Report of the

Business NZ Skills and Training Survey 2003

Findings of research conducted by

Business NZ

And the

Industry Training Federation of NZ

For the

Future of Work Research Programme

Department of Labour

June 2003

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of Findings	4
Methodology	11
Respondent profile	14
Prevalence and nature of training and skill development	29
Causes and effects of training and skill development	48
Perceptions of industry training and Modern Apprenticeships	72
Appendix 1: Survey Population – Firm Size	88
Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire	89
Appendix 2: Respondent Comments	101

Introduction

This report provides the results of a survey conducted by Business NZ in conjunction with the Department of Labour and the Industry Training Federation, and funded by the Future of Work research programme.

The research project was aimed at improving knowledge about the level and nature of enterprise-based training, as well as the drivers for, and the barriers to, training in the workplace. The survey built upon research conducted by the NZ Employers' Federation in 1989, 1994 and 1997. Like those surveys, it was conducted amongst firms and enterprises that belonged to the regional associations constituting Business NZ.

Given the nature of this sample, the results of this research are not conclusive as to the training practices and behaviour of the wider New Zealand business community. Nevertheless, this research provides valuable information about the drivers and effects of training in the workplace, particularly amongst those enterprises that are engaging in training and skill development.

This report presents a comprehensive overview of the results of that survey, but given the extensive nature of the data collected, there are many areas where further investigation could be undertaken, particularly of sub-groups within the sample, and further analysis of correlations between the data. The researchers are keen to receive suggestions and feedback from interested parties as to the areas where such further investigation would be productive and useful. It would also be useful to conduct more broad ranging, if less comprehensive, research to gain a better understanding of firms not engaging in training.

Jeremy Baker Stephen Summers Carrie Murdoch

Acknowledgements:

The researchers would like to thank the respondents for their time & participation; Dr Richard Blandy (Centre for Applied Economics, University of South Australia), Peter Conway & Don Farr (NZ Council of Trade Unions), and William Dillingham (Department of Labour) for their advice and support; and Business NZ's regional association members for their assistance with this research. Any errors or omissions in the report remain, however, the responsibility of the researchers.

Summary of Findings

This section provides a summary of the findings of the survey, details of which are contained in the rest of the report.¹

Respondent profile

479 enterprises responded to the survey, with over 49,000 employees. 15% of these enterprises had 5 or fewer employees, while 21% had 100 or more employees.

77% of staff employed by the respondent firms were full-time employees. 18% of employees in the respondent firms had no qualifications, 31% had only a school qualification.

The majority of these organisations were private limited liability companies (65%), but the were also a significant number of incorporated societies and trusts (13%), public companies (9%) and government agencies (5%). 70% had been in operation for more than 10 years.

The respondents were spread across a wide range of industries, with the largest proportion (28%) being in the manufacturing sector. 12% also consider their firm to be in the Tourism sector.

Self-assessed performance of enterprise and employees

Respondents were asked to assess their enterprise's comparative performance with similar or competitor organisations, both currently, and over the last 2 years, on a scale of 1 (very much worse) to 7 (very much better). The mean assessment of current comparative performance was 4.89, implying that respondents felt that they were doing about as well, on average, as their competitors.

Similarly, respondents were asked to assess the productivity of typical new employees with that of the productivity of typical employees after 2 years of employment, on a 100-point scale. The mean productivity gap was 45.

Prevalence and nature of training and skill development

89% of respondent enterprises indicated they were currently providing training for their employees. Larger firms were more likely to be offering training. More than half of respondents had increased the amount of training provided to their employees over the last 2 years. 95% of firms indicated they were likely to offer training in the next 12 months.

¹ As with any survey-based research, one needs to be aware of the sample properties and associated limitations before generalising from the data. We encourage the reader to carefully read the methodology section, with particular attention to the limitations.

Spending on training

The mean amount spent on training over the previous 12 months was **3.7%** of total payroll. This figure is comparable with the figure of 3.48% from the 1994 NZ Employers' Federation Survey. There were significant differences in the spending on training across different industries.

Quantum of training

59% of the employees of respondent firms had undergone training in the last 12 months. This figure was greater for the very smallest and largest firms. The average number of days training provided per employee was **4.4** days.

Recipients of training

Training for employees of respondent enterprises appeared to be provided across the skill and qualifications levels of employees – the proportion of those receiving training with any particular level of qualification was almost identical to the spread of qualified staff.

Form and kind of training provided

The most prevalent form in which training was provided was through external courses and programmes (for 85% of respondents), but many also used inhouse training programmes (79%) and one-off seminars (67%).

83% of respondent enterprises were providing training in specific technical and/or trade skills. A similarly large number of firms were providing training in Health & Safety (78%) and Computing / ICT skills (62%). Approximately half of firms were providing training in management and supervisory skills, and around 40% in communication, team and negotiation skills. A small but significant number (11%) were providing basic literacy and numeracy training to their employees.

Source of training provision

The most prevalent source of provision for firms' skill development and training was their own in-house training staff (82%). Slightly more than half of respondent firms made use of training consultants and contractors, private training providers and Industry Training Organisations (ITOs). 40% made use of the services of polytechnics, and 30% used university programmes as part of their training activities. 14% made use of Modern Apprenticeship coordinators.

Formal and informal training

The mean percentage of training that was formal (i.e. training or skill development where learning or skill level is assessed) was **43%** (the median was 40%). In general, larger firms had a higher mean percentage of formal training than smaller firms.

Prevalence of use of national skill standards

65% of those firms engaged in training (and 58% of all respondent firms) indicated that they used national skill standards for at least some training. Approximately 6% indicated they used national skill standards for all their training.

This compares with the 57% of all respondent firms in the 1997 NZ Employers' Federation Survey that agreed with the statement that "national work-related standards are important to my business".

Causes and effects of training and skill development

Decision making about training

In most respondent firms, senior managers and/or owners played a significant role in decision making about training and skill development. 49% of all respondents (and 53% of those engaged in training) indicated that skill development and training were a **key part** of their business strategy. This figure was even greater for the largest firms (100+ employees), where 66% identified skill development and training as key to business strategy.

Reasons for using national skill standards

Respondent firms indicated they made use of national skill standards, including unit standards, in a variety of ways. These included:

- quality assurance/consistency, for which 67% found skill standards useful;
- assessment of learning, for which 64% found skill standards useful;
- benchmarking, for which 55% of firms found skill standards useful; and
- attainment of industry-relevant skills, for which 74% of respondent firms found national skill standards useful.

Effects of training and skill development

Respondents were asked to identify their perceptions of a range of positive or negative effects of training on their business. Respondents identified the following as being positively affected by training (in order of prevalence):

- quality of output Nearly all respondents saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on the quality of output;
- productivity / motivation of staff A similar number of respondents saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on the productivity and motivation of staff;
- business growth Around 4/5ths of respondents saw training as enabling or being positive for business growth;
- health and safety a similar number saw training as having a positive effect on health and safety for their enterprise.

- retention of staff again, a similar number saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on the firms ability to retain staff;
- innovation a large majority of respondent firms saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on innovation;
- profitability a similar number of respondents saw training as having a
 positive effect on profitability; and
- costs a majority of respondents saw costs as being positively affected by training and skill development (but a significant minority saw training and skill development as having a negative effect in this area);

Methods of assessing the value of training

Most respondents assessed the value of training using staff feedback (78% of respondents). A large number of respondents also used customer feedback (53%) and assessments by HR & Line Managers (35%). A range of quantitative measures were used by respondents firms, including reduced errors / reworking (70%), productivity increases (61%), reduced accidents (49%), achievement of qualifications and standards (47%), improved turn-over and sales (36%), cost savings (35%), and reduced absenteeism (22%). Only a small percentage of firms were making use of formal cost / benefit analyses to assess the value of training (21%).

Overall assessment of impact of training on performance

The substantial majority of respondents (74%), and an even larger percentage of those who engaged in training (81%) believed that skill development and training contributed to improved performance for their firm.

Reasons cited by firms to continue or begin providing training

Respondents indicated that they would be most likely to continue to provide training, or begin providing training, if there were skill shortages within the enterprise and if suitable courses to meet training needs were available (55%). Other important drivers for training were identified as customer requirements (49%), a desire to grow the enterprise (48%), skill shortages in the industry (where these exist) (48%), and actual growth in the enterprise (47%).

Around one-third of respondents identified their improved knowledge of industry training as a consideration in deciding to provide training. A similar number identified the availability of suitable persons to be trained as a key consideration. Approximately a quarter of respondents saw Government subsidies for training, or changed regulations or incentives as key considerations in deciding to provide training. Neither high or low staff turn-over appeared to be particularly significant in decision making about training.

Barriers to offering training

Cost was the most cited reason not to provide training, or provide less than might otherwise be desirable (52%). The availability (or otherwise) of suitable training opportunities was also seen as a key factor (46%). Lack of interest from employees was seen as a barrier to training by 31% of respondents.

Both uncertainty in the business environment and actual decline in business performance were cited as relevant factors by about a quarter of respondents. Approximately 20% of respondents saw 'red tape' and a lack of information about training as potential barriers to offering optimal levels of training. A smaller share (16%) saw the level of Government subsidy as relevant.

Around 16% of respondent firms stated they preferred to employ skilled staff rather than train. 14% of firms stated they were too small to provide training (or at least all of their training needs). 11% of firms suggested that the possibility of staff being 'poached' within one year or more of their being provided training was a disincentive to train. 8% had similar concerns with respect to loosing staff after 6 months.

Other factors identified by a small number of respondents included: industrial relations issues (10%), high staff turn-over (8%), inability to assess the likely benefit (6%), and the difficulty of training staff (5%). Only 2% of respondent firms indicated it was their view that 'training was the employee's responsibility'.

Significant numbers of firms indicated (unprompted) that they would 'always provide training', irrespective of any reasons why they might not.

Performance, productivity and training

There appeared to be a range of weak non-linear relationships between the self-assessments by respondents of their firms' comparative performance and the productivity of their employees; and their activities and spending on training and skill development.

Firms with both the lowest and highest self-assessment of the productivity gain of their employees were spending the most (as a percentage of payroll) on training.

Similarly, while for most firms their comparative performance with other firms over the last 2 years did not appear to be related to their spending on training, the very worse performers spent considerably less than others, and the best performers spend more. Those firms with the lowest self-assessment of their current comparative performance were the least likely to indicate they would provide training in the next twelve months. However, these simple connections in no way imply a causal relationship between factors.

Information about training and skill development

Respondent firms obtained information about training and skill development from a wide variety of sources. The most prevalent source of information was business organisations (74%) and industry associations (70%). Training consultants were also an important source of information about skill development and training (59%), as were employees (53%). Around half of respondents obtained useful information about training from Industry Training Organisations and from the internet.

General comments about training and skill development

Nearly 100 respondents provided general comments about skill development and training. These responses are provided in full in Appendix 2 (although some have been altered to preserve anonymity).

Many respondents indicated their firm's commitment to skill development and training, and the critical importance placed on it. Many also, however, highlighted the difficulties associated with training, and in particular, difficulties in assessing the value of training. There were numerous comments about the difficulty in finding suitable providers of training to meet the enterprises' particular needs.

Perceptions of industry training and Modern Apprenticeships

Knowledge of ITOs and Modern Apprenticeships

42% of respondents were aware of an Industry Training Organisation (ITO) that covered their industry or enterprise. 29% indicated that there was no ITO covering their industry or enterprise, and 24% did not know. This compares with 53% of respondents being able to identify an ITO covering their industry in the 1997 NZ Employer's Federation Survey.

33% of respondents indicated they were aware of Modern Apprenticeships in their industry.

Understanding of costs and benefits

40% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the benefits and costs of ITO-arranged industry training were well understood within their enterprise – but 36% disagreed, or strongly disagreed with this statement. 24% did not know if this was the case.

29% of respondents indicated that the benefits and costs Modern Apprenticeship were well understood within their enterprise. 40% of respondents, however, indicated that Modern Apprenticeships were *not* well understood within their enterprise, and a further 31% did not know the extent to which there was an understanding of such issues within their enterprise.

Contribution to enterprises' skill development and employment needs

44% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ITO-arranged industry training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their enterprise. 36% had the same view with respect to Modern Apprenticeships' contribution.

Contribution to industries' skill development and employment needs

48% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ITO-arranged industry training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their industry. 42% saw Modern Apprenticeships making a similar contribution to their industry.

Methodology

Target Population

The survey's target population was the membership of Business NZ's five regional employer associations (Employers & Manufacturers Association (Northern), Employers & Manufacturers Association (Central), Canterbury Employers' Chamber of Commerce, Canterbury Manufacturer's Association and the Otago Southland Employers' Association). This population is not reflective of the whole of the New Zealand business community, but does provide a window into that community.²

Questionnaire Design, Consultation and Testing

The initial questions for the survey were originally based upon the Employer Survey on Training conducted by the New Zealand Employers' Federation³ up until 1997. The reasoning behind using the survey as a base was to enable continuation of a time-series of data.

After Business NZ designed an initial questionnaire, a draft was sent out to the five regional associations for comment. Once this was completed, a reference group was set up to provide ongoing evaluation and assistance in the development of the questionnaire. The reference group included representatives from the Labour Market Policy Group (LMPG), the Industry Training Federation (ITF), the Council of Trade Unions (CTU) and academics in relevant fields (including an overseas expert in survey design and methodology).

After a revised questionnaire was developed, cognitive testing then took place over a two-week period with various firms in the Wellington and Auckland regions. This was done to ensure against misinterpretation of questions by respondents. This process also investigated whether any further questions should be added so that all relevant issues pertaining to skills and training within the workplace were covered. All comments and feedback were documented, and then taken back to the reference group for further discussion and evaluation. After final feedback from the reference group, the final draft of the questionnaire was completed. This is attached as Appendix 2.

Delivery of Survey

The assumption was made that a high proportion of businesses currently have email/internet access, so a web-based survey was decided upon in terms of delivery. This had the main advantages over phone or paper-based surveys of relative low costs to set-up and administer. The URL addresses for the survey were set up using the Employers' & Manufacturers' Association (Central) web-survey system. Five URL links were established, one for each

² See Appendix 1 for a comparison between the target population, respondent profile and the Statistics New Zealand Business Demography Statistics.

³ In 2001, the New Zealand Employers' Federation joined with the New Zealand Manufacturers' Federation to become Business NZ.

of the regional associations. This meant individual branding could be displayed for each region.

Field Time and Data Capture

The regional associations were assigned with sending the survey into the field, along with identifying those who had email/internet access so that they could complete the questionnaire. The survey was sent out to 1000 firms nationwide, with the sample size for each regional association based upon the proportion the respective association made up in terms of the population of all five regional associations. In addition, Business NZ instructed each association to identify a specified number of firms by size bands in their sample, so that a representative mix of firms by size was obtained.

An email was sent out by the associations informing respondents of the background and aim of the survey, along with a URL link to the survey and a unique 4-digit identification number that the respondent would input when filling out the survey. Only the regional association and member of that particular association knew what their identification number was. The relationship between the identification number and the name of the enterprise was not disclosed to any other parties, including Business NZ, so confidentiality of respondents was preserved. After respondents submitted their responses over the web, data would then be automatically transferred to a data capture system, run by an independent IT contractor.

To avoid respondents submitting responses more than once, a cookie control was set up by the IT contractor, which automatically stored a random code onto the PC machine of the respondent to prevent more than one response. If the respondent tried to submit the survey again, they would be taken to a URL link that informed them they had already completed the survey. As the code was random, it did not have any connection with the respondent's identification number that they were given by their respective regional association. Also, the cookie code was not retained on any database, so confidentiality of respondents was assured.

Considering the length of the survey and the burden this might have placed on some respondents, the regional associations also provided incentives to complete the survey, which involved those submitting a response being entered into a draw for either training vouchers or goods.

The survey was conducted over a two-week period from the 31st March to the 11th April 2003. After the initial email was sent out by the associations to notify respondents of the survey and provide them with a link to the respective website, no more than two reminder emails were sent out by the associations over the two week period to respondents who had not yet filled in the survey.

Final Dataset

After the survey had officially closed, the raw dataset was sent to Business NZ, with results compiled and analysed by Business NZ staff. Of the 1,000 firms that were sent the survey, 479 responses were received. This resulted in a response rate of 47.9%. Comparatively, 440 responses were received for the Employer Survey on Training in 1997, which had a response rate around

55%. However, it is important to consider the variation of respondent burden between the two surveys. The New Zealand Employers' Federation Employer Survey on Training asked 28 questions, while the Business NZ survey placed a higher burden on respondents asking 45 main questions, with many having sub-questions to respond to.

Limitations of the data-set

The survey was conducted within a sample of the members of the regional business associations, which together constitute Business NZ. As such, it is not representative sample of New Zealand enterprises. The sample was purposefully selected to ensure a balance among Business NZ membership by region and firm size. The sample also included a wide range of industries.

