

Eldercare Policies in the Workplace Results of a Survey Conducted in 2007



State of Hawaii
Department of Health
Executive Office on Aging

December 2007

Prepared by:
Wesley Lum, MPH
UH Center on Aging

Pam Arnsberger, PhD
Jill Sur, MSW
Felix Blumhardt, PhD
Charles Nagatoshi, PhD
UH School of Social Work

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Background	5
Methodology	10
Results	14
Discussion	17
Conclusion	20
Tables	22
Bibliography	48
Survey Instrument	50

Executive Summary

Introduction

In both the U.S. and Hawai`i, the impact of an aging population is now beginning to be felt. Due to advances in medicine and public health, life expectancy has greatly increased in the last half century and in just the past 10 years, the number of people over 100 in the U.S. has doubled (AARP, 2002). Many people who find themselves faced with the demands of providing informal caregiving are also employed in the workforce (Scharlach, 1994). These individuals typically experience great strains in balancing work and caregiving responsibilities, some of which are manifested in the workplace. This issue thus should be of concern to employers in Hawai`i.

In 2007 a survey was undertaken to assess Hawai`i employers' response to this challenge in five specific areas:

- (1) The extent of eldercare policies in the workplace,
- (2) The availability of eldercare related benefits in the workplace,
- (3) The views of eldercare as an employer issue,
- (4) The effect of eldercare in the workplace, and
- (5) Motivations for and barriers to the implementation of eldercare benefits.

Methods

The survey instrument was developed and pre-tested in the spring and summer of 2007 and administered in an online survey in the fall of this year. A random sample of the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Hawai`i, the Hawai`i Business Roundtable, Small Business Hawaii, and the Hawai`i Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations was surveyed (N=593). From the beginning, the response rate was low. A combination of hard mailed incentives, follow-up reminders, and finally a redraw of the initial sample were used to increase the number of responses. Ultimately, 118 employers responded to and filled out the survey online.

The survey included questions about the size of the company (as determined by the number of employees), profit vs non profit designation, public vs private status, whether or not the company was part of a national firm or was entirely Hawai`i based, the percentage of female employees, the age of the employees, and whether or not the employees were part of a union. The data were also used to determine if other variables – such as the gender and age of the person completing the survey or their personal caregiving history - might have influenced the responses that reflected attitudes and opinions about eldercare policies.

Analysis of the data was directed towards initially ranking responses from employers and then determining whether or not responses from employers varied based on the above company and individual characteristics. Appropriate statistical tests were used to establish if there were significant differences between groups.

Results

Results indicated that one third of employers felt that at least 15% of their employees were providing eldercare. The two most common effects were: (a) employees arriving late or leaving early, and (b) employees re-arranging their work schedules. Across companies, the most commonly offered eldercare benefits were paid bereavement leave and unpaid family leave to do eldercare, as well as compliance with the provisions of the Family Medical Leave Act.

Almost 60% of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that employers should provide benefits for their employees affected by eldercare. Among public policy options, 70% favored a tax credit to purchase long term care insurance for employees; slightly under 50% said they favored or strongly favored a state subsidy to provide eldercare benefits or wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during an otherwise unpaid leave.

As expected, there were differences by company characteristics. Non-profits were less likely to provide certain eldercare related benefits than were proprietary companies, and the public sector tended to lag behind the private sector. Larger and nationally based companies tended to have a much more extensive package of eldercare related benefits, however smaller companies tended to be more flexible in their practices. Companies with unionized employees were more likely to provide certain benefits, such as employee's assistance programs but were relatively inflexible in allowing employees to work part time or to telecommute. Not surprisingly, there was also greater support for a number of eldercare sensitive policies when the company felt that it increased productivity to offer them. However, few companies collected any data at all on the cost or effects of eldercare policies, so that it is somewhat difficult to see how they might have made this determination.

Finally, there were a few differences by respondent characteristics. Analysis by age and gender indicated that younger, female CEO's, CFO's, and human resources managers tended to be more 'progressive' in their attitudes both about workplace benefits for eldercare and in their support for public policies designed to address this issue.

Open ended questions that allowed for comments by respondents were also analyzed. These responses indicated several trends. One was that companies are becoming aware of

the issue and while the companies might not be affected now, they expect to be in the future. Another trend was an acknowledgement of employees' stress and an awareness that more people were taking sick leave and leave without pay to deal with eldercare issues. Smaller companies in particular said that it was too expensive to offer all the benefits they wished, but they tried to be flexible and treat each situation with concern.

Introduction

While a small portion of the elderly in the U.S. are cared for in institutional long term care settings, informal (unpaid) caregivers provide the vast majority of the needed care (AARP, 1997). This is especially true in Hawai`i where there is the highest level of intergenerational living in the country. As the numbers of frail elderly needing care increases, this situation poses challenges to our state, especially to families who provide the major portion of the care (Robinson, 1997). Employers are aware that they have employees who are giving care but there is little information on how they are responding or even whether or not they feel it is their responsibility to respond to this issue. Additionally it is of interest to determine employer's attitudes toward public policies that may be developed in the future to address these issues. This survey was designed to shed light on this issue by sampling employers in small, medium, and large companies in Hawai`i in order to determine the policies and practices of their companies in the area of eldercare, as well as their knowledge of and attitudes towards possible policies in this area.

This report covers the background of this issue and describes (1) the impact of family caregiving on employees, the economy, and employers, and (2) federal and state government's response to support family caregivers. Questions to guide the analysis are then specified. The next section covers the survey methodology and includes (a) the purposes of the survey, (b) a description of the organizations that participated in the survey, (c) development of the survey instrument and pre-tests, (d) the sample size determinations, (e) steps to increase the response rates, and (f) data analysis. The final section covers the results, discussion, and conclusions from the survey. Tables reflecting the results are attached, as well as a bibliography and survey instrument.

Background

Impact of Family Caregiving on Employees, the Economy, and Employers

Between 14% - 21% of Hawai`i's adult population, or between 126,598-192,390 people, report that they provide care or assistance to a person age sixty or older (Executive Office on Aging, 2006). Nationally, 59% of caregivers are currently employed (National Alliance for Caregiving and AARP, 2004), while among Hawai`i's caregivers, 65% are employed (Executive Office on Aging, 2004). Negative impacts associated with balancing work and eldercare include taking leaves of absence, reporting to work late or leaving early, reducing hours from full-time to part-time employment, switching to less demanding jobs, retiring early, or giving up work completely (MetLife, et. al., 1999; Neal and Wagner, Year

Unknown). Consequently, caregiving may reduce a caregiver's retirement income because of reduced work hours or fewer years in the workforce, resulting in reduced contributions to pensions, social security, and other retirement savings. The average loss in total wealth experienced by these caregivers in lost wages, Social Security benefits, and pension benefits averages \$659,139 over their lifetimes (MetLife Mature Market Institute, National Alliance for Caregiving, and National Center on Women and Aging, 1999).

Arno, et.al. (1999) estimates that approximately 26 million family caregivers provide personal care to persons aged 15 years old and older, for a total of approximately 24 billion hours, resulting in an economic value of \$196 billion a year nationally. A more recent estimate values family caregiving at \$257 billion a year nationally (Arno, 2002). In Hawaii, approximately 115,000 family caregivers provide personal care to persons aged 15 years old and older, for an estimated total of 107 million hours, resulting in an estimated economic value for caregiving of approximately \$875 million per year (Arno and Memmott, 1997). The economic value of care provided by family members and friends far surpasses what is spent on home health care and nursing home care combined (Arno, et. al., 1999). While these estimates include caregiving to persons with disabilities aged 15 and over, including older adults with disabilities, the significance of these projections illustrate the tremendous value of informal caregiving and its savings for the economy.

Employers incur losses in productivity by employees who make workplace accommodations as a result of their eldercare responsibilities, including costs associated with employee replacement, absenteeism, crisis with a family member, workday interruptions, supervisory time, unpaid leave, and reduced hours from full-time to part-time. Eldercare costs to U.S. employers range between \$17.1 billion and \$33.6 billion annually in lost productivity (MetLife Mature Market Institute and National Alliance for Caregiving, 2006).

Recognizing the needs of employed caregivers, large-sized companies have responded by developing workplace eldercare programs such as referral services, lunch and after work educational sessions, case management services, and assistance with legal matters (Wagner, 2003).

