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1. INTRODUCTION

Research project *The Quest for Well-being in Growth Industries: A Collaborative Study in Finland and Scotland*, under the auspices of the *Academy of Finland* research programme, *The Future of Work and Well-being*. It aims to study work-related well-being policies in selected growth sectors. The Academy of Finland programme, *The Future of Work and Well-being*, comprises six research consortia and 15 research projects in universities and research institutions around Finland. The projects of this cross-disciplinary programme cover a wide variety of research topics in this field, drawing on *inter alia* economics, law, occupational health, political science, psychology, public health, social psychology, sociology, as well as studies of work, organisations and management. The original application for this project was made to the research co-operation between the Academy of Finland and Economic and Social Research Council (UK). The stated goal of the original call, targeted at Finnish and UK research collaboration, was to ‘explore the relationship between work and well-being, and to open up new research frontiers with a view to meeting future challenges’.

The research project examines the contradictory pressures for policies and practices towards both the inhibition and the enhancement of work-related well-being that are likely in growth industries. The overall aim is to evaluate the development, implementation and use of work-related well-being policies in four selected growth industries. These – electronics, care, finance and accounting, and tourism – have been selected on the basis of EU and national forecasts, and demographic and socio-economic trends in standard and non-standard employment. This collaborative project provides national and transnational data, analysis and outputs. The study is being conducted in Finland, Department of Management and Organisation, Hanken (www.hanken.fi), with collaboration with researchers in Scotland/UK, led by School of Law and Social Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University (www.gcal.ac.uk), with East London, Heriot-Watt and Reading Universities.1 2

The objectives and methods of the project are as follows:

1. To provide a systematic mapping and situational analysis of work-related legislation and policies for well-being in Finland.

---

1 *Hanken, Finland*: Professor Jeff Hearn (hearn@hanken.fi), Project leader, Researchers: Dr Teemu Tallberg (currently Helsinki University), Dr Hertta Niemi (currently Gemic Oy), Charlotta Niemistö. Associated researchers: Dr Pernilla Gripenberg, Dr Marjut Jyrkinen.  
2 *Scotland/UK*: Professor Linda McKie (L.McKie@gcal.ac.uk), Glasgow Caledonian University, Dr Andrew Smith, University of East London, Professor Gill Hogg, Heriot-Watt University, Dr Sophie Bowlby, Reading University.  
2 We are grateful to all the research participants for their cooperation, and to Karl-Erik Sveiby for constructive comments on an earlier version of this working paper.
2. To identify which policies are in place, are being used, monitored and evaluated, in the selected growth sectors of care services, electronics, finance and accounting, and tourism.

3. To examine the interactions between work-related well-being policies, practices and cultures.

4. To identify the opportunities (enhancements) and barriers (inhibitions) to the development of well-being policies and practices both formally and informally in the selected industries.

5. To examine how gender and other forms of social differentiation, such as age and including forms of employment (non-standard and standard), affect competitive advantage and well-being.

6. To examine how transnational processes and structures affect the operation of growth industries and work-related, well-being policies.

In particular, the project draws on earlier work on organisation carescapes (McKie et al., 2009b, 2009c) and more specifically on the conceptual and empirical background to the current research project (Hearn et al., 2009). The aim of this current paper is to review the survey that constitutes the second main phase of this research.

1.1. Transformations in the spheres of work and life

A number of recent studies gave drawn attention to the interrelationships of work, well-being and lifestyle across Europe. These include:

- Rotating module included in the European Social Survey 2004 on Family, Work and Wellbeing
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living & Working Conditions (Eurofound):
  - Results of the 4th European Working Conditions Survey undertaken in 2005
  - Working Time and Work-life Balance in European Companies undertaken in 2004/5
- ESRC funded research
  - Understanding Trends in Job Satisfaction (Green, 2005; R000220279)
  - Employment and the Family (Crompton, 2005; R000239727)

Across all of these studies a range of trends and issues can be identified. Workers in Europe tend to be relatively satisfied with many aspects of their home and working lives. Those working regular and predictable schedules perceive work-life balance most positively. There
are, however, tensions. Stresses can be caused by the pace and nature of growth and change. Conflicts among colleagues and with customers or clients may also cause stress. Uncertainties in corporate and public sector finances and downward economic trends also cause strains. Information technologies were the main factor in the changing nature of job content. Less change was evident in the gendered nature of work and work-life. Women working full time, and part-time, were more likely to report problems in combing caring and working than male counterparts. Regardless of gender and age, workers value scope for personal initiative, remain concerned about long hours, as well as job security and future incomes. A growing number of workers will traverse paths that shift across security and insecurity, as they are encouraged to be flexible. It is in this context that the notion of ‘flexicurity’, combining flexibility in labour markets with social protection is promoted across the EU (EU, 2006: 15).

Promoting and maintaining physical and psychological health is critical to ensuring well-being and productivity. Respondents to the health and well-being survey undertaken by Eurofound (2007) reported musculoskeletal problems (25%), psychosocial stresses (22%) and the experience or fear of harassment and violence (15%). Reasons for health-related problems at work included the changing nature of work, exposure to risk factors, repetitive and stressful work, time pressures, intensification and increased multi-skilling. Further, gender equality and diversity in work organisations remains a complex arena with attitudes and practices seemingly entrenched (see www.monikko.net).

In noting the transformations of work and home life Glucksmann’s (2005: 20) concept of the Total Social Organisation of Labour (TSOL) offers a useful framework. TSOL affords equal significance to developments in ‘non-market and unpaid work, including proliferation of the modes and extent of care work, the growth of voluntary or community work in the public domain, and shifts in both directions across the commodity / non commodity divide.’ In this project we also draw upon on-going empirical and conceptual work on work-life balance (McKie et al., 2007) and care in and around organisations (McKie et al., 2009a, 2009b).

Aspects of care and well-being can be found in a range of statutory duties, policies and related activities, including: health and safety, equality and diversity, maternity and parental leave, religious observance, bullying and harassment, personal development, voluntary redundancy, early retirement, employer pension schemes, grievance procedures, and dismissal. Care is, however, intrinsic to well-being. The term, well-being, affords a broader conceptual base and one that, while too often associated with health, builds upon ongoing EU surveys and work.
1.2. **Researching well-being and work**

A comprehensive transdisciplinary review of published work on the concept of well-being (Cronin de Chavez et al., 2005) examined definitions used in psychology, health studies, sociology and anthropology, economics and multidisciplinary projects. The authors of that paper (ibid.: 81) concluded that well-being is a ‘multifaceted concept which requires clearer definition and agreement among both researchers and practitioners.’ Given that the concept often appears ‘all-encompassing may well be its strength and its strategic attraction’ (ibid.). Certainly it is a term that offers breadth, but used unreflectively can mask potential misunderstandings, such as assuming a monolithic view of ‘well-being’, avoiding attention to social divisions within organisations (such as gender and class), or neglecting issues beyond the organisation (either in people’s home life or structurally in society).

The changing demographic profile of the EU has major implications for work and well-being. This, and the issues cited above are of major concern to the European Commission and Parliament. Businesses and organisations are grappling with a range of policies on these matters. Employers associations and trade unions are also exploring the transformations of work. In addition, a number of companies have emerged that offer practical HR and legal advice, lobby governments and the EU and undertake research on these matters (see, for example, www.eff.org.uk).

In our own research we seek to explore ways to examine well-being in which we can ‘operationalise’ the concept across all levels and sectors. Well-being in the original programme call for proposals was defined in terms of needs or resources, to influence and participate, in working life. The focus is upon the employee and employees more collectively, and the opportunities or challenges, posed by frameworks of employment and the balance between work and other spheres of life. Policies and practices in the workplace are, therefore, critical. Thus the conceptual basis to our research design requires research methods across a range of levels, namely:

- **the health and well-being of employees**, involving: health and safety legislation, bullying and harassment policies, grievance procedures, sickness absence and policies on stress;
- **equality and diversity issues**, encompassing: parental leave, sexual orientation, ethnic and race relations, disability and age discrimination, and religious observance; and
• **responsibilities and rights**, including: training, professional development and lifelong learning, flexibility and security (along with the notion of ‘flexicurity’), redundancy, employer pension schemes and retirement.