Firms that join business organisations are more likely to share characteristics with each other than with those that do not join. This may introduce bias into the results. For example, members may be more likely than non-members to engage in training for their employees. This appears to be reflected in the 89% respondents indicating they currently offered training for employees, and the 92% that indicated that skill development and training were a key part of their enterprise's business strategy.

Overall, the results of this research are likely to tell us more about those firms that do engage in training and skill development, and why they do so, than about those enterprises that do not do so.

Respondent Profile

Number of respondents

There were a total of 479 respondents to the survey, out of a total of 1,000 potential respondents.

Position of person completing questionnaire (Question 1)

Overall, most of the responses to the survey were provided by owners, directors or senior managers of the enterprises surveyed. A fairly large percentage of responses came from administrative employees.

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Owner / Director	158	33.0	33.0	33.0
CEO / GM	137	28.6	28.6	61.6
Line Manager	51	10.6	10.6	72.2
HR Manager	76	15.9	15.9	88.1
Admin / Office Mgr / Accounts	42	8.8	8.8	96.9
Training Manager	8	1.7	1.7	98.5
Other	7	1.5	1.5	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 1: Person Completing Survey

Unsurprisingly, this pattern varied dramatically across firm size. In larger firms, Human Resource (HR) managers were much more likely to take responsibility for completing the survey – but a surprisingly large number of Chief Executives still completed the survey in larger firms.

Title of Person Completing	Firm Size					
Survey	0-5	6-9	10-49	50-99	100+	
Owner / Director	74.3%	51.8%	32.6%	9.7%	7.0%	33.0%
CEO / GM	10.8%	30.4%	35.8%	33.9%	24.0%	28.6%
Line Manager	8.1%	7.1%	11.2%	14.5%	11.0%	10.6%
HR Manager		3.6%	8.0%	25.8%	43.0%	15.9%
Admin / Office Mgr / Accounts	5.4%	5.4%	10.7%	14.5%	6.0%	8.8%
Training Manager	1.4%	1.8%	.5%		5.0%	1.7%
Other			1.1%	1.6%	4.0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Nature of enterprise (Question 2)

A majority (65%) of the firms surveyed were private limited liability companies. There were however a good range of other forms of enterprise, including a significant number of incorporated societies and trusts (13%), public companies (9%) and government organisations (5%).

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sole Proprietorship / Self Employed	7	1.5	1.5	1.5
Partnership	22	4.6	4.6	6.1
Private Company	313	65.3	65.3	71.4
Public Company	45	9.4	9.4	80.8
Government Organisation	26	5.4	5.4	86.2
Incorporated Society / Trust	61	12.7	12.7	99.0
Other	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Nature of Enterprise

Number of years in operation (Question 3)

The respondent enterprises tended to have been in operation for more than 5 years, and nearly 70% had been in operation for over 10 years. In general, the respondent firms were well established organisations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 2 years	12	2.5	2.5	2.5
	2-5 years	52	10.9	10.9	13.4
	6-10 years	84	17.5	17.6	31.0
	11-20 years	122	25.5	25.6	56.6
	21-50 years	120	25.1	25.2	81.8
	51 + years	87	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	477	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 4: Number of Years Operating

Industry (Question 4)

Respondents were asked to classify their enterprise using the Australia and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) system.

The respondents were spread across a wide range of industries and sectors. The single largest group was those firms in the Manufacturing sector (132, or 28% of respondents), with significant numbers in the Property and Business Services sector (10% of respondents), the Wholesale Trade sector (8% of respondents), the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Education sectors (both 7% of respondents).

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	32	6.7	6.7	6.7
Mining	5	1.0	1.0	7.7
Manufacturing	132	27.6	27.6	35.3
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	8	1.7	1.7	37.0
Construction	24	5.0	5.0	42.0
Wholesale Trade	37	7.7	7.7	49.7
Retail Trade	23	4.8	4.8	54.5
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	16	3.3	3.3	57.8
Transport, Storage	23	4.8	4.8	62.6
Communications Services	8	1.7	1.7	64.3
Finance, Insurance	13	2.7	2.7	67.0
Property, Business Services	48	10.0	10.0	77.0
Government Admin / Local Govt	13	2.7	2.7	79.7
Education	32	6.7	6.7	86.4
Health, Community Services	34	7.1	7.1	93.5
Culture, Recreation Services	10	2.1	2.1	95.6
Personal & Other Services	21	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: ANZSIC Industry

In Question 11 (below), respondents were asked to specify their total number of employees. When correlated with industry, the Manufacturing sector remained the largest group in the sample (30% of employees), but the Construction sector was the second largest group (13% of employees). Health & Community Services, Government Administration / Local Government and Property and Business Services were all groups of respondents with large numbers of employees.

Industry	Number of employees	Percent
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	2306	4.7%
Mining	140	0.3%
Manufacturing	14678	29.9%
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	476	1.0%
Construction	6206	12.6%
Wholesale Trade	1685	3.4%
Retail Trade	710	1.4%
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	2133	4.3%
Transport, Storage	1513	3.1%
Communications Services	630	1.3%
Finance, Insurance	550	1.1%
Property, Business Services	4036	8.2%
Government Admin / Local Govt	3961	8.1%
Education	2211	4.5%
Health, Community Services	4505	9.2%
Culture, Recreation Services	516	1.0%
Personal & Other Services	2895	5.9%
Total:	49151	

Table 6: Number of Employees by ANZSIC Industry

For the purposes of sub-group analysis, the ANZSIC groups were organised into larger groups as follows:

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Primary – Ag, Fish, Mining	32	6.7	6.7	6.7
Manufacturing, Construction, Infrastructure	169	35.3	35.3	42.0
Trade, Accommodation, Transport, Business, Finance, Property	168	35.1	35.1	77.0
Govt, Education, Health, Cultural, Personal & Other	110	23.0	23.0	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 7: Grouped Industries (Large Groups)

Tourism Sector (Question 5)

In addition to classification using the ANZSIC system, respondents were also asked if they considered their enterprise to be in the tourism sector. 12% of respondents indicated they considered themselves to be in the tourism sector.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	57	11.9	12.1	12.1
	No	415	86.6	87.9	100.0
	Total	472	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.5		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 8: Tourism Sector

The enterprises which considered themselves to be in the tourism sector were spread across nearly every other ANZSIC classification:

Industry	In Tourism Ir	ndustry?	Total
	Yes	No	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	2	29	31
Mining	0	5	5
Manufacturing	13	116	129
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	0	8	8
Construction	1	23	24
Wholesale Trade	2	35	37
Retail Trade	3	20	23
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	13	3	16
Transport, Storage	4	19	23
Communications Services	2	6	8
Finance, Insurance	1	12	13
Property, Business Services	4	42	46
Government Admin / Local Govt	1	12	13
Education	2	30	32
Health, Community Services	3	30	33
Culture, Recreation Services	4	6	10
Personal & Other Services	2	19	21
Total	57	415	472

Table 9: ANZSIC Industry by Tourism Sector

Main Location (Question 6)

Respondents were asked to specify the main location of their enterprise. There were a large number of respondents from Auckland, but the single largest location was Canterbury / West Coast. However, most of the 'nation-wide' firms would be Auckland based. This spread reflects the large number of manufacturing firms in Auckland and Canterbury, and the number of large Government agencies in Wellington.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Northland	6	1.3	1.3	1.3
Auckland	105	21.9	21.9	23.2
Waikato	41	8.6	8.6	31.7
Bay of Plenty	24	5.0	5.0	36.7
Gisborne / Hawkes Bay	12	2.5	2.5	39.2
Taranaki / Wanganui / Manawatu	11	2.3	2.3	41.5
Wellington / Wairarapa	22	4.6	4.6	46.1
Nelson / Malborough	10	2.1	2.1	48.2
Canterbury / West Coast	151	31.5	31.5	79.7
Otago / Southland	49	10.2	10.2	90.0
Nation-wide activity	48	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 10: Main location

For analysis purposes, these locations were aggregated into the following regions:

Table 11: Region

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Auckland	105	21.9	21.9	21.9
Northern (non-Auckland)	71	14.8	14.8	36.7
Central	55	11.5	11.5	48.2
Canterbury / Westland	151	31.5	31.5	79.7
Otago / Southland	49	10.2	10.2	90.0
Nation-wide	48	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Current comparative performance (Question 7)

Respondents were asked to assess their firms current performance and/or profitability with its main competitors using a seven point scale – with 1 being 'very much worse' and 7 being 'very much better'.

The median assessment of current comparative performance was 5, the mean was 4.89. The spread of assessments was as follows:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very much worse	0	0	0.0	0.0
	2	10	2.1	2.2	2.2
	3	38	7.9	8.5	10.7
	Same	121	25.3	26.9	37.6
	5	150	31.3	33.4	71.0
	6	84	17.5	18.7	89.8
	Very much better	46	9.6	10.2	100.0
	Total	449	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	30	6.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 12: Current comparative performance

There was some variation in the mean self-assessment of current comparative performance by firm size, with the smallest firms assessing an average of only 4.43.

Table 13	Current	comparative	performance	by Firm Size
----------	---------	-------------	-------------	--------------

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	4.43	69	1.091
6-9	5.04	53	1.109
10-49	5.03	176	1.171
50-99	4.76	58	1.159
100+	4.94	93	1.249
Total	4.89	449	1.181

Past 2 years comparative performance (Question 8)

Respondents were also asked to assess their enterprises' performance relative to its competitors or other comparable organisations over the last 2 years, using the same scale. The mean self-assessed score was slightly lower than current performance, at 4.74; the median score was 5.

The spread of assessed performance of the last two years was as follows:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very much worse	5	1.0	1.1	1.1
	2	14	2.9	3.1	4.2
	3	48	10.0	10.6	14.9
	Same	126	26.3	27.9	42.8
	5	138	28.8	30.6	73.4
	6	74	15.4	16.4	89.8
	Very much better	46	9.6	10.2	100.0
	Total	451	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	28	5.8		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 14: Past 2 years comparative performance

As for current comparative performance, the smallest firms tended to perceive themselves as having performed relatively less well than larger firms:

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	4.28	69	1.223
6-9	4.83	53	1.326
10-49	4.84	177	1.302
50-99	4.71	58	1.155
100+	4.86	94	1.333
Total	4.74	451	1.292

Table 15: Past 2 years comparative performance by Firm Size

Number of Employees (Question 9)

Respondents were asked how many people their enterprise employed. The median number of employees was 20, the mean was 102. The largest firm employed 4,800, while a small number (6) had no employees. The total number of people employed by the respondent firms was 49,151.

The respondents were reasonably well spread across the five bands of firm size used in the Statistics NZ Business Demography statistics⁴. The sampling methodology used for survey was designed to ensure such a spread. The response rate for the survey was highest for the group of firms with between 10 and 49 employees, with a good response rate for the largest group of firms (100+).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-5	74	15.4	15.4	15.4
	6-9	56	11.7	11.7	27.1
	10-49	187	39.0	39.0	66.2
	50-99	62	12.9	12.9	79.1
	100+	100	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total	479	100.0	100.0	

Table 16: Number of employees (Firm Size)

The majority of the smaller respondents were from the Canterbury / West Coast region, with a significant number operating 'nation wide'. The significant number of large Government agencies in the Central region was also notable.

Region	Firm Size					Total
. togioni	0-5	6-9	10-49	50-99	100+	
Auckland	3.8%	7.6%	48.6%	15.2%	24.8%	100.0%
Northern (non- Auckland)	5.6%	7.0%	46.5%	19.7%	21.1%	100.0%
Central	3.6%	9.1%	30.9%	18.2%	38.2%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	35.8%	17.2%	35.8%	5.3%	6.0%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	6.1%	14.3%	44.9%	18.4%	16.3%	100.0%
Nation-wide	14.6%	10.4%	20.8%	10.4%	43.8%	100.0%
Total	15.4%	11.7%	39.0%	12.9%	20.9%	100.0%

Table 17: Region by Firm Size

⁴ New Zealand Business Demographic Statistics as at February 2002 – Hot Off the Press, 30 October 2002, Statistics New Zealand.

Table 18: Industry by Firm Size

% within Industry		Firm Size					
, o	0-5	6-9	10-49	50-99	100+		
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	15.6%	12.5%	31.3%	18.8%	21.9%	100.0%	
Mining		20.0%	60.0%	20.0%		100.0%	
Manufacturing	9.1%	9.8%	40.9%	22.0%	18.2%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply			37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
Construction	16.7%	4.2%	29.2%	8.3%	41.7%	100.0%	
Wholesale Trade	18.9%	21.6%	43.2%	5.4%	10.8%	100.0%	
Retail Trade	26.1%	17.4%	43.5%	8.7%	4.3%	100.0%	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	6.3%	6.3%	43.8%	6.3%	37.5%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	17.4%	13.0%	34.8%	17.4%	17.4%	100.0%	
Communications Services	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance	15.4%	23.1%	38.5%		23.1%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services	27.1%	10.4%	41.7%	2.1%	18.8%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt			23.1%	15.4%	61.5%	100.0%	
Education	12.5%	12.5%	50.0%		25.0%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services	11.8%	5.9%	41.2%	17.6%	23.5%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services	10.0%	40.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services	42.9%	9.5%	28.6%		19.0%	100.0%	
Total	15.4%	11.7%	39.0%	12.9%	20.9%	100.0%	

On average, the respondent firms employed slightly more male (58%) than female (42%) employees:

Table 19: Percentage	of female employees	(by band)
----------------------	---------------------	-----------

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 - 19 %	130	27.1	28.4	28.4
	20 - 39%	91	19.0	19.9	48.3
	40 - 59%	103	21.5	22.5	70.7
	60 - 79%	71	14.8	15.5	86.2
	80 - 100%	63	13.2	13.8	100.0
	Total	458	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	21	4.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Nature of Employment (Question 10)

77% of employees in the respondent firms were employed on a full time basis, although 44% of all firms had over 90% of their staff in full-time employment.

The distribution of levels of full-time employment was as follows:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-25%	32	6.7	6.8	6.8
	26-50%	53	11.1	11.2	18.0
	51-70%	60	12.5	12.7	30.7
	71-80%	50	10.4	10.6	41.3
	81-90%	65	13.6	13.8	55.1
	91-100%	212	44.3	44.9	100.0
	Total	472	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.5		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 20: Percentage of full-time employees (band)

Qualifications of Employees (Question 11)

Respondents were asked to identify the spread of the highest qualifications of their employees across five levels. Respondents indicated that, on average:

- 18% of their employees had no school qualification;
- 31% had a school qualification;
- 17% had a trade qualification;
- 17% had a diploma or certificate qualification; and
- 17% had a degree qualification.

Table 21: Qualifications of Employees

	Percentage of employees with no school qualification	Percentage of employees with a school qualification	Percentage of employees with trade qualification	Percentage of employees with diploma / cert qualification	Percentage of employees with degree qualification
N Valid	448	447	448	448	448
Missing	31	32	31	31	31
Mean	18.25	31.15	16.48	16.99	16.99
Median	5.00	26.00	9.18	10.00	7.00
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	100	100	100	100	100
Percentiles 25	.00	10.00	.00	2.00	.00
50	5.00	26.00	9.18	10.00	7.00
75	30.00	50.00	25.00	24.93	25.00

While the mean percentage of employees with no qualification was 18% across all respondents, 42% of firms had no employees in this category.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	201	42.0	45.2	45.2
	1 to 10%	62	12.9	13.9	59.1
	11 to 20%	47	9.8	10.6	69.7
	21 to 30%	34	7.1	7.6	77.3
	31 to 40%	28	5.8	6.3	83.6
	41 to 50%	25	5.2	5.6	89.2
	51 to 60%	13	2.7	2.9	92.1
	61 to 70%	8	1.7	1.8	93.9
	71 to 80%	15	3.1	3.4	97.3
	81 to 90%	7	1.5	1.6	98.9
	91 to 95%	1	.2	.2	99.1
	96%+	4	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	445	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	34	7.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 22: Percentage of employees with no qualification

Skill Level of Work Performed (Question 12)

Respondents were also asked to identify the spread of the skill-level of the work performed by their enterprise. Respondents indicated, on average that:

- 17% of work was at a simple skill level;
- 34% was at a moderate skill level;
- 31% was at a complex or technical skill level; and
- 18% was at a high skill level.

Table 23: Percentage of skill levels of work

		Percentage of work at simple skill level	Percentage at moderate skill level	Percentage at complex / technical skill level	Percentage at high skill level
Ν	Valid	463	463	462	463
	Missing	16	16	17	16
Mean		16.57	34.18	31.08	17.50
Median		10.00	30.00	25.00	10.00
Mode		0	20(a)	0	0
Std. Deviation		22.124	24.802	25.140	20.654
Minimum		0	0	0	0
Maximum		100	106	100	100
Percentiles	25	.00	15.00	12.00	1.00
	50	10.00	30.00	25.00	10.00
	75	25.00	50.00	50.00	25.00

a Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Productivity Scores (Questions 13 & 14)

Respondents were asked to rate their typical employee on a productivity scale from zero to 100, where 100 equaled the maximum productivity rating that their very best employee could attain in their typical employee's job, and zero meant absolutely no productivity.

