confirmed our hypothesis that increasing the use of a Jobcentre type service was critical to increasing employment opportunities for ONE relevant groups. Half (51 per cent) of employers who had recruited ONE relevant groups used the Jobcentre.

5.1.1 In principle, will employers use Jobcentre type services and take on people from ONE relevant groups?

The survey findings indicated that employers would use Jobcentre type services and would be willing to take on people from ONE relevant groups.

A high proportion of employers (47 per cent) already used Jobcentres and most of these would be likely to use them again in future. Even amongst those employers who had never used the Jobcentre before, only a relatively small proportion (12 per cent) would definitely not recruit through this channel.

Most employers would be willing, in principle, to recruit ONE relevant groups. The survey results suggest that this would be a rational business decision, not one based on charity or favour. Most employers who had recruited people from ONE relevant groups for the first time over the last three years, stated it was because they were the best person for the job. This finding must, however, be taken in the context of the current tight labour market for employers. With 47 per cent of employers experiencing recruitment difficulties, it would be reasonable to infer that the best person for the job now may not be the best person for the job in times of high labour supply (that is, they may not be the best person for the job if there were a greater supply of available and suitable workers to choose from).
Those sectors which offer greatest potential to increase usage of a Jobcentre type service include existing users, who are most likely to be large employers and employers in the production and retail distribution and leisure sectors, and non users, of which medium sized employers (25-99 employees) offer the most potential to generate new users.

A high proportion of employers (41 per cent) had already recruited people from ONE relevant groups and most of these would do so again in future, reflecting the high levels of satisfaction with recruits taken on so far. Even amongst employers who had not taken on people from ONE relevant groups before, a fifth (20 per cent) would be willing to do so in future.

Employers who had or would take on people from ONE relevant groups also showed a general willingness to make any necessary changes to accommodate the needs of these recruits. However, behaviour to date suggests they would be much more willing to adjust the hours and provide additional training and support, than to alter the job specification, reflecting the point made earlier that employers would only recruit someone who could do the job. Few would also be willing to make physical changes to their buildings.

There were also some concerns about employing people from ONE relevant groups more generally. Some employers were concerned that they may inadvertently fall foul of equal opportunities legislation and about the impact on other staff.

Those sectors which offer greatest potential to increase the recruitment of people from ONE relevant groups include employers who have recruited these groups in the past, who are most likely to be large employers and those in the public sector, and those who have not recruited these groups in the past, but would be willing to do so, in particular employers in the retail distribution and leisure sectors. For people with mental health problems the largest employers (200+ employees) are the key group to approach.

Employers’ current behaviour and stated future intentions indicated that they would be much more likely to take on lone parents or the long term unemployed than people with physical disabilities and particularly mental health problems.

Employers have been and would be most likely to take on lone parents. Whilst they were concerned about childcare issues, they recognised that these were not significantly greater than they would be for any parents with young children. There were also no serious barriers to employing the long term unemployed, provided they were willing to work and could demonstrate that there were good reasons why they had not been in employment for a while and they had used this time constructively.
Employers would be much less willing to employ people with physical disabilities and, in particular, mental health problems. Other research confirms that whilst smaller employers would not discriminate against these groups, it is only the larger employers who have the structures and support systems necessary to smoothly integrate these people into the workforce. It is predominantly the largest employers (200+ employees) who offer significant potential for employing people with mental health problems.

All the ideas tested in the research were of interest and relevance to employers and would be likely to have a positive impact on their likelihood to use Jobcentre type services and recruit people from ONE relevant groups.

The provision of specialist advisers and more information and advice for employers on employing people from ONE relevant groups would also be likely to impact positively on recruitment of these groups, by helping to address some of the concerns and difficulties employers might face in recruiting these groups and integrating them into the workforce. This type of provision exists to some extent already (for example Disability Employment Advisers) and would be of particular benefit and relevance to people with physical disabilities and mental health problems who would find it hardest to obtain employment.

The idea of the childcare facilitator was of much less appeal to employers and would have less impact on recruitment of lone parents. This may well reflect that employers saw few specific barriers to employing lone parents and that this measure was seen as being of more benefit to the lone parent than employer.

