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Summary

Introduction

An outcome of the Department for Work and Pensions’ (DWP’s) 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review was the development of a set of strategic objectives which express the outcomes that it intends to deliver. This study is concerned with Departmental Strategic Objective 7 (DSO7): to make DWP an exemplar of effective service delivery to individuals and employers, and this report focuses on Indicator 6 ‘The level of Employer Satisfaction’.

The findings that the report presents are drawn from the Annual Employer Survey 2008-2009 (AES 2008-2009). The survey explored employers’ engagement and satisfaction with three different types of contact they might have with DWP – contact relating to staff training and welfare, contact relating to pensions and pay and contact with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.

Overall employer engagement with DWP agencies

Overall, 19 per cent of all employers in Great Britain have had contact with DWP relating to staff training and welfare issues (approximately 480,000 employers), 18 per cent had contact with DWP relating to pensions and pay (approximately 450,000 employers) and 13 per cent had contact relating to placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus (approximately 330,000 employers).

The majority of employers with which DWP comes into contact are small, and medium and large employers form a relatively small part of the client base of DWP and its agencies. However, larger establishments are more likely to have contact with DWP and its agencies across all of the types of interaction explored in the survey.
Overall satisfaction with DWP

Across all three DWP areas the mean satisfaction score was high (in excess of seven out of ten). It was 7.77 for contact relating to pensions and pay, 7.76 for contact relating to staff training and welfare and 7.33 for dealings with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.

The mean scores for the three separate types of contact can be combined into a weighted composite score of 7.65 out of 10. This will be used as the baseline against which progress towards the employer element (Indicator 6) of DSO7 will be measured.

What drives employer satisfaction with contact relating to pensions and pay and staff training and welfare

Levels of satisfaction with the individual factors that drive overall satisfaction were very similar among employers contacting DWP with regards to both pensions and pay and staff training and welfare (averaging 7.5 out of 10). Indeed, ‘outcomes’ and the conduct of staff are key strengths for DWP in relation to both these types of contact.

However, there are differences in terms of the importance employers place on these factors. For employers contacting DWP in relation to staff training and welfare, the most important factors are that the interaction is efficiently conducted by staff who have a good depth of knowledge and that the outcomes are both speedy and tailored to the employer’s business (i.e. the factors are ‘outcome’ related). Contact with DWP regarding staff training and welfare is more likely to have been indirect, for example through a website, which explains why actual outcomes figure so heavily within this analysis.

When the engagement relates to pensions and pay, the most salient factors are that employer’s needs are understood, DWP staff are readily available and that they communicate clearly. As employers contacting DWP in relation to pensions and pay are more likely to do this directly (over the phone or through personal correspondence), all the factors among these employers were rated of higher importance. This highlights the need for DWP to maintain service standards for these employers.

The factors where DWP received lower satisfaction scores for both types of contact tended to be factors which employers rated of lesser importance. That said, by focusing on these factors DWP should be able to improve satisfaction further. These include:

- understanding the needs of the establishment and tailoring responses accordingly;
- the knowledge of the staff;
• staff keeping employers informed of how long their query will take to resolve; and
• generally increasing employer awareness of the services available to them.

What drives employer satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service

The satisfaction of employers using Jobcentre Plus to fill a vacancy was also driven largely by ‘outcomes’ as well as by whether Jobcentre Plus sent good quality candidates for the roles on offer. Staff listening to what employers have to say is also highly important in driving satisfaction among employers using Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service.

Employer satisfaction scores highlight that the key strengths of Jobcentre Plus are:
• the accuracy of service provided;
• the helpfulness and professionalism of staff; and
• the extent to which staff listen to employers.

Given that staff listening and the accuracy of service are the top two factors driving overall satisfaction it is important to maintain excellent service in these areas.

Keeping in contact throughout the handling of a vacancy is the key priority for improvement, as it was shown statistically to be the third largest driver of satisfaction, but was not rated as highly as the other factors mentioned above (a satisfaction score of under seven whereas the other factors averaged around eight). The quality of candidates, in terms of their work-readiness and their attendance at interviews, should also be seen as a key area to improve. Improvements in these factors will lead to the largest increases in overall satisfaction.

Employer responsibilities and attitudes to diversity

On the whole, employers understand their obligations and are supportive of the idea of having a diverse workforce. They are open to taking on both older workers and lone parents.

However, larger employers were more likely to have roles suitable for disabled workers, and were also more likely to agree that considering applicants with disabilities widened the pool of skilled potential recruits. This is likely to be because larger employers have a wider range of roles available in their establishments.

Overall, half of employers provide diversity training for staff, and a third have set targets to improve their workforce diversity. This shows a willingness to improve among some employers and suggests that these employers have seen the business case for diversity. These tended to be employers from the care and public sectors. These results show there is still some way to go to get all employers on board.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background

An outcome of DWP’s 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review was the development of a set of strategic objectives which express the outcomes that it intends to deliver. This study is concerned with DSO7: to make DWP an exemplar of effective service delivery to individuals and employers, and this report focuses on Indicator 6 ‘The level of Employer Satisfaction’.

The findings that the report presents are drawn from the AES 2008-2009. This was a complex and multifaceted survey conducted by IFF Research Ltd in spring 2009 among 5,578 employers, of whom 3,940 had had contact with DWP across its business units in the 12 months leading up to the survey fieldwork.

1.2 Research aims

This report presents a single summary measure of employer satisfaction with DWP and also details satisfaction with DWP across a number of service areas. Furthermore, this report:

• identifies the key drivers of satisfaction and explains which are the most important to employers;

• explores whether and how the satisfaction scores differ according to the type of dealing employers have with DWP;

• ascertains whether and how the satisfaction scores differ according to the size of employer, and the region and sector that they operate in; and

1 AES 2008-2009 also had the dual aim of reporting on the current state of the recruitment market and the role of Jobcentre Plus within it over time and to this end a further 1,638 interviews were conducted with employers who had tried to recruit externally in the last 12 months without having contact with DWP. Findings relating to this element of the study are included in a separate, standalone report.
makes recommendations on where DWP should focus its efforts in making improvements to service delivery and what DWP should do to maintain current service levels.

1.3 Survey approach

A total of 3,940 telephone interviews were conducted with establishments in Great Britain that had some form of contact with DWP in the last 12 months.

There are a variety of ways in which employers come into contact with DWP. Some types of interaction are initiated by employers themselves while others are associated with information requests initiated by the Department. Some services are more formal, structured and/or involved (such as the vacancy placing service or the Combined Pension Forecasting Service) while others take the form of more ad hoc advice services. In some instances, Jobcentre Plus initiates contact with employers to offer its services, for example, in interactions relating to Local Employment Partnerships and the Rapid Response Service for redundancy.

Furthermore, DWP operates through a series of distinct delivery businesses, which operate under their own brand identities and have their own separate ‘access’ points (websites, phone numbers and advisers). DWP also has its own separate website and corporate correspondence unit which deals with queries about policy and employer complaints. This means that some employers will have a perception of contact with DWP, while others will have a perception of contact with individual agencies and may not realise they have been in contact with DWP at all. With this in mind, employers were asked whether they had engaged in any of a series of activities in the 12 months covered by the survey, and if so whether they had done so with any assistance (including reading a leaflet or consulting a website) from DWP or its agencies. In this way, employers were able to respond to the survey even if they were unaware of the structure of DWP and its delivery businesses.

The list of activities that employers were asked about is set out below and can broadly be categorised into contact relating to recruitment, staff training and welfare issues and contact relating to pensions and pay:

---

2 Including Jobcentre Plus; The Pension Service, Disability and Carers Service and Business Link
Responsibility for these different activities, which could lead employers to contact with DWP's delivery businesses, is likely to extend across a number of different individuals within an organisation.

Reflecting this, the survey focused on two key functions common across most business establishments: the Human Resources (HR) or recruitment function and the finance function. Two linked enquiries were undertaken. In one, the most senior person responsible for HR or recruitment at the establishment was asked if they had engaged in any of the recruitment, staff training or welfare activities and in the other, respondents employed in finance functions were asked if they had engaged in any of the activities relating to pensions and pay. If they had engaged in any of the activities they were further asked if they had done so with the assistance of DWP or its agencies. Both sets of respondents were additionally asked whether they had received an information request from DWP, that is, whether DWP had sent them a form to fill in giving information about a current or former employee.

A total of 2,909 interviews were conducted within establishments’ HR or recruitment function and a total of 1,031 were conducted with establishments’ finance department.

The findings from the survey have been weighted to generate a total population of employers who have had dealings with DWP and its delivery businesses in the past 12 months, using survey screening data combined with Office for National Statistics (ONS) data on employer populations in Great Britain from March 2008 (the latest ONS survey for which the required data were available).

Further details of how the survey was conducted can be found in the technical appendix.
1.4 The population of employers who have had contact with DWP

To set the context for the rest of the report, this next section of the chapter assesses how many employers have had dealings with DWP and its delivery businesses, and how these employers are distributed by size.

Following the structure of the survey, which was designed to be employer-focused rather than ‘DWP-focused’, this population is described in relation to the broad service areas rather than focusing on the DWP delivery business ‘owning’ each area of employer interaction. However, the presentation also attempts to map which business unit(s) each interaction is likely to have been pursued through.

1.4.1 Employer contact with DWP relating to pensions and pay

Overall, 18 per cent of all establishments have had contact with DWP regarding issues relating to pensions and pay; this equates to around 450,000 establishments in total. Mapping the different types of interaction to business units suggests that nine per cent of all establishments (approximately 225,000) have had contact with Jobcentre Plus regarding pensions and pay, and three per cent (approximately 80,000) with the Pension Service. Figure 1.1 illustrates the level of employer engagement with DWP and its agencies relating to pensions and pay.
1.4.2 Employer contact with DWP relating to staff training and welfare issues

Overall, 19 per cent of all establishments have had contact with DWP relating to staff training and welfare issues; this equates to around 480,000 establishments in real terms. Most of these interactions are likely to have been through Jobcentre Plus (14 per cent), Figure 1.2 summarises the level of engagement with DWP and its agencies relating to staff training and welfare issues.
1.4.3 Employer contact relating to placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus

As the recruitment market was examined in some detail, contact regarding placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus was kept separate from other types of contact establishments may have.