They were first asked to rate the productivity score of their typical employee, relative to the productivity of their very best employee could attain in their typical employee's job, after they had been in the job for 2 years. They were then asked to provide the same assessment of a typical employee who had only been in the job for 2 weeks.

The mean productivity score of a typical employee after **2 years** was identified as 80 (with standard deviation of 11):

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	4	.8	.9	.9
	50	10	2.1	2.1	3.0
	60	23	4.8	4.9	7.9
	70	86	18.0	18.4	26.3
	80	180	37.6	38.5	64.7
	90	130	27.1	27.8	92.5
	100	35	7.3	7.5	100.0
	Total	468	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 24: Productivity score of best employee after 2 years

This compared to 35 (with a standard deviation of 22) for a typical employee after **2 weeks** in the typical job:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	21	4.4	4.5	4.5
	10	72	15.0	15.4	19.9
	20	75	15.7	16.0	35.9
	30	95	19.8	20.3	56.2
	40	57	11.9	12.2	68.4
	50	63	13.2	13.5	81.8
	60	38	7.9	8.1	90.0
	70	22	4.6	4.7	94.7
	80	10	2.1	2.1	96.8
	90	10	2.1	2.1	98.9
	100	5	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	468	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 25: Productivity score of typical employee after 2 weeks

Therefore the mean productivity score gain over a 2 year period was 45.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	-30	2	.4	.4	.4
	-20	2	.4	.4	.9
	-10	8	1.7	1.7	2.6
	0	15	3.1	3.2	5.8
	10	14	2.9	3.0	8.7
	20	37	7.7	7.9	16.6
	30	68	14.2	14.5	31.1
	40	72	15.0	15.4	46.5
	50	86	18.0	18.3	64.8
	60	80	16.7	17.1	81.9
	70	46	9.6	9.8	91.7
	80	32	6.7	6.8	98.5
	90	6	1.3	1.3	99.8
	100	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	469	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 26: Productivity Gain

There was little variation in productivity gain by region or firm size, for example:

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	42.50	72	26.203
6-9	45.18	56	24.120
10-49	46.00	185	23.012
50-99	45.57	61	18.214
100+	44.84	95	19.617

45.07

Table 27: Productivity Gain by Firm Size

There was, however, some small variation by industry:

469

Table 28: Productivity	Gain b	Grouped	Industrias	(Largo	Group	د)
Table 20. Frouuctivit	y Gaill D	y Groupeu	muustiles	(Laiye	Group	>)

22.405

Grouped Industries (Large Groups)	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Primary	46.88	32	26.572
Manufacturing, Construction, Infrastructure	46.41	167	20.007
Trade, Accom, Transport, Business, Finance, Property	47.62	164	22.507
Govt, Ed, Health, Cult, Personal & Other	38.49	106	23.494
Total	45.07	469	22.405

Total

For the purposes of comparative analysis, the outliers (the negative productivity 'gain' and those indicating a gain of 90% or more) were stripped out. The 'adjusted' productivity gain for the respondent group was as follows:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10	14	2.9	3.2	3.2
	20	37	7.7	8.5	11.7
	30	68	14.2	15.6	27.4
	40	72	15.0	16.6	43.9
	50	86	18.0	19.8	63.7
	60	80	16.7	18.4	82.1
	70	46	9.6	10.6	92.6
	80	32	6.7	7.4	100.0
	Total	435	90.8	100.0	
Missing	System	44	9.2		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 29: Productivity Gain (adjusted)

The mean 'adjusted' productivity gain was 47.54 (the median was 50, and the standard deviation 18.13).

Prevalence and Nature of Training and Skill Development

Respondents were asked a range of questions about the skill development and training that their organisation offered. Skill development and training were defined broadly, to mean any activities specifically aimed at improving skill levels or understanding. It included both activities organized by the respondent organisation, but also activities outside the firm that they had some involvement in, such as funding and/or providing time for staff to participate in training.

Formal training was defined as "any training or skill development where learning or skill level is assessed". All other forms of training were defined as **informal** training.

Provision of Training (Question 17)

89% of respondents were providing training to their employees at the time the survey was conducted.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	425	88.7	89.3	89.3
	No	51	10.6	10.7	100.0
	Total	476	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 30: Training currently provided

The likelihood of training being offered to employees was clearly related to firm size. Nearly a third of micro-enterprises (with 5 or fewer employees) did not provide training, while all firms with over 100 employees provided training.

Table 31: Training currently provided by Firm Size

		Is training provided for	Number of	
		Yes	No	Firms
Firm	0-5	69.9%	30.1%	74
Size	6-9	78.2%	21.8%	56
	10-49	91.4%	8.6%	187
	50-99	98.4%	1.6%	62
	100+	100.0%		100
Total		89.3%	10.7%	479

There was some variation in the prevalence of training between industries. In the Wholesale & Retail Trade sectors, over 20% of respondents indicated they did not currently provide training. In the Mining, Electricity Gas & Water Supply, Construction, Communication Services, Government Administration, Health & Community Services and Cultural & Recreational Services sectors, all or nearly all enterprises were offering training to their employees.

	Is training currently provided for employees		
% within Industry	Yes	No	Total
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	90.6%	9.4%	32
Mining	100.0%		5
Manufacturing	85.6%	14.4%	132
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	100.0%		8
Construction	100.0%		24
Wholesale Trade	77.1%	22.9%	35
Retail Trade	78.3%	21.7%	23
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	81.3%	18.8%	16
Transport, Storage	91.3%	8.7%	23
Communications Services	100.0%		8
Finance, Insurance	92.3%	7.7%	13
Property, Business Services	89.4%	10.6%	47
Government Admin / Local Govt	100.0%		13
Education	93.8%	6.3%	32
Health, Community Services	100.0%		34
Culture, Recreation Services	100.0%		10
Personal & Other Services	85.7%	14.3%	21
Total	89.3%	10.7%	476

Table 32: Training currently provided by Industry

There was very little variation by region that could not be accounted for by other variables (such as the larger number of small firm respondents in the Canterbury / Westland region).

Change in percentage of employees trained (Question 16)

Over half of respondent firms had increased the percentage of their employees they were offering training over the last 2 years, and 92% had either increased or maintained the number of employees trained.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Increased	273	57.0	57.6	57.6
	Maintained	164	34.2	34.6	92.2
	Decreased	20	4.2	4.2	96.4
	Not applicable (no training provided)	17	3.5	3.6	100.0
	Total	474	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 33: Change in percentage of employees trained in the last 2 years

As with current provision of training, changes in the percentage of employees trained over the last 2 years varied significantly depending upon firm size. While around 37% of micro firms increased training provision over the last 2 years, over 70% of the largest firms (100+) employees did so.

		Chan	Change in percentage of employees trained in the last 2 years				
		Increased	Increased Maintained Decreased provid				
Firm	0-5	37.5%	40.3%	5.6%	16.7%	74	
Size	6-9	58.2%	36.4%	5.5%		56	
	10-49	56.1%	35.8%	5.3%	2.7%	187	
	50-99	61.3%	37.1%	1.6%		62	
	100+	72.4%	25.5%	2.0%		100	
Total		57.6%	34.6%	4.2%	3.6%	479	

Table 34: Change in percentage of employees trained in the last 2 years by Firm Size

There were some variations in this pattern across industries, which largely mirrored those for current provision of training.

	Change in percentage of employees trained in the last 2 years			
Industry	Increased	Maintained	Decreased	NA (no training provided)
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	59.4%	28.1%	3.1%	9.4%
Mining	60.0%	40.0%		
Manufacturing	55.3%	32.6%	8.3%	3.8%
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	50.0%	50.0%		
Construction	62.5%	29.2%	8.3%	
Wholesale Trade	40.0%	54.3%	5.7%	
Retail Trade	56.5%	39.1%		4.3%
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	62.5%	31.3%		6.3%
Transport, Storage	73.9%	17.4%		8.7%
Communications Services	62.5%	37.5%		
Finance, Insurance	38.5%	53.8%		7.7%
Property, Business Services	56.5%	41.3%		2.2%
Government Admin / Local Govt	46.2%	46.2%	7.7%	
Education	68.8%	25.0%	3.1%	3.1%
Health, Community Services	64.7%	32.4%	2.9%	
Culture, Recreation Services	70.0%	30.0%		
Personal & Other Services	60.0%	25.0%	5.0%	10.0%
Total	57.6%	34.6%	4.2%	3.6%

Table 35: Change in percentage of employees trained in the last 2 years by Industry

Likelihood of providing training in the next 12 months (Question 33)

The overwhelming majority of respondent organisations (95%) indicated they were likely to provide training over the coming twelve months.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	447	93.3	94.7	94.7
	No	25	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	472	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.5		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 36: Likely to offer training over the next 12 months

Larger firms were more likely to indicate that they would be providing training over the next twelve months than smaller firms.

Table 37: Likely to offer training over the next 12 months by Firm Size

% within Firm	Likely to of over the nex		
Size	Yes No		Total
0-5	84.5%	15.5%	71
6-9	87.3%	12.7%	55
10-49	96.2%	3.8%	184
50-99	100.0%		62
100+	100.0%		100
Total	94.7%	5.3%	472
Missing 7			

Spending on skill development and training in the last 12 months, as a percentage of payroll (Question 19)

Respondents were asked to identify the percentage of their payroll spent on training over the last 12 months. They were provided the option of simply stating the percentage, or providing total payroll and the amount spent (or both). The larger proportion chose to simply provide the percentage, but 190 firms provided full details of their spending and payroll.

The mean percentage of payroll spent on training by respondent firms over the last 12 months was 3.7% (the median was 2.0%). The amount spent ranged from nothing (5 respondents) to a reported 20% of payroll (7 respondents).

		Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months	Amount spent on training in the last 12 months	Amount per employee
Ν	Valid	351	190	189
	Missing	128	289	290
Mean		3.6918	58847.56	913.2782
Median		2.0000	18000.00	589.2857
Mode		5.00	20000	1000.00
Std. Deviation		3.89457	149631.906	1163.39862
Minimum		.00	0	.00
Maximum		20.00	1200000	8333.33
Percentiles	25	1.0000	5000.00	240.8219
	50	2.0000	18000.00	589.2857
	75	5.0000	50282.25	1089.4545

Table 38: Spending on training over the last 12 months

While only 190 firms provided sufficient data to calculate the amount spent on training per employee, the responses indicate that firms were spending around \$900 per employee on training during the past year.

Tuble 00. I creentage of Layron opent by Linns 0120

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	5.1387	42	4.66980
6-9	3.3261	38	3.36674
10-49	4.1811	143	4.21081
50-99	2.8699	51	3.60230
100+	2.7188	77	2.79563
Total	3.6918	351	3.89457

Those smaller firms that did provided training for their employees spent a greater percentage of their payroll on training than larger firms.
The range of spending patterns as a percentage of payroll was as follows:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0%	5	1.0	1.4	1.4
	0.01 - 0.9%	42	8.8	12.0	13.4
	1.0 - 1.9%	81	16.9	23.1	36.5
	2.0 - 2.9%	69	14.4	19.7	56.1
	3.0 - 3.9%	30	6.3	8.5	64.7
	4.0 - 4.9%	19	4.0	5.4	70.1
	5.0 - 5.9%	53	11.1	15.1	85.2
	6.0 - 6.9%	6	1.3	1.7	86.9
	7.0 - 7.9%	4	.8	1.1	88.0
	8.0 - 8.9%	2	.4	.6	88.6
	9.0 - 9.9%	6	1.3	1.7	90.3
	10.0 - 14.9%	20	4.2	5.7	96.0
	15.0 - 19.9%	7	1.5	2.0	98.0
	20% +	7	1.5	2.0	100.0
	Total	351	73.3	100.0	
Missing	System	128	26.7		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 40: Percentage of Payroll spent on training (Band)



Percentage of Payroll spent on training (Band)

There appeared to be significant variations in the percentage of payroll spent on training in different industry sectors, although these variations were less apparent in the larger sector groupings. The Wholesale Trade, Transport & Storage and Health & Community Services sectors all appear to have had lower spending as a percentage of payroll (and less variation in patterns of spending).

Industry	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	4.8209	26	6.04406
Mining	3.1775	4	4.61476
Manufacturing	3.1569	95	3.51287
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	3.6113	8	2.87484
Construction	4.3081	19	5.49943
Wholesale Trade	2.6804	23	1.75444
Retail Trade	3.9942	12	4.31345
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	2.5487	8	2.12727
Transport, Storage	1.8405	20	1.71408
Communications Services	6.8800	5	3.28207
Finance, Insurance	4.9430	10	5.17466
Property, Business Services	5.1171	34	4.73692
Government Admin / Local Govt	3.9208	12	2.98369
Education	4.4539	23	2.77468
Health, Community Services	2.7478	27	1.69366
Culture, Recreation Services	4.0000	9	4.53459
Personal & Other Services	3.9281	16	4.69659
Total	3.6918	351	3.89457

Table 41: Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months

Table 42: Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months

Grouped Industries (Large Groups)	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Primary	4.8209	26	6.04406
Manufacturing, Construction, Infrastructure	3.3600	126	3.84474
Trade, Accom, Transport, Business, Finance, Property	3.7910	112	3.82323
Govt, Ed, Health, Cultural, Personal & Other	3.7072	87	3.19343
Total	3.6918	351	3.89457

Mean Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months by Industry



Industry

The percentage of payroll spent in different industries ranged across the following percentages:

		G				
				Trade, Accom,		
			Manufacturing	I ransport, Business	Govt Ed	
			Construction,	Finance,	Health, Cult,	
		Primary	Infrastructure	Property	Pers & Other	Total
Percentage of	0%	0	2	2	1	5
Payroll spent	0.1 - 0.9%	4	18	11	9	42
(Band)	1.0 - 1.9%	6	30	26	19	81
	2.0 - 2.9%	4	30	22	13	69
	3.0 - 3.9%	0	11	11	8	30
	4.0 - 4.9%	2	7	3	7	19
	5.0 - 5.9%	5	12	20	16	53
	6.0 - 6.9%	1	0	1	4	6
	7.0 - 7.9%	0	1	3	0	4
	8.0 - 8.9%	0	1	0	1	2
	9.0 - 9.9%	0	0	2	4	6
	10.0 - 14.9%	1	10	6	3	20
	15.0 - 19.9%	0	1	4	2	7
	20% +	3	3	1	0	7
Total		26	126	112	87	351

Table 43: Percentage of Payroll spent on training by Grouped Industries (Large Groups)

Table 44: Percentage of Payroll spent on training (Band) by Grouped Industries (Large Groups)

		Gr				
				Trade, Accom,		
			Manufation	Transport,		
			Manufacturing,	Business,	GOVI, EQ,	
		Primary	Infrastructure	Property	Pers & Other	Total
Percentage of	0%		1.6%	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%
Payroll spent	0.1 - 0.9%	15.4%	14.3%	9.8%	10.3%	12.0%
(Band)	1.0 - 1.9%	23.1%	23.8%	23.2%	21.8%	23.1%
()	2.0 - 2.9%	15.4%	23.8%	19.6%	14.9%	19.7%
	3.0 - 3.9%		8.7%	9.8%	9.2%	8.5%
	4.0 - 4.9%	7.7%	5.6%	2.7%	8.0%	5.4%
	5.0 - 5.9%	19.2%	9.5%	17.9%	18.4%	15.1%
	6.0 - 6.9%	3.8%		.9%	4.6%	1.7%
	7.0 - 7.9%		.8%	2.7%		1.1%
	8.0 - 8.9%		.8%		1.1%	.6%
	9.0 - 9.9%			1.8%	4.6%	1.7%
	10.0 - 14.9%	3.8%	7.9%	5.4%	3.4%	5.7%
	15.0 - 19.9%		.8%	3.6%	2.3%	2.0%
	20% +	11.5%	2.4%	.9%		2.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Percentage of employees undergoing training the last 12 months (Question 20)

59% of employees in the respondent firms had undergone training in the last 12 months. In a third of firms, over 80% of employees had undergone training over the last 12 months.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	8	1.7	1.9	1.9
	1-20%	80	16.7	19.0	21.0
	21-40%	60	12.5	14.3	35.2
	41-60%	69	14.4	16.4	51.7
	61-80%	65	13.6	15.5	67.1
	81-100%	138	28.8	32.9	100.0
	Total	420	87.7	100.0	
Missing	System	59	12.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 45: Percentage of Employees undergoing training in last 12 months (Band)

There was not a significant difference in the average percentage of employees who had undergone training (in those firms that offered training at all) between firms of different sizes:

Table 46: Percentage of Employees undergoing training in the last 12 months by Firm Size

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	68.2857	49	35.65985
6-9	58.6023	43	33.29358
10-49	55.5230	174	34.69253
50-99	55.3934	61	32.91873
100+	63.2258	93	30.80307
Total	59.0140	420	33.73743

There appeared to be some distinctions in the percentage of employees that underwent training in the last 12 months on the basis of industry. Communications Services, Government Administration and Education all appeared to provide training to significantly larger percentages of their employees than other sectors.