Providing employers with information on employment issues would not have a direct impact on recruitment of ONE relevant groups, but it may help to increase usage of Jobcentre type services by increasing the quality of service offered to employers.

Based on the findings of this research, we have made a number of recommendations as to how the findings could be taken forward and employers encouraged to take on more people from ONE relevant groups.

Our over-arching recommendation is that to increase employment opportunities for ONE relevant groups, the ONE service must place greater emphasis on employers and establish them as a (new) client group.

5.1.3 How can we encourage employers to recruit (more) people from ONE relevant groups?

5.2 Suggestions for policy development
We make a number of more specific suggestions about how this can be achieved as follows:

- Increased marketing to, and support for, employers in particular through the introduction of the account manager concept. The provision of employment information would also improve the quality of service offered to employers, but its impact is likely to be more limited and therefore to only be worth pursuing if it can be provided cost effectively.

- The sectors that offer greatest potential to increase use of a Jobcentre type service and which should therefore be targeted are:
  - existing users who are most likely to be large employers (100+ employees) and employers in the production and retail distribution and leisure sectors. It is important to capitalise on the recent increase in use of Jobcentres, in particular amongst employers in the retail distribution and leisure sector and small - medium sized employers to encourage them to become regular uses of the service;
  - non-users - medium sized employers (25 – 99 employees) are the group of non users who offer most potential to increasing usage of a Jobcentre type service.

- The key message to promote to employers about a Jobcentre type service are:
  - the quality of the account management – their relationship would be managed by a single contact who would be knowledgeable about their sector and skills requirements;
  - that it has a large pool of (local) recruits immediately available;
  - that it offers another (free) recruitment channel for them to use.

However, it would be necessary to continue to address employers’ misconceptions about the (limited) range of recruits available through the Jobcentre.

- Increased marketing of ONE relevant groups to, and support for, employers by:
  - providing more information on potential recruits, in particular ‘softer’ information which helps to demonstrate their broader skills and attributes;
  - having more specialist advisers assist people from ONE relevant groups to obtain employment and support both the client and employer during the recruitment process and early stages of employment;
  - providing more information and advice to employers about employing people from these groups and the range of assistance available to them.

5.2.1 Increasing use of a Jobcentre type service

5.3 Encouraging employers to recruit people from ONE relevant groups
• The sectors which offer greatest potential to recruit people from ONE relevant groups and therefore should be targeted are:
  - employers who have recruited these groups in the past to capitalise on the generally good experiences they have had. These are most likely to be larger employers and those in the public sector;
  - employers who have not recruited these groups in the past, but would be willing to do so, in particular employers in the retail distribution and leisure sectors. However, the largest employers (200+ employees) are the primary group worth targeting for recruitment of people with mental health problems.

People with physical disabilities, and in particular, those with mental health problems will require a significantly greater share of staff resources, to reflect the greater difficulty for these groups in obtaining sustained employment.
This section explains the methodology in greater detail, expanding on some of the more technical elements of the research design for the main quantitative survey.

The main quantitative stage consisted of 1201 telephone interviews with employers, who had five or more staff. Fieldwork was conducted between 1 November and 8 December 2000 from IFF’s CATI (Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing) Unit in London.

A.1 Sample structure

Interviews were conducted with a cross section of establishments, rather than companies. There were two main reasons for adopting an establishment based approach:

- The establishment is the level at which recruitment takes place and records are typically kept at establishment rather than the corporate level.
- It was the only way of ensuring that we only covered recruitment activity within the pilot areas.

Businesses which had not recruited any staff in the last three years were excluded from the study. This was done to concentrate interviewing resources on the target market, i.e. employers with some recent recruitment activity, who were the key focus of this study.