Overall, 13 per cent of establishments had placed a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus in the past 12 months, which is equivalent to around 330,000 establishments in total. A more detailed look at the recruitment market and how Jobcentre Plus sits relative to other recruitment channels is provided in the report *Annual Employer Survey 2008-2009: The Recruitment Market*; this report focuses on satisfaction with the service received. Figure 1.3 shows the Jobcentre Plus channels used by establishments wanting to place a vacancy.
Figure 1.3: Contact with Jobcentre Plus to fill a vacancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Contact Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Jobcentre Plus contact to fill a vacancy</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Direct</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Direct Online</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work trials</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train to Gain</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Employment Partnership</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Work</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Introduction Scheme</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All establishments (2.5m).

1.4.4 The relationship between size of establishment and contact with DWP agencies

To set the context for the satisfaction findings and to understand the profile of the employers in contact with DWP, this section breaks down contact by size of business.

The majority of employers with which DWP comes into contact are small, and medium and large employers form a relatively small part of the client base of DWP and its agencies. However, larger establishments are more likely to have contact with DWP and its agencies across all of the types of interaction explored in the survey.

---

3 Train to Gain is run by the Department for Business Innovation and Skills and is not the responsibility of Jobcentre Plus.
Almost all establishments with 250 or more employees had contacted DWP about issues relating to pensions and pay, compared to just 16 per cent of establishments with 1-49 employees, and around half of establishments with between 50 and 249 employees. These establishments were far less likely to have dealings with DWP relating to staff training and welfare, or to place a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus.

Across all other size bands, and all other types of interaction, employers who come into contact with DWP and its agencies are in the minority.
1.5 Report structure

The remainder of this report examines how satisfied these employers who come into contact with DWP and its agencies are with their interactions. The report is structured as follows:

Chapter 2: Overall satisfaction with DWP across all types of contact.

Chapter 3: Employers’ satisfaction with contact with DWP and its business units relating to pay and pensions, and relating to staff training and welfare issues.

Chapter 4: Employers’ satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus for placing vacancies.

Chapter 5: Employer responsibilities and attitudes to diversity.

Chapter 6: Exploration of sector patterns and trends.

Chapter 7: Exploration of regional patterns and trends.
2 Employers’ satisfaction with their dealings with DWP and its agencies

2.1 Overview

Overall satisfaction with each of the three areas of contact explored – contact related to staff training and welfare, contact related to pensions and pay and contact with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy – is high. In all three areas, the mean satisfaction score given was in excess of seven out of ten.

The mean scores for the three separate types of contact can be combined into a weighted composite score of 7.65 out of 10. This will be used as the baseline against which progress towards the employer element (Indicator 6) of Departmental Strategic Objective 7 (DSO7) will be measured.

Some employers state that they are likely to act as advocates for DWP services. For all three types of contact employers are more likely to speak highly of DWP than be critical:

- for each type of contact, at least half of employers state that they would speak highly of the service that they have received;

- but for each broad type of contact there is a large group who feel neutral.

Despite slightly lower levels of satisfaction than for other types of contact, employers who have used Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy are more likely to state that they would recommend the service than those using other DWP services.
2.2 Background and introduction

As described in the previous chapter, AES 2008-2009 was a complex survey structured to reflect the range of ways in which employers come into contact with DWP and its agencies, and to take into account that these contacts can involve different people or functions. The solution to these challenges was to conduct fieldwork in two parallel parts: with the finance function (for dealings relating to pensions and pay) and with the HR function (for dealings relating to staff training or welfare activities and to recruitment through Jobcentre Plus)\(^4\).

Where employers had had dealings with DWP or its agencies relating to pensions and pay, staff training or welfare activities or recruitment through Jobcentre Plus, the survey established a number of different satisfaction measures:

- overall satisfaction with all such contact with DWP over the previous 12 months;
- overall satisfaction with the last contact with DWP and its agencies; and
- satisfaction with various features or elements of the last contact with DWP and its agencies.

This chapter focuses on employers’ overall levels of satisfaction with DWP. It first presents overall satisfaction with dealings with DWP and its agencies relating to pensions and pay, to staff training or welfare and to recruitment through Jobcentre Plus and uses these measures to calculate a composite overall satisfaction score, which will be the DSO7 (Indicator 6) baseline measure of overall employer satisfaction with DWP. It then presents employers’ overall satisfaction with DWP on the most recent occasion that they had contact. The chapter concludes by considering measures of employer advocacy – their likelihood to recommend DWP's services to other employers.

2.3 Overall levels of employer satisfaction with DWP

Figure 2.1 shows employers’ mean level of overall satisfaction with each of the three broad types of contact they might have with DWP, and how these translate to a composite overall satisfaction score which sets a baseline for DSO7 Indicator 6.

---

\(^4\) Where the person most responsible for recruitment was different to the person most responsible for HR issues, an interview could be completed by two respondents, each answering questions about their own area of responsibility.
Overall levels of satisfaction with each of the three broad types of contact with DWP are both high and relatively uniform. There is minimal difference in mean levels of satisfaction with contact relating to staff training and welfare, and relating to pensions and pay. Levels of satisfaction are lower in respect of contact with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.

Figure 2.1 also illustrates how these overall satisfaction scores can be translated to a composite employer satisfaction score in respect of contact with DWP by combining the average ratings of overall satisfaction with each broad type of contact, and weighting them according to the proportion of employers which have had each type of contact. This gives an overall composite satisfaction score\(^5\) (7.65 out of 10) which will be the baseline for DSO7 Indicator 6.

---

\(^5\) A full explanation of how this was calculated can be found in the technical appendix.
2.4 Detailed overall satisfaction scores

As shown above, the overall mean and composite employer satisfaction ratings for contact with DWP are high. Figure 2.2 illustrates the range of overall satisfaction scores given by employers in respect of each type of contact, and shows that not all employers had a positive experience of their contact with DWP.

**Figure 2.2 Detailed overall satisfaction scores, by contact type**

![Chart showing overall satisfaction scores]

Overall ratings were positive, with at least seven in ten employers reporting they were satisfied (giving a rating of seven or more). Between four and ten per cent of employers were dissatisfied, depending on contact type, with those contacting Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy the most likely to give a negative rating of their overall experience.

The largest employers (with 250 or more staff) were less likely to state that they were satisfied with their experience of using Jobcentre Plus to fill a vacancy (57 per cent gave a rating of between seven and ten) although it should be noted that rather than being dissatisfied they were significantly more likely to be neutral (25 per cent rated their satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus as either five or six). This was not the case for the other contact types, where there was no variation by size.
2.5 Incident-based overall satisfaction scores

As well as collating a measure of overall satisfaction with all dealings with DWP and its agencies over the 12 months prior to survey fieldwork, the survey collated measures of overall satisfaction with the most recent contact an employer had had with DWP. These incident-based overall satisfaction scores are shown in Figure 2.3.

Figure 2.3 is structured in two parts: the left-hand column shows incident-based satisfaction with dealings relating to recruitment, staff training and welfare and the right-hand column shows incident-based satisfaction with dealings relating to pensions and pay.

As outlined in the introductory chapter, the survey did not explore directly which delivery businesses employers dealt with on each occasion, but we can ascertain from the type of dealing which agency the contact is most likely to have been with. Contacts which are most likely to have been with Jobcentre Plus are shown in dark green in Figure 2.3, and contacts which are most likely to have been with The Pension Service are shown in lighter blue.

Average levels of satisfaction with the most recent contact tend to be slightly higher than average levels of satisfaction, with overall contact across the whole year. This could indicate improving service levels, or alternatively be due to one bad experience about DWP bringing the whole score down for the overall rating. All types of contact delivered average satisfaction scores that were higher than the 7.65 overall composite satisfaction score presented in the previous chapter, with the exceptions of contact where employers were seeking advice on offering a company pension and – as already seen – of using Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.
Figure 2.3: Overall satisfaction with DWP for the most recent contact, by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract relating to recruitment, staff training and welfare issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding to requests from employees about flexible working policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about training and upskilling opportunities for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about how to provide support for employees who are to be made redundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing staff development training for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about how to recruit a more diverse workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about employers’ responsibilities under the Age Discrimination Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about employers’ responsibilities with regard to employing disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempting to fill a vacancy through Jobcentre Plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract relating to pensions and pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying Statutory Maternity Pay, Statutory Paternity Pay or Statutory Sick Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Combined Pension Forecast for employees*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping employees secure National Insurance numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information on stakeholder pensions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking advice on how to provide a company pension to employees*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the employment relationship, respondents were asked to consider whether they had been in contact with Jobcentre Plus or The Pension Service.
2.6 Likelihood to recommend DWP

Tied in with satisfaction, employers said they were more likely to speak highly of DWP than be critical, but for each broad type of contact there was a large group who said they would be neutral if asked.

Figure 2.4 Likelihood to recommend DWP

Employers were most likely to advocate the services of Jobcentre Plus for filling vacancies – two-thirds of employers who used Jobcentre Plus in their recruitment activity in the last 12 months would recommend this channel to other employers, and 31 per cent would be positive about their experience without prompting. Six per cent would be critical of Jobcentre Plus if asked, and two per cent would be critical without prompting.

Employers were less likely to be critical in respect of DWP’s role in dealing with issues relating to employee pensions and pay, but were also less likely to advocate DWP’s services. Only 19 per cent of employers who had dealings with DWP on these issues would be positive without prompting about their experience when speaking to other employers.
3 Drivers of satisfaction with contact relating to pensions and pay, and staff training and welfare

3.1 Overview

Underlying the overall satisfaction scores is the structure of key drivers and key sub-drivers. The key sub-drivers explored fall under three key drivers: the outcome that the contact results in, the extent to which DWP built a business relationship with the employer; and the extent to which the employer is treated well when dealing with the Department. Employers rated the factors feeding into these sub-drivers for their importance and satisfaction.