Industry	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	52.2857	28	31.40990
Mining	58.0000	5	29.49576
Manufacturing	46.5351	114	32.87316
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	62.5000	8	28.15772
Construction	65.0870	23	32.13171
Wholesale Trade	53.4074	27	30.91584
Retail Trade	55.6263	19	36.00691
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	50.7143	14	35.18397
Transport, Storage	49.5000	22	36.17385
Communications Services	82.6667	6	21.22891
Finance, Insurance	68.7500	12	36.75008
Property, Business Services	69.1220	41	31.92037
Government Admin / Local Govt	83.6923	13	19.99327
Education	81.1071	28	23.92943
Health, Community Services	76.9375	32	28.66034
Culture, Recreation Services	53.4000	10	32.71153
Personal & Other Services	51.2222	18	38.72308
Total	59.0140	420	33.73743

Table 47: Mean Percentage of Employees undergoing training in the last 12 months by Industry

Average number of days training per employee in the last 12 months (Question 21)

On average, employees in respondent firms that provided training had 4.4 days of training each over the previous 12 month period. The median number of days training was 3. Those very small enterprises that did provide training, tended to provide more days of training than others, although the variation in this group was large.

Firm Size	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
0-5	6.5707	46	6.54061
6-9	4.2738	42	3.46622
10-49	4.6824	165	4.26944
50-99	3.4183	57	4.88229
100+	3.6149	87	3.63742
Total	4.4426	397	4.55555

Table 48: Number of days training by Firm Size

The number of days training also appeared to vary by industry. Electricity, Gas & Water Supply and the Finance & Insurance sectors appeared to provide fewer days training than other sectors.

Industry	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	5.7630	27	6.23804
Mining	3.2000	5	1.78885
Manufacturing	3.8981	108	3.53967
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	2.7500	8	1.81265
Construction	5.6456	22	7.44107
Wholesale Trade	3.5370	27	3.14375
Retail Trade	6.6381	15	7.82137
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	5.0610	13	5.36940
Transport, Storage	4.0605	19	4.30763
Communications Services	4.3333	6	3.14113
Finance, Insurance	2.5000	12	2.30612
Property, Business Services	4.6250	36	4.57848
Government Admin / Local Govt	3.2077	13	2.82480
Education	6.8750	28	4.83740
Health, Community Services	4.2143	30	3.26615
Culture, Recreation Services	2.4500	10	1.42302
Personal & Other Services	4.4028	18	5.20261
Total	4.4426	397	4.55555

Table 49: Number of days training by Industry

Qualification level of employees undergoing training (Question 22)

The spread of training amongst employees closely followed the spread of qualifications levels of all employees (Question 11):

- 18% of all employees had no school qualification approximately 18% of those receiving training had no school qualification;
- 31% of employees had only a school qualification 30% of those receiving training had only a school qualification;
- 17% of employees had a trade qualification 16% of those receiving training had a trade qualification;
- 17% of employees had a diploma or certificate qualification 18% of those receiving training had a trade qualification; and
- 17% of employees had a degree qualification 17% of those receiving training had a degree qualification.

In other words, amongst the respondent firms, there did not appear to be a tendency to provide more training to higher skilled employees, or vice-versa.

		Percentage of employees in training with no school qualification	Percentage of employees in training with a school qualification	Percentage of employees in training with a trade qualification	Percentage of employees in training with a diploma / cert qualification	Percentage of employees in training with a degree qualification
Ν	Valid	368	367	368	368	368
	Missing	111	112	111	111	111
Mean		17.4916	30.1485	15.8353	17.5394	17.3391
Median		.0000	20.0000	4.5000	10.0000	5.0000
Mode		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Std. De	viation	27.57947	30.14715	24.70885	23.94189	26.54817
Minimu	m	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Maximu	ım	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Pert.	25	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
	50	.0000	20.0000	4.5000	10.0000	5.0000
	75	30.0000	50.0000	22.0000	25.0000	22.0000

Table 50: Qualification level of employees undergoing training

Form of training provided (Question 23)

Respondents were asked to identify all of the forms of training that were provided (directly or indirectly) to their employees. The most prevalent form of training provided or offered by respondents was external courses or programmes (85%), closely followed by in-house training (79%).

Many enterprises provided induction training (72%), while a large number used one-off seminars as part of their training activity (67%). Interestingly under half considered conferences to be part of their training provision.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
External courses & programmes	5	362	24.4	85.8
In-house training programme	3	335	22.3	79.4
Induction	1	306	20.4	72.5
One-off seminar	2	283	18.8	67.1
Conferences	4	201	13.4	47.6
Other	6	16	1.1	3.8
Total		1503	100.0	356.2
57 missing cases, 422 valid cases				

Table 51: From of Training Provided

Kind of training provided (Question 24)

83% of respondent enterprises were providing training in specific technical and / or trade skills. A similarly large number of firms were providing training in Health & Safety (78%) and Computing / ICT skills (62%).

Approximately half of firms were providing training in management and supervisory skills, and around 40% in communication, team and negotiation skills. A small but significant number (11%) were providing basic literacy and numeracy training to their employees.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Specific technical & trade skills	1	355	19.2	83.5
Health & Safety	3	330	18.0	77.6
Computing / ICT	2	262	14.3	61.6
Management skills	8	228	12.4	53.6
Supervisory skills	7	214	11.7	50.4
Communication skills	5	188	10.3	44.2
Team & negotiation skills	6	170	9.3	40.0
Literacy & Numeracy	4	46	2.5	10.8
Other	9	41	2.2	9.6
Total		1834	100.0	431.5
54 missing cases, 425 valid cases				

Table 52: Kind of Training Provided

Providers of skill development and training (Question 25)

The most prevalent source of provision for firms' skill development and training was their own in-house training staff (82%). Slightly more than half of respondent firms made use of training consultants & contractors, private training providers and Industry Training Organisations (ITOs).

40% made use of the services of polytechnics, and 30% used university programmes as part of their training activities. 14% made use of Modern Apprenticeship coordinators.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
In-house training staff	1	340	24.2	81.5
Training consultants / contractors	2	236	16.8	56.6
Private training provider	4	222	15.8	53.2
Industry Training Organisation (ITO)	6	221	15.7	53.0
Polytechnic	3	172	12.2	41.2
University	5	125	8.9	30.0
Modern Apprenticeship coordinator	7	59	4.2	14.1
Other	8	30	2.1	7.2
Total		1405	100.0	336.9
62 missing cases, 417 valid cases				

Table 53: Providers of skill development and training

Preferred training support materials (Question 26)

Respondents were asked their preferences as to support materials for training. The most preferred form of training materials was paper-based resources, although there was strong support for computer-based materials. Over 40% of firms indicated they would be happy to use online training materials.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Paper-based resources	1	349	32.6	82.7
Computer / CD-Rom based	2	269	25.2	63.7
Videos	3	247	23.1	58.5
Online materials	4	171	16.0	40.5
Other	5	33	3.1	7.8
Total		1069	100.0	253.3
57 missing cases, 422 valid cases				

Mix of formal and informal training (Question 27)

Using the definition outlined at the beginning of this section, respondents were asked to identify the mix of formal and informal training that their firm offered or provided to their employees.

The mean percentage of training that was formal (i.e. training or skill development where learning or skill level is assessed) was 43% (the median was 40%). In general, larger firms had a higher mean percentage of formal training than smaller firms.

Number of employees			
(by band)	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
0-5	38.95	37	23.940
6-9	39.88	40	30.244
10-49	45.35	150	28.059
50-99	40.81	58	26.597
100+	45.49	84	29.037
Total	43.43	369	27.901

Table 55: Percentage of formal training by Firm Size

There was some variation in the prevalence of formal training between industries. The Accommodation, Hospitality & Restaurant, Communications Services, Finance & Insurance, Property & Business Services, and Cultural & Recreational Services sectors all had a lower percentage of formal training than other sectors.

Industry	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	43.89	27	23.912
Mining	46.00	5	30.496
Manufacturing	45.84	104	28.705
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	46.25	8	27.742
Construction	44.68	22	28.130
Wholesale Trade	43.62	24	28.187
Retail Trade	53.67	15	30.849
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	30.83	12	24.664
Transport, Storage	50.21	19	24.181
Communications Services	27.50	6	20.433
Finance, Insurance	28.20	10	31.272
Property, Business Services	36.11	28	25.055
Government Admin / Local Govt	40.00	13	34.400
Education	49.79	24	27.126
Health, Community Services	46.37	30	29.246
Culture, Recreation Services	18.88	8	23.455
Personal & Other Services	42.86	14	24.707
Total	43.43	369	27.901

Table 56: Percentage of formal training by Industry

Use of National Skill Standards for Training (Question 28)

Respondents were asked the extent to which they made use of national skill standards (such as unit standards) in their training activities.

65% of those firms engaged in training (and 58% of all respondent firms) indicated that they used national skill standards for at least some training. Approximately 6% indicated they used national skill standards for all their training.

This compares with the 57% of all respondent firms in the 1997 NZ Employers' Federation Survey that agreed with the statement that "national work-related standards are important to my business".

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes, for all training	27	5.6	6.3	6.3
	Yes, for some training	249	52.0	58.2	64.5
	No, not at all	152	31.7	35.5	100.0
	Total	428	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	51	10.6		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 57: Use of national skill standards

Larger firms made greater use of national skill standards than smaller firms. 54% of micro-enterprises indicated they did not use national skill standards at all, compared to only 22% of firms with 100+ employees.

		Use of national skill standards (%)					
		Yes, for all training	Yes, for some training	No, not at all	Total Count		
Number of	0-5	6.0%	40.0%	54.0%	50		
employees	6-9	2.3%	47.7%	50.0%	44		
(by barru)	10-49	6.3%	53.7%	40.0%	175		
	50-99	8.2%	72.1%	19.7%	61		
	100+	7.1%	71.4%	21.4%	98		
Total Percentage		6.3%	58.2%	35.5%	428		
Total Count		27	249	152			

Some industries made significantly greater use of national skill standards than others. The Mining, Construction and Health & Community Services sectors made greater use of national skill standards than other sectors.

The Wholesale Trade, Communications Services, Finance & Insurance, Property & Business Services and Cultural & Recreational Services sectors all made significantly less use of national skill standards than other industries.

	Use of	Use of national skill standards (%)			
% within Industry	Yes, for all	Yes, for some	No. not at all	Count	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	training			20	
• • • •	13.8%	55.2%	31.0%	29	
Mining	20.0%	80.0%		5	
Manufacturing	6.0%	61.5%	32.5%	117	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply		75.0%	25.0%	8	
Construction	12.5%	75.0%	12.5%	24	
Wholesale Trade		42.9%	57.1%	28	
Retail Trade	5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	18	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant		78.6%	21.4%	14	
Transport, Storage		72.7%	27.3%	22	
Communications Services		28.6%	71.4%	7	
Finance, Insurance		25.0%	75.0%	12	
Property, Business Services	5.0%	35.0%	60.0%	40	
Government Admin / Local Govt		69.2%	30.8%	13	
Education	13.8%	58.6%	27.6%	29	
Health, Community Services	9.1%	75.8%	15.2%	33	
Culture, Recreation Services		20.0%	80.0%	10	
Personal & Other Services	40 50/	60 OV	00.00/	10	
	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%	19	
Total Percentage	6.3%	58.2%	35.5%	428	
Total Count	27	249	152		

Table 59: Use of national skill standards by Industry

Causes and Effects of Training and Skill Development

Respondents were asked a range of questions, spread throughout the questionnaire, to identify both causes and drivers for training and skill development, and the impact or effect of training and skill development on the enterprise.

Decision making about training and skill development (Question 15)

In most firms, senior managers and/or owners played a significant role in decision making about training and skill development:

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Owner / Director	1	201	25.4	42.1
CEO / GM	2	239	30.3	50.1
Line Manager	3	209	26.5	43.8
HR Manager	4	100	12.7	21.0
Training Manager	6	10	1.3	2.1
Admin / Accounts	7	6	.8	1.3
Employees	8	17	2.2	3.6
Quality / H&S Managers	9	6	.8	1.3
Other	5	2	.3	.4
Total responses		790	100.0	165.6
2 missing cases, 477 valid cases				

Table 60: People who make decisions about training

As might be expected, there were differences in decision making between smaller and larger firms. Nevertheless, senior managers and/or owners played a key role in decision making across all firms.

Table 61: People who make decisions about training by Firm Size

% of responses in	Firm Size					
each band of Firm Size	0-5	6-9	10-49	50-99	100+	Count
Owner / Director (1)	80.8	65.5	42.8	19.4	14.0	201
CEO / GM (2)	16.4	40.0	50.8	69.4	67.0	239
Line Manager (3)	8.2	9.1	36.4	80.6	80.0	209
HR Manager (4)	2.7	0.0	16.0	27.4	51.0	100
Training Manager (6)	0.0	1.8	1.1	3.2	5.0	10
Admin / Accounts (7)	1.4	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	6
Employees (8)	4.1	5.5	2.1	3.2	5.0	17
Quality / H&S Managers (9)	1.4	0.0	0.0	4.8	2.0	6
Other (5)	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	2
Total Count	73	55	187	62	100	477

Skill development and training and business strategy (Question 18)

49% of all respondents (and 53% of those engaged in training) indicated that skill development and training were a **key part** of their business strategy.

85% of all respondents (and 93% of those engaged in training) indicated that skill development and training were key to their business strategy, at least to 'some extent'.

Is skill development & training key to business strategy?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	233	48.6	53.2	53.2
	Yes, to some extent	174	36.3	39.7	92.9
	No	31	6.5	7.1	100.0
	Total	438	91.4	100.0	
Missing	System	41	8.6		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 62: Skill development, training & business strategy

There was less variation in this area on the basis of firm size than for some other variables, although skills development and training were clearly of greatest importance to the largest firms, where nearly 2/3rds identified skill development and training as 'key' to their business strategy.

		ls skill dev b			
% within Firm Size		Yes	Yes, to some extent	No	Number of Firms
Firm	0-5	51.9%	38.9%	9.3%	74
Size	6-9	46.8%	44.7%	8.5%	56
	10-49	50.6%	41.5%	8.0%	187
	50-99	45.9%	44.3%	9.8%	62
	100+	66.0%	32.0%	2.0%	100
Total		53.2%	39.7%	7.1%	479

Table 63: Skill development, training & business strategy by Firm Size

There were also some variations by region. Otago-Southland firms were less likely to see skill development and training as key to their business strategy than firms in other regions.

		ls skill dev b			
% within Region		Yes	Yes, to some extent	No	Total
Region	Auckland	52.0%	40.0%	8.0%	105
	Northern (non- Auckland)	55.9%	42.6%	1.5%	71
	Central	58.5%	34.0%	7.5%	55
	Canterbury / Westland	57.6%	35.2%	7.2%	151
	Otago / Southland	34.8%	54.3%	10.9%	49
	Nation-wide	52.2%	39.1%	8.7%	48
Total		53.2%	39.7%	7.1%	479

Table 64: Skill development, training & business strategy by Region

Between industry sectors, the Accommodation, Hospitality & Restaurant; and Transport & Storage sectors were less likely to see skills development and training as key to business strategy than other sectors.

Table 65: Skill development, training	& business strategy by Industry
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

	ls skill dev b	Is skill development & training key to business strategy?				
% within Industry	Yes	Yes, to some extent	No			
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	44.8%	55.2%		29		
Mining	40.0%	60.0%		5		
Manufacturing	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%	120		
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	25.0%	75.0%		8		
Construction	62.5%	37.5%		24		
Wholesale Trade	41.4%	48.3%	10.3%	29		
Retail Trade	55.6%	38.9%	5.6%	18		
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	42.9%	35.7%	21.4%	14		
Transport, Storage	30.4%	39.1%	30.4%	23		
Communications Services	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	8		
Finance, Insurance	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	12		
Property, Business Services	69.0%	28.6%	2.4%	42		
Government Admin / Local Govt	61.5%	38.5%		13		
Education	73.3%	20.0%	6.7%	30		
Health, Community Services	64.7%	35.3%		34		
Culture, Recreation Services	30.0%	70.0%		10		
Personal & Other Services	57.9%	31.6%	10.5%	19		
Total	53.2%	39.7%	7.1%	438		

Utility of national skill standards (Question 29)

Respondent firms indicated they made use of national skill standards (including unit standards) in a variety of ways. These included:

- quality assurance/consistency, for which 67% found skill standards useful;
- assessment of learning, for which 64% found skill standards useful;
- benchmarking, for which 55% of firms found skill standards useful; and
- attainment of industry-relevant skills, for which 74% of respondent firms found national skill standards useful.