Interviews were conducted across eight of the 12 pilot areas. This ensured that we obtained sufficient interviews to enable results to be reported by model type and area. The eight areas were carefully selected to cover each of the model types, areas with higher and lower levels of unemployment and urban and rural areas. Table A.1. shows the characteristics of each area at the time of selection and the number of interviews conducted. In the event, no significant differences were found by model type or area.
Table A.1 Sample profile by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>Urban/rural</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex SE</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>OHO</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Coast &amp; Renfrew</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>OHO</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent Borders</td>
<td>Call centre</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Call centres</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Private/voluntary</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cheshire</td>
<td>Private/voluntary</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Private/voluntary</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Private/voluntary</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>OHO</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Source = ASD2 Cluster analyses for geographical type. Claimant count and Census data for unemployment rates. OHO = older home owning areas

Quotas were set by establishment size (number of employees) and type (sector) or employer and whether they had recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years. The Jobcentre recruitment quota was set in order to allow comparison of results between those that had recruited through Jobcentres and those that had not. A total of 701 interviews were conducted with establishments that had recruited through the Jobcentre in the last three years and 500 who had not.

The achieved sample structure by establishment size and sector is shown in Table A.2. Quotas were set by size and sector within each area. The sample structure was designed based on the Annual Employment Survey 1998 figures for the business population in each area with five or more staff.

The sample structure was also designed to oversample larger employers, who accounted for a greater proportion of recruitment and were more likely to use Jobcentres as a recruitment channel. It also oversampled the production sector, which was also more likely to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment channel.

Table A.2 Sample profile by establishment size and sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total interviews</th>
<th>5-24</th>
<th>25-99</th>
<th>100-199</th>
<th>200+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail distribution/leisure</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interviews</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Definition of the sectors is based on Standard Industrial Clarification (SIC)

This sample was drawn from Business Database (BT’s comprehensive listing of business establishments). The database enabled us to draw a scientifically designed sample by establishment size and sector within each area (defined by postcode).
Survey results were projected to the total population of businesses employing five or more people in each area. The population figures were derived from the Annual Employment Survey 1998. The weighting and projection of results to the total business population corrected for any imbalances introduced by the sample design.

The overall response rate for the survey was good, with 64 per cent of those employers with whom IFF Research had contact agreeing to be interviewed. We do not consider that non-response has led to any significant bias of the results as the quotas placed on the interviews conducted ensured we obtained sufficient interviews with all sizes and types of employer in each area. A detailed breakdown of the response rates is shown in Table A.3.

Table A.3 Response rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population in scope of study (%)</th>
<th>Population in scope of fieldwork (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number sampled</td>
<td>4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recruited in last 3 years</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ &lt;5 staff</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In scope of study</td>
<td>4089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases not issued to interviewers</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reserve sample)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invalid Cases</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business ceased trading</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobtainable number</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of quota</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In scope of fieldwork</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews achieved</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact after 7+ times</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown during interview</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION ONE: RECRUITMENT.

ASK ALL
1) You just said that you had recruited people over the last 3 years. Have you recruited anyone in the last 12 months?

   Yes 1  RECRUITED IN LAST 12 MONTHS
   No 2  ASK Q1a IF NO (OTHERS GO TO Q2)

1a) Well have you recruited anyone in the last 2 years?

   Yes 1  RECRUITED IN LAST 2 YEARS
   No 2  RECRUITED IN LAST 3 YEARS

ASK ALL
2) [How many people have you recruited at this site in the past 12 months/How many people did you recruit at this site 2/3 years ago], either on a full or a part-time basis? (ADD IF NECESSARY – This includes replacing staff who have left as well as recruiting for new posts).

   WRITE DOWN EXACT NUMBER.  ___________________

   IF DON'T KNOW; X

   IF ONLY 1 OR 2 PEOPLE
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7
   8
   9
   10-19
   20-49
   50-99
   100+

3) [Have you had any difficulty in recruiting over the last 12 months/Did you have any difficulty in recruiting at the time]? (ADD IF NECESSARY – By this I mean did you find it difficult finding people who fit your specification or want to do this kind of work)?

   Yes 1
   No 2
   X

IF NO OTHERS GO TO Q2
4) THERE IS NO QUESTION 4.