Employers with contact relating to pensions and pay rated the sub-drivers of outcomes, accessibility and being treated well as being more important to them than those with contact relating to staff training and welfare. Levels of satisfaction; however, were similar for both.

Outcomes and the conduct of staff are key strengths for DWP, and high standards should be maintained as these areas are very important to employers. Conversely, areas that need to be focused on to improve satisfaction include:

• understanding the needs of the establishment and tailoring responses accordingly;
• the knowledge of the staff;
• staff keeping employers informed of how long their query will take to resolve; and,
• generally increasing employer awareness of the services available to them.
3.2 Background and introduction: drivers of satisfaction

DSO7 is to ‘make DWP an exemplar of effective service delivery to individuals and employers’. This means a continual drive to push levels of satisfaction upward. In order to manage such a drive, the Department needs to understand what it is currently delivering well and where it is performing less well. It also needs to understand what is influencing the scores that employers give. This chapter considers drivers of satisfaction with contact relating to pensions and pay, and to staff training and welfare issues.

In addition to being asked to provide overall satisfaction scores, employers were presented with a list of factors and asked both to indicate how satisfied they were with each in respect of their most recent contact with DWP, and to rate how important each was to them in ensuring that the service provided met their needs.

Key driver analysis has also been undertaken on the satisfaction scores, using multiple regression techniques to determine what areas of service are statistically most important in driving employer satisfaction, and this analysis is presented.

The key drivers below (Figure 3.1) were identified through qualitative work and aligned to other studies providing input into tracking progress on Departmental Strategic Objectives. They can be grouped into three key drivers: the outcome that the contact results in, the extent to which DWP built a business relationship with the employer and the extent to which the employer is treated well through the dealings. The three key drivers can each be further divided further into key sub-drivers (as highlighted in the figure below). A full list of question statements (factors) feeding into each key sub-driver is presented within each sector below and summarised in the technical appendix.
3.3 Drivers of satisfaction: Outcomes

As shown in Figure 3.1 above, factors that determine outcomes fall into three key sub-drivers. One of these (quality of candidates provided) is only applicable to contact with Jobcentre Plus to fill a vacancy. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

1. Whether a query is resolved
   The extent to which the response was tailored to the employer’s need;
   The accuracy of the information received;
   The extent to which the employer received the information they needed at the first time of asking;

2. Delivering on time
   The speed with which the query was resolved.
All of these factors were described as important by employers in respect both of dealings relating to pensions and pay, and to staff training and welfare, with average importance scores ranging from 8.6 out of 10 to 9.5 out of 10. All of the factors were rated as slightly more important in respect of dealings relating to pensions and pay than in respect of dealings relating to staff training and welfare.

Average levels of satisfaction with each were also high and closely clustered, ranging from 7.7 out of 10 to 8.2 out of 10.

Figure 3.2 plots employers’ mean satisfaction with each of the outcome measures against their stated importance. The grid line crosses at the mean average across all satisfaction/importance measures (not just outcome measures) making it easier to compare with all similar charts in the rest of this chapter. It should be noted, that as the majority of mean satisfaction/importance scores range between 7 and 9 the axes do not start at 0.

The chart can be interpreted in the following ways:

- Factors which appear in the top right quadrant are those where DWP is performing well (they are of high importance to employers and satisfaction is also high). The **accuracy of information** provided in respect of contact relating to both pensions and pay, and training and welfare falls into this category and the **extent to which information provided was right first time** with regards to pensions and pay.

- Factors in the top left quadrant are those where DWP should look to improve services as a priority (they are of high importance to employers but satisfaction is lower). The **speed of resolution** of dealings in regard to pensions and pay falls into this bracket, showing timings here need to be improved as a priority.

- Factors in the bottom left quadrant are areas where there is room for improvement, but as a secondary priority. A position in this quadrant indicates that DWP is performing at a lower level (satisfaction is lower), but that the factor is of lesser importance to employers. The extent to which DWP responses were **tailored to employers’ needs** falls into this category in respect both of dealings relating to pensions and pay, and to training and welfare.

- Factors in the bottom right quadrant are those where DWP is performing well, but importance is lower – it is important to maintain service levels here but they are not likely to improve overall satisfaction. The speed of resolution of dealings in regard to training and welfare, and the **extent to which information provided was right first time** both fall into this bracket.
3.4 Drivers of satisfaction: Being treated well

The factors that determine how well employers feel they are treated by DWP fall into two key sub-drivers as follows:

1. Treatment by staff
   - DWP were efficient in their dealings;
   - The extent to which staff listened;
   - The depth of knowledge of DWP staff;
   - The extent to which DWP staff took responsibility for dealing with your query;

2. Communication
   - DWP communicated in a way that could be understood;
   - DWP kept the employer informed about how long the query would take to resolve.

Importance and satisfaction scores around each of these factors were also high, and, in the main, relatively closely clustered. Using a similar analysis approach as in Figure 3.2, Figure 3.3 plots employer satisfaction with each factor against the importance credited to it.
Some interesting patterns emerge from this analysis.

The obvious first line priorities for improvement, in the top left quadrant, are making it clear what is required of employers for dealings relating to pensions and pay, and the knowledge of DWP staff for dealings relating to staff welfare and training.

Secondly, employers’ dealings with DWP about pensions and pay tend to be more successful in that employers’ priorities (the relative importance they accord to factors) are relatively well met by their experience (their satisfaction levels). Most of the blue circles appear in the top right-hand quadrant, indicating high levels of importance met by high levels of satisfaction.

Employers’ experiences of their treatment by DWP staff need to be understood in the context of the nature of their dealings. Three in ten employers who had made contact with DWP regarding staff training and welfare issues (29 per cent) had had personal contact with DWP staff, but for the remainder contact was through...
a website or leaflet or similar. By contrast, employers who had contact with DWP regarding pensions and pay were much more likely to have had personal contact (75 per cent of them). As discussed above, contacts relating to pensions and pay were generally more successful in relative terms.

3.5 Drivers of satisfaction: Building a business relationship

The factors that determine building a business relationship with employers fall into three key sub-drivers as follows:

1. Building a relationship
   - DWP understood employer business needs;

2. Two-way relationship
   - DWP made employer requirements clear;
   - DWP informed employer of other services;
   - Amount of time employer spends on administration for DWP;

3. Accessibility
   - Availability of DWP staff to assist employer;
   - Speed of DWP response.

Two-way relationships tend to be more profitable for both parties than unilateral relationships, and the extent to which the DWP-employer relationship can be thought of as two-way was explored through the survey by asking how burdensome employers found dealings with DWP and the extent to which DWP promotes and raises awareness of other services which might be of value to the employer.

Around a third of employers (34 per cent) who had contact with DWP about staff training and welfare issues were informed of other DWP services they were not previously aware of which might be of use to them and five per cent of these went on to use these services. Contact relating to pensions and pay was less likely to generate a referral to other services, but those who were referred were more likely to go on to use the services suggested. Almost one in five (19 per cent) employers who had contact relating to pensions and pay were referred to other services, and as many as two in five of these (38 per cent) pursued the referral. Those looking for information about training or upskilling were most likely to be referred to other services (50 per cent and 54 per cent respectively) followed by those looking to recruit a more diverse workforce (47 per cent). Those with more knowledge were actually more likely to report that they were referred to other services, suggesting that it is such referrals which are increasing their knowledge base.

The administrative burden that DWP places on employers does not appear to be too onerous. Of those contacting DWP regarding staff training and welfare only, 17 per cent agree that they ‘spend too much time on administration for the DWP’; among those whose contact regarded pensions and pay the proportion agreeing is slightly higher at 21 per cent.

---

6 Other than an information request.
Drivers of satisfaction with contact relating to pensions and pay, and staff training and welfare

Figure 3.4 Agreement that employers spend too much time on administration for DWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact regarding staff training and welfare</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Base: unweighted 2,909; weighted 700,074</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact regarding pensions and pay</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Base: unweighted 1,031; weighted 453,346</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Don’t know responses are not charted and therefore bars will not sum to 100%.

Figure 3.5 illustrates the mean satisfaction and importance scores that employers gave in respect of:

- the availability of DWP staff to assist employers;
- the speed with which DWP responded to employers;
- DWP is clear what is required of employers;
- DWP understands employers needs.

Where DWP could have most impact in respect of the treatment that employers feel they receive in their dealings relating both to pensions and pay and to staff training and welfare is by keeping employers better informed about how long their query is likely to take to resolve, and by working harder to understand employer needs, in particular in respect of staff training and welfare issues. The importance of these factors is relatively low, but so too is satisfaction.
In addition, there is a need to improve both the speed of response and the availability of staff in respect of dealings relating to pensions and pay. Both of these factors have high average importance for employers, but relatively low satisfaction.

In addition to these importance and satisfaction measures, employers were also asked to what extent they agreed that they found it easy to keep up to date with legislation relating to employment and to provide information to DWP, and that they knew how to access DWP services when they need them. Figure 3.6 shows that employers generally agree that they know how to access DWP’s services and can provide DWP with information easily when required, but that they have more trouble keeping up to date with employment legislation. Although DWP cannot necessarily impact legislation, the impact of legislation on DWP’s services is clear from the types of contact that employers have with the Department.
3.6 Key driver analysis

The analysis above focuses on self-stated importance and satisfaction for different key sub-drivers (and factors). This allows us to pick out discrete elements of DWP’s service which require some focus to improve delivery and maintain satisfaction. Key driver analysis looks at the factors that underpin overall satisfaction from a statistical perspective. It does not naturally or necessarily follow that something that is important to good service will statistically drive satisfaction. Employers will take it as a given that some elements are satisfactory; meeting expectations in these areas will not improve overall satisfaction, although not meeting expectation will fuel dissatisfaction. Key driver analysis, on the other hand, allows us to pick out the factors which most determine how positive the overall experience is.