It was interesting to note not just the generally high level of utility ascribed to national skill standards, but the diversity of uses, in addition to their generally assumed use as a means of measuring learning and competence.

Quality assurance / consistency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Useful	278	58.0	67.6	67.6
	Not Useful	34	7.1	8.3	75.9
	Not Applicable	99	20.7	24.1	100.0
	Total	411	85.8	100.0	
Missing	System	68	14.2		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 66: Usefulness of skill standards for quality assurance / consistency

Assessment

Table 67: Usefulness of skill standards for assessment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Useful	260	54.3	63.7	63.7
	Not Useful	46	9.6	11.3	75.0
	Not Applicable	102	21.3	25.0	100.0
	Total	408	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	71	14.8		
Total		479	100.0		

Benchmarking

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Useful	222	46.3	55.2	55.2
	Not Useful	60	12.5	14.9	70.1
	Not Applicable	120	25.1	29.9	100.0
	Total	402	83.9	100.0	
Missing	System	77	16.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 68: Usefulness of skill standards for benchmarking

Attainment of industry-relevant skills

Table 69: Usefulness of skill standards for industry relevant skills attainment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Useful	301	62.8	74.1	74.1
	Not Useful	25	5.2	6.2	80.3
	Not Applicable	80	16.7	19.7	100.0
	Total	406	84.8	100.0	
Missing	System	73	15.2		
Total		479	100.0		

There was quite a marked variation in the level of perceived utility of national skill standards across sectors, with 100% of firms in some sectors (such as Mining, and Electricity, Gas & Water Supply) seeing skill standards as useful for attaining industry-relevant skills. Relevance was seen as lowest in the Government, Communications and Cultural & Recreational Services sectors.

	Usefulness of skill standards for industry relevant skills attainment				
% within Industry	Useful	Not Useful	Not Applicable	Total	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	86.2%		13.8%	100.0%	
Mining	100.0%			100.0%	
Manufacturing	73.6%	9.1%	17.3%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	100.0%			100.0%	
Construction	91.3%		8.7%	100.0%	
Wholesale Trade	59.3%	11.1%	29.6%	100.0%	
Retail Trade	73.3%	6.7%	20.0%	100.0%	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	76.9%		23.1%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	90.5%		9.5%	100.0%	
Communications Services	62.5%		37.5%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance	60.0%	10.0%	30.0%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services	60.0%	5.0%	35.0%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt	58.3%		41.7%	100.0%	
Education	66.7%	18.5%	14.8%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services	90.9%	3.0%	6.1%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services	42.9%		57.1%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	100.0%	
Total	74.1%	6.2%	19.7%	100.0%	

Table 70: Usefulness of skill standards for industry relevant skills attainment by Industry

Effects of skill development and training (Question 30)

Respondents were asked to identify the positive or negative effects (as they perceived them) of training on a range of areas in their business. These included:

- costs which 60% saw as being positively affected by training and skill development (29% saw training and skill development as having a negative effect in this area);
- profitability 77% of respondents saw training as having a positive effect on profitability;
- business growth 85% of respondents saw training as enabling or being positive for business growth;
- quality of output 95% of respondents saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on the quality of output;
- innovation 79% of respondent firms saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on innovation;
- retention of staff 81% saw training and skill development as having a
 positive effect on the firms ability to retain staff;
- productivity / motivation of staff 94% of respondents saw training and skill development as having a positive effect on the productivity and motivation of staff; and
- health and safety 83% saw training as having a positive effect on health and safety for their enterprise.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	254	53.0	60.3	60.3
	Negative	121	25.3	28.7	89.1
	Not Applicable	46	9.6	10.9	100.0
	Total	421	87.9	100.0	
Missing	System	58	12.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Costs

Table 71: Effect of training on costs

Profitability

Table 72: Effect of training on profits

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	324	67.6	76.6	76.6
	Negative	25	5.2	5.9	82.5
	Not Applicable	74	15.4	17.5	100.0
	Total	423	88.3	100.0	
Missing	System	56	11.7		
Total		479	100.0		

Enable business growth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	357	74.5	84.8	84.8
	Negative	5	1.0	1.2	86.0
	Not Applicable	59	12.3	14.0	100.0
	Total	421	87.9	100.0	
Missing	System	58	12.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 73: Effect of training on business growth

Quality of output

Table 74: Effect of training on quality of output

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	407	85.0	94.9	94.9
	Negative	4	.8	.9	95.8
	Not Applicable	18	3.8	4.2	100.0
	Total	429	89.6	100.0	
Missing	System	50	10.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Innovation

Table 75: Effect of training on innovation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	328	68.5	78.5	78.5
	Negative	12	2.5	2.9	81.3
	Not Applicable	78	16.3	18.7	100.0
	Total	418	87.3	100.0	
Missing	System	61	12.7		
Total		479	100.0		

Retention of staff

Table 76: Effect of training on staff retention

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	342	71.4	81.0	81.0
	Negative	25	5.2	5.9	87.0
	Not Applicable	55	11.5	13.0	100.0
	Total	422	88.1	100.0	
Missing	System	57	11.9		
Total		479	100.0		

Productivity / motivation of staff

Table 77: Effect of training on productivity / motivation of staff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive	398	83.1	93.6	93.6
	Negative	6	1.3	1.4	95.1
	Not Applicable	21	4.4	4.9	100.0
	Total	425	88.7	100.0	
Missing	System	54	11.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Health and safety

Frequency Percent Valid Percent Cumulative Positive 349 72.9 82.7 82.7

Table 78: Effect of training on health & safety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Positive	349	72.9	82.7	82.7
	Negative	4	.8	.9	83.6
	Not Applicable	69	14.4	16.4	100.0
	Total	422	88.1	100.0	
Missing	System	57	11.9		
Total		479	100.0		

Methods of assessing the value of training (Question 31)

Respondents were asked to identify all the methods they used to assess the value of training.

The most used form of assessing the value of training was staff feedback (78% of respondents). A large number of respondents also used customer feedback (53%) and assessments by HR & Line managers (35%).

A range of quantitative measures were used by respondents firms, including reduced errors / reworking (70%), productivity increases (61%), reduced accidents (49%), achievement of qualifications and standards (47%), improved turn-over and sales (36%), cost savings (35%), and reduced absenteeism (22%).

Only a small percentage of firms were making use of formal cost / benefit analyses to assess the value of training (21%).

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Staff feedback	6	332	15.2	77.6
Reduced errors / reworking	9	298	13.6	69.6
Productivity increase	1	262	12.0	61.2
Customer feedback	8	227	10.4	53.0
Reduced accidents	10	208	9.5	48.6
Achievement of quals / standards	7	200	9.1	46.7
Improved turnover / sales	2	156	7.1	36.4
Cost savings	3	151	6.9	35.3
HR / Line Manager assessment	5	151	6.9	35.3
Reduced absenteeism	11	93	4.3	21.7
Cost / benefit analysis	4	90	4.1	21.0
Other	12	18	0.8	4.2
Total		2186	100.0	510.7
51 missing cases, 428 valid cases				

Table 79: Methods of assessing value of training

Overall assessment of contribution of skill development and training (Question 32)

The substantial majority of respondents (74%), and an even larger percentage of those who engaged in training (81%) believed that skill development and training contributed to improved performance for their firm.

However, this indicated that approximately 17% of firms that were engaged in training were unsure whether skill development and training actually contributed to improved performance for their firm.

Do skill development and training contribute to improved performance?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	353	73.7	81.1	81.1
	Possibly	73	15.2	16.8	97.9
	No	2	.4	.5	98.4
	Don't Know	7	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	435	90.8	100.0	
Missing	System	44	9.2		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 80: Contribution of training to improved performance

Interestingly, medium-to-large firms (those with 50-99 employees) were the least sure about the value of training and skill development in relation to improved performance.

0/		Do skill d	Do skill development and training contribute to improved performance					
% within Firm Size		Yes	Possibly	No Don't Know		Total		
	0-5	81.1%	15.1%		3.8%	100.0%		
Firm	6-9	86.4%	11.4%		2.3%	100.0%		
SIZE	10-49	83.1%	14.1%	1.1%	1.7%	100.0%		
	50-99	70.5%	27.9%		1.6%	100.0%		
	100+	82.0%	18.0%			100.0%		
Total		81.1%	16.8%	.5%	1.6%	100.0%		

Table 81: Contribution of training to improved performance by Firm Size

The Communications, Health, Education & Personal & Other Services sectors were the most sure that skill development and training were contributors to improved performance, while there those in the Transport & Storage sector were least confident that skill development and training contributed to improved performance.

	Do skill d	ontribute to			
% within Industry		inproved p	Demormance		Total
	Yes	Possibly	No	Don't Know	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	75.9%	24.1%			100.0%
Mining	40.0%	60.0%			100.0%
Manufacturing	77.8%	18.8%	.9%	2.6%	100.0%
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	87.5%	12.5%			100.0%
Construction	79.2%	20.8%			100.0%
Wholesale Trade	82.1%	10.7%		7.1%	100.0%
Retail Trade	83.3%	16.7%			100.0%
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	85.7%	14.3%			100.0%
Transport, Storage	50.0%	45.5%		4.5%	100.0%
Communications Services	100.0%				100.0%
Finance, Insurance	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%		100.0%
Property, Business Services	84.1%	13.6%		2.3%	100.0%
Government Admin / Local Govt	76.9%	23.1%			100.0%
Education	93.5%	6.5%			100.0%
Health, Community Services	94.1%	5.9%			100.0%
Culture, Recreation Services	90.0%	10.0%			100.0%
Personal & Other Services	94.4%	5.6%			100.0%
Total	81.1%	16.8%	.5%	1.6%	100.0%

Table 82: Contribution of training to improved performance by Industry

Key reasons to provide training (Question 34)

Respondents were asked to identify all the reasons that they would continue to provide, or begin providing, training over the next 12 months.

The most important reason that respondents would provide training was if there were skill shortages within their enterprise (55%). Whether there would be suitable courses to meet there training needs was equally important (55%).

Other important drivers for training were customer requirements (49%), a desire to grow the enterprise (48%), skill shortages in the industry (where they exist) (48%), and actual growth in the enterprise (47%).

Around a third of respondents identified their improved knowledge of industry training would be a consideration in deciding to provide training. A similar number identified the availability of suitable persons to be trained would be a key consideration.

Around a quarter of respondents identified that Government subsidies for training, or changed regulations or incentives would be key considerations in deciding to provide training.

Neither high or low staff turn-over appeared to be particularly significant in decision making about training.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Skill shortages in the enterprise	1	250	12.2	55.3
Availability of suitable courses	5	249	12.1	55.1
Customer requirements	12	221	10.7	48.9
Desire to grow enterprise	8	218	10.6	48.2
Skill shortages in the industry	4	216	10.5	47.8
Growth of enterprises	7	213	10.4	47.1
Improved knowledge of industry training	9	162	7.9	35.8
Availability of suitable persons	6	148	7.2	32.7
Government subsidies for training	10	110	5.3	24.3
Changed regulation or incentives	11	98	4.8	21.7
Low staff turnover in the enterprise	2	84	4.1	18.6
High staff turnover in the enterprise	3	71	3.5	15.7
Other	13	17	0.8	3.8
Total		2057	100.0	455.1
27 missing cases, 452 valid cases				

Fable 83: Key	/ reasons to	provide	training	in the	next 12 months
---------------	--------------	---------	----------	--------	----------------

Reasons not to provide training (or provide less) (Question 35)

Respondents were asked to identify reasons why they might not provide training in the next 12 months, or reasons why they may provide less training than they otherwise might.

Cost was the most cited reason not to provide training, or provide less than might otherwise be desirable (52%). The availability (or otherwise) of suitable training opportunities was also seen as a key factor (46%).

Lack of interest from employees was seen as a barrier to training by 31% of respondents.

Both uncertainty in the business environment and actual decline in business performance were cited as relevant factors by about a quarter of respondents.

Approximately 20% of respondents saw 'red tape' and a lack of information about training as potential barriers to offering optimal levels of training.

A small but significant number of enterprises identified low staff turnover as a reason not to provide training (18%). A similar number saw the level of Government subsidy as relevant (16%).

Around 16% of respondent firms stated they preferred to employ skilled staff rather than train. 14% of firms stated they were too small to provide training (or at least all of their training needs).

11% of firms suggested that the possibility of staff being 'poached' within one year or more of their being provided training was a disincentive to train. 8% had similar concerns with respect to loosing staff after 6 months.

Other factors identified by a small number of respondents included: industrial relations issues (10%), high staff turn-over (8%), inability to assess the likely benefit (6%), and the difficulty of training staff (5%).

Only 2% of respondent firms indicated it was their view that 'training was the employee's responsibility'.

Significant numbers of firms indicated (unprompted) that they would 'always provide training', irrespective of any reasons why they might not.

Category	Code	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Cases
Too expensive	5	207	15.0	52.3
Availability of suitable training	14	183	13.3	46.2
Lack of interest from employees	7	123	8.9	31.1
Uncertainty in business / operating environment	10	105	7.6	26.5
Decline in business / operating environment	9	95	6.9	24.0
'Red Tape' involved in arranging training	6	78	5.7	19.7
Lack of information about training	4	76	5.5	19.2
Low staff turnover in enterprise	1	73	5.3	18.4
Amount of Government subsidy	8	65	4.7	16.4
Prefer to employ skilled staff	12	65	4.7	16.4
Enterprise is too small	16	55	4.0	13.9
They will be 'poached' within one year or more	19	42	3.1	10.6
High availability of skilled labour	3	39	2.8	9.8
Industrial relations issues	11	38	2.8	9.6
They will be 'poached' within six months	18	31	2.3	7.8
High staff turnover in enterprise	2	30	2.2	7.6
Inability to assess likely benefit	17	23	1.7	5.8
Too difficult to train staff	15	21	1.5	5.3
Other	20	19	1.4	4.8
Training is the employee's responsibility	13	9	0.7	2.3
Total		1377	100.0	347.7
83 missing cases, 396 valid cases				

Table 84: Reasons not to provide training (or provide less) in next 12 months

Performance, Productivity and Training

Analysis of respondents self-assessment of both the productivity of their employees, and the comparative performance of their firm with their training activities revealed a non-linear relationship between skill development and training, employee productivity and firm performance.

Percentage of payroll spent on training and productivity gain

The mean percentage of payroll spent on training appeared to indicate that those firms with the lowest and highest self-assessment of the productivity of their employees were spending the most on training.

Excluding the lowest self-assessments of employee productivity, there was weak general trend for greater expenditure on training as percentage of payroll to be associated with higher productivity gain.

Table 85: Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months	
by Productivity Gain (adjusted)	

Productivity Gain (adjusted)	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
10	4.3944	9	3.18026
20	2.4164	24	2.16275
30	3.3414	49	3.51789
40	3.2140	57	3.07310
50	3.1004	68	3.31861
60	3.4322	59	3.24149
70	3.9503	36	4.42878
80	6.6968	22	6.48787
Total	3.5412	324	3.73798



Percentage of payroll spent on training and past comparative performance

The relationship between spending on training (over the last 12 months) and comparative performance over the last 2 years seems to indicate that those firms that perceive themselves to have performed well have spent more than others on training, while those who perceive themselves to have performed considerably worse also spent considerably less.

The relationship for other firms is much less clear.

Past 2 years comparative performance	Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation
Very much worse	1.5250	4	2.32433
2	4.1889	9	2.05757
3	4.0317	35	4.57984
Same	3.5897	95	4.13477
5	3.6271	107	3.64438
6	3.3594	53	3.34869
Very much better	5.0168	31	4.97235
Total	3.7354	334	3.94751

Table 86: Percentage of Payroll spent on training in the last 12 months by Past 2 years comparative performance



Current training provision and current comparative performance

Those firms that perceive their current comparative performance to be the worst also appeared less likely than any other firms to be providing training. Those firms that perceive themselves to be performing less well than average (but not the worst performing), however, appeared to be more likely to be providing training than all other firms.

Furthermore, those with the highest self-assessment of current performance were also (marginally) more likely to be offering training than most other respondents.

	Is training currently provided for employees		Total
Current comparative performance	Yes	No	
Very much worse	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
3	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
Same	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
5	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
6	89.2%	10.8%	100.0%
Very much better	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Total	89.2%	10.8%	100.0%

Table 87: Current training provision by Current comparative performance



Likelihood of future training and current comparative performance

Again, those firms with the lowest self-assessment of current comparative performance were the least likely indicate they would provide training in the next 12 months.

In general, firms with higher self-assessments of current performance were more likely to indicate they would provide training in the next twelve months – but there was a minor drop-off for those rating themselves the highest performing firms.

	Likely to offer training over the next 12 months		
Current comparative performance	Ves	No	Total
	103	INU	
Very much worse	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
3	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
Same	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
5	94.6%	5.4%	100.0%
6	97.6%	2.4%	100.0%
Very much better	95.6%	4.4%	100.0%
Total	94.8%	5.2%	100.0%

Table 88: Percentage of firms likely to train in the next 12 months by Current Comparative Performance



Information about skills development and training (Question 36)

Respondents were asked to identify the sources and value of information used to provide them with information about skill development and training.

