

The Wider Role and Benefits of Investors in People

Mark Cox and Rod Spires
PACEC

**Research Report
No 360**

The Wider Role and Benefits of Investors in People

**Mark Cox and Rod Spires
PACEC**

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© Queen's Printer 2002. Published with the permission of DfES on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

ISBN 1 84185 756 4
June 2002

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	3
Aims and objectives of the research	3
The findings of the research	3
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1. Background	6
1.2. Aim and objectives of the research	6
1.3. Approach and methodology	8
1.4. Structure of the report and presentation of survey results	11
2. Involvement with Investors in People	13
2.1. Introduction	13
2.2. Objectives in pursuing the Standard	13
2.3. Barriers to best practice in HR management	15
2.4. Financial and other support received in pursuing the Standard	16
2.5. Awareness and understanding of Investors in People amongst Non-Investors	17
2.6. Barriers to involvement	19
3. Intermediate Effects of Investors in People	22
3.1. Introduction	22
3.2. Achievement of objectives in participating	22
3.3. Effects on Recognised Organisations' HR management and practices	26
3.4. Effects on Committed Organisations' HR management and practices	28
3.5. HR practices in Non-investor organisations	29
3.6. Additionality	30
3.7. Effects on internal resources	33
4. Business Performance Effects	35
4.1. Introduction	35
4.2. Comparison of business performance	35
4.3. Subjective views of the impact of Investors in People on performance	39
5. Wider Effects	42
5.1. Introduction	42
5.2. Findings from the Surveys of employees	42
5.3. Employers' perceptions of wider effects	51
6. Investors in People Compared to Other Standards and Accreditations	55
6.1. Introduction	55
6.2. Involvement with other standards and accreditations	55
6.3. Relative usefulness of Investors in People	56
6.4. Use of other good practices	57
7. Maintaining and pursuing the standard	59
7.1. Introduction	59
7.2. Overall assessment of Investors in People	59
7.3. Re-assessment amongst accredited organisations	62
7.4. Progress of Committed Organisations	63
8. The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People.....	65
8.1. Introduction	65

Contents

8.2.	Definition of cost-benefit analysis and of rates of return	65
8.3.	The approach adopted	66
8.4.	The results	67
8.5.	Lessons to be learned for future cost-benefit analysis and /or measurement of rates of return	68
9.	Conclusions	71
9.1.	General conclusions	71
9.2.	Conclusions on the specified research issues	72
Appendix A:Backgrounds and Characteristics of Organisations Surveyed		75
A1	Introduction	75
A2	Type, sector, age etc	75
A3	Growth objectives and culture	77
A4	Management of training and development	80
Appendix B:Disaggregated Results from the Survey of Recognised Organisations		83
Appendix C:Disaggregated Results from the Survey of Committed Organisations		127
Appendix D:.....Disaggregated Results from the Survey of Non-Users		164

The Wider Role and Benefits of Investors in People

Executive Summary

Background

For more than ten years, Investors in People has been the Government's flagship workforce development initiative, providing a framework for good practice and investment in the development of employees at all levels within an organisation. Achievement of the (Investors in People) Standard is open to all organisations, irrespective of size, sector, and ownership. The Standard serves as a benchmark against which organisations are assessed.

Since its inception, the number of organisations becoming recognised Investors in People has grown steadily to total over 26,000 by the end of 2001, with a further 20,000 or so formally committed to achieving the Standard. Within the medium-sized and large employer sector, around 35% of organisations are now recognised Investors in People. However, a smaller proportion of small organisations (less than 50 employees) have sought recognition.

Aims and objectives of the research

Previous research on the effects of Investors in People has shown that the Standard has a positive impact on training and development strategy within committed organisations. Although the recognition process and the internal, immediate effects of Investors in People have been widely researched, the wider role and benefits of the Standard (e.g. persistence and diffusion of effects within organisations, effects on the workforce and on organisations not directly involved) are less well understood. This research was, therefore, undertaken in the context of the need to understand the wider contribution of Investors in People more fully. Key underlying aims of the research were:

- (a) To derive information that 'positions' Investors in People both within organisations and in terms of its wider impact on participating and non-participating firms, on individuals and on the economy more generally; and
- (b) To serve as a precursor to a fuller cost-benefit analysis and / or to identification of returns and rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development.