Further, and as developed in the previous UK research (McKie et al., 2009c), we seek to develop analysis that can encompass and move across and between the following:

- **Formal ‘well-being’ policies**: These may be defined as courses of action adopted in a written format on the range of areas in which well-being may be relevant. How does the adoption and form of such policies link to regulation by national and supranational governments and pressures from professional associations, trade unions and the labour market?
- **The implementation of policies and practices of well-being**: This would include, if applicable, human resource managers or departments, and line managers.
- **Experiences of well-being policies**: Firstly, within companies. How have policies and practices evolved? Who uses such policies? How, when and why? How far do practices match policies? Who holds discretion and how do they make decisions on accessing aspects of policies that are not statutory? Secondly, how do these practices link to wider cultures of well-being outside the workplace?
- **Well-being cultures in and around work organisations**: What are the cultures of well-being in work organisations? In what ways do these cultures evolve, develop and transform over time? What impact do these have on working relations, employer-employee attitudes towards the company, job security and well-being?
- **Relations between well-being inside and outside organisations**: How do formal well-being policies, their implementation, and well-being cultures in organisations affect and interlink with the experiences of well-being inside and outside organisations?

Thus we see ‘well-being’ as a multi-faceted and open ended conceptual frame for studying organisations that incorporates the often neglected questions of care within and around organisations. Accordingly, our approach is a multi-method one combining quantitative and qualitative methods. This approach is highly appropriate to the researching of policies and practices (Bryman, 2006). The project includes a survey of employers’ policies and practices, and the employment of a range of qualitative methods through what we define as ‘portraits of practice’. Mindful of the need to assess and enhance quality means addressing ‘traditional’ notions of internal validity and triangulation (Seale, 1999; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). First, we introduce the phases in the research plan, before going into more detail on the implementation of the survey.
2. SURVEY DESIGN

The aim of the survey was to gather information on the policies and practices relevant to the well-being of employing organisations in the four identified ‘growth industries’.

2.1. Sampling

Given the relevance of the number of employees to the development, implementation, use and evaluation of policies, and the existence of a Human Resources department or specialists, the sample was drawn on the basis of size as well as sector. The goal was a survey of 100 completed questionnaires: 25 completed questionnaires from each sector and within that biased to larger organisations, with 15 of the 25 from large and 5 from each of the micro and medium sized companies. We have recognised that most workers in the EU are employed by SMEs but also the crucial role that large companies play in economic growth and policy and practice development in well-being / care and work. The inclusion of large and medium sized, as well as the often ignored small companies, in the study brings different organisational contexts of well-being policies and practices that have been relatively neglected in some studies.

The survey sampling frame was as in the table below:

Table 1: The survey sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Small (1-49 workers)</th>
<th>Medium (50-249 workers)</th>
<th>Large (over 250 workers)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care agencies and services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and accounting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recruitment was proactive, and particular effort will be put into recruiting SMEs. Sampling for the survey was done on basis of the four selected growth sectors. Using the Standard Industrial Classification TOL 2002 (http://www.stat.fi/meta/luokitukset/toimiala/001-2002/index_en.html) a list of codes covering the four sectors was compiled (see Appendix 1). Organisations within these categories were searched from contact information database
In addition to the TOL classification, the number of employees was used as a filter in order to balance the sample in terms of size of the organisations. Additionally, organisations with less than 10 employees were excluded from the sample. On basis of these searches, a database with the basic and contact information of 544 organisations was compiled. The database included: company name; sector (TOL classification + possible details); company size; address; contact person; telephone; website address; information source (mainly Fonecta ProFinder B2B).

Considerable effort was devoted to identifying a senior person in the company with responsibilities for organisational policies and practices on well-being, including health and safety, disciplinary actions, grievances, bullying and harassment, as well as the more obvious policies on work-life reconciliation. In our experience a questionnaire sent to a specific person is much more likely to be completed.

2.2. Data collection

In developing the survey, attention was given to comparative and cross-national issues. Topics raised included the collation of basic characteristics of the company and staff arrangements, and policies and practices with regard to:

- Equality and diversity
- Health and well-being
- Responsibilities and rights
- Policy development and implementation
- Who uses policies, when and why
- Monitoring and evaluation

The questionnaire “Työ ja hyvinvointi” (see Appendices 2 and 3) drew on previous questionnaires from:

a. Scottish/UK team (UK Research Council [ESRC] study “Policies and practices of work-related well-being”) (McKie et al., 2009c);

b. previous Academy-funded research on gender policies in 100 largest companies in Finland (Hanken) (Hearn et al., 2002);

---

3 Fonecta ProFinder B2B (http://www.profinderb2b.fi/) is a search engine and a database mainly for sales and marketing purposes. It includes, among other things, contact information of companies and their decision makers, as well as financial figures, and a business life cycle (BLC) description.
c. STAKES project (“Perhevapaat ja työelämän tasa-arvo”) on practices of work and family reconciliation in companies (Salmi et al., 2009);

After developing the questionnaire through many drafts, piloting was carried out. At this point the questionnaire already existed online. Volunteers for the piloting were sought for through a letter to around 2,000 alumnae of the Hanken School of Economics. Despite the relatively few responses from this overture, the pilots proved extremely helpful in refining the survey. Indeed one might note that a small number of intensive ‘high quality’ pilots are often more useful than a larger number of less intense pilots.

The survey was sent out to 540 organisations in June 2009. The internet-based questionnaire was available in Finnish, but the informants were given the possibility to have the questionnaire in English if they wished. Throughout the survey contacting (sending out the survey and two reminders), email addresses bouncing back or otherwise found faulty were replaced by new ones, either from the same organisation or by substituting the organisation with a new one. The survey comprised open and closed questions, and analysis has reflected the differing forms of data. Where appropriate analysis has been undertaken using SPSS/PASW (closed questions and categorised data from open questions), and with open questions extensive consideration has been given by the team to the categorisation of data and subsequent handling.

3. INITIAL RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

3.1. Survey participants
The goal of the survey was to obtain 25 responses from each sector (n=100). The survey was sent out on 21st May and 28th May 2009, with two reminders on 2nd June and 9th June. This brought 107 positive responses, but with an uneven distribution, heavily concentrated on the care sector. After this, employing organisations were contacted randomly (using random numbers) among non-repliers from the data base. This brought 20 more positive responses. Through these additional contacts a satisfactory dataset of 127 responses was reached, comprising of 25 from electronics, 26 from finance and accounting, 53 from care, and 23 from tourism sector.
Table 2: Organisations participating the survey by size and sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>TOTAL⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The care sector organisations could be assumed to be more willing or used to participate in surveys of this kind, especially those addressing questions of well-being. In addition, some of the employing organisations were public sector, third sector or partnership organisations that may tend to respond more frequently to surveys. Still, the clearly higher response rate in the care sector was a surprise to us. In terms of size, participation varied among the sectors: in finance and accounting, as well as in electronics, the clear majority were large and medium size organisations, whereas in tourism participants were mostly small, and in the care sector small and medium sized organisations predominated. The majority (86.2%) of the individuals responding to the survey had a managerial level position.

Table 3: Survey respondents by their position within their organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toimitusjohtaja (CEO / office/general manager)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkilöstöpäällikkö (HR manager)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkilöstöjohtaja (chief HR manager)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talousjohtaja/päällikkö (finance manager)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muu johtaja (other manager)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkilöstöasistentti (HR assistant)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrittäjä (entrepreneur)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other⁵</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Five of the organisations participating the survey did not report the number of their employees.
⁵ Other reported titles: esimies (superior), hallintosihteeri (administrative secretary), hallintovastaava (administrator), henkilöstöasiantuntija (personnel expert).
3.2. Growth and expectations

It is important to contextualise the survey and the time it took place. The survey was carried out at a specific moment during a widespread economic downturn. Here the question of the multi-layered economic context can only be touched upon and the effects on the responses reflected on. We had extensive discussions in the research team on whether the ‘growth industry’ orientation should be rethought and reconceptualised. In the event we decided to maintain the initial plan to focus on ‘growth industries’ and the relations of ‘growth’ and ‘well-being’. To a large extent this decision was vindicated by the pattern of responses where we saw high levels of reporting of past and expected growth (see Table 4).

Table 4: Growth and growth expectations in terms of turnover and the number of employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has your organisation grown during the last five years in terms of turnover?</th>
<th>Do you expect your organisation to grow in the next five years?</th>
<th>Do you consider your sector a growth sector?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>turnover?</td>
<td>employees?</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>78% (94)</td>
<td>72% (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>20% (24)</td>
<td>27% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, most of the organisations that participated the survey have experienced growth within the last five years, are expecting growth years, and consider their sector a growth sector. There are significant correlations between growth during the past five years and growth expectations. There is an even stronger correlation between past growth in terms of turnover and in terms of number of employees. Moreover, it is likely that the data is skewed towards over-representation of employing organisations in terms of both growth and amount of well-being policies and practices. While this means that no or few claims of representativeness can be made, for our purposes, with our specific research questions regarding the inhibition and enhancement of well-being, this is not disadvantageous.