Government's Response to Support Family Caregivers

Both federal and state governments have recently played an increasingly important role in supporting family caregivers. The federal government has responded to the needs of working caregivers primarily through six basic initiatives (Neal and Wagner, Year Unknown):

- (1) Initiated in 1976, the federal Dependent Care Tax Credit enables qualified employed persons to deduct some of their employment-related dependent care expenses from taxes they paid in the previous year.
- (2) Authorized in 1981, the Dependent-Care Assistance Plan (DCAP) sets up accounts into which employees with dependent care responsibilities can allocate either their own pre-tax dollars or credits or flexible benefit dollars given to them by their employer. DCAPs are available only when set up by employers for employees and may or may not involve direct employer contributions. They are established for reimbursement of dependent care expenses that are work-related and incurred by the employee for the care of dependent children under the age of 13 or for spouses or dependents who are unable to care for themselves, regardless of age, and who regularly spend at least eight hours each day in the employee's household.
- (3) A third federal governmental response came in 1993 when the U.S. Congress passed the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). FMLA provides job protection for employees who need to take a leave of absence to care for a family member or to care for their own health care needs. The legislation applies to organizations with 50 or more employees and provides employees with 12 weeks of unpaid leave to be used during a 12-month period. The leave may be taken all at once or intermittently within the 12-month period. After taking leave, the employee returns to his or her job or to a job with equivalent pay and status.
- (4) A fourth federal response to caregivers, whether engaged in paid work or not, is the initiation by the Administration on Aging (AoA) of the Eldercare Locator program. The AoA supports this nationwide, toll-free information and assistance directory, 1-800-677-1116, which helps individuals seeking assistance for relatives or friends find the appropriate area agency on aging to help them.
- (5) A fifth federal governmental response, initiated in 2000, is the designation of November as National Family Caregivers Month. This designation places added emphasis on formally recognizing and honoring family caregivers.
- (6) Finally, the most recent federal governmental initiative related to working caregivers came with the enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000 which established the National Family Caregiver Support Program. This

program provides funding to the aging network for the explicit purpose of serving family caregivers as well as elders.

In Hawaii, Act 285, Session Laws of Hawaii, 2006, established the Joint Legislative Committee on Family Caregiving (JLCFC) to develop comprehensive public policy to strengthen support for family caregivers in Hawaii and to consider providing support in numerous categories, including balancing work and caregiving (S.B. No. 3253, C.D. 1, 2006). That same year, the legislature also passed several family caregiver-friendly pieces of legislation, including (1) a request to the Legislative Reference Bureau to study other states' laws and practices that promote good work-family policy, (2) an appropriation of \$206,000 to Kapiolani Community College to establish a Long-term Care Training Initiative for para-professional and family caregivers, (3) an appropriation of \$500,000 for additional direct services to older adults and their caregivers through the Kupuna Care program, and (4) an appropriation of \$80,000 to the Executive Office on Aging (EOA) to coordinate caregiver support services and policies statewide (Legislative Reference Bureau Systems Office, 2006).

In 2007, the Hawaii State Legislature passed a Caregiver Omnibus Bill that not only extends the life of the JLCFC for another year but also requires the JLCFC to explore establishing a paid family leave program under the state temporary disability insurance law, similar to the California paid family leave program, to provide wage replacement benefits for employees who take time off from work to care for a seriously ill family member (S.B. No. 1916, C.D. 1, 2007). Additionally, the Caregiver Omnibus Bill also (1) directs EOA to research alternative methods of providing financial assistance to family caregivers, including a cost-benefit analysis of a refundable caregiver tax credit and a Cash and Counseling program, and (2) appropriates funds for direct services to older adults and their family caregivers and streamlines access to long-term care services through the statewide establishment of the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC), which is a federal initiative (S.B. No. 1916, C.D. 1, 2007). The legislature also continues to support EOA's role in coordinating family caregiver support services and policies statewide by appropriating \$160,000 for the fiscal biennium for this purpose (H.B. No. 500, C.D. 1, 2007).

Questions Guiding the Analysis

In addition to the descriptive analysis of the data, a set of questions based on company characteristics and employer attitudes, as well as respondent characteristics, was developed to guide the analysis. These were based on a careful review of the literature on

organizational responsiveness and national data on caregiving, as well as an understanding of Hawai'i's business environment. They were:

- (1) Does the size of the company matter? In other words, are larger companies with more resources more likely to offer eldercare benefits than their smaller counterparts?
- (2) If employers perceive that the provision of eldercare benefits increases productivity to the organization, are they more likely to favor policies to reduce the burden of caregiving?
- (3) Given that a higher percentage of caregivers are women, if there is a greater proportion of female employees (or if respondent gender is female) in an organization, is there a greater likelihood of eldercare related benefits and more support for eldercare policies?
- (4) Given that caregivers' mean age is in the 50's, if there is a greater proportion of older employees (or older age of the respondent), is there a greater level of employer involvement in eldercare?
- (5) Hawai'i has a long history of strong support for unions. In a union company, is there a greater level of employer involvement in eldercare issues?
- (6) Data indicate that most individuals will be caregivers at some point in their lives. Will an organization have higher levels of eldercare responsiveness if top management has personal experience with eldercare?
- (7) Since not for profit organizations manage costs differently than proprietary ones, will nonprofit organizations be more responsive to eldercare issues than for profit organizations?
- (8) Public sector organizations do not have to deal with issues of profit. Will public sector organizations be more responsive than private sector organizations to eldercare issues?
- (9) Companies whose ownership rests outside of Hawai'i may have different personnel policies than locally owned businesses. Will there will be a difference between nationally owned and locally owned organizations in the levels of employer involvement in eldercare?

Methodology

Purposes of the 2007 Eldercare Survey of Hawaii's Employers

This survey was conducted by the Hawaii State Executive Office on Aging (EOA) with the assistance of the University of Hawaii (UH) School of Social Work to assess Hawai'i employers' response to eldercare challenges in five specific areas:

- (1) The extent of eldercare policies in the workplace,
- (2) The availability of eldercare related benefits in the workplace,
- (3) The views of eldercare as an employer issue,
- (4) The effect of eldercare in the workplace, and
- (5) Motivations for and barriers to the implementation of eldercare benefits.

A random sample of the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, Small Business Hawaii, Hawaii Business Roundtable, and the Hawaii Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations were surveyed.

Hawaii's Business and Nonprofit Organizations

The Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii (Chamber) works on behalf of its members and the entire business community to continue to find ways to help Hawaii's businesses be self-sustained, grow, and expand. Their principal functions include (1) advocating on behalf of business interests and the business community, (2) offering trainings and seminars to help businesses grow, (3) providing networking and marketing opportunities, (4) connecting businesses to Hawaii's military, and (5) keeping abreast on the latest issues and trends affecting Hawaii's business community. The Chamber represents the interests of small, medium, and large businesses, for-profit and non-profit businesses, and sole proprietors. Over 80% of its 1,100 members are small businesses, a reflection of Hawaii's business population (Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, 2007).

The Hawaii Business Roundtable (HBR), an organization of Chief Executive Officers and senior executives of companies headquartered or maintaining significant operations in Hawaii, has a membership of approximately 55 organizations. The HBR was established to promote the overall economic vitality and social health of Hawaii. To accomplish this mission, the HBR selects and takes action on a limited number of specific issues in which the knowledge and perspective of its members can make a unique contribution. Education and the economy continue to be the HBR's major concerns, but they are also interested in long-term care and Hawai'i's aging workforce (Hawai'i Business Roundtable, 2007).

Small Business Hawai`i (SBH) was initially established to advocate for the growing numbers of very small businesses, five employees or less. SBH's mission is to promote a better Hawaii through private, competitive, networked small businesses. It aims to foster job creation and to reduce taxes, government regulations, and business costs, while promoting, educating, and fighting for Hawai`i's small business community (Small Business Hawaii, 2007).

The Hawai`i Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations' (HANO) mission is to raise the stature of nonprofits through advocacy, training, professional development, and propagating successful practices. HANO aims to serve, promote, protect, and support the nonprofit sector by (1) providing quality information, training, and networking opportunities, (2) communicating to the public, business, and government the valuable contributions of Hawaii nonprofits and the challenges they face, (3) representing nonprofits at the policy-making table, and (4) offering savings through group buying and discount programs. Approximately 300 of Hawaii's nonprofit organizations are members of HANO (Hawaii Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations, 2007).

Survey Instrument and Pre-tests

In April, 2007, the first draft of the survey instrument was developed and distributed for feedback. Based on all of the comments that were received, a second draft of the survey instrument was developed that was considerably shorter in length and was geared for the human resource manager to complete while still asking a few public policy questions.

The Chamber offered to pre-test the second draft of the survey in July, 2007 with members of its Health Issues Committee. While the information collected from this group is valuable, these pre-test respondents are actively engaged in civic affairs and are not representative of most employers. So, in addition to this pre-test, the author conducted two person-to-person interviews with CEO's of small sized businesses to get their reactions to the survey. Furthermore, the Executive Directors of HANO, SBH, and HBR, the co-chairs of the JLCFC, and selected faculty at UH were also given an opportunity to provide feedback on the second draft of the survey instrument. The second and subsequent drafts of the survey instrument were developed and pre-tested on Survey Monkey, which is a web-based software tool that creates custom surveys.

Based on the results of the second draft, a third draft was tested by the staff of EOA to ensure that all technical issues were resolved. Concurrently, Institutional Review Board (IRB) clearance from the UH Committee on Human Studies was sought and approved on

September 21, 2007. An exemption was granted based on the criteria utilized by the IRB. Minor changes to the instructions page of the survey instrument were implemented to reflect IRB policies.