The findings of the research

Analysis of the results of surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors (involving interviews with 1,012 employers) and of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations (involving feedback from 278 employees) led to the following broad conclusions:

Effect on organisations' operations and performance

This research confirmed the finding from previous research that Investors in People has a clear and positive impact on Recognised and Committed Organisations' approaches and dedication to training and development. It showed that participating organisations generally achieve their objectives in pursuing the Standard; and are largely satisfied with their experiences of the Standard and the benefits it provides. It also showed that the changes

organisations make in pursuit of the Standard and after they have reached it, and the other intermediate effects and performance benefits they experience as a result, are additional to a large extent.

Moreover, comparison with the findings of previous research indicates that the objectives in pursuing Investors have widened in recent years. For instance, only 10% of organisations involved with Investors surveyed in 1995¹ anticipated increased quality of goods and services as a result of their involvement, while the current (2001) survey found that nearly a half of organisations pursued this as a broad objective. Likewise, only 8% saw Investors improving their financial performance in 1995, compared with 25-30% that now see Investors as a means to increased profitability and/or business growth.

Wider effects

This research has also demonstrated that there are wider effects of organisations' participation:

- The majority of organisations continue to develop their HR plans, systems and processes post-recognition (and not simply in order to gain re-recognition). There is also evidence that the effects of the Standard persist and, if anything, accumulate rather than fade over time.
- The increase in adoption of formal training plans, structures etc. across all organisations, including non-Investors, since the mid 1990s seems at least in part to have been due to the growing awareness of Investors in People and the need for effective HR management, albeit that most non-Investors do not appear to fully understand what Investors actually involves.
- It is unclear to what extent employees benefit from organisations' participation in Investors in People in terms of the net additional amount of training received. However, employees of organisations involved in Investors in People indicate that there is a net positive impact on their attitudes towards education and training (both related and unrelated to their jobs) and their performance at work. Employers tend to share these views.
- A few organisations recognise that their involvement affects their customers, suppliers and competitors (but it has to be admitted that most do not know whether there have been any effects).

However, the results of the survey would indicate that progress from commitment to recognition and beyond is important for the achievement of wider benefits, internal and external, and while the majority of employers report satisfactory progress towards recognition, up to 45% of organisations had either abandoned or suspended their commitment or were making slower than expected progress towards recognition.

The market position of Investors in People

¹ *The Return On Investors*. Institute for Employment Studies. Report 314, 1996.

In terms of the overall 'position' of Investors in People, this research suggests that the Standard appeals to organisations that are relatively ambitious to grow, and that already attach relatively great importance to human resource management and development. These factors should be taken into account in the assessment of the wider role and benefits of the Standard and its marketing.

Recognised Organisations are more likely than other organisations to have achieved other externally accredited standards. However, Investors in People and other standards are generally seen as complementary; and there is no clear evidence that Investors in People leads to the pursuit of other standards, or vice versa. Recognised and Committed Organisations tend to use other good practices, but the practices they follow do not obviously mark them out as being at in the vanguard of the leading edge in HR management and development.

Towards a cost-benefit analysis of Investors in People

The experimental approach towards the measurement of rates of return associated with Investors in People adopted by this research proved to have disappointing outcomes, but it did cast light on what might be a feasible (albeit longer-term) method of identifying the cost-benefit balance.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1.1.1. This report presents the results of research into the wider role and benefits of the Investors in People standard. The research was undertaken by Public and Corporate Economic Consultants Ltd (PACEC), for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

1.1.2. For more than ten years, Investors in People has been the Government's flagship workforce development initiative, providing a framework for good practice and investment in the development of employees at all levels within an organisation. However, it is about more than simply training. Rather, it is intended to be a dynamic and flexible tool which focuses on the enrichment of human capital as a means of enabling organisations to pursue a range of business or organisational aims and objectives.