The most prevalent source of information was business organisations (74%) and industry associations (70%).

Training consultants were also an important source of information about skill development and training (59%), as were employees (53%).

Around half of respondents obtained useful information about training from Industry Training Organisations and from the internet.

Polytechnics and trade journals assisted around 45% of respondent firms to obtain information about training. 40% obtained useful information from universities.

Around a third of firms found information from Government agencies useful – but a similar number indicated that information from Government agencies was inadequate.

Relatively small numbers of respondents obtained useful information from unions and secondary schools. 15 respondents (3%) indicated they had not received or accessed any information about training.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	325	67.8	73.9	73.9
	Inadequate	43	9.0	9.8	83.6
	Not Applicable	72	15.0	16.4	100.0
	Total	440	91.9	100.0	
Missing	System	39	8.1		
Total		479	100.0		

 Table 89: Source of information about training - Business Organisations

Table 90: Source of information about training - Industry Associations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	311	64.9	70.0	70.0
	Inadequate	67	14.0	15.1	85.1
	Not Applicable	66	13.8	14.9	100.0
	Total	444	92.7	100.0	
Missing	System	35	7.3		
Total		479	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	256	53.4	58.6	58.6
	Inadequate	57	11.9	13.0	71.6
	Not Applicable	124	25.9	28.4	100.0
	Total	437	91.2	100.0	
Missing	System	42	8.8		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 91: Source of information about training - Training Consultants

Table 92: Source of information about training - Employees

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	227	47.4	53.0	53.0
	Inadequate	64	13.4	15.0	68.0
	Not Applicable	137	28.6	32.0	100.0
	Total	428	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	51	10.6		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 93: Source of information about training - Internet / Web

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	217	45.3	51.3	51.3
	Inadequate	56	11.7	13.2	64.5
	Not Applicable	150	31.3	35.5	100.0
	Total	423	88.3	100.0	
Missing	System	56	11.7		
Total		479	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	228	47.6	51.2	51.2
	Inadequate	82	17.1	18.4	69.7
	Not Applicable	135	28.2	30.3	100.0
	Total	445	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	34	7.1		
Total		479	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	195	40.7	45.7	45.7
	Inadequate	99	20.7	23.2	68.9
	Not Applicable	133	27.8	31.1	100.0
	Total	427	89.1	100.0	
Missing	System	52	10.9		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 95: Source of information about training - Polytechnics

Table 96: Source of information about training - Trade Journals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	182	38.0	44.4	44.4
	Inadequate	61	12.7	14.9	59.3
	Not Applicable	167	34.9	40.7	100.0
	Total	410	85.6	100.0	
Missing	System	69	14.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 97: Source of information about training - Universities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	169	35.3	39.9	39.9
	Inadequate	50	10.4	11.8	51.7
	Not Applicable	205	42.8	48.3	100.0
	Total	424	88.5	100.0	
Missing	System	55	11.5		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 98:	Source of	information	about	training	- Media
-----------	-----------	-------------	-------	----------	---------

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	137	28.6	33.3	33.3
	Inadequate	74	15.4	18.0	51.3
	Not Applicable	200	41.8	48.7	100.0
	Total	411	85.8	100.0	
Missing	System	68	14.2		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 99: Source of information about training - Government dept/agency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	127	26.5	30.5	30.5
	Inadequate	121	25.3	29.1	59.6
	Not Applicable	168	35.1	40.4	100.0
	Total	416	86.8	100.0	
Missing	System	63	13.2		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 100: Source of information about training - Unions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	68	14.2	16.4	16.4
	Inadequate	58	12.1	14.0	30.4
	Not Applicable	288	60.1	69.6	100.0
	Total	414	86.4	100.0	
Missing	System	65	13.6		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 101: Source of information about training - Secondary Schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adequate	34	7.1	8.4	8.4
	Inadequate	73	15.2	18.0	26.4
	Not Applicable	299	62.4	73.6	100.0
	Total	406	84.8	100.0	
Missing	System	73	15.2		
Total		479	100.0		
General comments about skills development and training (Question 37)

Nearly 100 respondents provided general comments about skill development and training. These responses are provided in full in Appendix 2 (although some have been altered to preserve anonymity).

Many respondents indicated their firm's commitment to skill development and training, and the critical importance placed on it.

Many also, however, highlighted the difficulties associated with training, and in particular, difficulties in assessing the value of training.

There were numerous comments about the difficulty in finding suitable providers of training to meet the enterprises' particular needs.

Perceptions of Industry Training and Modern Apprenticeships

Respondents were asked a range of questions about their perceptions of industry training, which was defined as formal industry-related training arranged by Industry Training Organisations (ITOs) and Modern Apprenticeship Coordinators. It includes both traineeships and Modern Apprenticeships.

Knowledge of Industry Training (Question 38)

42% of respondents were aware of an Industry Training Organisation (ITO) that covered their industry or enterprise. 29% indicated that there was no ITO covering their industry or enterprise, and 24% did not know.

This compares with 53% of respondents being able to identify an ITO covering their industry in the 1997 NZ Employers' Federation Survey.

A small number of respondents incorrectly identified organisations such as tertiary institutions and professional bodies as ITOs.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	195	40.7	41.8	41.8
	No	137	28.6	29.3	71.1
	Don't Know	113	23.6	24.2	95.3
	Incorrectly identified	22	4.6	4.7	100.0
	Total	467	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	2.5		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 102: Known ITO covering enterprise or industry

Smaller firms were less likely to be able to identify an ITO covering their enterprise or industry.

Table 103: Known IT	O covering enterprise	or industry by Firm Size
---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

	Known ITO covering enterprise or industry						
Firm Size	Yes	No	Don't Know	Incorrectly identified	Total		
0-5	25.4%	35.2%	33.8%	5.6%	100.0%		
6-9	27.8%	40.7%	27.8%	3.7%	100.0%		
10-49	37.5%	32.6%	24.5%	5.4%	100.0%		
50-99	66.1%	12.9%	12.9%	8.1%	100.0%		
100+	54.2%	22.9%	21.9%	1.0%	100.0%		
Total	41.8%	29.3%	24.2%	4.7%	100.0%		

Knowledge of ITOs appeared to vary by region. Respondents in the northern half of the North Island outside of Auckland appeared to have a high level of knowledge of ITOs.

A significant number of respondents from Otago/Southland identified organisations such as colleges of education and professional bodies as ITOs.

	Knowr				
% within Region	Yes	No	Don't Know	Incorrectly identified	Total
Auckland	36.9%	32.0%	29.1%	1.9%	100.0%
Northern (non-Auckland)	64.3%	18.6%	11.4%	5.7%	100.0%
Central	57.7%	23.1%	17.3%	1.9%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	31.3%	36.1%	26.5%	6.1%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	46.9%	20.4%	20.4%	12.2%	100.0%
Nation-wide	28.3%	34.8%	37.0%		100.0%
Total	41.8%	29.3%	24.2%	4.7%	100.0%

Table 104: Known ITO covering enterprise or industry by Region

As was to be expected, there was considerable variation in knowledge and prevalence of ITOs across industries:

	Known ITO covering enterprise or industry						
% within Industry			Don't	Incorrectly	Total		
	Yes	No	Know	identified			
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	62.5%	25.0%	9.4%	3.1%	100.0%		
Mining	80.0%		20.0%		100.0%		
Manufacturing	50.4%	22.1%	24.4%	3.1%	100.0%		
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%		
Construction	75.0%	4.2%	12.5%	8.3%	100.0%		
Wholesale Trade	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%		100.0%		
Retail Trade	43.5%	21.7%	26.1%	8.7%	100.0%		
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	62.5%	18.8%	18.8%		100.0%		
Transport, Storage	69.6%	4.3%	17.4%	8.7%	100.0%		
Communications Services	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%		100.0%		
Finance, Insurance	16.7%	41.7%	25.0%	16.7%	100.0%		
Property, Business Services	13.3%	46.7%	35.6%	4.4%	100.0%		
Government Admin / Local Govt	46.2%	23.1%	30.8%		100.0%		
Education	32.3%	45.2%	12.9%	9.7%	100.0%		
Health, Community Services	34.4%	40.6%	18.8%	6.3%	100.0%		
Culture, Recreation Services	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%		100.0%		
Personal & Other Services	23.8%	47.6%	23.8%	4.8%	100.0%		
Total	41.8%	29.3%	24.2%	4.7%	100.0%		

Table 105: Known ITO covering enterprise or industry by Industry

Knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships (Question 39)

33% of respondents indicated they were aware of Modern Apprenticeships in their industry.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	152	31.7	32.5	32.5
	No	228	47.6	48.7	81.2
	Don't Know	88	18.4	18.8	100.0
	Total	468	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 106: Knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships in industry

As with knowledge of ITOs, knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships varied significantly with firm size. Only 20% of the smallest firms were aware of Modern Apprenticeships in their industry, while over half of firms with 50-99 employees were so aware.

Table 107. Rhowledge of modelin Apprenticeships in madsity by thim bize							
	Knowledge	Knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships in industry					
% within Firm Size	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total			
0-5	19.7%	66.2%	14.1%	100.0%			
6-9	25.9%	44.4%	29.6%	100.0%			
10-49	27.7%	53.8%	18.5%	100.0%			
50-99	53.2%	27.4%	19.4%	100.0%			
100+	41.2%	42.3%	16.5%	100.0%			
Total	32.5%	48.7%	18.8%	100.0%			

Table 107: Knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships in industry by Firm Size

There were some variation in knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships by region:

Table 108:	Knowledge o	f Modern /	Apprenticeshi	os in by region
------------	-------------	------------	---------------	-----------------

	Knowledge			
% within Region	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Auckland	26.0%	51.0%	23.1%	100.0%
Northern (non-Auckland)	45.7%	41.4%	12.9%	100.0%
Central	39.6%	43.4%	17.0%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	26.0%	54.1%	19.9%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	41.7%	39.6%	18.8%	100.0%
Nation-wide	29.8%	53.2%	17.0%	100.0%
Total	32.5%	48.7%	18.8%	100.0%

Again, there were marked differences in the knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships in different industries.

	Knowledge			
% within Industry	Voc	No	Don't Know	Total
Agriculture Forestry Fishing	165			
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	48.4%	35.5%	16.1%	100.0%
Mining		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Manufacturing	43.1%	34.6%	22.3%	100.0%
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	50.0%	50.0%		100.0%
Construction	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Wholesale Trade	17.1%	54.3%	28.6%	100.0%
Retail Trade	39.1%	47.8%	13.0%	100.0%
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	56.3%	6.3%	37.5%	100.0%
Transport, Storage	43.5%	30.4%	26.1%	100.0%
Communications Services	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Finance, Insurance	15.4%	76.9%	7.7%	100.0%
Property, Business Services	8.7%	73.9%	17.4%	100.0%
Government Admin / Local Govt	7.7%	76.9%	15.4%	100.0%
Education	25.8%	64.5%	9.7%	100.0%
Health, Community Services	12.5%	68.8%	18.8%	100.0%
Culture, Recreation Services	10.0%	90.0%		100.0%
Personal & Other Services	15.0%	80.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Total	32.5%	48.7%	18.8%	100.0%

Table 109: Knowledge of Modern Apprenticeships by Industry

Understanding of costs & benefits of ITO-arrange industry training (Question 40)

40% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the benefits and costs of ITO-arranged industry training were well understood within their enterprise – but 36% disagreed, or strongly disagreed with this statement. 24% did not know if this was the case.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	31	6.5	6.7	6.7
	Agree	154	32.2	33.3	40.0
	Disagree	134	28.0	28.9	68.9
	Strongly Disagree	31	6.5	6.7	75.6
	Don't Know	113	23.6	24.4	100.0
	Total	463	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	16	3.3		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 110: Costs & benefits of industry training well understood

Larger firms were more likely to have a good understanding of the costs and benefits of industry training, but understanding was greatest amongst firms with 50-99 employees, where 58% indicated a good understanding of these issues within their enterprise.

% within Firm	Costs					
Size	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total
0-5	7.4%	22.1%	36.8%	1.5%	32.4%	100.0%
6-9	5.5%	32.7%	23.6%	16.4%	21.8%	100.0%
10-49	4.9%	31.4%	31.4%	2.7%	29.7%	100.0%
50-99	8.1%	50.0%	19.4%	11.3%	11.3%	100.0%
100+	9.7%	34.4%	28.0%	9.7%	18.3%	100.0%
Total	6.7%	33.3%	28.9%	6.7%	24.4%	100.0%

Table 111: Costs & benefits of industry training well understood by Firm Size

Understanding of the costs and benefits of industry training varied significantly between firms in different industries.

Firms in the Mining, Electricity, Gas & Water Supply, and Construction sectors were more likely to have a good understanding of these issues.

Firms in the Wholesale Trade, Communications Services, and Property and Business Services sectors were least likely to have a good understanding of industry training issues.

	Costs & benefits of industry training are well understood within your enterprise							
% within Industry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total		
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	6.3%	37.5%	37.5%	6.3%	12.5%	100.0%		
Mining		80.0%			20.0%	100.0%		
Manufacturing	6.1%	35.6%	28.0%	5.3%	25.0%	100.0%		
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	25.0%	50.0%	12.5%		12.5%	100.0%		
Construction	8.3%	54.2%	20.8%	4.2%	12.5%	100.0%		
Wholesale Trade		17.1%	31.4%	5.7%	45.7%	100.0%		
Retail Trade	8.7%	39.1%	39.1%		13.0%	100.0%		
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	6.3%	31.3%	31.3%	18.8%	12.5%	100.0%		
Transport, Storage		39.1%	34.8%	13.0%	13.0%	100.0%		
Communications Services			28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	100.0%		
Finance, Insurance		7.7%	61.5%		30.8%	100.0%		
Property, Business Services	6.8%	27.3%	20.5%		45.5%	100.0%		
Government Admin / Local Govt		33.3%	33.3%	8.3%	25.0%	100.0%		
Education	17.2%	34.5%	24.1%	6.9%	17.2%	100.0%		
Health, Community Services	13.3%	26.7%	23.3%	13.3%	23.3%	100.0%		
Culture, Recreation Services		33.3%	11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%		
Personal & Other Services	9.5%	33.3%	38.1%	4.8%	14.3%	100.0%		
Total	6.7%	33.3%	28.9%	6.7%	24.4%	100.0%		

Table 112: Costs & benefits of industry training well understood by Industry

Understanding of the costs and benefits of Modern Apprenticeships (Question 41)

29% of respondents indicated that the benefits and costs Modern Apprenticeship were well understood within their enterprise. 40% of respondents, however, indicated that Modern Apprenticeships were *not* well understood within their enterprise, and a further 31% did not know the extent to which there was an understanding of such issues within their enterprise.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Agree	20	4.2	4.4	4.4
	Agree	109	22.8	24.1	28.5
	Disagree	134	28.0	29.6	58.1
	Strongly Disagree	47	9.8	10.4	68.4
	Don't Know	143	29.9	31.6	100.0
	Total	453	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	26	5.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 113: Costs & benefits of Modern Apprenticeship well understood

The variation in understanding about Modern Apprenticeships between firms of different sizes was not as marked as for understanding of industry training. Once again it was firms with 50 to 99 employees that had the greatest level of understanding, with 40% indicating that the costs and benefits of Modern Apprenticeships were well understood within their enterprise.

% within Firm	Costs & be					
Size	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total
0-5	4.5%	20.9%	29.9%	9.0%	35.8%	100.0%
6-9	5.6%	22.2%	31.5%	14.8%	25.9%	100.0%
10-49	2.8%	22.2%	30.0%	7.2%	37.8%	100.0%
50-99	8.3%	31.7%	21.7%	18.3%	20.0%	100.0%
100+	4.3%	26.1%	32.6%	9.8%	27.2%	100.0%
Total	4.4%	24.1%	29.6%	10.4%	31.6%	100.0%

There were differences in the level of understanding of Modern Apprenticeships across different industries. Half the respondents in the Electricity, Gas & Water Supply sector agreed or strongly agreed that their firm understood the costs and benefits of Modern Apprenticeships.