Determining the Sample Size

A stratified random sampling approach was used to select the sample. Four lists of employers were generated and were first stratified on the basis of size. Large companies were selected from the HBR (N= 47) while small companies were selected from SBH (N= 809). Medium companies were selected from the Chamber list (N=1051). Nonprofit employers who were not represented by any of the other lists were obtained from HANO (N=289). All four lists were compared; overlapping organizations and those that participated in the pre-testing process were eliminated.

The sample size for each group was calculated on the basis of population size for each group, using a standard 95% confidence level and a six point confidence interval. The estimates are 95% likely to be correct within plus or minus three percentage points. From the large company list, the entire sample was selected (N= 47). From the nonprofit list, every other agency was randomly selected (N=139). From the small company list, every fourth organization was randomly selected (N=199). From the medium company list, every fifth organization was selected (N=208). This resulted in an overall sample size of 593 unduplicated employers.

Increasing the Response Rate

Based on available response rates for this type of survey, the EOA and faculty at UH believed that it would be difficult to get the sample size that was necessary to have confidence in the findings. Several methods were thus used to increase the expected low response rate.

- (1) Week one, the Chamber, SBH, HBR, and HANO e-mailed a link to the survey instrument with background information explaining why it is important to participate.
- (2) Week two, the Chamber, SBH, HBR, and HANO e-mailed a follow-up reminder with another link to the survey instrument.
- (3) Week four, EOA mailed a “thank you” packet as an incentive to complete the survey.
- (4) Week five, the Chamber, SBH, HBR, and HANO e-mailed a “last chance” reminder.

(5) Week six, EOA mailed a postcard as the final reminder.

One of the strategies was to mail a “thank you” packet. Based on discussions with the Chamber, SBH, HBR, and HANO, as well as what was feasible to assemble and within the budget guidelines, EOA sent to the sample a “thank you” packet that consisted of selected material from the Family Caregiver Resource Kit for Businesses developed by the Hawai`i Caregiver Coalition. Information from this Kit can be used to start a caregiver resource center in the workplace. Additionally, copies of the U.S. Administration of Aging’s “When Employees Become Caregivers: A Manager’s Workbook” were also included. Based on guidelines from the UH IRB, the incentive packet was mailed to the entire sample, not only the respondents. Furthermore, the anonymous nature of the survey made this the only feasible method.

However, even given these efforts, there was a lower response rate than anticipated. At least 100 respondents were necessary, but to allow for missing data, 125 respondents was desirable to get a sample size to eventually allow for multivariate analysis of the data. Given that the survey was anonymous, respondents who had not responded could not be sent reminders or phoned. Even if possible, this would have been a violation of the IRB exemption which relied on the anonymity of the respondent.

When the response rate by October 15, 2007 was only approximately 15%, it was determined that increasing the population size by conducting a random redraw would be necessary. Two hundred additional employers randomly selected (not stratified by size), were sent letters inviting them to participate in the survey. As with the other sample, the new sample also received incentives and follow-up postcards to remind them of the survey. In this way, a final sample size of 118 respondents was obtained by the latest possible date that could be allowed to still meet legislative and EOA administrative deadlines, November 15, 2007. On that date, the survey site was closed and the data were downloaded into an Excel file from which the SPSS analytic data file was created.

Data Analysis

In the first step of the analysis, univariate procedures (frequencies and descriptive statistics) were used to analyze the data. Bivariate analysis was then used to make comparisons between two more groups on outcomes of interest. Crosstabs employing chi squared tests of significance were used to determine if there was a difference in categorical responses between two groups, such as men and women. In order to determine the difference between mean scores of two groups (that measured, for instance, the degree of

support for the attitudes and opinions about eldercare), an independent T-Test was used. When comparing the mean scores for three or more groups (such as opinion item scores among small, medium, and large employers) an analysis of variance procedure was used with the LSD test of significance to determine differences among the three groups. In situations where two continuous or interval variables were being compared (such as the percentage of women in the workplace and the support for a particular item measured on a 1-5 scale), correlations were utilized with the Pearson's or Spearman's R tests to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two items.

Qualitative analysis of the open-ended responses involved examining the responses for themes and organizing them by category.

Results

Results indicated that one third of employers felt that over 15% of their employees were providing eldercare. Additionally, 38% saw an increase in the past two years in this percentage. The two most common effects noted in the workplace were (1) employees arriving late or leaving early, and (2) re-arranging their work schedules (mentioned by slightly less than half of the employers). Across companies, the most commonly offered benefits were paid bereavement leave and unpaid family leave to do eldercare, as well as compliance with the provisions of FMLA. It is important to note that only 30% of companies offered policies that, in their opinion, had any costs at all attached to the provision of whatever benefits they provided, and of these, most said that the cost was less than \$200 annually per employee.

In attitudes on eldercare as an employer issue, results indicated that almost 60% agreed or strongly agreed that employers should provide benefits for their employees affected by eldercare. Almost 60% said they are more aware of eldercare issues than in the past. Almost 80% agreed or strongly agreed that the number of employees providing eldercare will increase in the next 5 years.

Among public policy options, 70% favored a tax credit to purchase long-term care insurance for employees; slightly under 50% said they favored or strongly favored a state subsidy to provide eldercare benefits or wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during an otherwise unpaid leave.

For those companies offering benefits, the most often mentioned motivation was "important to offer a full complement of benefits and services to employees" (almost 50%).

Another 40% mentioned FMLA requirements. An additional one third said it was adapting to an aging society.

Conditions preventing companies offering eldercare benefits included cost issues (just under 50% of the sample mentioned this as a concern). Additionally, slightly over one quarter of the sample reported that it was not a relevant issue for their employees. The same percentage also mentioned that covering the employee's time was a barrier to offering benefits.

Interesting findings showed differences between nationally based companies with a branch in Hawai'i and locally owned companies. Significantly more of the former provided employee assistance programs for eldercare and leave without pay options, but local companies offered more flextime and job sharing options. Nationally based firms were also more likely to say that eldercare issues could affect an employee's career advancement.

Not for profit firms also differed significantly from proprietary firms in several ways. Not for profits were less likely to offer unpaid leave for family care and long-term care insurance, but more likely to offer paid bereavement leave and flextime for employees dealing with eldercare. Non-profits were also more likely to say that much more money in the next five years would be spent by them on eldercare issues. Non-profits were also significantly more likely to support policy efforts such as paid family leave through temporary disability insurance with employee contributions and a state subsidy to provide a package of eldercare benefits in workplace.

There were few differences between public and private entities. Private entities were more likely to provide legal services, literature, and eldercare information and referral, but public entities were more likely to provide flextime for eldercare.

While there were no significant differences in the opinions and attitudes about eldercare between unionized and non unionized companies, there were many significant difference in the benefits offered. Companies with unions were significantly less likely to offer eldercare information and referral services, literature, compressed work schedules, and telecommuting opportunities and to offer employees part time work or job sharing (the last two items approached significance only). On the other hand, they were significantly more likely to offer employee assistance programs, paid family leave, dependent care flexible accounts (approached significance), and compliance with the provisions of FMLA.

If the employer felt that offering eldercare benefits would enhance productivity, there would be more support for eldercare benefits and eldercare policies. Employers who

endorsed this item were seven times as likely to offer legal services to their employees and twice as likely to provide literature (approached significance only). They were also almost twice as likely to support dependent care flexible accounts and part time work and were also significantly more likely to support flextime and telecommuting.

The question suggesting the larger percentage of women in the company's workforce would affect employer's policies also found support in this survey. A higher percentage of women in the workplace correlated positively with attitudinal items such as "employees are generally more aware of eldercare issues today" and "offering eldercare benefits will enhance employee's productivity" (approached significance only). In addition, on two items there was an inverse correlation between the percentage of women and an assessment that "eldercare would cost the company a lot of money" and "offering benefits is too costly for our company," indicating strong support for company supported policies when there are more women in the company. Women respondents also showed significant differences from male respondents on support for public eldercare policies (see below).

The question – does the size of the company matter – could be answered largely 'yes'. While in some areas there were no differences, analysis of variance indicated that large companies (200 or more employees) were significantly more likely than small or medium sized companies to offer legal services, informational events, literature on eldercare, elderly assistance programs on eldercare, paid family and bereavement leave, and to comply with the provisions of FMLA. Medium sized companies (from 20 – 200 employees) were significantly more likely to offer unpaid leave, dependent care flexible spending accounts, and leave without pay options.

The impact of certain of the personal characteristics of the respondents was also examined as a test of whether one's opinions and attitudes about eldercare might vary by age and gender. This was the case. Women managers were more likely than men to support the statement that their company "offered eldercare policies because of previous experience with similar issues." In addition, they were more likely to support the policy option of providing paid family leave through the provision of temporary disability insurance and to support the idea of a state subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace. While there were few differences by the age of the employees in the company, there were differences in the age of the respondent. Being younger was significantly more likely to be correlated with attitudes that employers should provide eldercare benefits to support the policy of providing paid family leave through the provision of temporary disability insurance,

and to support the idea of a state subsidy to provide a package of eldercare benefits in workplace.