1.1.3. Achievement of the (Investors in People) Standard is open to all organisations, irrespective of size, sector, and ownership. The Standard serves as a benchmark against which organisations are assessed and is maintained and promoted by Investors in People UK, a non-departmental public body. The Standard is assessed and delivered by the Learning and Skills Councils (formerly TECs) in England and Wales, and LECs in Scotland.

1.1.4. Since its inception in the late 1980s, the number of organisations becoming recognised Investors in People has grown steadily to total over 26,000 by the end of 2001, with a further 20,000 or so formally committed to achieving the Standard. Within the medium-sized and large employer sector (i.e. those with more than 50 employees), more than 12,000 employers are now recognised Investors in People, equivalent to around 35% of the population of those employers. However, a much smaller proportion of small businesses (less than 50 employees) have sought recognition².

1.2. Aim and objectives of the research

1.2.1. Previous research on the effects of Investors in People has shown that the Standard has a positive impact on training and development strategies and practices within organisations involved with Investors in People³. Although the recognition

² In part due to the greater focus until recently on attracting larger organisations into Investors in People.

³ See "Review Of Research and Evaluation on Investors in People" DfES Research Brief, RBX 18-01, October 2001.

Introduction

process and the internal, immediate effects of Investors in People have been widely researched, the wider role and benefits of the Standard (e.g. the persistence of impacts, effects on the workforce and on organisations not directly involved) are less well understood. This research was, therefore, undertaken in the context of the need to understand the wider contribution of Investors in People more fully.

1.2.2. The research leading to the production of this report was, therefore, concerned with obtaining evidence that would support identification of potential strategies towards workforce development. Key underlying aims of the research were:

- (a) **To derive information that 'positions' Investors in People both within organisations and more broadly, within the economy and the 'learning society' more generally; and**
- (b) **To serve as a precursor to a fuller cost-benefit analysis and / or to identification of returns and rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development.**

1.2.3. Associated with these two aims, important research issues included the following:

- (a) The extent to which Investors in People has impacted on organisations involved with the Standard. In particular, for recognised organisations, has the process of achieving the Standard stimulated ongoing changes and development within the organisations, with regard to HR practices, structure and culture, especially post-recognition? In other words, have the benefits persisted and widened, or has Investors in People been a one-off, leading to little on-going development? Was Investors in People a necessary condition for these changes? Do these changes differ across sectors and types of organisation?
- (b) Are recognised organisations generally in the vanguard of 'leading-edge' HR practice? What do employers generally now expect from HR initiatives? And where and how large are the gaps between practices and expectations on the part of the recognised organisations and organisations more generally?
- (c) The nature and scale of 'spillover' impacts amongst employers, including Non-Investors. How far has Investors in People permeated the approach to HR to organisations more generally; in raising the profile of human capital; in realising wider economic benefits, besides those to the organisations involved with the Standard?
- (d) The nature and scale of additionality, and the indirect impacts Investors in People may have had on individuals employed within recognised organisations, in particular in the impact on individuals' take-up of, and attitudes to learning and training; on the returns to training for individuals that Investors in People may have instigated; and on their employability and social 'inclusivity'.

1.3. Approach and methodology

1.3.1. In order to address the aims and to explore the issues above, a large scale programme of survey based-research was

Introduction

undertaken. The programme had five main components:

1. A survey of organisations which have achieved the Standard (referred to hereafter as the **Survey of Recognised Organisations**).
2. A survey of organisations which have committed to achieving the Standard, but which have not yet done so (referred to hereafter as the **Survey of Committed Organisations**).
3. A survey of organisations which have had no involvement with the standard; i.e. have neither achieved the Standard nor are committed to it (referred to hereafter as the **Survey of Non-Investors**).
4. A survey of employees of organisations which have achieved the Standard (referred to hereafter as the **Survey of Employees of Recognised Organisations**).
5. A survey of employees of organisations which have committed to achieving the Standard (referred to hereafter as the **Survey of Employees of Committed Organisations**).

1.3.2. The surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors were all based mainly on telephone interviews using structured questionnaires. These telephone interviews were supplemented by a number of face to face interviews which followed the same broad structure as the telephone interviews, but which were designed to enable organisations' responses to particular questions to be examined in greater depth. In all three surveys the samples were stratified to ensure a significant number of interviews with organisations in different employment size bands⁴. In the cases of the surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations the samples were also stratified to ensure broadly equal numbers of interviews with organisations which had achieved, or committed to, the Standard before 1998 and from 1998 onwards⁵.