5) You said earlier that you recruited X people (TEXT SUBSTITUTE NUMBER FROM Q2) at this site [in the last 12 months/2/3 years ago]. Were any of them …

... in professional, managerial or supervisory positions
... in clerical or secretarial positions
... in service based manual positions... in skilled or unskilled manual positions or in operative occupations

PROMPT IF NECESSARY:

Service-based manual: sales assistants, waitresses, bar staff, computer operators, etc.
Skilled or unskilled manual or operatives: drivers, assembly line operatives, fitters, construction workers, etc.

6) [INTERVIEWER NOTE: READ INTRO SLOWLY AND CAREFULLY]

We are particularly interested in whether you have recruited any people from groups who typically find it more difficult to get jobs. This includes:

Lone Parents – single parents who are entering or returning to the workforce after a period looking after their children
Long-term unemployed people – people who have been unemployed for at least 12 months, and
People with physical disabilities or mental health problems

I know you don’t always know these things, but to the best of your knowledge, were any of the people you recruited [in the last 12 months/2/3 years ago] …

Yes – definitely
Definitely not
Don’t Know

7) THERE IS NO QUESTION 7

8) THERE IS NO QUESTION 8

9) And approximately how many of the X people (TEXT SUBSTITUTE NUMBER FROM Q2) you recruited [over the last 12 months/2/3 years ago] were from (… SUBSTITUTE GROUPS FROM Q6) ...

WRITE DOWN EXACT NUMBER

If Don’t Know; Was it ...

(         )

11
2 or 3
More than 3
Don’t Know

10) [IF 1 RECRUIT AT Q9] Was this job a new or additional position at the site or was the recruit replacing another person?

[IF MORE THAN 1 RECRUIT AT Q9] Were these jobs new or additional positions at the site or were the recruits replacing another person?

New/additional position
Replacement
Both
Don’t Know

11) Was this the first time you had taken on lone parents/long-term unemployed people/people with disabilities (TEXT SUBSTITUTE FROM Q6) (ADD IF NECESSARY- in the last few years)?

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF FIRST TIME RECRUITED HARD TO PLACE GROUPS FOR MANY YEARS - E.G. MORE THAN 5 YEARS, RECORD AS "YES"

Yes
No
Don’t Know

12) IF RECRUITED ANY DIFFICULT TO PLACE GROUP (ANY YES - CODE 1 AT Q6). IF ALL NO GO TO INSTRUCTIONS ABOVE Q16.
12) Why did you decide to start recruiting this/these types of people?

- Change in recruitment criteria
- No reason – just the best person for the post
- Could not find anyone better
- Have difficulty filling these types of posts – have to take what can get
- (Change in) company policy
- Government/charitable organisation approached us directly
- Don't Know
- Other (WRITE IN)

13) Which of the following changes or adjustments, if any, did you make to your establishment or working arrangements in order to recruit this person/these people?

*Only show if recruited people with physical disability at Q6

- Physical changes to the building e.g. ramp, disabled toilet, induction loop
- Purchase any special equipment or have any equipment specially adapted for their use
- Change working hours from full-time to part-time
- More flexible working hours
- Introduce or allow job sharing
- Introduce or allow working from home
- Provide additional or different training
- Provide mentorship or introduce a mentoring system
- Changes to the job specification
- Did you make any other changes?

14) In general terms, how satisfied have you been with the quality of the lone parents/long-term unemployed people/people with disabilities (TEXT SUBSTITUTE FROM Q6) you recruited [over the last year/2/3 years ago]. By this I mean how well they have done their work and fitted in?

Please use a scale from 1 – 5, where 1 means you are totally dissatisfied and 5 means you are totally satisfied.

Satisfaction score ____________________

15) What problems have you encountered?

16) You said earlier that you had used the Jobcentre in the last 3 years. When did you first start using the Jobcentre to recruit staff?

- In last 12 months
- 2-3 years ago
- 4-5 years ago
- More than 5 years ago
- Don't know
- Respondent new to job

17) If recruited via Jobcentres (CODE 1 AT 6), others go to Q20

Provide full text of Q6, if applicable.