The proportions and numbers of public and third sector organisations are small within the data: 12% of the participant organisations are from the third sector (n=15), 11% from public sector (n=14). Among these there is, still, a clear tendency concerning issues of growth (questions 7 and 8, see Appendices 2 and 3). In private, public and third sector more than two-thirds answered positively in questions concerning growth of turnover and number of employees during the past five years. In the case of expected growth, public sector
organisations differ clearly in terms of poor expectations compared with the private and third sector respondents that generally expect both turnover and employment growth.

In addition to the questions on turnover and employment growth, respondents were asked, whether they consider their own sector a growth sector or not. In general, the survey responses support the selection of the four sectors to represent growth industries. Respondents mainly consider their own sector as a growth sector, most strongly in electronics and care, less so in finance and accounting. These views can be considered indicative, though the definition “own sector” was not pre-given: thus, when answering, the respondents may have identified themselves somewhat differently in terms of their understanding of their “own sector”.

Table 5: Considering own sector as a growth sector (Q 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>91.3% (21)</td>
<td>4.3% (1)</td>
<td>4.3% (1)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; accounting</td>
<td>53.8% (14)</td>
<td>19.2% (5)</td>
<td>26.9% (7)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>86.5% (45)</td>
<td>9.6% (5)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>78.0% (16)</td>
<td>22.7% (5)</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>78.0% (96)</td>
<td>13.0% (16)</td>
<td>8.9% (11)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of past growth, organisations in finance and accounting and care have been growing most often: more than three out of four survey participants in those sectors had experienced growth in terms of both turnover and the number of employees, respectively (Table 6). More than half of the organisations within electronics, finance and accounting, and care were expecting growth in terms of both turnover and number of employees (Table 7).

Table 6: Growth in the organisation during the last five years by sector (Q 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover and personnel growth</th>
<th>Some growth</th>
<th>No growth</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>52.4% (11)</td>
<td>14.3% (3)</td>
<td>33.3% (7)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; accounting</td>
<td>76.9% (20)</td>
<td>19.2% (5)</td>
<td>3.8% (1)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>76.6% (36)</td>
<td>17.0% (8)</td>
<td>6.4% (3)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>47.6% (10)</td>
<td>28.6% (6)</td>
<td>23.8% (5)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67.0% (77)</td>
<td>19.1% (22)</td>
<td>13.9% (16)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Expecting growth in the organisation during the next five years (Q 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover and personnel growth</th>
<th>Some growth</th>
<th>No growth</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>57.9% (11)</td>
<td>26.3% (5)</td>
<td>15.8% (3)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; accounting</td>
<td>52.6% (10)</td>
<td>36.8% (7)</td>
<td>10.5% (2)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>51.4% (19)</td>
<td>18.9% (7)</td>
<td>29.7% (11)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>27.8% (5)</td>
<td>55.6% (10)</td>
<td>16.7% (3)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48.4% (45)</td>
<td>31.2% (29)</td>
<td>20.4% (19)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Personnel and working arrangements

The organisations that participated in the survey varied greatly and in many respects. Within the sectors, organisations of different nature, size, and personnel profiles were included. The number of employees varied from six to several thousands (mean 409, median 90). The medium age of the personnel within the participating organisations was 40.4 years. Among the organisations, the average age varied between 25-54. On average, the youngest employees were in the tourism sector (average age 38.0), and the oldest in finance and accounting (average age 43.1).

The over-representation of the care sector skewed the data in terms of gender balance. When the participating organisations were categorised into men-concentrated and women-concentrated organisations (signifying that more than 60% of the employees were of certain gender) and gender-balanced organisations (proportion of both men and women falling between 40-60%), more than two thirds of all the organisations were women-concentrated. Still, also within finance and accounting, and tourism, the majority of the respondent organisations were women-concentrated (75% and 64% respectively compared to 96% of the care sector organisations). Of the electronics organisations, 77% were men-concentrated.

---

6 Although organisations with less than ten employees were excluded in the sampling phase, in the survey four organisations reported having less than ten employees. This may be due to reduction of employees within the organisations or un-updated information in the Fonecta ProFinder database.
Table 8: Distribution of the organisations according to gender balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of organisations</th>
<th>Men-concentrated (&gt;60%)</th>
<th>Gender-balanced (60/40)</th>
<th>Women-concentrated (&gt;60%)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% (18)</td>
<td>17% (20)</td>
<td>68% (80)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100% (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution among the sectors</td>
<td>Electronics (17) Tourism (1)</td>
<td>Tourism (7) F&amp;A (6) Electronics (5) Care (2)</td>
<td>Care (48) F&amp;A (18) Tourism (14)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half (46%) of the respondents reported that employees in their organisation work mainly or only daytime. Every fifth reported that work in their organisation is mainly or only done in shifts. Among the organisations in the study, working in shifts was heavily concentrated on the care and tourism sectors.

Table 9: Use of flexible working arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Are the following used in your organisation?” (Q19)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>I DO NOT KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible working hours</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time working</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of shift patterns by/among the employees</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work a compressed working week/day</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Vuorotteluvapaa”7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work only during school term-time or school holiday-time</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal work</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeworking / remote work</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly speaking, the use of flexible working arrangements was similar among the organisations in the study. The size of the organisation did not affect whether or not the listed flexible modes of working (see Table 9 above) were used in practice. Only shift changing and seasonal work correlated significantly with sector (0.01 level): The possibility of changing shifts among the employees concentrated heavily in the care and tourism sectors;

7 “Job alternation leave is an arrangement whereby a full-time employee […] takes job alternation leave according to an agreement made with his or her employer. The employer hires a person registered as an unemployed job seeker […] as a substitute for the same period. The person hired as the job alternation substitute should primarily be a young person, a long-term unemployed or a person who has recently completed an academic or vocational degree.” http://www.tyj.fi/default.asp?id=129
only three out of 51 care organisations did not have this possibility. Seasonal work was possible in two-thirds of the tourism organisations, whereas in the other sectors less than a quarter of the organisations used seasonal work.

### 3.4. Well-being as organisational goal, policy and practice

In a listing of nine organisational goals (see Appendix 4, Table on question 33), the respondents rated the well-being of their employees as the second most important goal, and their sustainability as an employer third; only customer service surpassed these goals. Growth of the organisation was generally seen as much less central a goal, as were other more directly economic goals (market leadership, and return to shareholders). The centrality of growth as an organisational goal correlated significantly with expectations of future growth of the organisation in terms of turnover (.386**) and number of employees (.321**).

The question concerning return to shareholders can be seen as somewhat problematic as the respondents of the questionnaire have not been asked whether or not the organisation actually has shareholders. It seems that those respondents whose organisations do not have shareholders have given the 'return to shareholders' as a goal mainly valued from 0 to 1. Comparing attitudes concerning economic and other goals becomes rather more difficult when excluding this problematic variable.

Answers to question 33 are based on the comparative judgements of the respondents between different organisational goals. Can the views emphasising the well-being of employees be biased thinking of the HR managers and other employees working on Human Resource tasks? In order to see whether the position of the respondent plays a role in the answers, the data was split into two: one including the responses of the HR personnel (n=50), the other including non-HR respondents (n=73).

Comparing the means between the HR and the non-HR respondents shows that the responses are very close to each other for all the other parts of question 33 – including the centrality of employees' well-being – except for questions concerning market leadership and the problematic return to shareholders: HR respondents see both of these economic goals as more central goals in their organisations than do the non-HR respondents.

Concerning the formal well-being policies and the implementation of well-being policies and practices, there were two main questions in the survey. Question 24 listed thirty areas of policies and practices (such as retirement, mentoring, incentives, gender equality, and
occupational safety) asking whether or not there were personnel policies and practices related to them in the organisation. The respondents were also asked to choose the five areas they found most important. Question 29 presented a list of twenty-three services and benefits (such as staff canteen, language training, rehabilitation, and company car), asking which of them are provided to the employees by the employing organisation and, again, which they find most important ones.

It is difficult to hypothesise to what extent existing national legislation regarding certain areas of personnel policy has in the above listing reduced the importance assigned to some policy areas. Still, there are areas of strong legislative guidance at both ends of the listing (occupational health and safety versus parental leaves and discrimination). In addition, it is hard to say to what extent the choice of the most important areas actually reflects the understanding of the respondents concerning what ‘well-being’ is, rather than the importance of the thematic areas in the opinion of respondents.