1.3.3. The questionnaires for the surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors were designed to ensure as far as possible that the three groups were asked the same questions. Thus, all three types of organisation were asked about:

- their background characteristics and culture (e.g. sector, age, growth objectives, importance attached to training and development and approach to HR management)
- their use of other (i.e. Non-Investors in People) standards and accreditations
- trends in their business / organisational performance.

Similarly, both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations were

⁴ Four employment size bands were used: i) fewer than 10 employees, i.e. micro-organisations; ii) 10-49 employees, i.e. small organisations; iii) 50-249 employees, i.e. medium-sized organisations; and iv) 250+ employees, i.e. large organisations.

⁵ The before 1998 / 1998 onwards cut-off was used to distinguish short and medium term effects of achieving the standard, or committing to it, from longer term effects. In the case of Investors, the cut-off date is also significant because organisations that achieved the standard before 1998 should have been through the process of re-recognition.

Introduction

asked about:

- their reasons for, or objectives in, pursuing the Standard
- the intermediate and performance effects, or effects to date, of achieving, or pursuing, the Standard
- the wider effects (e.g. on employees and other organisations), or effects to date, of achieving, or pursuing, the Standard
- usefulness of other standards and accreditations, compared to Investors in People
- barriers, if any, to re-recognition or achieving the Standard.

The Non-Investors were asked about their awareness and understanding of the Standard and the barriers to their involvement.

1.3.4. The surveys of Employees of Recognised Organisations and of Committed Organisations were based on self-fill questionnaires, which were distributed amongst their staff members by Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations which were interviewed face to face⁶. The questionnaires for both surveys were designed to cover the following issues:

- job satisfaction and perceptions of employer commitment to training and development
- job-related and unrelated education and training in the last year
- awareness of organisation's involvement in Investors in People and understanding of the Standard
- perceptions of the effects of Investors in People on the organisation and the individual.

1.3.5. Table 1.1 shows the target and achieved sample sizes for the five surveys undertaken.

⁶ It was not possible, therefore, to impose response quotas to ensure that the samples achieved were representative.

Table 1.1 Target and achieved survey samples

Survey:	Target Sample Size	Achieved Sample Size
Recognised Organisations	500 telephone interviews plus 100 face to face	493 telephone interviews plus 100 face to face
Committed Organisations	300 telephone interviews plus 60 face to face	297 telephone interviews plus 60 face to face
Non-Investors	200 telephone interviews plus 40 face to face	222 telephone interviews plus 40 face to face
Employees of Recognised Organisations	Approximately 300 self-fill returned by mail	193 returned
Employees of Committed Organisations	Approximately 300 self-fill returned by mail	85 returned

Source: All surveys, PACEC

1.3.6 Appendix A provides a backdrop to the analysis in the subsequent chapters of this report by examining and comparing the backgrounds and characteristics of the three groups of organisations surveyed. However, in summary, it shows that there were some significant differences in the characteristics of the organisation surveyed in terms of their size, business activity, growth objectives and approaches to human resource management. For example:

- Recognised Organisations were more likely to be public sector organisations and less likely to be businesses than Committed Organisations or Non-Investors.
- Recognised Organisations were, on average, larger than Committed Organisations, which, in turn, were larger than the Non-Investors.
- Two thirds of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations wanted to grow moderately, but Non-Investors were more likely to want to stay the same size.

There were also differences in the importance the three groups attached to, or approached, human resource management:

- Investors and Committed Organisations perceived human resources management and development as more important for organisational success than did Non-Investors.
- Non-Investors were considerably less likely than the Investors and Committed Organisations to have an HR department or an HR manager, or to have a specific training and development budget.
- Few Investors and Committed Organisations had dedicated Investors in People champions or Investors in People managers. A small minority of Committed Organisations had no one responsible for Investors in People.
- Most with an Investors in People champion or manager had considered what would happen if this person left the organisation, but a significant minority had not.