	Costs & benefits of Modern Apprenticeship are well understood within your enterprise						
% Industry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	6.5%	29.0%	32.3%	9.7%	22.6%	100.0%	
Mining			40.0%		60.0%	100.0%	
Manufacturing	3.1%	29.0%	31.3%	9.2%	27.5%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	12.5%	37.5%	25.0%		25.0%	100.0%	
Construction	4.2%	33.3%	29.2%	12.5%	20.8%	100.0%	
Wholesale Trade	2.9%	23.5%	26.5%	5.9%	41.2%	100.0%	
Retail Trade		17.4%	43.5%	4.3%	34.8%	100.0%	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	6.3%	18.8%	31.3%	18.8%	25.0%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	9.1%	22.7%	22.7%	22.7%	22.7%	100.0%	
Communications Services			14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance			46.2%	15.4%	38.5%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services	2.3%	25.6%	25.6%	4.7%	41.9%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt		8.3%	33.3%	25.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
Education	20.7%	27.6%	24.1%	10.3%	17.2%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services	3.6%	14.3%	17.9%	10.7%	53.6%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services		12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services		31.6%	36.8%	10.5%	21.1%	100.0%	
Total	4.4%	24.1%	29.6%	10.4%	31.6%	100.0%	

Table 115: Costs & benefits of Modern Apprenticeship well understood by Industry

While there were variations in the levels of understanding of Modern Apprenticeships across regions, these were not as significant as for the level of understanding of industry training.

Table 116: Costs	& benefits of Modern	Apprenticeship we	Il understood by Region
		i Apprendeesinp we	in understood by Region

	Costs & benefits of Modern Apprenticeship are well understood within your enterprise						
% within Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total	
Auckland	4.0%	18.0%	31.0%	13.0%	34.0%	100.0%	
Northern (non- Auckland)	7.5%	25.4%	25.4%	6.0%	35.8%	100.0%	
Central	7.8%	33.3%	23.5%	13.7%	21.6%	100.0%	
Canterbury / Westland	2.1%	22.4%	32.2%	10.5%	32.9%	100.0%	
Otago / Southland	2.1%	33.3%	25.0%	12.5%	27.1%	100.0%	
Nation-wide	6.8%	20.5%	36.4%	4.5%	31.8%	100.0%	
Total	4.4%	24.1%	29.6%	10.4%	31.6%	100.0%	

Contribution of ITO-arranged industry training to the enterprise (Question 42)

44% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ITO-arranged industry training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their enterprise.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	36	7.5	8.3	8.3
	Agree	156	32.6	35.9	44.2
	Disagree	173	36.1	39.9	84.1
	Strongly Disagree	69	14.4	15.9	100.0
	Total	434	90.6	100.0	
Missing	System	45	9.4		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 117: Effective contribution by ITO-arranged industry

Larger firms were much more likely to consider that ITO-arranged training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or training needs of their enterprise -55% of firms with 100+ employees agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Table 118: Effective contribution to enterprise by ITO-arranged industry training by Firm Size

	ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my enterprise							
% within Firm Size	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total			
0-5	4.7%	26.6%	53.1%	15.6%	100.0%			
6-9	9.3%	29.6%	33.3%	27.8%	100.0%			
10-49	7.0%	36.3%	41.5%	15.2%	100.0%			
50-99	9.8%	41.0%	34.4%	14.8%	100.0%			
100+	11.9%	42.9%	34.5%	10.7%	100.0%			
Total	8.3%	35.9%	39.9%	15.9%	100.0%			

Firms in Auckland and Canterbury / Westland were significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the proposition that ITO-arranged industry training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development or employment needs of their enterprise.

	ITO-arrang contribution emp				
% within Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Auckland	8.5%	22.3%	47.9%	21.3%	100.0%
Northern (non-Auckland)	15.2%	45.5%	31.8%	7.6%	100.0%
Central	4.3%	46.8%	36.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	7.2%	31.2%	39.1%	22.5%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	4.3%	46.8%	40.4%	8.5%	100.0%
Nation-wide	9.5%	42.9%	40.5%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	8.3%	35.9%	39.9%	15.9%	100.0%

Table 119: Effective Contribution by ITO-arranged industry training by Region

There was, once again, a wide range of differing responses in this area on the basis of industry:

	ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my enterprise					
% within Industry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	6.7%	43.3%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%	
Mining	20.0%	80.0%			100.0%	
Manufacturing	12.2%	31.7%	45.5%	10.6%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	14.3%	42.9%	42.9%		100.0%	
Construction	4.3%	69.6%	26.1%		100.0%	
Wholesale Trade	3.1%	21.9%	46.9%	28.1%	100.0%	
Retail Trade	8.7%	39.1%	39.1%	13.0%	100.0%	
Accom., Hospitality, Restaurant	6.3%	31.3%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	8.7%	43.5%	43.5%	4.3%	100.0%	
Communications Services		42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance		30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services	2.6%	30.8%	41.0%	25.6%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt		60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
Education	13.8%	20.7%	44.8%	20.7%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services	10.3%	41.4%	31.0%	17.2%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services		42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services	11.1%	22.2%	38.9%	27.8%	100.0%	
Total	8.3%	35.9%	39.9%	15.9%	100.0%	

Table 120: Effective contribution by ITO-arranged industry training by Industry

Contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to the enterprise (Question 43)

36% of respondents indicated that Modern apprenticeships made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their enterprise.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Agree	29	6.1	7.0	7.0
	Agree	118	24.6	28.6	35.6
	Disagree	184	38.4	44.6	80.1
	Strongly Disagree	82	17.1	19.9	100.0
	Total	413	86.2	100.0	
Missing	System	66	13.8		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 121: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to enterprise's skill needs

Firms with 50-99 employees were most likely to perceive Modern Apprenticeships as valuable to their enterprise – while firms with 6-9 employees were least likely to do so.

Table 122: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships
to enterprise's skill needs by Firm Size

			iccus by I iii	0120		
% within Firm	Modern Apprenticeships make an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my enterprise					
Size	Strongly			Strongly	Total	
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree		
0-5	4.9%	27.9%	50.8%	16.4%	100.0%	
6-9	5.9%	25.5%	39.2%	29.4%	100.0%	
10-49	4.9%	28.7%	47.0%	19.5%	100.0%	
50-99	15.8%	28.1%	35.1%	21.1%	100.0%	
100+	7.5%	31.3%	45.0%	16.3%	100.0%	
Total	7.0%	28.6%	44.6%	19.9%	100.0%	

Auckland and Canterbury / Westland firms were less likely than others to consider Modern Apprenticeships made an effective contribution to their firm.

Table 123: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships	\$
to enterprise's skill needs by Region	

	Modern Appre meeting the sl				
% within Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Auckland	8.1%	15.1%	51.2%	25.6%	100.0%
Northern (non-Auckland)	7.7%	36.9%	47.7%	7.7%	100.0%
Central	4.4%	28.9%	46.7%	20.0%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	6.2%	27.7%	40.0%	26.2%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	8.7%	37.0%	45.7%	8.7%	100.0%
Nation-wide	7.3%	36.6%	36.6%	19.5%	100.0%
Total	7.0%	28.6%	44.6%	19.9%	100.0%

There were significant differences in the perception of firms in different industries with respect to the value of the contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to their enterprise.

	Modern					
	contribution	contribution to meeting the skill development and/or				
	emp	loyment need	is of my enter	prise	lotal	
	Stronaly			Stronaly		
Industry	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree		
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	9.7%	38.7%	38.7%	12.9%	100.0%	
Mining			75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
Manufacturing	10.9%	26.9%	46.2%	16.0%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%		100.0%	
Construction	4.5%	54.5%	36.4%	4.5%	100.0%	
Wholesale Trade	3.3%	20.0%	50.0%	26.7%	100.0%	
Retail Trade	4.3%	30.4%	47.8%	17.4%	100.0%	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	12.5%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	5.0%	35.0%	55.0%	5.0%	100.0%	
Communications Services		42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance	7.7%	30.8%	53.8%	7.7%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services		19.4%	36.1%	44.4%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt			72.7%	27.3%	100.0%	
Education	12.5%	16.7%	50.0%	20.8%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services		36.0%	36.0%	28.0%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services		14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services	5.9%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	100.0%	
Total	7.0%	28.6%	44.6%	19.9%	100.0%	

Table 124: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to enterprise's skill needs by Industry

Contribution of ITO-arranged industry training to the industry (Question 44)

48% of respondents considered ITO-arranged industry training made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their industry.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Agree	29	6.1	6.9	6.9
	Agree	173	36.1	40.9	47.8
	Disagree	156	32.6	36.9	84.6
	Strongly Disagree	65	13.6	15.4	100.0
	Total	423	88.3	100.0	
Missing	System	56	11.7		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 125: Effective contribution of ITO-arranged industry training to industry

Larger firms tended to be more positive about the contribution of industry training to their industry.

% within Firm	ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my industry					
Size	Strongly			Strongly	Total	
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree		
0-5	4.7%	34.4%	48.4%	12.5%	100.0%	
6-9	7.4%	38.9%	27.8%	25.9%	100.0%	
10-49	5.6%	40.7%	39.5%	14.2%	100.0%	
50-99	8.2%	49.2%	29.5%	13.1%	100.0%	
100+	9.8%	41.5%	34.1%	14.6%	100.0%	
Total	6.9%	40.9%	36.9%	15.4%	100.0%	

Auckland firms were the least positive about the contribution of industry training to their industry.

Table 127: Effective contributior	n of ITO-arranged industry	training to industry by Region
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------

	ITO-arrang contribution em				
% within Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Auckland	8.9%	23.3%	46.7%	21.1%	100.0%
Northern (non-Auckland)	7.8%	54.7%	29.7%	7.8%	100.0%
Central	4.3%	51.1%	27.7%	17.0%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	6.7%	35.1%	38.8%	19.4%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	6.5%	54.3%	30.4%	8.7%	100.0%
Nation-wide	4.8%	100.0%			
Total	6.9%	40.9%	36.9%	15.4%	100.0%

The Mining and Electricity, Gas & Water Supply sectors were significantly more positive about the contribution of industry training to their industry than other sectors.

Interestingly, 59% firms in the Transport & Storage sector agreed or strongly agreed that industry training made an effective contribution to the skill development and / or employment needs of their industry, even though this sector had the highest proportion of firms stating that skill development and training was not key to their business strategy – but this correlated well with the fact that 90% of firms in this sector used national skill standards.

	ITO-arran contributio ei	ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my industry				
% within Industry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	6.7%	50.0%	30.0%	13.3%	100.0%	
Mining		100.0%			100.0%	
Manufacturing	8.3%	41.7%	40.0%	10.0%	100.0%	
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%		100.0%	
Construction	4.3%	65.2%	30.4%		100.0%	
Wholesale Trade		23.3%	50.0%	26.7%	100.0%	
Retail Trade	13.6%	45.5%	36.4%	4.5%	100.0%	
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	13.3%	33.3%	40.0%	13.3%	100.0%	
Transport, Storage	4.5%	54.5%	31.8%	9.1%	100.0%	
Communications Services		28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%	
Finance, Insurance		30.8%	53.8%	15.4%	100.0%	
Property, Business Services	2.6%	28.9%	42.1%	26.3%	100.0%	
Government Admin / Local Govt		45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	100.0%	
Education	14.8%	29.6%	29.6%	25.9%	100.0%	
Health, Community Services	7.1%	46.4%	25.0%	21.4%	100.0%	
Culture, Recreation Services		28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%	
Personal & Other Services	5.6%	33.3%	33.3%	27.8%	100.0%	
Total	6.9%	40.9%	36.9%	15.4%	100.0%	

Table 128: Effective contribution of ITO-arranged industry training to industry by Region

Contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to the industry (Question 45)

42% of respondents believed that Modern apprenticeships made an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of their industry.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Agree	29	6.1	7.2	7.2
	Agree	141	29.4	35.1	42.3
	Disagree	164	34.2	40.8	83.1
	Strongly Disagree	68	14.2	16.9	100.0
	Total	402	83.9	100.0	
Missing	System	77	16.1		
Total		479	100.0		

Table 129: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to industry

Firms with 50-99 employees were most positive about Modern Apprenticeships' contribution to their industry.

Table 130: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to industry by Firm Size

% within Firm	Modern Apprentie skill develop				
Size		•	Ċ		Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
0-5	5.1%	35.6%	44.1%	15.3%	100.0%
6-9	7.7%	26.9%	34.6%	30.8%	100.0%
10-49	5.7%	33.5%	44.9%	15.8%	100.0%
50-99	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%
100+	5.1%	44.3%	39.2%	11.4%	100.0%
Total	7.2%	35.1%	40.8%	16.9%	100.0%

Otago / Southland respondents were more likely than others to see Modern Apprenticeships as making an effective contribution to the skill needs of their industry.

Table 13	1: Effective	contribution	of Modern	Apprenticeships	to industry b	v Region

	Modern contribution em				
% within Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	Total
Augkland	7 igi 80	, (gi 00	21003100		100.00/
Auckianu	6.0%	31.0%	46.4%	16.7%	100.0%
Northern (non- Auckland)	6.6%	44.3%	39.3%	9.8%	100.0%
Central	6.5%	32.6%	45.7%	15.2%	100.0%
Canterbury / Westland	6.5%	33.9%	37.9%	21.8%	100.0%
Otago / Southland	10.9%	37.0%	41.3%	10.9%	100.0%
Nation-wide	9.8%	34.1%	34.1%	22.0%	100.0%
Total	7.2%	35.1%	40.8%	16.9%	100.0%

The Electricity, Gas & Water Supply, Construction, Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing, and the Accommodation, Hospitality and Restaurant sectors were more likely than others to consider Modern Apprenticeships to be making a valuable contribution to the skill development and / or employment needs of their industry.

	Modern Apprenticeships make ar contribution to meeting the skill develo employment needs of my inc						
% within Industry	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total		
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	9.7%	41.9%	35.5%	12.9%	100.0%		
Mining			66.7%	33.3%	100.0%		
Manufacturing	10.4%	39.1%	38.3%	12.2%	100.0%		
Electricity, Gas & Water Supply	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%		100.0%		
Construction	4.5%	63.6%	31.8%		100.0%		
Wholesale Trade		19.4%	58.1%	22.6%	100.0%		
Retail Trade	4.8%	42.9%	38.1%	14.3%	100.0%		
Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurant	7.1%	50.0%	35.7%	7.1%	100.0%		
Transport, Storage	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%	10.0%	100.0%		
Communications Services		42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%		
Finance, Insurance	7.7%	30.8%	53.8%	7.7%	100.0%		
Property, Business Services	2.9%	20.0%	40.0%	37.1%	100.0%		
Government Admin / Local Govt		9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%		
Education	11.5%	26.9%	38.5%	23.1%	100.0%		
Health, Community Services	4.3%	34.8%	39.1%	21.7%	100.0%		
Culture, Recreation Services		28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%		
Personal & Other Services		26.7%	40.0%	33.3%	100.0%		
Total	7.2%	35.1%	40.8%	16.9%	100.0%		

Table 132: Effective contribution of Modern Apprenticeships to industry by Industry

Appendix 1: Survey Population – Firm Size

This appendix identifies the firm size of the survey respondents in comparison with the survey population (regional association membership), and the Statistics New Zealand Business Demographic statistics for February 2002.

The tables below identify the numbers of enterprises in each category of firm size used by SNZ's Business Demographic statistics. In addition, it highlights the important distinctions between the survey population and the broader business community.

Firm Size	Respondents	Regional Association Membership	SNZ Business Demography (Feb 2002)
0-5	74	4,761	242,079
6-9	56	1,492	182,55
10-49	187	3,157	18,132
50-99	62	622	1,536
100+	100	703	1,337
Total	479	10,735	281,339

Total Enterprises - Numbers

Total Enterprises – Percentages

Firm Size	Respondents	Regional Association Membership	SNZ Business Demography (Feb 2002)
0-5	15.4	44.4	86.0
6-9	11.7	13.9	6.5
10-49	39.0	29.4	6.4
50-99	12.9	5.8	0.5
100+	20.9	6.5	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

Background Information

The following survey is being conducted to gather information about enterprise perceptions of skill development and training. It is being run by Business NZ and the Industry Training Federation, with funding support from the Department of Labour.

The questionnaire is part of a research project investigating the level and nature of enterprise-based training, as well as the drivers for, and the barriers against, training in the workplace. It has been developed through discussion and trialing with a range of enterprises across New Zealand, and is intended to assist in improving the level and quality of training in the workplace.

The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete and all individual enterprise information collected will be **CONFIDENTIAL.** The aggregate results of the survey will be publicly available, and all respondents will be provided with a summary of these results.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact Jeremy Baker on ph (04) 496 6555 or email <u>jbaker@businessnz.org.nz</u>

Thank you in advance for your participation.