The listed personnel policy and practice areas can loosely be divided into three categories: health and well-being, responsibilities and rights, and equality and diversity related issues (Hearn et al., 2009; McKie et al., 2009c). As can be seen in Table 10, the most important policies and practices concern health and employees’ rights rather than equality issues. The same division into the three categories is, to some extent relevant in terms of the services and benefits offered by the employing organisations (see Table 10). Still, no further analysis has been carried out based on this categorisation in relation to, for example, sector or size of the organisations.
Table 10: Personnel policies and practices in order of importance (Q 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH AND WELL-BEING</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS</th>
<th>EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational health</td>
<td>Personnel training</td>
<td>General policy on equality and discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational safety</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Absence for social reasons (sickness of dependents etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness absence</td>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>Gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and drug misuse</td>
<td>Staff appraisal / personnel assessment</td>
<td>Motherhood leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and harassment</td>
<td>Flexible working (flexible or shortened work time, part-time work)</td>
<td>Other parental leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace violence</td>
<td>Holiday entitlement</td>
<td>Racial and ethnic discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplinary procedures</td>
<td>Disability discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>Fatherhood leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>Religious observance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Age discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>Sexual and gender orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unionising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grievance procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each figure refers to the number of organisations that considered the particular policy and practice area among the five most important ones within the listing.

On basis of question 24 concerning personnel policies and practices, a sum variable was constructed to represent the level of ‘well-being activity’ of each organisation. On each policy and practice area, one to two points were given for reporting of written policies and/or other practices (maximum points being 60). For further analysis, the data was categorised in terms of well-being activity into three groups of approximately the same size.
Table 11: Well-being activity (Q 24) by size and by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WELL-BEING ACTIVITY GROUP</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% (7)</td>
<td>44% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most active</td>
<td>46% (10)</td>
<td>23% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-group</td>
<td>38% (16)</td>
<td>35% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% (6)</td>
<td>54% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least active</td>
<td>45% (19)</td>
<td>21% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% (6)</td>
<td>23% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (42)</td>
<td>100% (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (22)</td>
<td>100% (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large and medium sized organisations seem to be more active than small organisations in terms of well-being policies and practices (Table 11). Yet, well-being activity does not correlate significantly with neither sector or size, nor with gender balance of the organisation, past growth, or expected growth. Organisations that are active in terms of well-being tend to see their own sector as a growth sector more often than the less active ones (correlation .203*). When analysing the existence of written policies and other practices respectively, the larger the organisation the more written policies of well-being there tend to be (correlation .322**).

An alternative way of looking at the well-being input of employing organisations is through the different services and benefits they offer to their employees. The offered services and benefits might as well be referred to as ‘well-being activity’ like the above discussed policies and practices, and they partly overlap; existence of well-being policies and practices also correlates strongly (.638**) with the number of offered services and benefits. Still, in this paper these two groups of activities have only been looked at separately.8

---

8 Although both question 24 and question 29 were followed by questions concerning additional policies and practices or services and benefits (beyond the listed ones), in the analysis the reported additional activities have not been included (in terms of, for example, giving extra weighting).
Table 12: Services and benefits offered by the employing organisation in order of importance (Q 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Benefit</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational health service</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>Financial support for care of sick children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym or exercise facilities, exercise coupons</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pension/financial advice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff canteen</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Free / supported holiday trips/accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of life-long learning</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Support for transport-to-work expenses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health checks</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Company car</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support for education/training</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pre-retirement courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work dress or equipment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Massage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships or support for young workers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Day-care / nursery access</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy lifestyle provision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Services / advice on care for other dependents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company phone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Finnish language classes for migrant workers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Financial advice/support</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each figure refers to the number of organisations that considered the particular policy and practice theme among the five most important ones within the listing.

Very much like the policies and practices, neither does the number of offered services and benefits correlate significantly with organisations’ sector, size, gender balance, past growth, or expected growth. Again, organisations that offer more services and benefits see their own sector as a growth sector more often than others (correlation .257**).
Table 13: Number of services and benefits (ticked from the list) offered by the employing organisation (OSB classification) by sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Electronics</th>
<th>Finance &amp; accounting</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8 services and benefits</td>
<td>29.2% (7)</td>
<td>30.8% (8)</td>
<td>37.7% (20)</td>
<td>40.9% (9)</td>
<td>35.2% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 services and benefits</td>
<td>29.2% (7)</td>
<td>23.1% (6)</td>
<td>35.8% (19)</td>
<td>22.7% (5)</td>
<td>29.6% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-19 services and benefits</td>
<td>41.7% (10)</td>
<td>46.2% (12)</td>
<td>26.4% (14)</td>
<td>36.4% (8)</td>
<td>35.2% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (24)</td>
<td>100% (26)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>100% (22)</td>
<td>100% (125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Number of services and benefits (ticked from the list) offered by the employing organisation (OSB classification) by sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8 services and benefits</td>
<td>51.2% (21)</td>
<td>29.1% (16)</td>
<td>24.1% (7)</td>
<td>35.2% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 services and benefits</td>
<td>31.7% (13)</td>
<td>34.5% (19)</td>
<td>17.2% (5)</td>
<td>29.6% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-19 services and benefits</td>
<td>17.1% (7)</td>
<td>36.4% (20)</td>
<td>58.6% (17)</td>
<td>35.2% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (41)</td>
<td>100% (55)</td>
<td>100% (29)</td>
<td>100% (125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 31 was asking on a scale of 1-7 “When you think about the above discussed policies and practices related to well-being of your organisation, what is your opinion on the following statements: [list of ten statements]”. As the results in Appendix 4 show, in terms of the sources of well-being at work, the respondents put much emphasis on practices and on what happens in practice in the organisation. Some weight is put on written policies, too, but they rarely play a central role in well-being terms. Organisation’s well-being actions are generally seen as instrumental especially in terms of increasing the commitment and working satisfaction of the employees, slightly less so in terms of increasing productivity and the attractiveness of the organisation as an employer.

Question 32 (“Would you say that your organisation promotes the well-being of its employees primarily a) in their work? b) in their lives in general? c) Organisation does not promote the well-being of its employees”) divided the data into two groups. A slight majority
connected the well-being efforts mainly with work (53%, n=66) while almost as many saw
the well-being promotion being more general (45%, n=56). There is a significant correlation
between different answers to this question and the number of services and benefits offered
by the organisation (Q 29). Organisations that have more services and benefits state they
promote well-being of their employees in their lives in general, not only in relation to work.
Only two respondents stated their organisation did not promote the well-being of its
employees at all.

The open question 35 concerning issues that were left undiscussed in the questionnaire
brought up some additional themes that are perhaps challenging to tackle in a survey and
worth paying attention in the later phases of the research project. The key themes that were
repeatedly brought up in the surprisingly large number of answers to this open-ended
question included the role of management and leadership (especially immediate superiors)
in well-being, and the employees’ own responsibility for well-being. Additionally, references
to “communality” and “work in itself” came up several times. These further comments seem
to emphasise the importance of the variety of social relations at the workplace, as well as the
meanings and meaningfulness of work. The central purpose of the following qualitative
phase of the research project is to study the relations between these and the existing (and
non-existing) policies and practices related to well-being.

A summary of the initial results from the survey was fed back to the respondent
organisations, before planning the next phase.

3.5. Regression models, questions and explanations

After learning which policies were available in the respondent organisations, the arising
question was, what issues might affect the amount of established policies, and would other
focus questions of our study have any correlation in this issue.

We divided the respondent companies in two equally large groups and defined them as the
group with more and the group with less well-being policies and practices (i.e. higher and
lower in terms of ‘well-being activity’). The choice of having only two groups was partly due
to the sample size and relatively few observations, and thus, the need to conduct a logistic
regression analysis, which required a binary variable.
**Dependent variable**

In this study we focus on one dependent variable: the activity in the diverse field of well-being related policies and practices in the respondent organisations. The reason for choosing this specific variable as the dependent variable in the analysis is: to see what kind of factors correlate with the well-being activity in organisations, and if growth factors in turnover or personnel and age-related factors among employees have any connection to the well-being activities of organisations operating in different sectors.