18) Why did you decide to recruit these/these types of people?
17) Why did you decide to start using the Jobcentre?

**DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL MENTIONED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>Code 3</th>
<th>Code 4</th>
<th>Code 5</th>
<th>Code 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First time recruited for a while</td>
<td>Other recruitment sources disappointing</td>
<td>Jobcentre contacted us</td>
<td>Jobcentre good for recruiting certain types of positions e.g. administrative roles</td>
<td>Jobcentre good for recruiting certain types of people e.g. young or long-term unemployed</td>
<td>Last Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool of people immediately available</td>
<td>Company Policy</td>
<td>Saw/heard advert for the Jobcentre</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Other (WRITE IN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) Which of the following statements best describes the extent to which you use the Jobcentre…?

**READ OUT ALL OPTIONS. CODE ONE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>Code 3</th>
<th>Code 4</th>
<th>Code 5</th>
<th>Code 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is our main recruitment source</td>
<td>It is one of our main recruitment sources</td>
<td>We use the Jobcentre regularly but only for certain types of jobs</td>
<td>We only use the Jobcentre if unable to recruit through other means</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Other (WRITE IN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) There is no question 19.

20) And thinking about the lone parents/long-term unemployed/people with disabilities (TEXT SUBSTITUTE FROM Q6) you recruited [in the last year/2/3 years ago], to the best of your knowledge how did you recruit this person/these people. Was it through…?

**READ OUT ALL OPTIONS. CODE ONE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>Code 3</th>
<th>Code 4</th>
<th>Code 5</th>
<th>Code 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>Advertisement (press, radio)</td>
<td>Employment agency</td>
<td>Or some other means? SPECIFY: _________________</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Other (WRITE IN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21) In the future, say in the next two to three years, how likely or unlikely do you think you will be to use the Jobcentre to recruit people for this site?

**PROMPT AS NECESSARY. CODE ONE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>Code 3</th>
<th>Code 4</th>
<th>Code 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will use</td>
<td>Very likely to use</td>
<td>Quite likely to use</td>
<td>Not very likely to use</td>
<td>Not at all likely to use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO: ATTITUDES TO RISK – ASK ALL

30) Now I am going to read out a number of statements about employing different types of people and I would like you to tell me the extent to which you agree or disagree with each. READ OUT EACH STATEMENT. RANDOMISE

**People who have been unemployed for more than 12 months will put in more effort and be more enthusiastic at work as they haven’t had a job for a long time** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**People who have been unemployed for more than 12 months are not interested in working** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**I’d be just as likely to take on someone who has been unemployed for more than 2 years as more than 12 months** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**The problems of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Lone parents are more likely to have less skills or skills which are less up to date, than other recruits** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**When I think of people with disabilities I think of wheelchairs not people with less severe physical disabilities or mental health problems** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Coping with their physical disability or mental health problems gives many of these people a strong will to succeed** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**I would have less concern about employing someone with a physical disability than those with mental health problems** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**We prefer to employ workers over 50 where possible as they have a greater depth of skills and experience** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**I would have some concerns employing people over the age of 50 as they are less adaptable** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Most young people under the age of 25 who have not worked before lack the discipline and commitment that we require from our staff** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Where possible, we prefer to employ young people under the age of 25 because it is easier to train them to work to our standards and procedures** 1 2 3 4 5 X

31) THERE IS NO QUESTION 31

32) And in terms of the three groups which we talked about earlier, namely lone parents, long term unemployed people and people with physical or mental disabilities, to what extent do you agree or disagree that the following statements apply to these harder to place groups

Firstly…READ OUT EACH STATEMENT. ROTATE STATEMENTS

**We would be concerned that employing people like this might mean we inadvertently have problems with equal opportunities legislation** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Line managers would be concerned about the impact on themselves and other staff if we employed people from these groups** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**ASK ALL**

**People with mental health problems** 1 2 3 4 X

**We would be concerned that this group might suffer problems with equal opportunities legislation and work in general** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**When we interviewed them we recommended that applicants with mental health problems were interviewed by a panel** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**We would be concerned that this group might suffer problems with equal opportunities legislation and work in general** 1 2 3 4 5 X