Finally, it made a large difference when the employer him/herself had had personal experience with eldercare. When this was the case, there was significantly more support for the statement “employees are generally more aware of eldercare issues” and “the number of employees providing care will increase” (approached significance only). Additionally, when an employer was currently or had been a caregiver, the workplace was significantly more likely to offer brown bags on eldercare issues, employee assistance programs, paid family leave, and were more likely to adhere to the provisions of the FMLA. They were also much more likely to support flextime and dependent care flexible accounts, although these differences were not significant.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made by respondents indicated that companies were generally just becoming aware of this issue. A subset said that it was not as of yet a problem. Generally these employers referred to the fact that they had younger employees. Other companies felt that it was not their place to get involved. One comment was “We feel that our company will do as much as possible to help employees, but this is basically a personal situation. We would not get any more or less involved if an employee had a death in the immediate family or divorce or birth of a child.”

Smaller companies were trying to deal with eldercare issues on a case by case basis. A typical response was as follows, “The issue is common; however we are very flexible and while it isn’t always easy we have been able to accommodate out employees needs.” Larger companies were more aware that there were issues with lost productivity and employee stress secondary to eldercare. A typical comment was this: “There is a decrease in productivity” and again “Employees call in sick but don’t state the reason.”

Most common was a sense that eldercare is an impending issue that companies will have to deal with in the near future. As one respondent said, “We have not experienced negative impact yet but anticipate the need for eldercare will increase and will challenge both recruitment and retention of valued employees.”

Discussion

The Effect of Eldercare on Workers

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of employees at their organization facing eldercare issues. Among Hawaii’s caregivers, 65% are employed (Executive Office on Aging, 2004); yet of the respondents, two-thirds (67.3%) of the

respondents said that less than 15% of their employees are providing eldercare. Human resource professionals may consider only the primary caregiver to be facing eldercare issues and, therefore, does not count someone who, for example, has a spouse at home caring for an ill parent. Human resource managers may simply not be aware of any home caregiving that many employees consider to be a private and emotional issue.

Thirty-eight percent of respondents indicated that the number of employees dealing with eldercare issues has increased in the past two years. Fifty-nine percent said that they were not aware of any change, and three percent said that the number of employees dealing with eldercare issues has decreased. These last two numbers are inconsistent; as the number of older adults increase, the number of people caring for an older adult relative or friend logically increases as well. The fact that only a little over a third of the respondents indicated that the number of employees dealing with eldercare issues has increased points to the possibility that human resource professionals may not be fully aware of the scope of eldercare issues in their workplaces, or that employees are not forthcoming with their issues. Had survey respondents been line managers, who may be more familiar with their individual employees' issues, the results to this question would likely have been different.

The Extent of Eldercare Policies and Benefits in the Workplace

Respondents were asked whether their organization offers eldercare benefits that were characterized as “information/referral/services,” “financial,” or “personnel polices.” Respondents were asked to answer “yes” if their organization offers the benefit in such a way that the benefit can be used for eldercare, “no” if their organization does not offer the benefit for eldercare and has no plans to offer the benefit in the next 12 months, or “plan” if their organization does not currently offer the benefit for eldercare but plans to offer it in the next 12 months.

In the financial category, 79.8% of respondents indicated that their organization offers paid bereavement leave. However, bereavement leave should not be specifically considered an eldercare benefit as it does not help with day-to-day eldercare support. More than two-thirds offer FMLA leave for eldercare reasons (67.3%) and unpaid family leave for eldercare issues (70.2%).

Three of the top four eldercare leave benefits offered (bereavement leave, unpaid leave for eldercare, FMLA leave, and leave without pay options) are typically unpaid. While offering unpaid leave options allows organizations to balance employee needs with the bottom line, the financial implications of unpaid leave make it an impractical option for many

workers. Employees who take unpaid leave face a reduced income while also, to some extent, supporting an additional dependent.

In the information/referral/services category, one out of four respondents (25%) indicated that their organization offers eldercare information and referral. Fewer than that provide literature, brown bag lunch sessions on eldercare issues, or informational events such as a caregiver fair. Benefits such as these that provide basic information on eldercare are free or low cost and are an easy way to support employed caregivers and demonstrate the employer's commitment to employee needs. However, few organizations offer them.

Almost 30% of respondents indicated that their organization offers an employee assistance program (EAP) for counseling and support of caregivers. Some EAPs also provide referral and legal services that may be useful to caregivers. Human resource departments seeking proactive and inexpensive avenues to provide eldercare support can make good use of their EAP by ensuring that employees know about all available services.

Because eldercare benefits vary across different employers, new hire orientation programs are a critical opportunity for companies to ensure that new employees are aware of all the benefits to them. Yet, only 21.9% of the respondents surveyed indicated that information on their organization's eldercare policies is included in their new hire orientation program. If an employee doesn't hear about a benefit soon after starting employment, the employee may not realize that the benefit is available. In the case of eldercare benefits, this disconnect could lead to an underutilization of the benefits. If the company incurs the cost of offering the benefit, it should make sure that employees use the benefit. Low awareness could also translate to decreased productivity if an employee spends time and energy searching for information that an eldercare referral service, such as the Area Agency on Aging, could easily have provided or resentment if the employee spends money or uses vacation time for eldercare when the employer could have reimbursed the employee or offered time off for that purpose.

Respondents were also asked whether their organization ever makes exceptions to formal policies to provide more flexibility to employees facing eldercare issues. Exceptions to formal policies could be a significant source of support for the caregiver. As seen in Table 4, 65.6% of the respondents indicated that their company makes exceptions to formal policies for eldercare. The fact that the majority of respondents are willing to be flexible to employee caregivers is encouraging, but formal policies would be preferable for both employees and employers. Informal policies are flexible but less reliable in their consistency and application.

Only 11.7% of respondents indicated that their organization trains managers to understand and deal with employee eldercare issues. In other words, nearly nine out of ten respondents stated that their organization does not specifically train managers in these issues. Because eldercare is such a private issue, and with employees of different generations heading up departments, understanding eldercare issues is an important management skill. Through managerial training, companies can provide eldercare information that benefits both the manager and the employee.

The Views of Eldercare as an Employer Issue

Although few companies are currently offering much or planning to offer much in the way of eldercare benefits, there have been some significant inroads into these issues. On the whole, companies were fairly evenly divided on which of several policy options to support eldercare would be best. However, there were differences by company characteristics. Larger companies, national companies with a Hawai`i branch, and those companies with a higher percentage of female employees and managers especially seem to be on the road to developing policies and benefit packages to support caregivers. However there does seem to be little effort on their part to collect data on this issue or to analyze the costs associated with the provision of eldercare benefits. The biggest concern about offering them is that it will be expensive.

Most who responded to the survey were not adamantly opposed to looking at increasing what they currently offered and most accepted that improving caregiver policy was an issue that, if not substantial now, was likely to become significant in the near future. The reason for this finding might be the universality of the caregiving experience. The fact that the answers varied by age, gender, and caregiving history of the respondent indicated that respondents were picturing themselves in the position of providing eldercare and thinking about what they might need (or did need!) in that situation.

Note that 75% of the respondents were women, and the age was relatively young (in their 40's). If the future of business in Hawai`i is going in the direction of younger managers, a more female management staff, or indeed more female employees, increasing support for public policies directed towards eldercare could occur. For this group, even if it might cost the company to provide eldercare benefits, the group may consider it money well spent.

Conclusions

As society looks toward the future in Hawai`i and the aging society that we will become, finding methods to support families providing eldercare who are employed in the

workplace will be crucial. The number of caregivers will continue to grow in the next three decades as the baby boomer generation moves into old age. Older adults prefer to live in their own homes and communities with the option of residing in institutional settings. However, nursing homes and residential care homes in Hawai'i are already without vacancies. Thus, working families and adult children will continue to be involved in caregiving. The delivery of services, benefits, and public policies to ultimately support employees who are balancing their work and eldercare responsibilities is of necessity a problem for the public and private sectors alike. Preparing for the growing eldercare concern now ensures that employers are properly equipped to handle eldercare issues as they become more common.

Hawaii has led the way in publicly funding caregiver support initiatives for caregivers. Federal programs have also tried to create comprehensive, accessible, and affordable caregiver support systems. Labor unions and the private sector have recognized the importance of supporting their employees who have caregiving responsibilities by creating workplace programs and financial incentives (Bueno, 2007). It is hoped that findings from this study will help shape organizational and public policies for a combined response to address the multi-faceted challenges of Hawaii's employed caregivers.