Figures 3.7 and 3.8 show the outcomes of the key driver analyses relating to contact about staff training and welfare and about pensions and pay, respectively.
Figure 3.7  Key drivers of satisfaction with contact relating to staff training and welfare

Correlation with overall satisfaction

1. Efficiency of DWP in dealing with you: 0.72
2. Depth of knowledge of DWP staff: 0.70
3. Tailoring of response to needs: 0.69
4. Speed with which query was resolved: 0.69

69% of variance in overall satisfaction explained by model

Mean satisfaction with contact relating to recruitment, staff training and welfare issues
Figure 3.8  Key drivers of satisfaction with contact relating to pensions and pay

The key factors driving satisfaction with contact relating to staff training and welfare and to pension and pay are quite different. When employers engage with DWP on the former range of issues, it is most important that the interaction is efficiently conducted by staff, who have a good depth of knowledge, and that the outcomes are both speedy and tailored to an employer’s business. When the engagement relates to pensions and pay, the most salient drivers are that their needs are understood, DWP staff are readily available and that they communicate clearly. Contact with DWP regarding staff training and welfare is more likely to have been indirect, for example through a website, which explains why actual outcomes figure so heavily among the statistical drivers.
4 Satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service

4.1 Overview

The series of key drivers and key sub-drivers underlying the overall satisfaction scores of employers is also relevant for those contacting Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy. The same broad key driver structure holds, although some of the key sub-drivers are slightly different to be more specific to the type of contact had.

Strengths for Jobcentre Plus include:

- the accuracy of the service provided;
- the helpfulness and professionalism of the staff; and
- the extent to which staff listen to employers.

Staff listening and the accuracy of service are the top two factors influencing satisfaction so it is important to maintain excellent service in these areas. Employers using Employer Direct Online are also particularly happy with the speed and efficiency of the service.

Keeping in contact throughout the handling of the vacancy is the key priority for improvement, as it was shown statistically to be the third largest driver of satisfaction but was not rated as highly as some of the other factors. The quality of candidates, in terms of their work-readiness and their attendance at interviews should also be seen as a key area to improve. Improvements in these factors will lead to the largest increases in overall satisfaction.

Of those who feel the service has improved, the main reasons given include improvements to communication and a faster and more efficient service.
4.2 Background and introduction

This chapter of the report focuses on better understanding what drives satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service.

The analysis compares employers’ satisfaction with the outcomes and accessibility of Jobcentre Plus and the way in which they are treated when using them with the importance that they attribute to these factors. A key driver analysis is then presented to further illustrate the areas which most drive employer satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus for placing vacancies.

The analysis of drivers of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service has been presented separately from the drivers of satisfaction with DWP and its agencies (including Jobcentre Plus) both to simplify the analysis and because some of the factors covered (relating to the provision of candidates) are specific to Jobcentre Plus.

The second part of the chapter examines how satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service has evolved over time, looking back to previous waves of the Annual Employers Survey.

4.3 Drivers of satisfaction: outcomes

The ‘outcome’ measures explored in respect of dealings with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service were more extensive than those explored in respect of other contact with DWP, and can be summarised as follows:

1. Whether a query is resolved
   The service was delivered as expected;
   The extent to which the employer received the information they needed at the first time of asking;

2. Delivering on time
   The speed of providing candidates;

3. Quality of candidates
   The suitability of candidates for the vacancy;
   The number of candidates that applied;
   The ‘work-readiness’ of candidates, the extent to which they had the right skills for the job and whether or not they turned up for interview when they were supposed to.7

---

7 Employers’ satisfaction with candidates’ work-readiness, skills and punctuality for interviews was explored through the survey, but not the importance of these factors.
Figure 4.1 plots the mean satisfaction with all ‘outcome’ measures against their mean stated importance (for all those statements where employers were asked to provide importance ratings). As in the previous chapter, the grid lines cross at the mean average across all satisfaction/importance measures (not just outcome measures) making it easier to compare with all similar charts in the rest of this chapter.

**Figure 4.1 Outcomes satisfaction compared to importance**

Improving the match between candidate suitability and employer vacancies is the action most likely to improve overall satisfaction with ‘outcomes’. The suitability of candidates was among the most important factors to employers but was an area where satisfaction was lowest, and as a result this appears in the top left quadrant of the chart. The data show that employer satisfaction with the quality of candidates and with the skills that they held was relatively low, and there is perhaps scope for better matching of candidate skills with employer requirements.

A secondary priority is to better match the quantity of candidates provided to employer expectations. Although quantity of supply was the least important of the factors employers were asked about, it was also an area where the mean
satisfaction score was comparatively low. As in previous years, the majority (92 per cent this year) of those employers dissatisfied with the number of candidates provided considered that they had received too few candidates rather than too many. Employers would like to see more candidates, but only if they are suitable for the vacancy.

Speed of providing candidates, delivering to expectations and receiving an accurate service at the first time of asking all received high satisfaction scores and were ranked highly in terms of importance by employers (hence they appear in the top right quadrant of the chart). These are areas in which DWP is performing well and needs to continue to deliver well.

4.4 Drivers of satisfaction: Being treated well

The factors that determine how well employers feel they are treated by DWP fall into two key sub-drivers as follows:

1. Treatment by staff
   - Staff knowledge of the local labour market;
   - Staff dealing in a professional/helpful manner;
   - Staff taking responsibility for dealing with the request;
   - Staff listening to what the employer had to say;

2. Communication
   - Extent to which Jobcentre Plus kept in contact.

Almost half of those who had placed a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus (49 per cent) had had personal contact with Jobcentre Plus staff.

Satisfaction scores in terms of being treated well were higher than satisfaction with the outcomes of placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus, indicating that employers were happy with the experience, but less so ultimately with the outcome. This was particularly the case for staff being professional and helpful, taking responsibility, listening and making it clear what was required from the employer. Employers were less satisfied in terms of the extent of ongoing contact and advisers’ knowledge of the local labour market.

Mapping satisfaction against importance suggests that service delivery is broadly matching expectations; however, there are no factors in the top left quadrant (where satisfaction falls behind importance); rather factors which are most important to employers receive highest satisfaction and those which are least important provide least satisfaction.
4.5 Drivers of satisfaction: building a business relationship

The factors that determine building a relationship with employers fall into three key sub-drivers as follows:

1. **Building a relationship**
   - Staff understanding employer business needs;
   - Responsiveness of LEP account manager;

2. **Two-way relationship**
   - Staff making it clear what is required;
   - Jobcentre Plus informing employer of other recruitment services;

3. **Accessibility**
   - Ease and efficiency of the system to register a vacancy;
   - The availability of staff;
   - The ease of finding out about other Jobcentre Plus services.
In terms of the relationship being two-way, employers were satisfied that the member of staff they had spoken to at Jobcentre Plus had made it clear what was required of them, with a mean score of eight out of ten. Indeed 43 per cent rated Jobcentre Plus a nine or ten out of ten for this measure.

During this contact, 24 per cent of employers who placed a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus had been informed of other services which might be of use to them; this was slightly higher for those who had used Employer Direct (26 per cent) than those who had used Employer Direct Online (21 per cent). Almost one in five (19 per cent) subsequently went on to use these services.

Knowledge of services offered is generally quite low, with just seven per cent of those placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus regarding staff training and welfare issues claiming to have a ‘very good’ knowledge of the range of services Jobcentre Plus offers. Around two in five (39 per cent) reported having a fairly good knowledge, but just over half (51 per cent) report having little or no knowledge of the services offered. Increasing awareness among these employers, who have already shown themselves to be open to using Jobcentre Plus services, should increase usage accordingly.

Of all employers who had recruited in the 12 months covered by the survey, six per cent reported that they were involved in Local Employment Partnerships, which equates to almost 18,000 establishments in real terms. The real number of employers involved in this initiative is around 25,000, suggesting that a number of these employers are either not aware or not sufficiently engaged to feel they are involved in the Local Employment Partnership. Far from a two-way relationship, these employers are not seeing a relationship at all, and it is important to get them engaged with the process either by regular contact or similar means if they are to successfully use Local Employment Partnerships to employ people from groups they may not reach by other means.

Those employers who reported being involved in Local Employment Partnerships gave their account manager a mean rating of seven out of ten for their understanding of the business’ needs. They rated their Account Managers very highly for responsiveness, with a mean score of 7.6 out of 10; just five per cent were dissatisfied with this measure.

The Local Employment Partnerships allow the employers to build a relationship with Jobcentre Plus, which can increase their positivity towards Jobcentre Plus. Employers who stated they were involved in Local Employment Partnerships feel that their involvement with the partnership has made them more positive towards Jobcentre Plus, with 37 per cent saying they felt more positive as a result. The main reasons given for this were the good quality of candidates they had seen (31 per cent), and 22 per cent put it down to the levels of support from the account manager. Fifty-six per cent saying it had no impact on their perception of Jobcentre Plus. Six per cent actually felt more negative as a result.
As was the case with ‘being treated well’, in the main employers seem to be most satisfied with what they consider to be the most important aspects of the Jobcentre Plus service (i.e. satisfaction is highest for the most important factors – the ease and efficiency of the system and the availability of staff).

Figure 4.3 plots the satisfaction with these factors measuring ‘building a business relationship’ against the importance attached to them by employers. Ease and efficiency of the system for registering the vacancy appears in the top right quadrant – highlighting that it is an important measure for employers and Jobcentre Plus is performing well in this area. Those using Employer Direct Online were particularly likely to be satisfied with this aspect, with a mean rating of 8.6 out of 10 compared to a mean of 7.9 out of 10 for Employer Direct.

Satisfaction is lower in terms of staff understanding the specific business needs of the employer in respect of the ease of finding out about other Jobcentre Plus services, but these are areas that are deemed of less importance by employers. It may well be in Jobcentre Plus’ interest to improve employers’ awareness of services, since ensuring knowledge of the full range of services available may ultimately help employers to select those of most relevance to them, which ultimately may improve overall satisfaction levels.