1.3.7 Some additional work was undertaken in order to address the particular aim that the research should serve as a precursor to a fuller cost-benefit analysis and / or to identification of returns and rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development. This involved a brief desk based review of previous relevant research, coupled with follow-up interviews with a sub-sample of Recognised Organisations mainly intended to explore the flow of costs and benefits over time. This additional work and its findings are described in more detail in Chapter 8.

1.4. Structure of the report and presentation of survey results

1.4.1. The report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 mainly analyses Recognised Organisations' and Committed Organisations' objectives in pursuing the Standard; and Non-Investors' awareness and understanding of Investors in People.
- Chapter 3 considers whether organisations satisfy their objectives in pursuing the Standard; and looks at the intermediate effects (e.g. changes in HR management and practices) the Standard brings about.
- Chapter 4 assesses the business performance effects of committing to and achieving the Standard.
- Chapter 5 examines the wider "external" effects of Investors in People, including an assessment of how it impacts on employees of organisations involved.
- Chapter 6 uses the survey data to compare Investors in People with other externally accredited standards and other good practices that Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations have adopted.
- Chapter 7 reports organisations' views on the overall usefulness of Investors in People; and addresses the issues of what, if anything, prevents Committed Organisations achieving the Standard and what, if anything, prevents Recognised Organisations seeking re-recognition.
- Chapter 8 sets out the results of the additional work designed to serve as a precursor to a fuller cost-benefit analysis and / or to identification of returns and rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development.
- Lastly, Chapter 9 draws conclusions from the research and highlights the implications for policy development.

1.4.2. Reflecting the fact that the Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors were asked the same survey questions as far as possible, the data tabulations in the main body of the report directly compare the responses of the three groups. However, Appendix B also shows how survey responses varied within the groups, i.e. by breaking down the results according to size of organisation, broad sector and type of organisation (for all three groups) and according to date of commitment or achieving the Standard (for Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations). The text in the

Introduction

main body of the report also notes where there were large and statistically significant differences in the survey results according to size of organisation. The data from the two surveys of employees are treated in the same way, i.e. in the main part of the report employees of Recognised Organisations are compared with employees of Committed Organisations and differences within the two groups are examined in Appendix B.

2. Involvement with Investors in People

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. Mainly as a prelude to the analysis in the subsequent chapters of the various outputs, outcomes and effects of Investors in People, this chapter examines:

- Recognised Organisations' and Committed Organisations' objectives in pursuing the Standard;
- Barriers to the implementation of best practices in human resource management outside the Investors in People framework; and
- Whether and to what extent Recognised Organisations received, and Committed Organisations have received, external financial and other support to help them to achieve the Standard.

2.1.2 Awareness and understanding of the Standard amongst Non-Investors is also examined as a means of assessing the barriers to its more widespread use. And comparison with previous research findings⁷ allows us to assess the extent to which the objectives and appreciation/awareness of the benefits and barriers of participation have widened in recent years.

2.2. Objectives in pursuing the Standard

2.2.1 The Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations had a similar set of broad objectives in pursuing the Standard. As Table 2.1 shows, both groups implicitly ranked 'Efficiency gains', 'Increased quality products and services' and 'Staff retention and easier recruitment' as their top three objectives, some way ahead of the business performance indicators listed. The Committed Organisations were statistically significantly more likely than the Recognised Organisations to specify business performance objectives, but the differences were not great.

⁷ Principally "The Return on Investors". Institute for Employment Studies (IES), Report 314. 1996.

Involvement with Investors in People

Table 2.1 Broad objectives in pursuing the Standard, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Efficiency gains	47	54
Increase in quality of products / services	46	45
Staff retention and easier recruitment	41	44
Increase in profitability	23	31
Business growth	23	29
Change of corporate culture	13	11
Other	35	24
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	462	334

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

2.2.2 The 'Other' broad objectives alluded to in Table 2.1 were most frequently specified by both the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations as (in descending order): a desire for better or more formal HR and training practices, a desire for internal and external recognition of existing good practice, and improved communications and relations with staff.