Table 1
Description of Company

Item	Valid Percentage
Number of Employees	
<20	39.6%
21-200	35.4%
201 or more	25.0%
Average Age of Employees	
<21	0%
22-40	37.5%
41-61	62.5%
>61	0%
Island Location (choose as many as apply)	
Oahu	70.1%
Maui	23.1%
Kauai	14.5%
Hawai i	19.7%
Moloka`i	5.1%
Lana`i	3.4%
Branch of a National Company?	21.1%
Are There Unionized Employees?	19.8%
For profit	61.5%
Not for profit	38.5%
Public	18.8%
Private	81.3%
Human Resources/Personnel Services Provided	94.7%

**Table 1 (cont.)
Description of Company**

Item	Valid Percentage
Description of Business	
Mining	1.0%
Construction	4.2%
Manufacturing	4.2%
Wholesale Trade	3.1%
Retail Trade	4.2%
Transportation and Warehousing	6.3%
Information	1.0%
Finance and Insurance	8.3%
Real Estate	10.4%
Prof Tech Scientific	9.4%
Management of Companies	1.0%
Admin and Sup Waste Mngmnt	1.0%
Education	9.4%
Healthcare/Social Service	14.6%
Arts and Entertainment	1.0%
Accommodation and Food industry	3.1%
Other	17.7%
Percentage of Your Workforce That is Female	57.52 (mean percent)
Description of Respondent	
Age	46.62 (mean age)
Gender	
Male	24.7%
Female	75.3%
Now or Previously Been Caregiver	34.7%
Position in Company	
CEO, CFO, Chair of Bd, President, etc	39.8%
General or Plant Manager	16.1%
Office Manager, Shift Supervisor, etc	44.1%

Table 2
Employees Balancing Work and Eldercare

Item	Valid Percentage
Percentage of Employees Providing Eldercare	
<15%	67.3%
16-25%	22.1%
26-50%	7.7%
51-75%	1.9%
76% or more	1.0%
Change in Past Two Years in This Percentage?	
Yes, Decrease	3%
Yes, Increase	38%
No	59%
Has Eldercare Affected the Workplace or Employees:	
Arriving Late/Leaving Early	41%
Early Retirement	12%
Personal Business During Work Hrs	24.8%
Give Up Work Entirely	8.5%
Distracted at Work/Poor Concentration	21.4%
Missed App'ts/Meetings	9.4%
Rearrange Work Schedule	45.3%
Reduce Hours FT to PT	12.0%
Resentment From Co-workers	3.4%
Scheduling Difficulties	17.1%
Strained Employee/Manager Relationships	2.6%
Stress Related Health Problems	12.0%
Unpaid Leaves of Absence	17.1%
Less Demanding Job	0%
Second or Third Job	1.7%
Time Off During Day to Provide Care	35%
Turn Down Promotion	0%
Work Day Interruptions Crises	18.8%
No Problems I Am Aware Of	29.9%

Table 3
Eldercare Benefits/Policies

Item	No	Plan	Yes
Brown Bag Lunches on Eldercare	81.7%	6.7%	11.5%
Caregiver Support Group	89.4%	1.9%	8.7%
On site Eldercare Services	100%	0%	0%
Eldercare Information and Referral	71.2%	3.8%	25.0%
Legal Services	90.4%	0%	9.6%
Informational Events	84.6%	2.9%	12.5%
Provide Literature	71.2%	4.8%	24.0%
EAP Program for Eldercare	65.4%	4.8%	29.8%
Unpaid Family Leave for Eldercare	26.9%	2.9%	70.2%
Paid Family Leave for Eldercare	53.8%	2.9%	43.3%
Paid Bereavement Leave	19.2%	1.0%	79.8%
Paid Sick Leave for Eldercare	44.2%	1.9%	53.8%
Dependent Care Flexible Spending Accounts	53.8%	1.9%	44.2%
Leave Without Pay Options	30.8%	2.9%	66.3%
LTC Insurance	78.8%	5.8%	15.4%
Allow PT Work	59.6%	1.9%	38.5%
Compressed Work Schedules	65.4%	1.9%	32.7%
Employee Leave Sharing	90.4%	0%	9.6%
Family and Medical Leave Act	27.9%	4.8%	67.3%
Flextime for Eldercare	40.4%	3.8%	55.8%
Job Sharing for Eldercare	85.6%	2.9%	11.5%
Telecommuting for Eldercare	76.0%	1.9%	22.1%

Table 4
Eldercare Policies

Item	Valid Percentage
Annual Direct/Indirect Costs of Eldercare Benefits Per Employee	
\$1-\$199	9.6%
\$200-\$499	5.8%
\$500-\$999	1.9%
\$1000-\$4999	5.8%
\$5000-\$9999	1.9%
Not Provided	5.8%
Not Applicable	69.2%
Information Provided Eldercare Benefits to New Hires at Orientation	21.9%
Managers are Trained on Eldercare Issues	11.7%
Paid Time Off Policy (sick leave/vacation) Includes Eldercare	17.6%
Exceptions Offered to Formal Policies to Provide Flexibility	65.6%
Individuals the Company Can Use Eldercare Benefits For:	
Any Blood Relative	12.8%
Anyone	14.5%
Anyone in Employees Household	10.3%
Grandparents	31.6%
Parents	45.3%
Parents of Legal Spouse	30.8%
Parents of Domestic Partner (opposite sex)	13.8%
Parents of Domestic Partner (same sex)	12.8%
Stepparents	23.9%
Other	6.0%
Not applicable	31.6%
Company Collects Information on Eldercare Issues	6.9%
Company Belongs to Other Organizations/Coalitions Re: Aging Issues	37.6%

Table 5
Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	4.0%	5.0%	31.7%	45.5%	13.9%
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	1.0%	5.9%	13.9%	61.4%	17.8%
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	1.0%	4.0%	45.5%	39.6%	9.9%
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	0%	3.0%	16.8%	55.4%	24.8%
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	2.0%	21.8%	53.5%	15.8%	6.9%
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	2.0%	7.9%	43.6%	34.7%	11.9%
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	0%	16.8%	54.5%	23.8%	5.0%
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	0%	10.9%	40.6%	43.6%	5.0%
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	4.0%	16.8%	29.7%	45.5%	4.0%
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	2.0%	19.8%	38.6%	33.7%	5.9%
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	3.0%	16.8%	63.4%	16.8%	0%

Table 6
Opinions/Attitudes on Public Policy Options

Item	Do Not Favor At All	Do Not Favor	Undecided	Favor	Strongly Favor
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	8.9%	27.7%	35.6%	21.8%	5.9%
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	9.9%	11.9%	31.7%	39.6%	6.9%
Tax credit to purchase LTC Insurance for employees	1.0%	5.0%	24.8%	38.6%	30.7%
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	6.0%	13.0%	35.0%	37.0%	9.0%

Table 7
Reasons for Offering Eldercare Benefits

Item	Valid Percentage
Employees asked for it	33.3%
Management saw a need	38.5%
Increased productivity	12.0%
To recruit and retain employees	23.9%
Important to offer range of support & benefits	47.9%
Other companies implement eldercare policies well	12.8%
Insurance offering	12.0%
Union/labor negotiation	8.5%
Legal Requirements/FMLA	38.5%
EAP program brought it to our attention	6.8%
Adapting to an aging society	31.6%
Don't know	3.4%
Not applicable	15.4%

Table 8
Conditions that Prevent Offering Eldercare Benefits

Item	Valid Percentage
Cost issues	47.0%
Not a relevant issue for our employees	27.4%
Increased paperwork/admin issues	13.7%
Covering the employees time	27.4%
Difficulty hiring/replacing workers	14.5%
Technology issues	1.7%
Decreased productivity	8.5%
Effect on existing leave benefits	15.4%
No control/national office dictates policies	9.4%
Interaction with other laws	6.8%
Don't know	4.3%
Not applicable	16.2%

Table 9
Comparing Respondents That Are Part of a National Company with Local Companies
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	P=.052 (national companies 30% vs local 16%)
Caregiver support group	No difference
On site eldercare services	No difference (note: 100% answered no)
Eldercare information and referral	No difference
Legal services	No difference
Informational events	No difference
Provide literature	No difference
EAP program for eldercare	P=.022 (national companies 55% vs local 24%)
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	No difference
Paid family leave for eldercare	No difference
Paid bereavement leave	No difference
Paid sick leave for eldercare	No difference
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	No difference
Leave without pay options	P=.007 (national companies 75% vs local 36%)
LTC insurance	No difference
Allow PT work	No difference
Compressed work schedules	No difference
Employee leave sharing	No difference
Family and Medical Leave Act	No difference
Flextime for eldercare	P=.1 (national companies 40% vs local 61.3%) *
Job sharing for eldercare	P=.04 (national companies 0% vs local 13.3%)
Telecommuting for eldercare	No difference

* approached significance only

Table 10
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by
National Branch or Local Company