**Figure 4.3  Satisfaction charted against importance for accessibility**

- A: Ease and efficiency of system
- B: Availability of staff
- C: Ease of finding out about Jobcentre Plus services
- D: Understanding needs of business
- E: Clear requirements
4.6 Key drivers of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus for placing vacancies

Figure 4.4 shows the key drivers of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus for placing vacancies. Compared to other types of dealings that employers have with DWP, the picture here is of a more complex set of dealings in which multiple factors impact on employers’ ultimate satisfaction.

**Figure 4.4 Key drivers of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus for placing vacancies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation with overall satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff listening to what you had to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving accurate service at the first time of asking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping in contact while handling the vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates that applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which Local Employment Partnerships Jobcentre Plus contact understands needs of business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ease of finding out what services Jobcentre Plus offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease and efficiency of system for registering a vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which candidates turned up for interview when they were supposed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘work-readiness’ of candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The satisfaction of those using Jobcentre Plus to place vacancies and recruit staff was driven largely by the outcomes from the action, that is, whether Jobcentre Plus sent good quality candidates for the roles on offer. Staff listening to what employers have to say is also highly important in driving satisfaction, and could also be seen as having a direct influence on the outcome if the member of staff at Jobcentre Plus listened to the employer’s needs.
4.7 Comparing satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus over time

4.7.1 A note about comparisons

This chapter is able to make some comparisons with previous years’ data, as satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus has been measured by the Annual Employers Survey for some years. However, a note of caution should be made regarding the comparison as the scale on which satisfaction is measured has changed. In 2008/09 all satisfaction questions were asked on a ten point numeric scale (with ten being extremely satisfied and one being not at all satisfied) to ensure there is consistency with other DWP surveys that are providing input into the measurement of progress against Departmental Strategic Objectives. In previous waves of the Annual Employers Survey, most satisfaction questions were asked on a five point semantic scale, and overall satisfaction was measured on a four point scale. Throughout this section, to facilitate indicative comparisons with previous waves of the Annual Employers Survey, ratings given on the ten point scale have been grouped as follows; nine to ten: very satisfied, seven to eight: fairly satisfied, five to six: neutral; three to four: fairly dissatisfied and one to two: very dissatisfied.

4.7.2 Overall satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus in the 12 months covered by the survey

It has already been seen that overall satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service over the 12 months covered by the survey was slightly lower than satisfaction for the other types of contact. Three-quarters (75 per cent) of all employers that had used Jobcentre Plus to try to fill a vacancy gave a satisfaction rating of at least six out of ten; this is in line with scores from 2006/07 and 2005/06.

4.7.3 Quality of service from Jobcentre Plus recruitment services

Just under a quarter (24 per cent) of employers felt the service offered by Jobcentre Plus had improved over the 12 months covered by the survey, and over half (53 per cent) felt the service had remained the same; only a very small minority of employers (four per cent) felt service had deteriorated.

The period over which employers were being asked to comment i.e. from Quarter 1 2008 to Quarter 1 2009 has seen considerable economic slowdown and, with it, a rise in the number of job seekers in turn placing pressure on Jobcentre Plus services. It is encouraging to note that only a very small proportion of employers feel that the service they had received has deteriorated in response to this additional pressure in the early stages of the downturn.

Thirty-two per cent of employers mentioned communication and follow-up calls from Jobcentre Plus as having improved in the 12 months covered by the survey, and 18 per cent mentioned a faster, more efficient service. Quality of staff (in terms of helpfulness and knowledge of specific business needs) was also cited by 16 per cent and 15 per cent of employers respectively.
Reasons for thinking that the service had improved varied depending on the channel used to place the vacancy. The key differences were that employers using Employer Direct and Employer Direct Online were both more likely to mention that Jobcentre Plus had become more faster/more efficient (21 per cent using Employer Direct and 19 per cent using Employer Direct Online) than employers using other Jobcentre Plus [vacancy] services (13 per cent).

Employers using Employer Direct Online were also more likely to state that the service had become easier to use (16 per cent compared to 11 per cent using Employer Direct and 8 per cent using other Jobcentre Plus services).

Table 4.1 shows a summary of the most common responses broken down by the Jobcentre Plus channel used.

**Table 4.1 Reasons why employers felt the service offered by Jobcentre Plus had got better by type of service used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employer Direct Online</th>
<th>Employer Direct</th>
<th>Other Jobcentre Plus vacancy service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication/follow-up calls</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster service/more efficient service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff friendly/helpful</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff knowledgeable about recruitment needs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become easier to use services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better quality of applicants/candidates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applicants/candidates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a wider range of services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All establishments using Jobcentre Plus and felt service had got better over last 12 months (weighted)*

| Base: All establishments using Jobcentre Plus and felt service had got better over last 12 months (weighted) | 83,701 | 26,078 | 50,998 | 30,746 |

*Base: All establishments using Jobcentre Plus and felt service had got better over last 12 months (unweighted)*

| Base: All establishments using Jobcentre Plus and felt service had got better over last 12 months (unweighted) | 471    | 189    | 322    | 223    |
The four per cent of employers who felt that the service had got worse over the 12 months gave the following key reasons:

1. service levels not maintained (45 per cent);
2. errors by Jobcentre Plus staff/following wrong procedures (18 per cent);
3. poor quality of candidates provided (14 per cent); and
4. lack of personal contact from Jobcentre Plus staff/poor communication (12 per cent).

With the exception of poor quality candidates, employers that felt Jobcentre Plus services had deteriorated over the 12 months covered by the survey primarily cited reasons related to Jobcentre Plus staff. One possibility is that this is a reflection of increased workloads in Jobcentre Plus offices as a result of the economic downturn making it difficult for staff to maintain service standards.

4.7.4 Change in episode-based satisfaction over time

Some of the satisfaction measures have been included in previous waves of the Annual Employers Survey allowing some scope for tracking trends over time.

Figure 4.5 shows the proportion of employers that were very or fairly satisfied over time with each of the measures that have been included in previous waves. This analysis shows that there has been relatively little change over time in terms of satisfaction with the ease and efficiency of the system for registering vacancies and the number of candidates. In terms of the speed of providing candidates, satisfaction levels have tended to increase year on year with this trend continuing in 2008/09.

However, the time series data does indicate that there have been decreases in satisfaction with the extent to which Jobcentre Plus staff have kept in contact while the vacancy has been placed with them, the knowledge of Jobcentre Plus staff and the quality of candidates provided by Jobcentre Plus. However, the larger pool of candidates that higher unemployment rates generate could be expected to lead to increases in the quality of candidates that employers have access to through Jobcentre Plus. The fact that satisfaction in this area has decreased perhaps means that more could be done to ensure better matching of candidates to vacancies. The overall quality of candidates is the one area explored within the survey where there currently appears to be a mismatch between its stated importance to employers and levels of satisfaction, highlighting it as a key area to address.
It is worth noting that these drops in satisfaction in individual areas of knowledge and keeping in contact do not yet appear to have impacted on overall satisfaction scores which have remained relatively high. This is partly because some of these drops are in areas rated of lesser importance by employers. ‘Staff kept in contact’ is a particular problem for some regions, a finding explored further in Chapter 7.

4.7.5 Future usage of Jobcentre Plus

At an overall level, it is likely that levels of use of Jobcentre Plus will decline slightly over the 12 months following the survey. Only 13 per cent of employers that had used Jobcentre Plus in the 12 months covered by the survey stated that they would use Jobcentre Plus more often in the future (see Figure 4.6). About three-fifths (62 per cent) stated their usage of Jobcentre Plus would not change and around a fifth (21 per cent) stated they would use Jobcentre Plus less.

This is likely to be partially due to the current economic climate; when asked about future recruitment only 19 per cent felt that they would recruit more people in the 12 months following the survey and almost two-fifths (39 per cent) expected to recruit fewer staff in the coming months.
However, employers who were dissatisfied with Jobcentre Plus were much more likely to report that their usage of the services would decrease, with 51 per cent saying this compared to 21 per cent overall.

The largest establishments (with 250 or more staff) were the most likely to anticipate greater use of Jobcentre Plus over the next 12 months (21 per cent of the largest establishments expect to use Jobcentre Plus more in the next 12 months, approximately 12 per cent of the smallest establishments).

**Figure 4.6  Future use of Jobcentre Plus**

5 Employer responsibilities and attitudes to diversity

5.1 Overview

On the whole, employers understand their obligations and are supportive of the idea of having a diverse workforce. They are open to taking on both older workers and lone parents.

Attitudes to disability varied according to the sort of job roles available. Large organisations were more likely to have roles suitable for disabled workers, and were also more likely to agree that considering applicants with disabilities widened the pool of skilled potential recruits.

Overall, half of employers provide diversity training for staff, and a third of employers have set targets to improve their workforce diversity. This shows a willingness to improve among some employers and suggests that these employers have seen the business case for diversity, although there is still some way to go to get employers on board.

5.2 Introduction

The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) works closely with employers of all sizes and sectors to encourage them to open up employment opportunities to under-represented groups, advising on recruitment best practices and offering Human Resource (HR) expertise. During the period covered by the survey DWP has helped large numbers of disabled and older people into work who may not otherwise have had the opportunity. In order to continue this positive work it is

---

8 Previous research carried out by DWP has demonstrated that a diverse workforce can improve business and attract recruits; diversity is looked on positively by both employees and customers.
important to better understand attitudes to diversity so that employers can be supported in the most effective way possible.

5.3 Responsibilities around diversity

All employers were asked whether they understand what is expected of them regarding diversity and equal opportunities, and the majority say they do. As Figure 5.1 shows there was a mean agreement level of 8.7 out of 10.

Figure 5.1 Employers’ understanding of obligations

An employer’s ability to understand their responsibilities is of course a separate issue to their ability or intention to improve their approach to diversity, and the extent to which they view such improvement as necessary.

5.4 Employer aims to diversify workforce

Thirty-seven per cent of employers who had been in contact with DWP for staff training or welfare issues, or to place a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus, said that they had targets or aims to improve the overall diversity of their workforce, and half (50 per cent) had diversity training in place for managers and staff.