2.2.3 The disaggregated survey results (see Appendix B) show that organisations that had achieved recognition in 1998 or later were significantly more likely than those that were recognised pre-1998 to specify business growth and efficiency gains as a broad objective in pursuing the Standard. This might be an indication that Investors in People is increasingly associated with enhanced overall performance. However, there were no marked size-related differences in the objectives specified⁸.

2.2.4 The organisations interviewed face to face were also invited, where they had specified more than one broad objective, to identify their main objective in pursuing the Standard. Amongst both the Recognised Organisations and the Committed Organisations the desire for 'Increased quality of products and services' was at the forefront. However, the Recognised Organisations mentioned 'Efficiency gains' and 'Staff retention and easier recruitment' as primary objectives more frequently than Committed Organisations, whereas the latter mentioned 'Business growth' and 'Change of corporate culture' more frequently than the former.

2.2.5 Comparison with the findings of previous research indicates that the objectives in pursuing Investors are widening. For instance, only 10% of organisations involved with Investors at the time of IES 1995 survey anticipated increased quality of goods and services as a result of their involvement. The 2001 survey found that nearly a half of organisations pursued this as a broad objective. Likewise, only 8% saw Investors improving their

⁸ As was indicated in Chapter 1, differences in the survey results according to size of organisation are only referred to in the main body of the report where the differences were large and statistically significant.

Involvement with Investors in People

financial performance in 1995, compared with 25-30% that now see Investors as a means to increased profitability and/or business growth. Conversely, relatively few mentioned improved training practices as a broad objective in 2001 whereas in 1995 "improved training system" was regarded as the most important anticipated benefit (mentioned by a third of those involved).

2.2.6 These findings indicate that Investors has become embedded within organisations' wider product and financial strategies, beyond the HR function.

2.3. Barriers to best practice in HR management

2.3.1. When they were asked what had prevented them from implementing best practices in human resources management before they became a Recognised or Committed Organisation, small majorities of both groups indicated that there were no particular barriers and that they already pursued best practice (Table 2.2). Indeed, the most frequently mentioned barrier (lack of time) was mentioned by only 6% of Recognised Organisations and 10% of Committed Organisations. However, the face to face interviews (which provided better opportunities for probing and considered responses) found that the most significant barriers were conservatism / traditionalism / reluctance to change (amongst the Recognised Organisations) and a lack of time or a lack of understanding / knowledge of HR management (amongst the Committed Organisations).

Table 2.2 Barriers to implementation of best HR practices before achieving or committing to the Standard, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Lack of time	6	10
Conservatism / traditionalism / reluctance to change	4	2
Lack of understanding / knowledge of HR mgt.	4	5
Cost / finance generally	3	5
Lack of awareness of Investors in People	3	5
Lack of skill	2	2
Lack of external advice and support	2	1
Risks involved	1	0
Unaware of financial support from local TEC / BL	1	0
Other	7	4
None - already pursued best practice	59	51
None- other	5	4
Don't know	15	20
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	563	349

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

2.4. Financial and other support received in pursuing the Standard

2.4.1. The data in Table 2.2 might lead to doubts about whether Investors in People makes much happen that would not happen anyway. However, Tables 2.3 and 2.4 imply that a sizeable minority of organisations would not have pursued the Standard without support. Table 2.3 shows that a majority of both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations received in-kind support from public sources to help them pursue the Standard, and that a majority of Recognised Organisations received public financial support⁹.

Table 2.3 Receipt of financial and in-kind support from public sources, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Received financial support?		
Yes	56	36
No	29	42
Don't know	15	22
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>350</i>
Received in-kind support?		
Yes	62	61
No	21	22
Don't know	17	17
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>579</i>	<i>348</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

2.4.2 For its part, Table 2.4 suggests that, amongst those that received it, organisations were roughly four times as likely to indicate that they would definitely or probably have pursued the Standard without support than to indicate that they would definitely or probably have not pursued it. However, it should be noted that, especially amongst the Recognised Organisations, this is an ex-post response, i.e. after benefits had been secured. In other words, it might be questioned whether the provision of support is as unimportant as the data in Table 2.4 suggest.