Item	Nat'l Branch	Local	Sig level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.45	3.61	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	3.55	3.97	P=.100
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.35	3.56	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	4.15	3.97	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.05	3.05	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.75	3.39	P=.108
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	2.95	3.15	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.40	3.37	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.60	3.13	P=.010
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.50	3.17	P=.140
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	2.80	2.96	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.70	2.89	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	3.10	3.19	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	3.85	3.95	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.42	3.21	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 11
Comparing Respondents From For Profit vs Not For Profit Organizations
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	No difference
Caregiver support group	No difference
On site eldercare services	No difference
Eldercare information and referral	No difference
Legal services	No difference
Informational events	No difference
Provide literature	No difference
EAP program for eldercare	No difference
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	P=.054 (for profit 78% vs not for profit 59.5%)
Paid family leave for eldercare	No difference
Paid bereavement leave	P=.066 (for profit 72.9% vs not for profit 89.2%)*
Paid sick leave for eldercare	No difference
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	No difference
Leave without pay options	No difference
LTC insurance	P=.027 (for profit 30.5% vs not for profit 8.2%)
Allow PT work	No difference
Compressed work schedules	No difference
Employee leave sharing	No difference
Family and Medical Leave Act	No difference
Flextime for eldercare	P=.043 (for profit 51.9% vs not for profit 75%)
Job sharing for eldercare	No difference
Telecommuting for eldercare	No difference

* approached significance only

Table 12
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Profit vs Non Profit Status

Item	For Profit	Non Profit	Sig level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.54	3.65	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	3.85	3.95	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.46	3.62	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	4.05	3.95	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.12	2.95	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.59	3.27	P=.080
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	3.05	3.22	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.37	3.41	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.32	3.08	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.24	3.27	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	2.95	2.89	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.68	3.14	P=.035
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	2.98	3.49	P=.018
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	3.95	3.89	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.16	3.43	P=.195

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant, otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 13
Comparing Respondents from Public vs Private Organizations
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	No difference
Caregiver support group	No difference
On site eldercare services	No difference
Eldercare information and referral	P=.095 (11.1% of public vs 32% private)*
Legal services	P=.036 (0% of public vs 12.8% private)
Informational events	No difference
Provide literature	P=.101 (11.1% of public vs 32% private)*
EAP program for eldercare	No difference
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	No difference
Paid family leave for eldercare	No difference
Paid bereavement leave	No difference
Paid sick leave for eldercare	No difference
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	No difference
Leave w/out pay options	No difference
LTC insurance	No difference
Allow PT work	No difference
Compressed work schedules	No difference
Employee leave sharing	No difference
Family and Medical Leave Act	No difference
Flextime for eldercare	P=.11 (77.8% of public vs 56.4% private)*
Job sharing for eldercare	No difference
Telecommuting for eldercare	No difference

*approached significance only

(Note: Did not produce public vs private table on attitudes and opinions because no differences even approached significance)

Table 14
Comparing Respondents from Small, Medium or Large Companies¹
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Small	Medium	Large	Sig level ²
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	13.5%	2.9%	8.7%	NS
Caregiver support group	0%	3.8%	6.9%	NS
On site eldercare services	0%	0%	0%	NS
Eldercare information and referral	16.2%	31.4%	26.1%	NS
Legal services	2.6%	11.8%	20.8%	P=.057
Informational events	2.6%	12.1%	30.4%	P=.007
Provide literature	10.8%	33.3%	36.4%	P=.035
EAP program for eldercare	5.3%	35.5%	69.6%	P=.001
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	50%	91.2%	79.2%	P=.001
Paid family leave for eldercare	37.8%	35.3%	66.7%	P=.037
Paid bereavement leave	67.6%	82.4%	95.8%	P=.024
Paid sick leave for eldercare	50%	60.6%	58.3%	NS
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	13.2%	66.7%	62.5%	P=.001
Leave without pay options	45.9%	86.2%	75.0%	P=.001
LTC insurance	8.3%	31.3%	13.0%	P=.037
Allow PT work	36.1%	47.9%	29.2%	NS
Compressed work schedules	36.1%	38.2%	20.8%	NS
Employee leave sharing	10.5%	0%	16.7%	P=.064
Family and Medical Leave Act	40.0%	85.3%	95.8%	P=.001
Flextime for eldercare	51.4%	61.8%	66.7%	NS
Job sharing for eldercare	13.9%	14.7%	4.2%	NS
Telecommuting for eldercare	24.3%	26.5%	16.7%	NS

¹ Defined by the number of employees

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 15
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Company Size²

Item	Small	Medium	Large	Sig level ³
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.58	3.62	3.54	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	3.95	3.79	3.92	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.61	3.44	3.50	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	3.89	4.00	4.21	P=.103 (between small and large)
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.16	2.94	3.04	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.21	3.50	3.83	P=.007 (between small and large)
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	3.03	3.21	3.13	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.29	3.41	3.50	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.16	3.26	3.29	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	2.89	3.41	3.58	P=.011 and .002 (between each of the three)
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	2.79	2.94	3.13	P=.053 and .020 (between small and all others)
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	3.18	2.62	2.67	P=.053 (between small and large)
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	3.32	3.00	3.21	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	3.71	4.12	4.00	P=.065 (between small and medium)
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.47	3.12	3.13	P=.138 (between small and medium)

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Defined by the number of employees

³ Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 16
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Respondent's Gender

Item	Male Mean Score	Female Mean Score	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.57	3.56	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	4.00	3.83	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.61	3.46	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	3.91	3.43	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.09	3.07	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.26	3.51	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	3.30	3.06	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.43	3.34	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.22	3.24	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.09	3.29	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	3.13	3.24	P=.047
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.52	2.96	P=.061
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	2.74	3.29	P=.033
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	4.09	3.86	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.04	3.33	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 17
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Respondent's Age

Item	R Values	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	-.197	P=.068
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	.196	.069
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	.016	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	.057	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	.044	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	.077	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	.154	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	-.052	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	-.083	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	.203	P=.06
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	-.105	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	-.341	P=.001
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	-.284	P=.008
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	.006	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	-.154	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 18
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by
Percentage of the Workforce Being Female

Item	R Values	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	.115	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	.177	.084
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	.177	.084
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	-.085	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	-.224	.028
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	-.178	.082
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	.050	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	.098	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	.044	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	-.047	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	.017	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	-.032	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	.002	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	-.104	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	.101	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 19
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Employee's Age Groups*

Item	22-40 Mean Score	41-61 Mean Score	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.64	3.55	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	3.75	3.97	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.56	3.50	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	3.92	4.07	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.08	3.03	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.39	3.52	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	3.19	3.07	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.42	3.37	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.28	3.20	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.25	3.25	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	3.00	2.88	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.98	2.78	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	3.31	3.10	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	3.92	3.93	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.46	3.15	P=.146

* Note: only two age groups were represented in the sample (22-40 and 41-61) so independent T-tests were used to analyze these data

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 20
Comparing Respondents Who Endorsed the Item 'Providing Eldercare Benefits Increases Productivity'
On the Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	NS
Caregiver support group	NS
On site eldercare services	NS
Eldercare information and referral	NS
Legal services	P=.001 (endorsers =35.7% vs non endorsers 5.6%)
Informational events	NS
Provide literature	P=.063 (endorsers =46.2% vs non endorsers 22.1%)
EAP program for eldercare	NS
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	NS
Paid family leave for eldercare	NS
Paid bereavement leave	NS
Paid sick leave for eldercare	NS
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	P=.033 (endorsers =71.4% vs non endorsers 40.9%)
Leave without pay options	NS
LTC insurance	NS
Allow PT work	P=.039 (endorsers =64.3% vs non endorsers 35.2%)
Compressed work schedules	NS
Employee leave sharing	NS
Family and Medical Leave Act	NS
Flextime for eldercare	P=.004 (endorsers =92.9% vs non endorsers 52.3%)
Job sharing for eldercare	NS
Telecommuting for eldercare	P=.05 (endorsers =42.9% vs non endorsers 19.3%)

Table 21
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by
'Reason Offering Benefits' Being Increased Productivity

Item	Item Endorsed Mean Score	Not Endorsed Mean Score	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.79	3.57	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	4.07	3.86	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	4.00	3.46	P=.014
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	4.43	3.95	P=.024
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.21	3.01	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.86	3.40	P=.072
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	3.86	3.06	P=.001
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	4.07	3.32	P=.001
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.71	3.22	P=.064
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.64	3.15	P=.057
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	2.93	2,94	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.79	2.90	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	2.93	3.26	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	4.29	3.87	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.57	3.26	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 22
Comparing Respondents Employers with Eldercare Experience with Those Who Do Not
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	P=.004 (emp w/exp = 26.7% vs emp w/out exp 5.2%)
Caregiver support group	NS
On site eldercare services	NS
Eldercare information and referral	NS
Legal services	NS
Informational events	NS
Provide literature	NS
EAP program for eldercare	P=.048 (emp w/exp = 43.8% vs emp w/out exp 23.7%)
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	NS
Paid family leave for eldercare	P=.004 (emp w/exp = 63.6% vs emp w/out exp 32.8%)
Paid bereavement leave	NS
Paid sick leave for eldercare	NS
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	NS
Leave without pay options	NS
LTC insurance	NS
Allow PT work	NS
Compressed work schedules	NS
Employee leave sharing	NS
Family and Medical Leave Act	P=.010 (emp w/exp = 67.5% vs emp w/out exp 61.7%)
Flextime for eldercare	NS
Job sharing for eldercare	NS
Telecommuting for eldercare	NS

Table 23
Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by Employer Having Been a Caregiver