**Independent variables**

Initially, altogether six characters were hypothesized as correlating with well-being activity. The hypothesized characters were tested by using respective variables from the survey:

- the mean age of the employees in the organisation
- expected growth in the amount of personnel
- past growth in turnover in the respondent organisation
- proportion of men in the respondent organisation
- sector as one of four target sectors
- company size in absolute numbers of employees

Gender balance (measured here with the proportion of men in the respondent organisation) can be relevant in relation to well-being activity since many flexibility-increasing policies are introduced in the Anglophone world in order to increase the amount of female employees in the organisation. This does, however, not seem to apply in the Finnish context (Niemistö 2011, forthcoming). In Finland, the dual breadwinner- and dual carer-model are widely supported by both men and women (Lammi-Taskula 2007). The dual carer-model was introduced already in the 1960s (Julkunen 1995). In practice, women have still remained the primary carers: while experiencing inequalities in working life, women still seem to hold the hegemonic power of motherhood in households (Lammi-Taskula 2007). This means that as women still are seen as primary carers they also take most of the family leaves, which are included in the well-being policies in our survey.

Company size was included as based on some previous research corporate policies increase when the corporation grows in number of personnel (see e.g. Aycan 2005).

**Results**

As the sample size was not very large, we recoded the control variable from three different variables (measuring well-being policies, practices, and other well-being activity) into one binary variable and, then, fed the hypothesized characters into a logistic regression model.
The dependent variable was the activity in the diverse field of well-being related policies and practices in the respondent organisations with 0 = less activity, 1 = more activity, the group of organisations divided in two equally large groups. The mean age of the employees in the organisation, the expected growth in the amount of personnel, past growth in turnover, percentage amount of men in the respondent organisation, sector and company size in absolute numbers were used as independent variables in the analysis.

The results showed the company size in absolute numbers of employees (p<0.011**) to be the decisive independent variable in relation to organisational well-being activity, when factors like sector, expected growth of personnel, actualized growth in turnover, the median age of employers and the amount of male workers (as oppose to female workers) were accounted for. The omnibus tests of model coefficients showed a significance of 0.087** and a chi-square of 11,056. The Nagelkerke R square is 0.119, which is not especially good but adequate with so very different kinds of variables. In this model 119 of 125 possible cases are included. See Table 15 below for the regression model.

Table 15: The regression model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium age of employees</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected growth in personnel</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in turnover</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of men</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the organisation</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>6.450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011**</td>
<td>2.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>5.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to adjust the sample so that the sectors would be evenly distributed, 25 care sector companies were randomly picked out from the database, and the same analysis was done with the smaller set of companies. The results of this analysis were in-line with the ones presented above, and the Nagelkerke R square improved some, to 0.143, thus, the model explaining the variation a somewhat better than the previous one. The statistical significance of the variable ‘size of the organisation’ diminished to 0.039*, remaining as the only
statistically significant result of the analysis. However, the mean age of the employees had a t-value of 0.07, so in this adjusted model age would seem to gain in importance. This result indicates that the mean age of the employees in the surveyed workplaces correlates negatively with the well-being activity of the organisation: to put it simply, the higher the mean age of employees, the lower the organisational well-being activity. We see this as a very interesting finding.

While testing different models with numerous variables, almost none was found that would show a statistical significance in relation to the well-being activities of organisations. Our primary interest was to learn if economic growth or the age of employees would, in different combinations, have any effect on the well-being activities of the organisations. Interestingly enough, none of the numerous combinations with expected growth in personnel or turnover, real growth in personnel or turnover, amount of temporary workforce, amount of foreign workforce, sector, size of organisation, age of employees and amount of male workers showed any significance until the above presented logistic regression, where the size of the organisation actually seemed to play a significant role. To conclude, it can be stated that the larger organisations are more active in their well-being policies, practices and other well-being activities than the smaller organisations, regardless of the sector or other above tested characteristics.

4. CONCLUDING ISSUES

4.1 Summary of findings

In this working paper we have reported the results of the second main phase of the Quest for Well-being in Growth Industries project. There are a number of summary conclusions at this stage. Some of these conclusions could be said to be negative, in the sense that they do not show clear and consistent patterns and relationships across the four sectors. A number of correlations that might be expected have not been found to be significant. This might well be to do with the methodological limitations of survey method, as well as variations in the understandings of “well-being”, despite our efforts to “translate” this into concrete policies and practices, services and benefits.

Participation in the survey across the four sectors was uneven. The care sector proved to be by far the most willing to participate in the survey. Although the extent of this was something of surprise, it is perhaps less so when considering that the focus was on questions of well-
being. In this sector, some of the employing organisations were public sector, third sector or partnership organisations that may tend respond more frequently to surveys. In terms of size, participant organisations in the tourism sector were mostly small, and care sector organisations were mostly small and medium sized, while in finance and accounting, and electronics, the clear majority were large and medium size organisations. These variations in size might have also influenced response rates in that respondents in smaller organisations might have found completing the survey easier. The great majority of those responding to the survey had a managerial level position.

Despite our concerns that “growth” might be an inappropriate focus in the light of the changing economic situation, the respondents were generally growth-orientated, in terms of both past and expected future performance. There was also significant correlation between growth during the past five years and growth expectations, and an even stronger correlation between past growth in terms of turnover and in terms of number of employees. It is likely that there was skew towards employing organisations in terms of both growth and amount of well-being policies and practices. However, for our purposes this is not necessarily disadvantageous.

In terms of organisational goals, respondents rated well-being of their employees as the second most important goal and their sustainability as an employer third, with customer service the top choice. Paradoxically, growth of the organisation, along with other more directly economic goals, was seen as much less central.

When we turn more specifically to policies and practices around “well-being”, the picture becomes more complex. First, in terms of well-being, there is a strong tendency to focus on policies and practices that are linked to health and rights, in their broadest senses, rather than issues of equality. In developing a measure of “well-being activity” large and medium sized organisations seemed to be more active than small organisations in terms of well-being policies and practices. However, this was not borne out in terms of simple correlations: well-being activity did not correlate with size, sector or indeed with gender balance of the organisation, past growth, or expected growth. On the other hand, as regards the existence of written policies and other practices respectively, the larger the organisation the more written policies of well-being there tend to be. Moreover, in conducting the regression analyses none of the numerous combinations showed significance until that where size of the organisation seemed to play a significant role. Thus from this method the larger organisations are shown as more active in their well-being policies, practices and other well-being activities than smaller organisations, regardless of sector or other characteristics. Also, interestingly,
organisations that are active in terms of well-being tend to see their own sector as a growth sector more often than those that are less active ones.

Many respondents emphasised the importance of organisational practices and what happens in practice in the organisation, though some weight is put on written policies, even if they are seen as rarely playing a central role in well-being. Organisation’s well-being actions are often seen instrumental especially in increasing the commitment and working satisfaction of the employees, slightly less so in terms of increasing productivity and the attractiveness of the organisation as an employer.

In the open question answers, key themes repeatedly brought up by respondents included the role of management and leadership, especially immediate superiors, in well-being, and the employees’ own responsibility for well-being, as well as some references to “communality” and “work in itself”. These seem to emphasise the importance of the variety of social relations at the workplace, as well as the meanings and meaningfulness of work.

Thus while in larger organisations there tend to be more written policies relating to well-being, the importance of practices in the organisations was clear. Though some weight is put on written policies in the survey responses, these do not seem in themselves to be solely or strictly determinant, and are rarely seen as central in constructions of well-being. In contrast, respondents emphasised the role of management, immediate superiors and leadership, and employees’ own responsibility for well-being, as well as referring to “communality” and “work in itself”. These circumstances point to the importance of the social relations at the workplace, at the immediate local and more corporate levels, and the meanings and meaningfulness of work. Accordingly, a central purpose of the following phase of the research project is to study the relations between these organisational social relations and practices, and the existing (and non-existing) policies and practices related to well-being. In the third main phase of the project we focus on practices and the everyday experiences of work and well-being in selected employing organisations. These are to be researched through the approach we have termed ‘portraits of practice’, which constitute the next phase of the project.