Large employers were significantly more likely (59 per cent) than small employers (36 per cent) to have such targets or aims. Similarly, large employers were also more likely to have diversity training in place. Nevertheless, with 41 per cent of large employers having no targets or aims to improve diversity, there is still considerable scope for improvement even in this group. Figure 5.2 shows the proportions overall, and by size.

Note: Don’t know and neutral responses are not charted and therefore bars will not sum to 100%.

Attitudes and responsibilities towards diversity can be complex and questions can be difficult for employers to answer candidly.
5.5 Employer attitudes to older workers

Employers were asked if they had at any point recruited employees who were over the age of 65 at the start of their employment, with 34 per cent saying they had. The likelihood of having recruited older employees increased with the size of the establishment (60 per cent of large employers had). This might be expected as large employers have higher levels of recruitment and take on more people than smaller employers.

In terms of current workforce, 69 per cent of employers overall said they employed no one above the age of 65 at present. This means, on average, 4.79 per cent of the total workforce is aged over 65 (see Figure 5.3). By comparison, 2.55 per cent of workers working for large employers are aged over 65, compared to 7.35 per cent of those working for small employers.
Employers were asked whether they ever accommodated employees by changing roles and responsibilities as they got older, and 47 per cent said they had. Large employers were far more likely to have done so (84 per cent) (see Figure 5.4). However, large employers were less likely to say they have jobs suitable for older workers (37 per cent compared to 55 per cent overall).

10 ‘Don’t know’ answers are likely to indicate the employer does not know the number of employees, rather than don’t know if they have any. Such ‘don’t know’ answers have been excluded from the mean calculation.
Figure 5.4  Employer practices and perceptions in employing older workers

![Chart showing employer practices and perceptions](chart.png)

5.6  Employer attitudes to disability

Employers were asked to what extent they agreed with statements relating to disability (Figure 5.5). Employers recognised that considering disabled applicants for roles widens the pool of potential recruits, but for many there is a limited supply of suitable roles. The majority of employers also say they face the challenge of having to offer additional support to these employees.

Large employers were more likely to agree that there were plenty of roles in their company which could be performed by disabled people, giving a mean agreement score of 7.0. Large employers were also more likely to agree that considering disabled applicants widened the pool of skilled recruits, with a mean agreement rating of 8.1. This is likely to be because larger employers have a wider range of roles available in their establishments.
Figure 5.5 Agreement with statements relating to employee disability

There are plenty of roles in my company which could be performed by a disabled person

- Disagree strongly: 17%
- Disagree slightly: 13%
- Agree slightly: 11%
- Agree strongly: 19%

Mean: 5.7

By considering disabled applicants, I can gain access to a wider pool of skilled potential recruits

- Disagree strongly: 8%
- Disagree slightly: 8%
- Agree slightly: 32%
- Agree strongly: 25%

Mean: 6.8

Managers and colleagues may need to give additional support to disabled employees, which can be difficult during busy periods

- Disagree strongly: 8%
- Disagree slightly: 7%
- Agree slightly: 33%
- Agree strongly: 23%

Mean: 6.7

Base: unweighted 2,885, weighted 698,854.
Note: Don’t know and neutral responses are not charted and therefore bars will not sum to 100%.

Smaller employers were less likely to agree, and this might be because their resource to make the adjustments required and their experience of recruiting disabled applicants may be more limited.

Over half (56 per cent) of employers acknowledged that disabled workers may require more support from managers and colleagues, and that this can be difficult to provide during busy periods (mean agreement 6.7). The size of the organisation had little bearing on the level of agreement with this statement.

5.7 Employer attitudes to lone parents

Employers were also asked about lone parents, and the extent to which they agreed with the statement ‘the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally’. The overall mean agreement score for this statement was the highest of all reported in this chapter, suggesting that employers generally do not consider lone parents to be any more of a burden on resources than other parents.

Large employers are most likely to agree, with a mean agreement score of 8.0 compared to 7.4 for small employers.
Figure 5.6  Extent to which employers agree that the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children

The challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: unweighted 2,885, weighted 698,854.
Note: Don’t know and neutral responses are not charted and therefore bars will not sum to 100%.
6  Exploration of sector patterns and trends

6.1  Overview

With overall satisfaction scores high in the majority of cases, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) is delivering a good level of service to employers across all sectors. Attitudes to disability and diversity did, however, vary across the sectors.

Notable sector findings included the higher levels of satisfaction expressed by retail employers (particularly with regard to pensions and pay), and by construction sector employers (particularly when dealing with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service). Construction employers, however, were far less likely to be satisfied with contact relating to staff training and welfare than they were with pensions and pay or when placing a vacancy.

Finance sector employers were very satisfied with Jobcentre Plus' vacancy placing services, which is particularly noteworthy given that the finance sector is not a target sector for Jobcentre Plus. Very few finance employers have had contact with Jobcentre Plus in this way, but those that have are very happy with it. Care sector employers have, proportionally, had considerable interaction with DWP, yet their satisfaction levels with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy service is low in comparison to employers from other sectors.

Employers in the care and public sectors are the most committed to diversity in the workforce overall, being the most likely to have aims or targets to improve, to have training in place, to have employed older workers, and to have roles suitable for disabled people. The construction and manufacturing sectors were the least active in attempts to improve workforce diversity. The finance sector employers were open to the idea of workforce diversity, however, when it actually came to the practical measures they were less likely to have older workers either now or to have recruited them in the past.
6.2 Introduction

Previous chapters have explored the overall picture of what is driving satisfaction with DWP and the experiences employers have had when contacting DWP. This chapter focuses on how these experiences and perceptions differ by sector.

Sectors were determined by Jobcentre Plus’s target and non-target groups. They were defined as follows:

- care;
- construction;
- hospitality;
- logistics;
- manufacturing;
- public sector;
- retail;
- other Jobcentre Plus target sectors (including legal, advertising, consultancy, security and recruitment);
- finance; and,
- other sectors (including agriculture, utilities, vehicle maintenance, real estate and other community, social and personal service activities).

6.3 The relationship between employment sector and level/experience of contact with DWP agencies

As shown in Figure 6.1, employers in the care sector are far more likely to have had contact with all three function areas, particularly pensions and pay (39 per cent compared with 18 per cent overall). Public sector employers were also more likely to have contacted DWP about pensions and pay (31 per cent).

Sectors in Figure 6.1 are displayed in the order of the amount of employers who have contacted DWP overall in the period covered by the survey; they will be displayed in this order throughout the chapter.
6.4 Overall satisfaction with DWP

Overall, satisfaction levels are high across the board.

While employers in the construction sector were the least likely to have had contact with DWP, those that did were the most satisfied overall, followed by those in retail and manufacturing. Logistics and other target business employers were the least satisfied.

---

11 Sectors will be presented in the order shown in this chart (proportion contacted DWP) throughout the remainder of the chapter.
6.4.1 Satisfaction with DWP by type of contact

Figure 6.3 shows the overall satisfaction scores with DWP for each sector by type of contact in the bars, and the overall composite score on the line graph. Among the sectors with the most contact (care, public sector, hospitality and finance), satisfaction is very consistent overall with the variations only really coming in among those sectors with less contact with DWP (for example other target businesses and construction).

The construction sector gave DWP the highest rating of all the sectors, and Figure 6.3 shows that was largely driven by contact regarding pensions and pay, and contact with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service where employers from the construction sector gave DWP the highest ratings of all the sectors.

Retail employers also rated DWP highly overall, and this was driven mainly by those with contact regarding pensions and pay.

Employers in the logistics sector and in other target sectors rated DWP slightly lower than other sectors; this was mainly due to the lower than average ratings given by those contacting DWP regarding pay and pensions.
Sector satisfaction with pensions and pay functions is broadly correlated with overall satisfaction, with the construction and retail sectors rating DWP highest. Other target businesses and logistics are less satisfied with DWP, with around one in ten dissatisfied (nine per cent for logistics and ten per cent for other target sectors).

Sector differences were less marked in relation to staff training and welfare. Employers within the hospitality sector who contacted DWP regarding staff welfare and training were more likely to be positive about their experiences with DWP than both employers from other sectors, and other hospitality employers who contacted DWP for other reasons. Employers from the finance sector were the least likely to be satisfied with their contact with DWP regarding staff welfare and training, although these were more likely to give a neutral rating of 5 or 6 out of 10 rather than being actively dissatisfied.

In previous surveys, construction sector employers have demonstrated a greater level of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ recruitment services than other employers, and they rate Jobcentre Plus more highly than other sectors this year. Dissatisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service was greater among the care sector (18 per cent dissatisfied) and the public sector (16 per cent dissatisfied). Figure 6.1
shows that these two sectors are most likely to use Jobcentre Plus, with 34 per cent of all care establishments, and 22 per cent of all public sector establishments, having used Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy in the year covered by the survey.

6.5 Sub-drivers of satisfaction

This section investigates the sub-drivers for satisfaction across different employment sectors for contact relating to staff training and welfare and for contact with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service.\(^{12}\)

Where satisfaction is considerably higher or lower, the sub-drivers are examined to determine where service is good, or where it needs improving.\(^{13}\)

6.5.1 Contact with DWP relating to staff training and welfare

Table 6.1 summarises whether the mean scores are higher or lower than the national average for each of the key sub-drivers. All differences stated are statistically significant at the 95 per cent level.

As described below, employers within the hospitality sector were, relatively, more satisfied in their dealings with DWP relating to staff welfare and training. In particular, they were more satisfied with the depth of knowledge staff had and the way DWP staff kept them informed of how long the query would take to resolve.

Employers in the care sector were more satisfied across the board, particularly in terms of treatment by staff, while employers within the other target business sector were less satisfied than the national average across all of the key sub-drivers and those in the manufacturing and logistics sectors were also less satisfied than average across a number of key sub-drivers.

Least satisfied overall was the finance sector, and Table 6.1 shows accessibility to be a specific area of dissatisfaction.

\(^{12}\) In terms of contact relating to pensions and pay, the base sizes are too small (under 50) to conduct any sub-group analysis by sector.