**Depends on the individual/person** 1

**Nature of the job** 1

**Previous negative experience** 2

**Too few applications** 3

**INTERVIEWER NOTE: ASK PEOPLE FOR THEIR COMMENTS ON EACH OF THE ABOVE GROUPS. USE FOLLOWING PRECODES:**

**( )**

33) In the future, say in the next two to three years, how likely would you be to recruit people from any of the following groups?  READ OUT AND CODE FOR ALL FOUR GROUPS

**Very likely** 1 2 3 4 X

**Quite likely** 1 2 3 4 X

**Not very likely** 1 2 3 4 X

**Not at all** 1 2 3 4 X

**Lone parents** 1 2 3 4 X

**Long term unemployed people (that is people who have been employed for 12 months or more)** 1 2 3 4 X

**People with physical disabilities** 1 2 3 4 X

**People with mental health problems** 1 2 3 4 X

INTERVIEWER NOTE: ASK PEOPLE FOR THEIR COMMENTS ON EACH OF THE ABOVE GROUPS. USE FOLLOWING PRECODES:

**( )**

Nature of the job 1

Previous negative experience 2

Too few applications 3

Depends on the individual/person 4
ASK Q34 FOR EACH GROUP VERY/QUITE LIKELY TO RECRUIT AT Q33 (CODE 1 OR 2 ON Q33)

34) When taking on (GROUP) it may be necessary to [ADD FOR PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES ONLY - make some physical changes to the building or] purchase special equipment or make changes to the job specification. How willing would you be to make these kinds of changes. Would you…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Willingness to Make Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lone parents</td>
<td>Definitely make any necessary changes if you wanted to recruit the person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Probably do so (by this I mean seriously consider whether to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with physical disabilities</td>
<td>Be unlikely to do so (by this I mean only likely to do so if we really had no choice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with mental health problems</td>
<td>Definitely would not do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ALREADY MADE CHANGES, CODE AS CODE 1.

(ADD FOR PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES ONLY - make some physical changes to the building or)

(CODE 1 OR 2 ON Q33)
SECTION THREE: TESTING IDEA CONCEPTS

As you will have realised by now, one of the key areas of recruitment activity that we are interested in is recruitment from Jobcentres, and particularly recruitment of people who traditionally find it more difficult to get jobs.

The government have been working closely with employers to identify ways to encourage firms like yourself to help more disadvantaged groups to find employment. We would like to get your reactions to some of these ideas.

There are six ideas in total. The first couple look at ways of encouraging use of Jobcentres. The first idea would be to expand the functions of the Jobcentre to provide more information and advice on all aspects of Human Resource management and development, for example:

- Legislative requirements
- Health & Safety
- Reward schemes
- Training

Information and advice could be made available through a variety of media such as telephone help-lines, a web site and seminars.

35) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced? (   )

- Very interested 1
- Quite interested 2
- Not very interested 3
- Not at all interested 4

If interested (code 1 or 2 at Q35)

36) And if this idea were introduced would it have any affect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source. Would you…? (   )

- Definitely use the Jobcentre 1
- Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre 2
- Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre 3
- Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference 4
- Be less likely to use the Jobcentre 5
- Don't know X

A second idea is that all employers contacting the Jobcentre be directed towards an adviser with specialist knowledge of business and staffing issues in the relevant business sector. This person could then become your point of contact with the Jobcentre and contacts with the Jobcentre and your business.

38) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced? (   )

- Very interested 1
- Quite interested 2
- Not very interested 3
- Not at all interested 4

If interested (code 1 or 2 at Q38)

39) And if this idea were introduced would it have any affect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source. Would you…? (   )

- Definitely use the Jobcentre 1
- Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre 2
- Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre 3
- Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference 4
- Be less likely to use the Jobcentre 5
- Don't know X

( )

37) THERE IS NO QUESTION 37.

40) THERE IS NO QUESTION 40.
Turning now to ideas to help encourage employers to take on people who find it more difficult to get jobs …

The next of these ideas would be to introduce Personal Advisers specialising in people with particular types of difficulty.