4.2. Portraits of practice

The survey provides the sampling frame, in terms of variant employing organisations within the four sectors, for the ‘portraits of practice’ that constitute the next phase of the project. These ‘portraits of practice’ are detailed interpretative cases focussed on how the issues of
well-being and care are managed within different organisations (Hart et al., 2006). This type of ‘case study’ goes beyond the illustrative by virtue of the researchers’ immersion in the issues apparent in the organisation and is developed (in metaphorical terms in the same way as an artist) by drawing upon the researchers pre-understanding of the conceptual and regulatory context and the culture and climate of the organisation to develop a picture of the application of theory in practice. Methods used include:

- Collation and analysis of relevant policies;
- Interviews with workers, managers, HR personnel, and senior company personnel;
- Field notes and observations undertaken before, during and after interviews

Analysis of such qualitative data is best seen as an iterative process, based upon a thematic analysis of responses to open questions and verbatim transcripts, supported by the field notes, observations and other data (Bowling, 1997). A future working paper will address the results of the ‘portraits of practice’.
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APPENDIX 1: TOL codings used in the sampling

Standard Industrial Classification (TOL) of the Statistics Finland was revised during the QUEST research project (http://www.stat.fi/meta/luokitukset/toimiala/001-2008/index_en.html). Still, in the QUEST project, the TOL 2002 was used as basis for sampling. The sample covered the subcategories listed below. These were included in the bolded main categories D, H, J, N, and O.

A Agriculture, hunting and forestry
B Fishing
C Mining and quarrying
D **Manufacturing**
E Electricity, gas and water supply
F Construction
G Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods
H **Hotels and restaurants**
I Transport, storage and communication
J **Financial intermediation**
K Real estate, renting and business activities
L Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
M Education
N **Health and social work**
O **Other community, social and personal service activities**
P Private households employing domestic staff and undifferentiated production activities of households for own use
Q Extra-territorial organizations and bodies
X Industry unknown'

**ELECTRONICS**

32 **Manufacture of radio, television and communication equipment and apparatus**

31 **Manufacture of electrical machinery and apparatus n.e.c.**
312 Manufacture of electricity distribution and control apparatus
314 Manufacture of accumulators, primary cells and primary batteries
316 Manufacture of electrical equipment n.e.c.
  3161 Manufacture of electrical equipment for engines and vehicles n.e.c.
  3162 Manufacture of other electrical equipment n.e.c.

33 **Manufacture of medical, precision and optical instruments, watches and clocks**
331 Manufacture of medical and surgical equipment and orthopaedic appliances
332 Manufacture of instruments and appliances for measuring, checking, testing, navigating and other purposes, except industry
333 Manufacture of industrial process control equipment
### TOURISM

#### 55 Hotels and restaurants
- **551 Hotels**
- **552 Camping sites and other provision of short-stay accommodation**
  - **5521 Youth hostels and mountain refuges**
  - **5522 Camping sites, including caravan sites**
  - **5523 Other provision of lodgings n.e.c.**
    - **55231 Boarding houses**
    - **55232 Holiday villages**
    - **55239 Provision of lodgings n.e.c.**

#### 63 Supporting and auxiliary transport activities; activities of travel agencies
- **633 Activities of travel agencies and tour operators; tourist assistance activities n.e.c.**
  - **63301 Activities of travel agencies and tour operators**
  - **63302 Tourist assistance activities n.e.c.**

#### 92 Recreational, cultural and sporting activities
- **923 Other entertainment activities**
  - **92330 Fair and amusement park activities**
- **926 Sporting activities**
  - **92610 Operation of sports arenas and stadiums**

### FINANCE & ACCOUNTING

#### 65 Financial intermediation, except insurance and pension funding
- **651 Monetary intermediation**
  - **6511 Central banking**
  - **6512 Other monetary intermediation**
    - **65120 Monetary intermediation by deposit banks**
- **652 Other financial intermediation**
  - **6521 Financial leasing**
  - **6522 Other credit granting**
  - **6523 Other financial intermediation n.e.c.**
    - **65231 Investment and development company activities**
    - **65232 Unit trust activities**
    - **65239 Other investment activities**

#### 66 Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security
- **660 Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security**
  - **6601 Life insurance**
  - **6602 Pension funding**
  - **6603 Non-life insurance**
    - **66031 Non-life insurance companies**
    - **66032 Insurance associations**
    - **66039 Other non-life insurance**

#### 67 Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation
- **671 Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation, except insurance and pension funding**
  - **6711 Administration of financial markets**
    - **67111 Stock broking**
    - **67119 Other administration of financial markets**
  - **6712 Security broking and fund management**
  - **6713 Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation n.e.c.**
- **672 Activities auxiliary to insurance and pension funding**
851 Human health activities
  85112 Rehabilitation centres and nursing homes
  85141 Physiotherapy
  85144 Ambulance service
  85149 Other health care services

853 Social work activities
  8531 Social work activities with accommodation
    85311 Child and youth welfare institutions
    85312 Institutions for the disabled
    85313 Institutions for the elderly
    85314 Institutions for alcoholics and drug abusers
    85315 Service centres and residences
    85316 Mother and child homes and shelters
    85319 Other institutions and housing services
  8532 Social work activities without accommodation
    85321 Child day care
    85322 Day care activities
    85323 Home help services
    85324 Sheltered work and rehabilitation
    85325 Child health clinics
    85326 Outpatient rehabilitation for intoxicant abusers
    85329 Other social work activities
APPENDIX 2: The questionnaires in Finnish

TYÖ JA HYVINVINTI – KYSELYTUTKIMUS

Hyvä vastaanottaja,


Kyselytutkimuksemme on osa Suomen Akatemian rahoittamaa tutkimusprojektia "Päämääränä hyvinvointi". Kysely koskee organisationneen henkilöstöä sekä työhyvinvointiin liittyviä toimenpiteitä. Tutkimus kattaa satoja rahoituksen ja laskentatoimen, matkailun, elektriikkateollisuuden ja hoitoalan organisaatioita sekä näihin toimialoihin liittyviä tai niitä tukevia organisaatioita.


Olkaa hyvä ja ottakaa yhteyttä mikäli haluatte lisätietoja tutkimuksesta. If you wish to have the questionnaire in English, please contact us.

Yhteistyöterveisin,

FT Teemu Tallberg ja professori Jeff Hearn
Hanken Svenska handelshögskolan
Johtamisen ja organisaatiotutkimuksen laitos
teemu.tallberg@hanken.fi, Tel. (0)40-3521 502
jeff.hearn@hanken.fi, Tel. (0)40-3521 206

A = avoin kysymys
K/E/EOS = kyllä/ei/en osaa sanoa
MV = monivalinta
DD = drop-down valikko
1. Vastaajan nimi (A)

2. Vastaajan asema organisaatiossa (DD + A)
   a. henkilöstöjohtaja
   b. henkilöstöpäällikkö
   c. henkilöstöassistentti
   d. talousjohtaja/päällikkö
   e. toimitusjohtaja
   f. muu johtaja
   g. yrittäjä
   h. muu, mikä?)

3. Vastaajan ikä (A)

4. Organisaationne nimi (A)

5. Organisaationne perustamisvuosi (A)

6. Onko organisaationne osa (MV + A)
   a. julkista sektoria
   b. yksityistä sektoria
   c. kolmatta sektoria
   d. muu, mikä?

7. Onko organisaationne kasvanut viimeisen viiden vuoden aikana (K/E/EOS)
   a. tuloksen osalta?
   b. henkilöstömäärian osalta?

8. Odotatteko organisaationne kasvavan seuraavan viiden vuoden aikana (K/E/EOS)
   a. tuloksen osalta?
   b. henkilöstömäärian osalta?

9. Millä toimialalla organisaationne pääasiassa toimii? (A)

10. Pidättekö toimialaanne kasvualana? (K/E/EOS)

11. Kuinka monta henkilöä organisaatiosanne työskentelee? (A)

12. Kuinka monta naista organisaatiosanne työskentelee? (A)

13. Kuinka monta miestä organisaatiosanne työskentelee? (A)

14. Onko organisaationne henkilöstö (MV)
   a. enimmäkseen tai pelkästään alle 45-vuotiaita
   b. suunnilleen yhtä paljon alle ja yli 45-vuotiaita
   c. enimmäkseen tai pelkästään yli 45-vuotiaita?

15. Mikä on työntekijöidenne keski-ikä? (A)

16. Suurin piirtein kuinka suuri osuus (%) nykyisistä työntekijöistänne on (A)
   a. ulkomaalaisia, muita kuin Suomen kansalaisia, maahanmuuttajia
   b. työrajoitteisia
   c. tilapäisi/vuokratyövoimaa
   d. kuuluu ammattiliittoon/henkilöstöjärjestöön?
17. Kuinka suuri osuus (%) organisaation henkilöstöstä on määräaikaisessa työsuhteessa? (A)

18. Tehdäänkö organisaatiotason (MV) a. enimmäkseen tai pelkästään päivätyötä b. sekä päivätyötä että vuorotyötä c. enimmäkseen tai pelkästään vuorotyötä?