\(^{13}\) For a full list of key drivers and their sub-drivers, and the factors that feed into them, see the technical appendix.
Table 6.1  Contact relating to staff training and welfare: key sub-drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Being treated well</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Building a business relationship</th>
<th>Two way relationship</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment by staff</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>[↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[↑]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[↑]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
<td>[↑, ↑, ↑]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other target business</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
<td>[↓, ↓, ↓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green/up arrow: Higher than average  
White/no arrow: Average  
Red/down arrow: Lower than average
6.5.2 Contact with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service

Table 6.2 summarises the significant differences in satisfaction with each of the key sub-drivers for each sector among those employers who had contacted Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.

At the overall level it was employers from the construction sector who were most likely to be satisfied with Jobcentre Plus. Closer analysis reveals that these employers rated DWP higher than average in three key sub-driver measures (outcomes, communication and building a relationship), and specifically in terms of staff keeping in contact while handling the vacancy, which is one of the main statistical drivers. They were also particularly satisfied with the suitability of candidates for the vacancy.

Employers from the finance sector rated above average for all but one factor (the suitability of candidates). This is interesting as the finance sector is not seen as a key target sector by Jobcentre Plus, and in fact just 13 per cent of financial establishments have used Jobcentre Plus to help with their recruitment in the period covered by the survey.

Employers within the manufacturing sector gave higher satisfaction ratings across all individual factors. In particular they were more satisfied with the efficiency of the system, the speed at which candidates were provided and receiving an accurate service at the first time of asking.

In contrast, employers from the care sector were significantly less satisfied with nearly all factors from Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service. Two key areas of dissatisfaction were staff knowledge of the labour market and the suitability of candidates provided. This is a particular area of concern given the importance of this sector to Jobcentre Plus, and the proportion of care establishments who use Jobcentre Plus to help them recruit staff (34 per cent in the period covered by the survey).

Public sector employers gave the second lowest overall satisfaction score for placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus and Table 6.2 shows they score lower in all key sub-driver measures except for treatment by staff. They were particularly dissatisfied with the number of candidates who applied, with a mean score of just 5.6 out of 10 – the lowest score given to any of these sub-drivers by any sector group.
### Table 6.2  Contact with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service: key drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Being treated well</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Building a business relationship</th>
<th>Two way relationship</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green (up arrow): Higher than average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green/\up arrow\: Higher than average  
White/\no arrow\: Average  
Red/\down arrow\: Lower than average
6.6 Employer responsibilities and attitudes to diversity

Another aim of the survey was to monitor employers’ attitudes and actions to promote a more diverse workforce. As discussed in Chapter 5, DWP works closely with all sectors to encourage employment of under-represented groups, through advice and through more proactive schemes such as Local Employment Partnerships.

6.6.1 Employer aims to diversify workforce

As discussed in Chapter 5, 37 per cent of employers have aims, or targets, for improving diversity, and 50 per cent offer training to staff. Employers in the care and public sectors were significantly more likely than the national average to have targets or aims to improve their workforce diversity, and were also most likely to offer diversity training to their staff. Manufacturing and construction were the sectors least likely to have diversity aims or targets, and were significantly less likely than the average to offer diversity training (see Figure 6.4).
6.6.2 Employer attitudes on older workers

Around a third of employers had recruited older workers in the past. The public (43 per cent) and care (45 per cent) sectors were most likely to have recruited older workers, with construction again the least likely, (22 per cent) and finance (24 per cent) also significantly less likely to have done so.
The average proportion of older workers at a company is around five per cent. Employers in the retail, care and ‘other Jobcentre Plus target business activities’ sectors have the highest percentage of their workforce aged over 65 (see Figure 6.5). The manufacturing, finance and construction sectors employed the lowest proportion of older workers.

**Figure 6.5  Any workers over the age of 65**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 45%</td>
<td>Yes: 42%</td>
<td>Yes: 26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know: 5%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 5%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 50%</td>
<td>No: 53%</td>
<td>No: 73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.35% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>4.31% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>5.38% of workforce 65+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 14%</td>
<td>Yes: 28%</td>
<td>Yes: 34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know: 6%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 1%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 70%</td>
<td>No: 71%</td>
<td>No: 63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>3.99% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>2.95% of workforce 65+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 28%</td>
<td>Yes: 24%</td>
<td>Yes: 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know: 1%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 3%</td>
<td>Don’t know: 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 71%</td>
<td>No: 73%</td>
<td>No: 69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.48% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>5.38% of workforce 65+</td>
<td>7.07% of workforce 65+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 22%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know: 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.6.3  Employer attitudes to disability**

Employers from the financial, care and public sectors were most likely to agree both that there were plenty of roles in their company that could be performed by disabled people and that considering disabled applicants provided a wider pool of skilled potential recruits, with employers in the construction industry least likely to concur on both accounts.

Hospitality sector employers were most likely to acknowledge that it can be difficult to provide the required support to disabled workers during busy periods, with those from the finance sector least likely.

Table 6.3 shows a full breakdown of results.
Table 6.3  Mean agreement scores on disabled worker statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Base Unweighted</th>
<th>Base Weighted</th>
<th>There are plenty of roles in my company which could be performed by a disabled person</th>
<th>By considering disabled applicants, I can gain access to a wider pool of skilled potential recruits</th>
<th>Managers and colleagues may need to give additional support to disabled employees, which can be difficult during busy periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>698,854</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>38,071</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>51,307</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>64,904</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>61,858</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>44,021</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>83,898</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>181,856</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other target</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>96,875</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>60,933</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.4 Employer attitudes to lone parents

Employers were also asked about lone parents, and the extent to which they agreed with the statement that ‘the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally’. Employers in the retail, public, health and education and ‘other target’ sectors displayed higher levels of agreement than the average (mean agreement was 7.5 out of 10). Those in the hospitality sector were least likely to agree. Table 6.4 shows the scores by sector.
Table 6.4  Mean agreement that the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing people with young children generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>698,854</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>38,071</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>51,307</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>64,904</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>61,858</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>44,021</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>83,898</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>181,856</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other target</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>96,875</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>60,933</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Exploration of regional patterns and trends

7.1 Overview

Overall, employers from Scotland were most satisfied with the service they received from Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) in the period covered by the survey. However, this was only true for contact relating to pensions and pay, and to placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus. The employers from Scotland were in fact one of the least satisfied with contact relating to staff training and welfare. The other most satisfied regions were the West Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber.

Employers in the North East had the most contact with DWP during the period covered by the survey, but were one of the least satisfied regions. These employers were least satisfied for contact relating to pensions and pay and to placing vacancies with Jobcentre Plus, but they were one of the most satisfied regions when it came to contact regarding staff training and welfare.

When it comes to diversity, employers in the North East were least likely to actively work to diversify their workforce with the fewest older workers and the most guarded attitudes towards employing those with a disability or lone parents. This is despite nearly half having diversity training in place for staff. Other than this there were few trends in attitudes to diversity, with little consistent differences between the regions.

7.2 Introduction

This chapter focuses on how employers’ experiences and contact with DWP differs by region.
7.3 The relationship between region and level/experience of contact with DWP agencies

The regional profile of employers who have had contact with DWP (regarding pensions and pay, staff training and welfare or to fill a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus) is broadly in line with the overall profile of employers in the UK. Figure 7.1 demonstrates employers in the North East were more likely to have contact regarding pensions and pay than they were to have other types of contact, and particularly more likely than the other regions to have this type of contact. They were also among the most likely to have contact in relation to staff training and welfare, and to advertise a vacancy through Jobcentre Plus.

Regions in Figure 7.1 are displayed in the order of the amount of employers who have contacted DWP overall in the period covered by the survey; they will be displayed in this order throughout the chapter.

**Figure 7.1 Proportion of employers engaging with DWP, by region**

Regions will be presented in the order shown in this chart (proportion contacted DWP) throughout the remainder of the chapter.

---

14 Regions will be presented in the order shown in this chart (proportion contacted DWP) throughout the remainder of the chapter.
7.4 Overall satisfaction with DWP

The same method of calculating a composite satisfaction score as was applied in Chapter 2 was used to calculate an overall score for each region (Figure 7.2).

Employers in Scotland were most satisfied overall with the service received from DWP over the period covered by the survey, followed by the West Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber. Least satisfied by a long way were employers in London. Employers in the North East and South West were also less likely to be satisfied at an overall level.

The following sections will explore how this compares depending on type of contact and reasons for the variation in satisfaction as well as showing where specific regions may need more investment in improvements from DWP.

Figure 7.2 Composite overall satisfaction, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.1 Satisfaction with DWP by type of contact

Figure 7.3 shows the overall satisfaction scores with DWP for each region by type of contact, and the overall composite score as a line graph. It can be seen from the chart that variations in satisfaction are not large in general and overall satisfaction is high. Differences between regions highlighted in this chapter are significant; however, there is no region with levels of satisfaction so low as to cause concern.
Employers in Scotland gave the highest satisfaction ratings to DWP overall and Figure 7.3 shows that this was driven largely by the high ratings given by employers contacting DWP about pensions and pay, and those placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus. When it comes to contact regarding staff training and welfare, employers in Scotland actually rate DWP second lowest of all the regions.

Overall, satisfaction in the West Midlands was relatively high as a consequence of higher satisfaction in relation to contacting DWP regarding staff training and welfare (but lower in terms of dealings relating to pensions and dealing with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy).

London was the least satisfied overall and this was due to low ratings given particularly for pensions and pay contact, although staff training and welfare contact was also rated below average.

Satisfaction in the North East was, in fact, above average for staff training and welfare. However, contact regarding pensions and pay and placing a vacancy with Jobcentre Plus brought the average down. This was also the case for satisfaction in the South West.
Looking specifically by contact type, the picture for dealings relating to pensions and pay was very similar to the overall picture, with employers in Scotland most satisfied with their contact and employers in London the least satisfied. Those in the North West were more satisfied with their contact regarding pensions and pay than they were with their other types of contact, giving the second highest rating here. Employers in Yorkshire and the Humber conversely were less satisfied with their contact regarding pensions and pay than they were with their contact for other reasons. In general, those who were not highly satisfied tended to give neutral answers of five or six out of ten rather than actively stating they were dissatisfied. The exception to this was in the North East, where nine per cent of employers gave a rating of just one or two out of ten. This is significantly more than the average and explains why the overall composite satisfaction score among employers in this region was relatively low.