SECTION A: ENTERPRISE PROFILE

1.	Position of person completing questionnaire Owner Chief Executive / General Manager Line Manager HR Manager Other (please specify)
2.	What is the nature of your enterprise? Sole Proprietorship / Self Employed Partnership Private Company Public Company Government Organisation Incorporated Society / Trust Other (please specify)
3.	How many years has your enterprise been operating? Less than 2 years 2-5 years 6-10 years 11-20 years 21-50 years 51+ years
4.	Please select the industry category that best describes your business. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing Mining Manufacturing Electricity, Gas & Water Supply Construction Wholesale Trade Retail Trade Accommodation, Hospitality, Restaurants Transport, Storage Communications Services Finance, Insurance Property, Business Services Government Admin (including Local Government) Education Health, Community Services Culture, Recreation Services Personal & Other Services Other (please specify)

5. In addition, do you consider your enterprise to be in the Tourism sector? Yes No

6.	What is the <u>main</u> lo	cation of	of your e	nterp	rise in	New Ze	ealand	?			
	Northland										
	Auckland										
	Waikato										
	Bay of Plenty										
	Gisborne / Hawkes I	Bay									
	Taranaki / Wanganu	i / Mana	watu								
	Wellington / Wairara	ра									
	Nelson / Marlboroug	h									
	Canterbury / West C	oast									
	Otago / Southland										
	OR										
	Nation-wide activity										
7.	How does your ent compare with its m	erprise' ain com	s curren petitors	t perfe ? (Ple	orman ase se	ce/prof	itabilit optior	y 1)			
	1 2 Very much worse	3	4 Same	5	6 Vervi	7 much be	otter				
		•	Came		vory						
8.	How has it compared competitors? (Plea	r <mark>ed ove</mark> se selec	r the pas t one opt	t 2 ye a tion)	ars wi	th its m	ain				
	1 2	3	4	5	6	7					
	Very much worse	;	Same	-	Very	much be	etter				
9.	How many people	does yo	ur enterj	prise o	curren	itly emp	loy?	·			
	remale						Total				
							rotal				
40			onth, om	nlovo	d in th		vina				

10. How many people are currently employed in the following categories? Full Time

Part Time (permanent, but less than 30 hours per week) Casual / Other



11. What is the spread of qualification levels of the employees in your enterprise?

No School Qualification School Qualification Trade Qualification Certificate / Diploma Qualification Degree Qualification

%
%
%
%
%
100 %

12. What is the spread of skill levels in the work performed by the employees in your enterprise?

Simple skill level (little experience required) Moderate skill level (some experience required, qualification desirable) Complex / technical skill level (a number of years experience and a qualification normally required)

Very high skill level (five years experience and a formal qualification essential)

%
%
%
%
100 %

The following questions ask you to rate your typical employee on a productivity scale from zero to 100, where 100 equals the maximum productivity rating that <u>your very best employee could attain</u> in your typical employee's job, and zero means absolutely no productivity.

13. What productivity score (relative to the productivity that your very best employee could attain in your typical employee's job) would you give your typical employee who has been in this job for two years? (*Please select one*)

	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Lowes	st proc	ductivit	у		F	lighest	produ	ctivity

14. What productivity score (relative to the productivity that your very best employee could attain in your typical employee's job) would you give your typical employee in their first two weeks in this job? (*Please select one*)

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Low	est pro	ductivit	y				ŀ	lighest	produ	ctivity

Please continue to Section B

SECTION B: SKILL DEVELOPMENT & TRAINING

This section ask questions about the skill development and training that your organisation offers. By skill development and training, we mean any activities specifically aimed at improving skill levels or understanding. It includes activities organized by your organisation, but also activities outside the firm that you have some involvement in, such as funding, providing time for staff to participate in, and so forth. By **formal** training, we mean any training or skill development where learning or skill level is assessed. All other forms of training are described in this questionnaire as **informal** training.

15. In your enterprise, who makes decisions about skill development and training? (select all that apply)

Owner	
Chief Executive / General Manager	
Line Manager	
HR Manager	
Other (please specify)	

16. In the past two (2) years, has your enterprise increased, maintained or decreased the percentage of employees it trains?

Increased
Maintained
Decreased
Not applicable (no training provided)

- **17.Do you <u>currently</u> provide or offer training for any of your employees?** Yes (please continue on to question 18) No (please go to question 33)
- 18.Is skill development and training a key part of your enterprise's business strategy?

Yes it is key Yes to some extent No its not key

19. How much did your enterprise spend on skill development and training in the last 12 months, as a percentage of your payroll?

(Please estimate the percentage, or provide actual figures)

Percentage of payroll spent on training

%

\$

OR

Amount Spent \$

Total Payroll ('000)



ļ	

20. What percentage of your employees have undergone training in the last 12 months?

Percentage of all employees

%

- 21.What was the average number of days training your enterprise provided per employee over the last 12 months? (Please estimate) Average number of days training per employee
- 22. Of those employees who underwent training in the last 12 months, what percentage were at the following qualifications levels (prior to undergoing training)?

No School Qualification School Qualification Trade Qualification Certificate / Diploma Qualification Degree Qualification

%
%
%
%
%
100 %

23. What form does the training you provide or offer your employees take? (please select all that apply)
Induction
One-off seminars
In house training programmes

In-house training programmes Conferences External courses & programmes Other (*please specify*)

- 24. What kinds of training do you provide or offer your employees? (please select all that apply)

Specific technical & trade skills Computing / Information & Communication Technology (ICT) Health & safety Literacy & numeracy Communication skills Team & negotiations skills Supervisory skills Management skills Other (*please specify*)



25.Which of the following provide your employees with development and training? (please select all that apply)	skill
In-house training staff	
Training consultants / contractors	
Polytechnic	
Private training provider	
University	
Industry training organisation	
Modern Apprenticeship co-ordinator	
Other (please specify)	

26. Which support materials (if any) would you prefer to use in supporting skill development & training? (please select all that apply)
Paper based resources
Computer / CD-Rom based resources
Videos
Online materials
Other (please specify)

27. Of the training you offer or provide, what is the mix of formal and informal training?

Percentage formal (i.e. assessed) Percentage informal (i.e. not assessed)

(By **formal** training, we mean any training or skill development where learning or skill level is assessed. All other forms of training are described in this questionnaire as **informal** training.)

28. Does your enterprise use national skill standards for skill development and training? (For example, unit standards)

Yes for all training Yes for some training No not at all

%

%

29. In what ways are national skill standards useful / not useful to your enterprise? (please select all that apply)

	Useful	Not Us	seful
Quality assurance / consistency			
Assessment			
Benchmarking			
Attainment of industry-relevant skills			
Other (please specify)			

30.What effect does skill development and training have on your enterprise, both positive & negative? (please select all that apply)

	Positive	Negative
Costs		
Profitability		
Enable business growth		
Quality of output		
Innovation		
Retention of staff		
Productivity / motivation of staff		
Health and safety		
Other (please specify)		

31. How does your enterprise assess the value of training?

Productivity increase Improved turnover Cost savings Cost / benefit analysis HR / Line manager assessment Staff feedback Achievement of formal qualifications / standards Customer feedback Reduced errors / reworking Reduced accidents Reduced absenteeism Other (please specify)

32. Overall, would you say that skills development and training contribute to improved performance for your enterprise?

Yes
Possibly
No
Don't know

33. Are you likely to provide or offer training for your employees in the next twelve months?

Yes (*Please continue on to question 34*) No (*Please go to question 35*)

34.	What would be the key considerations in your continuing or	r
	beginning to provide or offer training for your employees in the nex	t
	twelve months? (please select all that apply)	
	Skill shortage in your enterprise	
	Low staff turnover in your enterprise	
	High staff turnover in your enterprise	
	Skill shortage in your industry	
	Availability of suitable courses	
	Availability of suitable persons	
	Growth of enterprise	
	Desire to grow enterprise	
	Improved knowledge of industry training	
	Government subsidies for training	
	Changed regulations or incentives such as ISO	
	Customer requirements	
	Other (please specify)	

35. Why might your enterprise not provide or offer training to your employees in the next twelve months, or provide less than you **otherwise might?** (please select all that apply) Low staff turnover in your enterprise High staff turnover in your enterprise High availability of skilled labour in your industry Lack of information about training Too expensive "Red tape" involved in arranging training Lack of interest from employees Amount of government subsidy (financial support given) Decline in business / operating environment Uncertainty in business / operating environment Industrial relations issues Prefer to employ skilled staff Training is the employee's responsibility Availability of suitable training Too difficult to train employees Enterprise is too small Inability to assess the likely benefit They will be 'poached' within six months They will be 'poached' within one year or more Other (please specify)

36. Where do you get information about skills and training, and is it adequate? (please select all that apply)

	Adequate	Inadequate
Industry Training Organisation (ITO)	Ĺ l	
Training consultants		
Polytechnic		
University		
Secondary school		
Industry associations		
Business organisations		
Government Department/Agency		
Unions		
Employees		
Trade Journals		
Media		
Internet / Web (generally)		
Other (please specify)		

Never received or obtained any information

37. General comments about skills development and training:

If you have any general comments you would like to make about skills development and training issues, please feel free to do so:

Please continue to Section C

SECTION C: PERCEPTIONS OF INDUSTRY TRAINING & MODERN APPRENTICESHIPS

This section contains questions about your perceptions of industry training, which is formal industry-related training arranged by Industry Training Organisations (ITOs) and Modern Apprenticeship Co-ordinators. It includes both traineeships and Modern Apprenticeships.

38. To your knowledge, is there an Industry Training Organisation (or ITOs) that cover(s) your enterprise or industry?

Yes (please specify: ______ No Don't Know

39. To your knowledge, are there Modern Apprenticeships in your industry?

Yes No Don't Know

)

For each of the following questions, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

40. The benefits and costs of ITO-arranged industry training are well understood within your enterprise

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

41. The benefits and costs Modern Apprenticeship are well understood within your enterprise

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

42. ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my <u>enterprise</u>

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

43. Modern apprenticeships make an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my enterprise

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

<u>44.</u>ITO-arranged industry training makes an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my industry

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

<u>45.</u>Modern apprenticeships make an effective contribution to meeting the skill development and/or employment needs of my <u>industry</u>

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Further information about industry training and Modern Apprenticeships is available from the Industry Training Federation, (04) 499-8155, PO Box 24-194, Wellington. <u>http://ww.itf.org.nz/</u>

Appendix 3: Respondent Comments

A must for a successful business.

Always hard to justify costs, and always hard to convince line managers that they should put aside some "non productive time" for training

As a passenger service provider staff are required to hold the appropriate driving licenses and endorsements to be considered for employment

As almost all our staff hold a formal qualification, I'm thinking that the skills training that is meant in this survey could be different to what we consider to be skills training.

As owner I train the team myself, to our specific requirements rather than a general industry programme

Our organisation sees employees as the most important asset and their development is paramount. Whether they stay within our organisation or move to a new company as a result of our training we are satisfied to have been part of their personal growth

Comments below re ITOs are based on the fact that I have not had any contact from the relevant ITO. I have researched it on the web and am keen to find out more about how it can add value to my organisation.

Company is totally committed to training but expenditure in future will be at risk if we cannot measure the returns

Concerned with HSI - our ITO - that it now offers training in competition with private providers and has subsidies other providers do not have access to. They have set the standards and are now setting up a monopoly on providing e.g. Cookery modern apprenticeship.

Cost is a key concern for our business. Not just the price of the training but relief staff, transport, payment of staff to attend out of normal work time.

Difficult industry people come and go regularly

Difficult to assess amount of time spent on "hands-on" training. Every employee needs varying levels and gets what they need to complete the tasks allocated to them

Difficult to assess what training will definitely enhance employee output

Difficult to find AutoCAD trained people

Due to isolated location, large percentage of training costs are made up of travel and accommodation, due to small numbers requiring specific technical training which inhibits arranging in house training as a cost reducer.

Our ITO is a secret squirrel organisation

Training is essential

Essential for competence, safety, success, and compliance in our industry

Essential in our industry

Getting training in our area can be difficult and makes training more expensive. i.e. travel costs, replacement tutors

Given the specialised nature of some of our work, it is hard to access relevant training. Many staff are reluctant to commit the time required to achieve formal quals. Good government requirements no regulatory body for particular field in my business - therefore relies on the integrity of business owner to ensure staff trained adequately and health and safety issues addressed. Need to have a national training body. Govt has been useless in providing a strategy to go with their stated goal of increasing the number of young persons in apprenticeships. Our training is haphazard Hard to justify except for basic induction, on the job training and safety training High priority I learn it and then teach it as there are few useful courses on developing positive attitudes with teams. I place importance on attitudinal training as well as skills development and training. Important In our industry important to continue to enhance and develop staff, training in technical skills is vitally important and will be ongoing. We would do it anyway so it is a bonus for us and our staff that we can have it formally assessed and recognised. inability to recognise small business issues. Information for courses very hard to find - therefore tend to put the job off! Investment well spent, only problem is trying to stop enthusiastic few taking more than others! Isolation given our location It's DIY stuff for us It is necessary but not essential lack of short term, part-time training which is also affordable Literacy and Numeracy training is difficult to locate and introduce Minimal skills are required for most staff No training, no growth, poor staff moral and motivation not suitable to diverse factory / manufacturing operations Our business is basic and needs people with basic skills i.e.: add, subtract, multiply, read etc, when we find someone who can not do this we then see whether they want to and if they are worth keeping. Our company has a commitment to training and development of its employees. Thee are great concerns that we are having to cover the costs involved in training. Our ITO will slowly reduce its subsidies as the number of unit standard credits reduce. This is a major concern for us. Our enterprise has several different groups of skills required (i.e. nurses, cleaners, gardeners, cooks and management, with only a few in each group - staff training is therefore very generalised.

Pilots must meet NZ CAA Standards

Plenty available

Professional arts industry (particularly opera production) has no available training sources - we have had to actively create our own training opportunities

Skill shortage of machine operators and have been constantly trying to recruit since Sept 02

Skilled and motivated team is essential for our business maintenance and future survival.

Skills development and training is the to improve production, quality and health and safety however customers are not willing to pay the extra cost training occurs

Sometimes get the feeling it is a struggle to stay ahead of all the new legislation requirements for employee training etc coming through

Training for us is in a specialised field

Staff skills are what makes any business work-----a business can be no better than its staff

sufficient at this stage

tend to stick with known providers

The business is a key vehicle for enabling the personal development of single employee. The more development and training I undertake, the greater the opportunities that I discover for growing my business.

the employee needs to be informed and show a desire to train, needs to informed in some way other than by the employer

The Government needs to become more involved in the skills development at manufacturing level. We still need a skilled labour force, not everything is run by computer!

The only way we can increase our business. The work is available if we have the skilled staff to do it. We are not actively seeking additional work, as we lack the skills to increase sales significantly. Our business is growing as our skill levels increase,

The right skills and development training pitched at the right level does benefit both employees and the employer financially and non-financially.

The skills required in our business are so specialised that we have never found anybody who could provide them. The most closely related tertiary courses are inadequate and non-specific.

there is a general lack of training for basic skills and apprenticeships

There is difficulty motivating staff to accept the need to upskill and develop themselves to meet trends

There is no course that prepares for our industry to an acceptable level of training.

Time to find appropriate courses and time available to take them

To be a manufacturer in the global environment skills training is essential ingredient for survival.

To remain competitive we need to be innovative-so source a lot of training from international branches of our company

Too many industry courses at the lower skill levels, and not enough subsidised training available for more senior roles

Training & skill development training specific to early childhood education is best designed in house and complimented by other business training

Training is a major focus for all our employees.

Training is vital in our industry to stay abreast or ahead of changes to best practice and technology

Training still going through a learning curve and feel this could be at least 5 years before we see any real benefits

Training, refresher and upgrading is an ongoing commitment.

try to source available courses that can cater for our manufacturing environment where the literacy & numeracy skills have traditionally been very poor as well as being able to cater for more recent recruits who are more educated and skilled

Training is Tuff

Undervalued by this organisation in the past, seen by management and supervisors as a cost and down time not as an investment. ITO's huge discrepancies between different organisations - hard to compare.

Varies from institution to institution

Very difficult for a small business to afford the price and the time out of the office to take part in training courses

Very difficult to motivate existing mature staff to take on formal (written) training

very important

Very important, information needs to be readily available in some kind of directory either paper based or electronic

Vital

We are a small business and need training. It's hard to make the time.

We are a small co, it is difficult to see results of "training"; we do a lot of on the job & job specific training. We recognise the need for a highly skilled workforce. The aviation industry requires high levels of skill & therefore high levels of training

We are designing an in-house training programme. It is still in its early stages but we are trying to design an in-house training programme that deals with grass-roots issues in the marine painting industry as the industry offers nothing at a level 1-3.

We can not afford not to train or upskill our people. It is part of who we are and where we wish to go in our industry. Without highly skilled and trained personnel we will not be effective unless we are always seeking to be better and prepared to adopt a

we consider there is joint responsibility between employer/employee to skills development & training. We are concerned about the declining numbers of qualified Valuers.

We do our own training

We have independent consultants not employees where training is available

We need our employees to have a sound knowledge and good experience of furniture making before we take them on. We have taken on less experienced people in the past however this puts a huge strain on our business in terms of stress for the business partners.

we need to do more

We only hire experienced employees.

We see it as an investment in the organisation.

we train our staff to our standards using our Food Safety and HACCP principles ,staff must pass a food handling cert. and are monitored .

Within our organisation, providing a sound skills development plan is essential to the long term viability of our business. We operate a whanau, hapu and iwi organisation and it is in our best interests to invest in our staff over a long period of time.

Without financial incentive to employees skills development and training is incredibly difficult in our enterprise