19. Tehdäänkö organisaatiotason (MV-taulukko) (Kyllä / Ei / En osaa sanoa)
   - työtä joustavin työajoin
   - osa-aikatyötä
   - lyhennettyä työviikoja/ työpäiviä
   - työvuorojen vaihtoja työntekijöiden kesken
   - etäöitytä (kotoa käsin)
   - ns. sesonkityötä
   - Onko työtä mahdollista tehdä vain koulujen lukukausien tai lomien aikana työntekijän niin halutessa?
   - Pidetäänkö organisaatiotason vuorotteluvapaa?

20. Koskevatko epätyyppilliset työajojärjestelyt erityisesti jokin henkilöstöryhmä (ikä, sukupuoli, ammattiryhmä tms.)? (Kyllä / Ei / Ei / se on organisaatiollamme mahdollista)
   a. joustavat työajat
   b. osa-aikatyö
   c. lyhennettyä työviikoja/päivää
   d. työvuorojen vaihto työntekijöiden kesken
   e. etäöitytä
   f. ns. sesonkityötä
   g. Onko työtä mahdollista tehdä vain koulujen lukukausien tai lomien aikana (työntekijän niin halutessa)
   h. Vuorotteluvapaa

21. Mikä on organisaation suurin henkilöstöstä koskeva haaste lähitulevaisuudessa? (A)

22. Kuka vastaa organisaatiotason henkilöstöasioista (MV + A):
   a. henkilöstöosasto/yksikkö
   b. yksittäinen/useampi henkilö, millä ammattinimikkeillä?
   c. ei varsinaisesti kukaan
   d. En osaa sanoa

23. Onko seuraavissa organisaation dokumentteissa mainittu jotain työhyvinvoinnista (K/E/organisaatiollamme ei ole kyseistä dokumenttia/EOS)
   a. kehityskeskusteluja koskevat ohjeet
   b. organisaation strategia
   c. tasa-arvo-ohjelma
   d. työhyvinvointiohjelma
   e. työsuojelun toimintaohjelma
   f. vuosikertomus
   g. muu, mikä?

24. Onko organisaatiotason käytössä seuraaviin aihepiireihin liittyviä toimintaohjeita tai henkilöstöjohtamisen välineitä? Valitakaa lisäksi viisi tärkeintä (Kijallisia toimintaohjeita / Muita käytäntöjä / En osaa sanoa / 5 organisaatiotason tärkeintä)
• alkoholin ja huumausaineiden käyttö
• ammattijärjestötoiminta
• eläkkeelle siirtyminen
• erottaminen / viraltapano / työsuhteen purkaminen
• henkilöstön arviointi
• henkilöstön koulutus
• ikäsyntyjä
• irtisanominen
• joustava työskentely (joustava tai lyhennetty työaika, osa-aikatyö)
• kurinpidolliset toimet
• lomaoikeudet
• mentorointi
• palkitseminen / kannustimet
• poissaolot sosiaalisista syistä (läheisten sairastuminen jne.)
• rotu- ja etninen syrjintä
• sairauspoissaolot
• seksuaalinen ja sukupuolinen suuntautuminen
• sukupuolten välisestä tasa-arvosta
• syrjintä
• työpaikkakäytäntöä
• työterveys
• työturvallisuus
• uskonnon harjoittaminen
• valituskäytännöt
• vammaisin kohdistuva syrjintä
• väkivaltatilanteet
• yleinen tasa-arvoa ja syrjintää käsittelevä toimintaohje/säännöstö
• isyysvapaa
• äitiysvapaa
• muut vanhempainvapaa

25. Mitä muita kuin edellä mainittuja toimintaohjeita tai henkilöstöjohtamisen välineitä organisaatiosanne on käytössä? (A)

26. Mitä kautta työntekijöitänne informoidaan edellä mainituista toimintaohjeista ja käytännöistä? (Informaatiokanava kakkien työntekijöiden kohdalla / Informaatiokanava joidenkin työntekijöiden kohdalla / Ei käytössä / En osaa sanoa)
   a. esimies/työnjohto
   b. henkilöstökäsikirja
   c. henkilöstötiedote
   d. ilmoitustaulu
   e. intranet
   f. perehdyttämisohjelma
   g. sähköposti
   h. työsoojelun
   i. toimintaohjelma

27. Onko organisaatiosanne viime vuosina tehty säännöllisesti (MV + A)
   a. henkilöstötilinpäätös
   b. työilmapiiri- tai työyhtyväisyykselytä
   c. muita henkilöstön hyvinvointiin liittyviä selvityksiä, mitä?

28. Miten yllä mainittujen selvitysten tulokset vaikuttavat organisaationne henkilöstökäytäntöihin? (A)

29. Mitkä seuraavista palveluista ja eduista ovat työnantajan toimesta henkilöstönne käytettävissä? Valitkaa lisäksi viisi tärkeintä (K/E/EOS/ 5 organisaatiolannalle tärkeintä)

• elinikäisen oppimisen edistäminen
• eläke- tai taloudellinen neuvonta
• eläkkeelle siirtymiseen valmistava koulutus
• henkilöstöruokala
• hieronta
• ilmaiset/tuetut lomamatkat tai -majoitus
• kielikoulutus
• kouluttautumisen taloudellinen tukenen
• kuntosalii / muu liikuntatila / liikuntasetelit
• kuntoutus
• lasten päivähoito
• muiden huollettavien hoitoa koskevat palvelut tai neuvonta
• ohjaus terveellisiin elämäntapoihin
• oppisopimuskoulutus / työharjoittelu
30. Mitä muita palveluita – edellä mainittujen lisäksi – on henkilöstönne käytettävissä työnantajan toimesta? (A)

31. Kun ajattelette edellä mainittuja organisationne hyvinvointiin liittyviä käytäntöjä ja toimintoahjeita, mitä mieltä olette seuraavista väittämistä: (MV; 1=Pitää täysin paikkansa, 7=Ei pidä lainkaan paikkaansa; En osaa sanoa)

- Organisaatiomme hyvinvointi perustuu siihen mitä käytännössä tehdään
- Organisaatiomme hyvinvointi perustuu kirjoitetuihin ohjeisiin ja suunnitelmiin
- Organisaatiossamme hyvinvointiin pyritään pääasiassa paperilla
- Organisaatiossamme hyvinvointiin pyritään pääasiassa käytännön toimin
- Hyvinvointitoimenpiteemme lisäävät työntekijöidemme sitoutumista
- Hyvinvointitoimenpiteemme lisäävät työtyytyväisyyttä
- Hyvinvointitoimenpiteemme lisäävät tuottavuutta
- Organisaatiomme työntekijät voivat hyvin
- Organisaatiomme pitää työntekijöistään hyvää huolta
- Hyvinvointitoimenpiteemme lisäävät organisaatiomme houkuttelevuutta työnantajana

32. Katsotteko organisationne pyrkivän edistämään työntekijöidenne hyvinvointia ensisijaiseksi tehtävänä (MV)

a. työssään
b. elämässään yleisesti
c. organisaatio ei pyri edistämään työntekijöidensä hyvinvointia

33. Miten keskeisiä seuraavat tavoitteet ovat organisaatiomme (likert scale, 1=ei lainkaan tärkeä, 7=erittäin tärkeä):

- asiakaspalvelu
- markkinajohtajuus
- organisaation kasvu
- organisaation uudistuminen ja innovatiivisuus
- osinkojen tuottaminen osakkaille
- työntekijöiden hyvinvointi
- vakaus työnantajana
- yhteiskunnallinen luotettavuus
- ympäristöarvot

34. Onko edellä jäänyt mielestäsi käsittelemättä joitakin tärkeitä asioita? Jos on, mitä asioita jälös käsitteleminen on? (A)

Kysely päättyy tähän.
Painattehan vielä "Lähetä" nappia.
APPENDIX 3: The survey questionnaire in English

WORK AND WELL-BEING – SURVEY

1. Name of the respondent

2. Position of the respondent in the organisation
   a. HR/personnel manager
   b. Chief of HRM
   c. Personnel assistant
   d. Finance manager / Chief of finance
   e. Chief Executive Officer
   f. Other manager
   g. Entrepreneur
   h. Other, please specify:

3. Age of the respondent

4. Full title of the organisation

5. Start-up year of your organisation

6. Is your organisation a part of the
   a. public sector
   b. private sector
   c. voluntary/third sector
   d. other, please specify:

7. Has your organisation grown during the last five years in terms of (Yes / No / Don’t know)
   a. turnover?
   b. number of employees?