These Personal Advisers could provide additional support to new recruits and their employers both before employment commenced and on an on-going basis for up to the first 6 months.

They would be able to advise employers employing certain groups of people and ensure that employees are well prepared for and knowledgeable about what they would be expected to do in their new role. They could also help sort out any initial problems and provide additional support and training for the new recruit in the early weeks.

41) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Quite interested</th>
<th>Not very interested</th>
<th>Not at all interested</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If interested (Code 1 or 2 at Q41)

42) And if this idea were introduced would it have any effect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source? Would you…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference</th>
<th>Be less likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43) And if this service were introduced how much more likely would you be to take on lone parents, long-term unemployed people or people with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much more likely</th>
<th>More likely</th>
<th>A little more likely</th>
<th>Just as likely/make no difference</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next idea is that employers would receive much more detailed information about potential new recruits. As well as details about their qualifications and experience, it would include other ‘softer’ information such as references, work experience, hobbies, interests, and any other information that would help employers make more informed decisions about new recruits. For example, employers could be provided with information about key attributes they might expect in potential new recruits such as commitment, strong sense of responsibility, good time keeping, etc.

44) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Quite interested</th>
<th>Not very interested</th>
<th>Not at all interested</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If interested (Code 1 or 2 at Q44)

45) And if this idea were introduced would it have any effect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source? Would you…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference</th>
<th>Be less likely to use the Jobcentre</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46) And if this service were introduced how much more likely would you be to take on lone parents, long-term unemployed people or people with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more likely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more likely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just as likely/make no difference</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47) The next idea is for Jobcentres to provide more information and advice for employers about employing harder to place groups. The emphasis here would be on practicalities such as user friendly checklists for employers about what they need to know and do and information on the range of extra assistance including financial support that is available for employers who recruit these groups.

48) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided already</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49) And if this idea were introduced would it have any effect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source. Would you…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be less likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50) A final idea is for a lone parent childcare facilitator. This would be a centralised information service which would work towards the objective of ensuring that the services provided by their employer have the very best chance of being effective for the employee. It aims to minimise disruption caused to employers by their employees' childcare needs. The service would provide a clear and simple process for accessing emergency, same-day childcare support. It would be free, but lone parents or their employers would be expected to pay for the provision themselves. The service would be open to anyone who might need it. The service would work towards the objective of ensuring that the services provided by their employer have the very best chance of being effective for the employee. It aims to minimise disruption caused to employers by their employees' childcare needs. The service would provide a clear and simple process for accessing emergency, same-day childcare support. It would be free, but lone parents or their employers would be expected to pay for the provision themselves.

51) Can you tell me how interested you would be in this idea if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided already</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52) And if this idea were introduced would it have any effect on your likelihood to use the Jobcentre as a recruitment source. Would you…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be much more likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a little more likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be just as likely to use the Jobcentre / it would make no difference</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be less likely to use the Jobcentre</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If this service were introduced how much more likely would you be to take on lone parents?

[ ] Much more likely
[ ] More likely
[ ] A little more likely
[ ] Just as likely/make no difference
[ ] Don't Know

IF NOT INTERESTED IN ANY IDEA (NOT CODE 1 OR 2 AT Q35, Q38, Q41, Q44, OR Q50)

53) You did not express an interest in any of these ideas. Why were there a particular reason why none of these ideas appealed to you?

[ ] Don't Know
[ ] Is this idea not relevant to your situation?