Item	Item Endorsed Mean Score	Not Endorsed Mean Score	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.48	3.63	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	4.12	3.76	P=.031
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.64	3.45	NS
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	4.18	3.92	P=.098
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	2.97	3.10	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.52	3.45	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	2.97	3.19	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.27	3.44	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.21	3.26	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.45	3.13	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	3.03	2.85	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.67	2.97	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	3.27	3.10	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	4.06	3.84	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.21	3.30	NS

¹ Scored from 1=strongly disagree or disfavor to 5=strongly agree or favor

² Reported only if significant or close to significant; otherwise NS denotes no difference

Table 24
Comparing Respondents from Unionized vs Non Union Companies
On The Provision (Or Planned Provision) of Eldercare Benefits

Item	Significance Level (if <.05) and Percentage
Brown bag lunches on eldercare	NS
Caregiver support group	P=.051 (union 0% vs non union 10.7%)
On site eldercare services	NS
Eldercare information and referral	P=.029 (union 5.6% non union 30.7%)
Legal services	NS
Informational events	NS
Provide literature	P=.044 (union =5.9% vs non union 29.3%)
EAP program for eldercare	P=.014 (union =55.6% vs non union 25.7%)
Unpaid family leave for eldercare	NS
Paid family leave for eldercare	P=.004 (union =73.7% vs non union 36.8%)
Paid bereavement leave	NS
Paid sick leave for eldercare	NS
Dependent care flexible spending accounts	P=.063 (union = 63.2% vs non union 39.5%)
Leave without pay options	NS
LTC insurance	NS
Allow PT work	P=.083 (union = 21.1% vs non union 42.7%)
Compressed work schedules	P=.020 (union = 10.5% vs non union 38.9%)
Employee leave sharing	NS
Family and Medical Leave Act	P=.046 (union = 89.5% vs non union 66.2%)
Flextime for eldercare	NS
Job sharing for eldercare	P=.076 (union =0% vs non union 14.7%)
Telecommuting for eldercare	P=.039 (union =5.3% vs non union 27.6%)

Table 25
 Comparing Opinions/Attitudes on Eldercare as an Employer Issue and Public Policy Options Support¹ by
 Employer Having Unionized Employees

Item	Item Endorsed Mean Score	Not Endorsed Mean Score	Sig Level ²
Employers should provide benefits for employees with eldercare issues	3.47	3.61	NS
Employers are more aware of eldercare issues today than the past	3.74	3.92	NS
Offering eldercare benefits will enhance productivity	3.32	3.57	P=.108
The # of employees providing eldercare will increase in 5 yrs	4.11	3.99	NS
Providing eldercare benefits too costly for my company	3.00	3.06	NS
Eldercare issues will cost much more \$ in next 5 yrs	3.63	3.43	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to recruit employees	2.95	3.16	NS
Providing eldercare benefits helps to retain employees	3.42	3.38	NS
Eldercare can impact employee's career advancement	3.21	3.23	NS
I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare	3.37	3.22	NS
Experience w/similar issues led to development of eldercare policies	2.79	2.96	NS
Paid family leave thru temp disability insurance with employee contributions	2.84	2.86	NS
State subsidy to provide package of eldercare benefits in workplace	3.00	3.22	NS
Tax credit to purchase LTC insurance for employees	3.89	3.94	NS
Wage replacement savings plan to provide wages during otherwise unpaid leaves	3.06	3.31	NS

Bibliography

AARP (2002). Global Aging: Achieving its Potential. Retrieved November 12, 2007 from <http://www.aarp/globalaging>.

Arno, P. (2002). Economic Value of Informal Caregiving: 2000. Powerpoint presentation at the American Association of Geriatric Psychiatry. Orlando, Florida, February 24, 2002. Available at <http://www.thefamilycaregiver.org/pdfs/pa2000.ppt>.

Arno, P., Levine, C. and Memmott, M. (1999). "The Economic Value of Informal Caregiving." Health Affairs. 18: 182-188. Available at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/18/2/182>.

Arno, P. and Memmott, M. (1997). Estimated Value of Informal Caregiving, Number of Informal Caregivers and Caregiving Hours by State. Washington, D.C.: Alzheimer's Association, March 1999. In Feinberg, L., Newman, S., and Van Steenberg, C. (2002).

Bueno, A. (2007). Selected Issues in Work-Family Policy: A Brief Overview. Legislative Reference Bureau: Honolulu, Hawaii. Available at <http://www.hawaii.gov/lrb/rpts07/workfam.pdf>.

Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii (2007). Website visited on May 10, 2007. Available at <http://www.cochawaii.com>.

Conference Board (1992). "Elder care." Work-Family Roundtable, 3:1-11. In Goodstein, J. (1995). "Employer Involvement in Eldercare: An Organizational Perspective." Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 38, No. 6, pp 1657-1671.

Executive Office on Aging (2004). Family Caregivers: A Summary of National and Local Data. Department of Health, Executive Office on Aging: Honolulu, Hawaii. Available at <http://www4.hawaii.gov/eoa/information/stats/caregiver2004.pdf>.

Executive Office on Aging (2006). Profile of Hawaii's Older Adults and Their Caregivers. Department of Health, Executive Office on Aging: Honolulu, Hawaii. Available at www4.hawaii.gov/eoa/information/stats/profile2006rev.pdf.

Hawaii Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations (2007). Website visited on September 6, 2007. Available at www.hano-hawaii.org.

Hawaii Business Roundtable (2007). Mission Statement. Honolulu, HI.

House Bill No. 500, Conference Draft 1 (2007). Signed into law as Act 213 on June 27, 2007. Available at: http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessioncurrent/Bills/HB500_CD1_.pdf.

Legislative Reference Bureau Systems Office (2006). Bills Passed by the Hawaii State Legislature Regular Session of 2006. Honolulu, Hawaii. Available at <http://www.hawaii.gov/lrb/legis06/passed06.pdf>.

MetLife Mature Market Institute and National Alliance for Caregiving (2006). The MetLife Caregiving Cost Study: Productivity Losses to U.S. Business. Westport, CT. Available at www.caregiving.org/data/Caregiver%20Cost%20Study.pdf.

MetLife Mature Market Institute, National Alliance for Caregiving, and National Center on Women and Aging (1999). The MetLife Juggling Act Study: Balancing Caregiving with Work and the Costs Involved. Westport, CT. Available at <http://www.geckosystems.com/downloads/juggling.pdf>.

National Alliance for Caregiving and AARP (2004). Caregiving in the U.S. Washington, D.C. Available at www.caregiving.org/data/04finalreport.pdf.

Neal, M. and Wagner, D (Date Unknown). Working Caregivers: Issues, Challenges, and Opportunities for the Aging Network. NFCSP Program Development Issue Brief. Available at http://www.aoa.gov/prof/aoaprogram/caregiver/careprof/proguidance/background/program_issues/Fin-Neal-Wagner.pdf.

Robinson, K. (1997). The family's role in long term care. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 23(9), 7-11.

Senate Bill No. 1916, Conference Draft 1 (2007). Signed into law on June 21, 2007 as Act 204. Available at http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessioncurrent/Bills/SB1916_CD1_.pdf.

Senate Bill No. 3253, Conference Draft 1 (2006). Signed into law on July 7, 2006 as Act 285. Available at http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2006/Bills/SB3253_CD1_.pdf.

Scharlach, A. (1994). "Caregiving and Employment: Competing or Complementary roles?" *The Gerontologist*, 34, 378-385.

Small Business Hawaii (2007). Website visited on May 10, 2007. Available at <http://www.smallbusinesshawaii.com>.

Wagner, D. (2003). Workplace Programs for Family Caregivers: Good Business and Good Practice. Family Caregiver Alliance: San Francisco, California. Available at http://www.caregiver.org/caregiver/jsp/content/pdfs/op_2003_workplace_programs.pdf.

1. Introduction

The Executive Office on Aging, with the assistance of the University of Hawaii School of Social Work, is conducting a survey of Hawaii's employers to determine:

1. The extent of eldercare policies and benefits in the workplace,
2. The effect of eldercare on workers,
3. The views of eldercare as an employer issue,
4. Why eldercare policies and benefits are offered or not.

For the purposes of this survey, "eldercare" is when a person provides unpaid care or assistance to an adult 60 years old or older who has physical and/or cognitive limitations.

Members of the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, Small Business Hawaii, the Hawaii Business Roundtable, and the Hawaii Alliance of Nonprofit Organizations have been randomly selected to participate.

2. Instructions

This survey should be completed by the person who is most knowledgeable about human resource policies and work-family benefits in your organization. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. This survey is anonymous and the information you provide will not be connected to you in any way. Your consent is assumed by your participation in this survey. This survey has been reviewed and approved by the University of Hawaii-Manoa's Committee on Human Studies. Should you have any concerns, please contact them at 956-7659.

Please answer the following questions and click the "done" button at the end of the survey no later than Tuesday, November 13, 2007. If you have any questions, please contact either Dr. Pam Arnsberger at 808-956-6121 or at arnsburg@hawaii.edu or Dr. Felix Blumhardt at 808-956-6236 or at felixb@hawaii.edu.

This survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

3. Part 1: Employees that are Balancing Work and Eldercare

1. What percentage of your employees would you estimate are currently balancing work and eldercare?

- less than 15%
- 16% -25%
- 26% - 50%
- 51% - 75%
- 76% or More
- Don't know

2. Have you seen a change in the number of employees dealing with eldercare at your organization in the past 2 years?

- Yes, there has been a decrease
- Yes, there has been an increase
- No, there has been no change that I am aware of
- Don't Know

3. Have you witnessed any of the following by employees facing eldercare (please select all that apply)?

- Arrive late or leave early during the day to provide care
- Choose early retirement/retire
- Excessive personal business during work hours (e.g., phone calls)
- Give up work entirely
- Mental/concentration problems/employee is distracted at work
- Missed appointments/meetings
- Rearrange work schedule
- Reduce hours from full-time to part-time
- Resentment from co-workers
- Scheduling difficulties
- Strained employee/manager relationships
- Stress-related health problems
- Take an unpaid leave of absence
- Take a less demanding job
- Take a second or third job
- Take time off during the day to provide eldercare
- Turn down a promotion
- Workday interruptions for crisis care
- No problems I am aware of

€ Other (please specify)

4. Part 2: Organizational Benefits/Policies for Eldercare

1. Please indicate whether your organization offers the following benefits that can be used for eldercare. Answer as follows:

- YES if your organization offers the benefit (formally or informally) in such a way that it can be used for eldercare;
- No if your organization does not offer the benefit for eldercare, and has no plans to offer it in the next 12 months; or
- PLAN if your organization does not currently offer the benefit for eldercare, but plans to in the next 12 months

Information/Referral/Services

	Yes	No	Plan
A. Brown bag lunches to discuss eldercare issues	jn	jn	jn
B. Caregiver support group	jn	jn	jn
C. On-site eldercare services	jn	jn	jn
D. Eldercare referral or information service	jn	jn	jn
E. Legal services for eldercare issues	jn	jn	jn
F. Informational events about eldercare issues (e.g., caregiver fairs)	jn	jn	jn
G. Provide literature on eldercare issues	jn	jn	jn
H. Employee assistance program for eldercare	jn	jn	jn

2. Financial

	Yes	No	Plan
H. Unpaid family leave for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
I. Paid family leave for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
J. Paid bereavement leave	jn	jn	jn
K. Paid sick leave for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
L. Dependent care flexible spending accounts	jn	jn	jn

M. Leave without pay options for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
N. Long-term care insurance covering older relatives	jn	jn	jn

3. Personnel Policies

	Yes	No	Plan
O. Allow employees to work part-time for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
P. Compressed work schedules for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
Q. Employee leave sharing for eldercare (employees can donate leave time for use by other employees)	jn	jn	jn
R. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
S. Flextime for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
T. Job sharing for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn
U. Telecommuting for eldercare reasons	jn	jn	jn

4. How else does your organization provide any other eldercare-related benefits to employees?

5. How much does it cost your organization, directly and indirectly, annually to provide eldercare benefits per employee?

- jn \$1 - \$199
- jn \$200 - \$499
- jn \$500 - \$999
- jn \$1,000 - \$4,999
- jn \$5,000 - \$9,999
- jn \$10,000 or more
- jn We do not provide eldercare benefits
- jn Don't Know

6. Is information on your organization's eldercare policies included in your new hire orientation program?

- jn Yes
- jn No
- jn Not Applicable

7. Does your organization train managers to help them understand employee eldercare issues?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

8. Does your organization's paid time off policy (sick leave/vacation) specifically include eldercare?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

9. Does your organization ever make exceptions to formal policies to provide more flexibility to employees facing eldercare (e.g., allowing an employee to use a sick day to care for an in-law)?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

10. For which of the following individuals may an employee at your organization use eldercare benefits to provide care (please select all that apply)?

- Any blood relative
- Anyone (employee's discretion)
- Anyone in the employee's household
- Grandparents
- Parents
- Parents of legal spouse
- Parents of domestic partner (opposite sex)
- Parents of domestic partner (same sex)
- Stepparents
- Other
- Not Applicable

11. Does your organization collect information on eldercare concerns (i.e., exit surveys, interviews, focus groups)?

- Yes

No

Not Applicable

12. How has eldercare affected your organization?

13. Does your organization belong to other groups, coalitions, or associations that currently, or have previously, responded to other aging issues (i.e., age discrimination, pensions, 401 (K), Long-term Care Insurance)?

Yes

No

Don't Know

5. Part 3: Views of Eldercare as an Employer Issue

1. How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements (check one for each statement)?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
A. Employers should provide resources/benefits for employees facing eldercare issues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Employees are generally more aware of eldercare issues today than they have been in the past.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Offering eldercare benefits will enhance employee production.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. The number of our employees caring for older relatives will increase over the next five years.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Providing eldercare resources/benefits to employees is too costly to be feasible for my company.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Eldercare issues are likely to cost our organization much more money over the next five years.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Providing eldercare resources/benefits helps to recruit employees.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Providing eldercare resources /benefits helps to retain employees.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Eldercare issues can impact an employee's	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

career advancement opportunities.

J. I understand employment law as it relates to eldercare.

jn

jn

jn

jn

jn

K. Our organization's experience facing similar issues (e.g., childcare) has helped us develop eldercare policies.

jn

jn

jn

jn

jn

2. How strongly do you favor each of the following public policy options (check one for each statement)?

	Strongly do not favor	Do not favor	Undecided	Favor	Strongly favor
A. Paid family leave through Temporary Disability Insurance with employee contributions	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
B. State subsidy to provide a package of eldercare benefits in the workplace	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
C. Tax credit to purchase Long-term Care Insurance for employees	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
D. Creation of a wage replacement savings plan that would provide wages during an otherwise unpaid leave of absence	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

6. Part 4: Reasons for Offering Eldercare Benefits/Policies

1. What conditions encourage your organization to offer eldercare benefits/policies (please select all that apply)?

- A. Employees asked for it.
- B. Management saw a need.
- C. Increased productivity.
- D. To recruit and retain employees.
- E. It's important to our company that we offer a range of support and benefits to our employees.
- F. Other companies implement eldercare programs successfully.
- G. Insurance offering.
- H. Union/labor negotiation.
- I. Legal requirements/Family and Medical Leave Act.
- J. Employee Assistance Program brought eldercare to our attention.
- K. Adapting to an aging society with eldercare/long-term care issues.
- L. Don't know.
- M. Not applicable.
- Other (please specify)

2. What conditions prevent your organization from offering eldercare

benefits/policies (please select all that apply)?

- A. Cost issues.
- B. Not a relevant issue for our employees.
- C. Increased paperwork/administrative issues.
- D. Covering the employee's time.
- E. Difficulty hiring/replacing workers.
- F. Technology issues.
- G. Decreased productivity.
- H. Effect on existing leave benefits.
- I. No control over personnel policies/national office dictates policies.
- J. Interaction with other laws/legal requirements.
- K. Don't know.
- L. Not applicable.

Other (please specify)

7. Part 5: About Your Organization

1. How many employees work for your organization?

- 20 or less employees
- Between 21-200 employees
- 201 or more employees

2. Approximately what percentage of your workforce is female?

Enter percent in box

3. What is the average age of employees in your organization?

- Less than 21 years old
- 22-40 years old
- 41-61 years old
- 62 years old or older

4. On which island is your organization located (check all that apply)?

- Oahu
- Maui
- Kauai
- Hawaii

Molokai

Lanai

5. Is your organization a branch of a national company?

Yes

No

Don't know

6. Are there unionized employees (under a collective bargaining agreement) within your organization?

Yes

No

7. What percentage of employees within your organization is unionized (under a collective bargaining agreement)?

Enter percent in box

8. Which industry best describes your organization's main business (check only one)?

Mining

Utilities

Construction

Manufacturing

Wholesale Trade

Retail Trade

Transportation and Warehousing

Information

Finance and Insurance

Real Estate and Rental and Leasing

Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services

Management of Companies and Enterprises

Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services

Educational Services

Health Care and Social Assistance

Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation

Accommodation and Food Services

Other Services

9. Is your organization profit or not-for-profit?

For profit

Not-for-profit

10. Is your organization in the public or private sector?

Public sector

Private sector

8. Part 6: About You

1. Do you provide human resource/personnel functions?

Yes

No

2. What is your management level?

Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Chief Operations Officer (COO), Chief Information Officer (CIO), Chairperson of the Board, President, Vice President, Corporate Head

General Manager, Plant Manager, Regional Manager, and Division Manager

Office Manager, Shift Supervisor, Department Manager, Foreperson, Crew Leader, Store Manager

3. Are you personally currently providing eldercare, or have provided eldercare in the past two years, for an immediate family member, relative, or friend?

Yes

No

4. What is your age?

5. What is your sex?

Male

Female

6. Please provide any additional comments you may have about any material that was or was not covered in this survey.



9. Thank you for completing this survey!