8. Do you expect your organisation to grow in the next five years? (Yes / No / Don’t know)

9. In what sector does your organisation mainly operate?

10. Do you consider your sector a growth sector? (Yes / No / Don’t know)

11. How many employees do you currently have (on the payroll) in your organisation?

12. How many women do you currently have (on the payroll) in your organisation?

13. How many men do you currently have (on the payroll) in your organisation?

14. Is the personnel of your organisation aged
   a. mainly or only under 45 years
   b. approximately as many over as under 45 years
   c. mainly or only over 45 years

15. What is the medium age of the personnel in your organisation?
16. Approximately what proportion (%) of your employees are
   a. foreigners, non-Finnish nationals, immigrants
   b. disabled
   c. temporary or agency employees
   d. members in a union or staff association?

17. How large a proportion (%) of your personnel are fixed term employed?

18. Do employees in your organisation work
   a. mainly or only daytime
   b. both in daytime and in shifts
   c. mainly or only in shifts?

19. Are the following used in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. flexible working hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. part-time working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. work a compressed working week/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. change of shift patterns by/among the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. work only during school term-time or school holiday-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. homeworking / remote work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. seasonal work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. &quot;vuorotteluvapaa&quot; (unemployed workers temporarily replacing permanent staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Are there any particular groups of staff who are more likely to make use of these flexible working arrangements (age, gender, occupational group etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>flexible working hours</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Which group of staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>part-time working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work a compressed working week/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change of shift patterns by/among the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work only during school term-time or school holiday-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeworking / remote work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seasonal work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;vuorotteluvapaa&quot; (unemployed workers temporarily replacing permanent staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What is, concerning human resources, the biggest challenge that your organisation is facing in the near future?

22. Who is in your organisation responsible for human resource issues?
   a. Human Resource / Personnel department
   b. Particular person(s), with what titles?
c. Nobody in particular

d. I do not know

23. Do any of the following documents in your organisation mention/discuss work-related well-being? (yes / no / organisation does not have the document in question / do not know):

   a. instructions concerning performance assessment / development discussions
   b. organisational strategy
   c. (gender) equality programme / plan
   d. work well-being programme / plan
   e. industrial safety / health and safety programme / plan
   f. annual report

24. In your organisation, are there personnel policies or practices concerning the following areas? Choose the five most important ones.

   • alcohol and drug misuse
   • unionising
   • retirement
   • dismissal
   • staff appraisal / personnel assessment
   • personnel training
   • age discrimination
   • redundancy
   • flexible working (flexible or shortened work time, part-time work)
   • disciplinary procedures
   • holiday entitlement
   • mentoring
   • incentives
   • absence for social reasons (sickness of dependents etc.)
   • racial and ethnic discrimination
   • sickness absence
   • sexual and gender orientation
   • gender equality
   • working hours
   • bullying and harassment
   • occupational health
   • occupational safety
   • religious observance
   • grievance procedures
   • disability discrimination
   • workplace violence
   • general policy on equality and discrimination
   • fatherhood leave
   • motherhood leave
   • other parental leave
25. What other personnel policies and practices do you have in your organisation?

26. How are the above mentioned policies usually communicated to employees?
   a. supervisor / line manager
   b. staff handbook
   c. staff newsletters
   d. staff notice board
   e. intranet or computer network
   f. staff induction programme / material
   g. e-mail
   h. contract of employment
   i. occupational health and safety programme

27. Have the following been conducted in your organisation regularly during the past years:
   a. working climate surveys
   b. personnel report / personnel accounting
   c. other accounts concerning work well-being?

28. How do the results of the above mentioned accounts affect the human resource management of your organisation?

29. Which of the following services and benefits are, by the employer, available to your employees? Choose the five most important ones.
   - promotion of life-long learning
   - pension/financial advice
   - pre-retirement courses
   - staff canteen
   - massage
   - free / supported holiday trips/accommodation
   - language training
   - financial support for education/training
   - gym or exercise facilities, exercise coupons
   - rehabilitation
   - day-care / nursery access
   - services / advice on care for other dependents
   - healthy lifestyle provision
   - apprenticeships or support for young workers
   - financial support for care of sick children
   - Finnish language classes for migrant workers
   - financial advice/support
   - health checks
   - support for transport-to-work expenses
   - company car
   - company phone
   - occupational health service
   - work dress or equipment

30. In addition to the above mentioned, what other services and benefits are, by the employer, available to your employees?
31. When you think about the above discussed policies and practices related to well-being of your organisation, what is your opinion on the following statements (likert scale; 1 = I agree totally; 7 = I do not agree at all; I don’t know):

- In our organisation well-being comes from what happens in practice
- In our organisation well-being comes from written policies
- In our organisation well-being is managed mainly on paper
- In our organisation well-being is managed mainly by practices
- Our actions regarding well-being increase the commitment of our employees
- Our well-being actions increase working satisfaction
- Our well-being actions increase productivity
- Our employees’ well-being is generally good
- Our organisation takes good care of its employees
- Our well-being actions increase the attractiveness of the organisation as an employer

32. Would you say that your organisation promotes the well-being of its employees primarily

a. in their work?
b. in their lives in general?
c. the organisation does not promote the well-being of its employees

33. How central are the following goals in your organisation (likert scale, 1 = Not at all important, 7 = Very important):

- customer service
- market leadership
- growth of the organisation
- organisational renewal and innovativeness
- return to shareholders
- well-being of the employees
- sustainability as an employer
- societal impact
- environmental concerns

34. In your opinion, has this survey left some important issues undiscussed? If so, please say what they are.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR ANSWERS!
APPENDIX 4: Tables on questions 31 and 33

“When you think about the above discussed policies and practices related to well-being of your organisation, what is your opinion on the following statements: (Q 31)”

| | I do not agree at all | | | | | | | I agree totally | | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| In our organisation well-being comes from what happens in practice | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 36 | 48 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 124 |
| | 0.8% | 0% | 0% | 7.3% | 22.6% | 29% | 38.7% | 1.6% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| In our organisation well-being comes from written policies | 6 | 15 | 19 | 34 | 26 | 19 | 3 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 122 |
| | 4.9% | 12.3% | 15.6% | 27.9% | 21.3% | 15.6% | 2.5% | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| In our organisation well-being is managed mainly by written policies | 38 | 44 | 17 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 121 |
| | 31.4% | 36.4% | 14% | 9.1% | 5% | 2.5% | 0.8% | 0.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| In our organisation well-being is managed mainly by practices | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 49 | 45 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 123 |
| | 0.8% | 0% | 1.6% | 6.5% | 14.6% | 39.8% | 36.6% | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our actions regarding well-being increase the commitment of our employees | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 28 | 47 | 32 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 123 |
| | 0% | 1.6% | 2.4% | 8.1% | 22.8% | 38.2% | 26% | 0.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our well-being actions increase working satisfaction | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 25 | 52 | 38 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 123 |
| | 0% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 4.1% | 20.3% | 42.3% | 30.9% | 0.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our well-being actions increase productivity | 0 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 29 | 48 | 26 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 124 |
| | 0% | 2.4% | 0.8% | 12.9% | 23.4% | 38.7% | 21% | 0.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our employees’ well-being is generally good | 0 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 41 | 12 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 124 |
| | 0% | 2.4% | 0% | 14.5% | 40.3% | 33.1% | 9.7% | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our organisation takes good care of its employees | 0 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 32 | 49 | 26 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 122 |
| | 0% | 1.6% | 0.8% | 9.8% | 26.2% | 40.2% | 21.3% | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
| Our well-being actions increase the attractiveness of the organisation as an employer | 0 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 34 | 43 | 24 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 123 |
| | 0% | 1.6% | 3.3% | 12.2% | 27.6% | 35% | 19.5% | 0.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% |
Centrality of goals in organisation (1=not at all important, 7=very important)? (Q 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being of the employees</td>
<td>0 0 2 1 25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability as an employer</td>
<td>0 0 1.6% 1.6% 0.8% 0.8%</td>
<td>1.6% 0.8% 20.2% 32.3% 45.2%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational renewal and innovation</td>
<td>0 0 3 8 16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concerns</td>
<td>1 6 3 26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal impact</td>
<td>4 2 12 21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of the organization</td>
<td>6 5 12 23 47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market leadership</td>
<td>9 9 9 46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to shareholders</td>
<td>35 8 12 24 18 12 13 13 123</td>
<td>28.7% 6.6% 9.8% 19.7% 14.8% 9.8% 10.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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