IF NOT INTERESTED IN ANY IDEA (NOT CODE 1 OR 2 AT Q35, Q38, Q41, Q44, OR Q50)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is this idea not relevant to your situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A bit more likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much more likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this service were introduced how much more likely would you be to take on lone parents?
SECTION FOUR: FINAL QUESTIONS

Finally, I would just like to ask a few questions to help us classify your responses:

62) At this establishment are there unions, staff associations or works councils?
   (   )
   - Unions 1
   - Staff Associations 2
   - Works Councils 3
   - DK X

63) Do you have a written equal opportunities policy or statement?
   (   )
   - Yes 1
   - No 2

64) Have you participated in any other governmental schemes that aim to encourage more people back to work?
   (   )
   - Yes (PLEASE SPECIFY) 1
   - No 2
   - DK 3

65) Is this the only site of the organisation or are there others in the UK?
   (   )
   - Only site 1
   - Others 2

66) Is this site the…?
   (   )
   - Head Office (UK Head Office) 1
   - Regional or Divisional Office 2
   - Operating site or branch 3
   - Other (SPECIFY) 4

67) With regard to employing people who find it more difficult to get jobs, would decisions about employing these kinds of people be made here or elsewhere?
   (   )
   - Here 1
   - Elsewhere 2
   - Policies at head office – individual recruitment decisions at site level 3
   - Other (SPECIFY) 4
   - Don't know X

68) Which of the following best describes your role and personal involvement in the recruitment process?
   (   )
   - I am the main or one of the main people responsible for recruitment for this site and also for other sites in the UK 1
   - I am the main or one of the main people responsible for recruitment just at this site 2
   - (DO NOT READ OUT) Don't know X

69) How long have you been employed in your present position at this company?
   (   )
   - Less than a year 1
   - 1-2 years 2
   - 3-5 years 3
   - More than 5 years 4
   - Don't know X

---

Please answer the following questions:

65) Is this the only site of the organisation or are there others in the UK?
   (   )
   - Yes 1
   - No 2

66) Is this site the…?
   (   )
   - Head Office (UK Head Office) 1
   - Regional or Divisional Office 2
   - Operating site or branch 3
   - Other (SPECIFY) 4

67) With regard to employing people who find it more difficult to get jobs, would decisions about employing these kinds of people be made here or elsewhere?
   (   )
   - Here 1
   - Elsewhere 2
   - Policies at head office – individual recruitment decisions at site level 3
   - Other (SPECIFY) 4
   - Don't know X

68) Which of the following best describes your role and personal involvement in the recruitment process?
   (   )
   - I am the main or one of the main people responsible for recruitment for this site and also for other sites in the UK 1
   - I am the main or one of the main people responsible for recruitment just at this site 2
   - (DO NOT READ OUT) Don't know X

69) How long have you been employed in your present position at this company?
   (   )
   - Less than a year 1
   - 1-2 years 2
   - 3-5 years 3
   - More than 5 years 4
   - Don't know X

---

Finally, I would just like to ask a few questions to help us classify your responses:
And finally, can I just take your age?

WRITE IN AND CODE: ______________

( )

16 – 24

( )

25 – 34

( )

35 – 44

( )

45 – 54

( )

55 – 64

( )

65+

( )

Refused

Male 1

Female 2

We would like to thank you for taking part in this survey.

We will be conducting a small follow-up study amongst some groups of employers. Would you be willing to participate in another interview?

ADD IF NECESSARY:

This follow-up work would discuss in more detail the problems of recruiting these people and in particular your experiences with this group.

We would like to thank you for taking part in this survey.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

I declare that this survey has been carried out under IFF instructions and within the rules of the MRS Code of Conduct.

Interviewer signature: Date: Finish time: Interview Length mins
OTHER RESEARCH REPORTS AVAILABLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ISBN</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Thirty Families: Their living standards in unemployment</td>
<td>011 761683 4</td>
<td>£6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Disability, Household Income &amp; Expenditure</td>
<td>011 761755 5</td>
<td>£5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Housing Benefit Reviews</td>
<td>011 761821 7</td>
<td>£16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Social Security &amp; Community Care: The case of the Invalid Care Allowance</td>
<td>011 761820 9</td>
<td>£9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Attendance Allowance Medical Examination: Monitoring consumer views</td>
<td>011 761819 5</td>
<td>£5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lone Parent Families in the UK</td>
<td>011 761868 3</td>
<td>£15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Incomes In and Out of Work</td>
<td>011 761910 8</td>
<td>£17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Working the Social Fund</td>
<td>011 761952 3</td>
<td>£9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Evaluating the Social Fund</td>
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