Regional differences for those contacting DWP relating to staff welfare and training showed slightly different trends to those contacting DWP about pensions and pay. Once again, employers in London were less satisfied than the average, but once again they were more likely to be fairly satisfied, giving ratings of seven or eight out of ten, or neutral rather than dissatisfied. Yorkshire and the Humber employers were significantly more likely to rate themselves as very satisfied, which is more in line with their overall rating as the third most satisfied regional group of employers.

Employers in Scotland rate their Jobcentre Plus vacancy placing service highly, giving the second highest score of all the regions. However, it is Yorkshire and the Humber region’s employers who again rate DWP the highest in this respect. Employers in London rate Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing services higher than they do other DWP services, however, employers in the wider South East were the least satisfied with the service received. Opinion in the South West was polarised, with employers both significantly more likely to be very satisfied, and very dissatisfied.

7.5 Sub-drivers of satisfaction

Having profiled the regions where employers are more satisfied or dissatisfied than the national average, the following sections determine what drives the relative satisfaction/dissatisfaction within these regions.15

For contact relating to staff training and welfare, and for contact with Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy, the following sections show whether regions are more or less likely than average to be satisfied with DWP across the key sub-driver areas. Where satisfaction is considerably higher or lower, the factors are examined to determine the exact area where service is good, or where it needs improving.16

---

15 In terms of contact relating to pensions and pay, the base sizes are too small (under 50) to conduct any sub-group analysis by sector.

16 For a full list of key drivers and their sub-drivers, and the factors that feed into them, see the technical appendix.
7.5.1 Contact with DWP relating to staff training and welfare

Table 7.1 summarises whether the mean regional scores are higher or lower than
the national average for each of the key sub-drivers. All differences stated are
statistically significant at the 95 per cent level.

Employers in Scotland were one of the least satisfied groups overall and, as Table
7.1 shows, they also gave below average ratings for most of the key sub-drivers. The
dissatisfaction in Scotland resulted from timeliness, speed of the response
(mean 7.1 compared to an overall score of 8.0) and speed with which the query
was resolved (7.2 compared to 8.2 overall), along with the extent to which the
staff listened to them (7.2 compared to 8.1) and the response was tailored to their
needs (6.6 compared to 7.7).

London, the least satisfied region overall, do not give DWP a particularly low rating
in this regard and, in fact, give higher than average ratings for the understanding
of DWP staff.

As seen in the overall satisfaction ratings, employers in Yorkshire and the Humber
and in Wales were the most satisfied with their dealings with DWP over the past
year regarding staff welfare and training. This is reflected in the sub-driver scores,
with both regions’ employers consistently giving higher ratings than the average.
Both employers from Yorkshire and the Humber and employers from Wales gave
particularly higher than average ratings for the knowledge of DWP’s staff (with
means of 9.1 and 8.8 respectively, compared to 7.8 overall), and for the way they
were kept informed (8.6 and 8.7 respectively, compared to 7.7 overall). Yorkshire
and the Humber’s employers were also particularly happy about the way DWP’s
staff understood the needs of their business (mean 8.2 compared to 7.0 overall).

The dissatisfaction in the Eastern region stemmed largely from the extent to which
these employers received the information they needed at the first time of asking
(6.2 compared to 8.0), the knowledge of DWP staff (6.4 compared to 7.8) and the
efficiency with which they were dealt with (6.8 compared to 8.1).
Table 7.1  Contact relating to staff training and welfare: key sub-driver mean scores summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Being treated well</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Building a business relationship</th>
<th>Two way relationship</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green/up arrow: Higher than average
White/no arrow: Average
Red/down arrow: Lower than average
7.5.2 Contact with Jobcentre Plus to fill place a vacancy

Table 7.2 summarises the significant differences in satisfaction with each of the key sub-drivers for each sector among those employers who had contacted Jobcentre Plus to place a vacancy.

As described previously, employers in the Eastern region consistently gave lower scores about contact relating to staff training and welfare (contact which is most likely to be through Jobcentre Plus). However, as Table 7.2 shows, employers from this region are rating Jobcentre Plus in line with the overall scores for the UK across all drivers of placing a vacancy. The fact that Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy service in the Eastern region is performing well suggests there is no specific problem with Jobcentre Plus in this region, despite the lower scores relating to staff training and welfare.

Employers in the North East and the South East show the most cause for concern when rating the sub-drivers of satisfaction with Jobcentre Plus’ vacancy placing service, and these two regions were the least satisfied overall. However, the concerns of each were quite different. Employers in the North East were least satisfied when compared to the overall scores with the availability of staff (mean 6.7 compared to 8.1 overall), receiving accurate service at the first time of asking (mean 6.8 compared to 7.9 overall), the speed of providing candidates (mean 6.8 compared to 7.8 overall) and staff listening to what they had to say (mean 7.4 compared to 8.4 overall). Those in the South East, meanwhile, were less satisfied with the extent to which staff kept in contact (mean 6.1 compared to 6.9 overall) and staff making it clear what was required of them (mean 7.2 compared to 8.0 overall), along with the speed of providing candidates (mean 7.0 compared to 7.8 overall).

Employers in Yorkshire and the Humber were the most satisfied and this is reflected in Table 7.2, which shows that these employers gave consistently high ratings. This was particularly the case in the extent to which staff kept in contact (mean 7.6 compared to 6.9 overall) and staff making it clear what was required of them (mean 8.7 compared to 8.0 overall) – two factors which those in the South East rated among the most negative – and around the ease and efficiency of registering the vacancy (mean 9.0 compared to 8.3 overall). It could be the case that due to better communications in this region (around staff keeping in contact and making it clear what was required), the perceived ease of using the system improves with this extra support.
Table 7.2  Contact with Jobcentre Plus to fill a vacancy: key sub-driver mean scores summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being treated well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment by staff</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green/up arrow: Higher than average  
White/no arrow: Average  
Red/down arrow: Lower than average
7.6 Employer responsibilities and attitudes to diversity

The survey was also set up to monitor employers’ attitudes and actions to promote a more diverse workforce. As discussed in Chapter 5, DWP works closely with all sectors to encourage the employment of under-representative groups, through advice and through more proactive schemes such as Local Employment Partnerships. This section looks at the differences in region regarding attitudes towards minority groups and actions taken to increase diversity.

7.6.1 Employer aims to diversify workforce

As discussed in Chapter 5, 37 per cent of all employers have aims or targets for improving diversity and 50 per cent offer training to staff. Employers in London and Wales were significantly more likely than average to have targets to improve their workforce diversity. However, they were no more likely than average to offer diversity training to their staff. Employers in the North West were significantly less likely to have targets, but no less likely to offer training. The South West’s employers were the least active region in this regard, significantly less likely than average to have targets or to offer training.

Employers in the East of England and in Scotland were the most likely to offer diversity training to their staff.
Figure 7.4  Proportion of employers with targets to diversify workforce/with diversity training in place, split by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Have diversity training in place</th>
<th>Have targets/aims to improve diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6.2 Employer attitude to older workers

Around a third of employers overall had recruited older workers in the past. Employers located in Scotland, the South East and the West Midlands were most likely (all 40 per cent), and those in the East Midlands were least likely, to recruit older workers. The average proportion of older workers at a company overall is around five per cent. Those in the West Midlands have, on average, the highest percentage of their workforce as being over the age of 65, with 7.6 per cent of the average workforce made up of this age group (see Figure 7.5). Employers in the North East were least likely to have any older workers at all, with 84 per cent reporting they had none, and just 1.2 per cent of the average workforce over this age.

Figure 7.5 Any workers over the age of 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage of workforce 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employers in Wales (56 per cent), the South East (55 per cent) and the Eastern (53 per cent) regions were most likely to report having accommodated employees changing roles and responsibilities as they get older. Least likely to report having done this were employers in Yorkshire and the Humber (38 per cent) and the South West (41 per cent).
7.6.3 Employer attitudes to disability

Employers were asked on a scale of 1 to 10 how strongly they agreed (or disagreed) with a range of statements relating to employing disabled people.

Employers in London and Wales were most likely, and those in the North East were least likely, to agree that there were plenty of roles in their organisation suitable for disabled people. Similarly, employers based in London and Wales were more likely to agree that considering disabled applicants provided a wider pool of skilled potential recruits. Employers in the East Midlands and the South West were the least likely to agree.

Looking at employers’ opinion that it can be difficult to provide the required support to disabled workers during busy periods, employers in Yorkshire and the Humber were most likely and in the East Midlands least likely to agree with this point of view.

Table 7.3 gives a full breakdown of scores.

Table 7.3 Mean agreement scores on disabled worker statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Base Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>By considering disabled applicants, I can gain access to a wider pool of skilled potential recruits</th>
<th>Managers and colleagues may need to give additional support to disabled employees, which can be difficult during busy periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>50,393</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>73,426</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>58,507</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>98,139</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>67,895</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>698,854</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>62,904</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>53,752</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>103,468</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>27,011</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>36,022</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>67,337</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6.4   Employer attitudes to lone parents

Finally, employers were also asked about lone parents, and the extent to which they agreed with the statement that ‘the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing parents with young children generally’. There were limited regional differences in agreement; the highest mean agreement score was for employers based in Yorkshire and the Humber (7.8) and the lowest for those in the North East (7.1).

Table 7.4 gives a full breakdown of results.

Table 7.4   Mean agreement that the challenges of employing lone parents are no different to employing people with young children generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>698,854</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>53,752</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>103,468</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>98,139</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>27,011</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>67,895</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>58,507</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>50,393</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>36,022</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>62,904</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>73,426</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>67,337</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>