2.4.3 The data tabulations in Appendix B also suggest that size of organisation has a strong bearing on whether organisations would have pursued that Standard without support. For example, amongst the Recognised Organisations that received financial support, 30% of micro-organisations (fewer than 10 employees) and 51% of small organisations (10-49 employees), compared to 60% of medium sized organisations (50-249 employees) and 74% of large organisations (250+

⁹ The terms 'financial support' and 'in-kind support' were not defined in the survey questionnaires. However, 'financial support' clearly implies a subsidy or a grant. 'In-kind support' implies the provision of goods and services without charge.

Involvement with Investors in People

employees), indicated that they would definitely or probably have pursued the Standard anyway. The findings for the Recognised Organisations in relation to in-kind support showed a similarly strong size correlation. However, the responses of the Committed Organisations did not appear to be influenced in the same way.

Table 2.4 Effect of support on the pursuit of the Standard, (% organisations which received support)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Would have pursued Standard without financial support?		
Definitely	20	27
Probably	36	35
Possibly	29	26
Probably not	13	12
Definitely not	2	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	315	113
Would have pursued Standard without in-kind support?		
Definitely	20	20
Probably	41	41
Possibly	24	26
Probably not	12	11
Definitely not	3	2
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	339	197

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

2.5. Awareness and understanding of Investors in People amongst Non-Investors

2.5.1. In terms of increasing the penetration of the Standard amongst non-Investors, Table 2.5 includes an important finding from the current research, in that it highlights that there are considerable obstacles to the increased uptake of the Standard, and therefore of widening its role. In particular, it shows not only that around 40% of the Non-Investors interviewed were previously unaware of Investors in People, but also that only one third of those aware of Investors in People claimed to understand what it is about¹⁰. In other words, the table implies that only 20% of Non-Investors are aware of the Standard and understand it. The other 80% have either not heard of Investors in People or do not understand it well, or at all. Thus, while Investors seems to have

¹⁰ The 1998 Skill Needs in Britain report found that 76% of organisations surveyed were aware of the Standard. However, this included only organisations with more than 25 employees, whereas half of the non-Investor organisations surveyed for the current research had fewer than this number.

Involvement with Investors in People

widened its role in terms of raising its profile amongst employers generally (levels of awareness grew steadily through the 1990s according to successive surveys¹¹), levels of understanding of what it aims to achieve are still relatively low.

Table 2.5 Non-Investors' awareness and understanding of Investors in People, %

Aware of Investors in People before the interview	58
Not aware of Investors in People before the interview	42
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>252</i>
If aware of Investors in People:	
Understand what Investors in People is about	34
Vaguely / partly understand what Investors in People is about	52
Don't understand what Investors in People is about	13
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>143</i>

Source: Surveys of Non-Investors, PACEC

2.5.2. In terms of positioning and promoting Investors in People and its potentially wider role within organisations, Table 2.6 is more encouraging than Table 2.5, because it shows that the Non-Investors aware of Investors in People believe that there is a relatively wide range of potential benefits associated with reaching the Standard. The benefits nominated do not feature 'hard' business performance benefits prominently, but it is interesting to note that potential wider benefits (e.g. improved external perception and customer satisfaction) rank highly, suggesting that although many Non-Investors are unaware of Investors and what it is about, amongst those that are aware there is an appreciation of the potential wider benefits of Investors, commensurate with the increase in wider broad aims amongst recognised and committed organisations (see Table 2.1).

¹¹ See Skill Needs In Britain

Involvement with Investors in People

Table 2.6 Non-Investors' perceptions of the potential benefits from achieving the Standard, (% of Non-Investors aware)

More effective training and development	31
Improved external perception of the organisation	23
Improved customer satisfaction	22
Improved recruitment and retention of staff	21
Improved quality of products / services	19
More formal HR / personnel systems	15
Improved business growth or performance	14
More business development opportunities	5
Improved productivity	5
Other	9
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>

Source: Surveys of Non-Investors, PACEC

2.6. Barriers to involvement

2.6.1. As Table 2.7 shows, roughly one in six Non-Investors aware of Investors in People said that they had formally considered pursuing the Standard¹², but nearly twice as many did not know whether they had considered the issue or not. Table 2.8 reveals that, amongst the majority who said that they had not formally considered pursuing Investors in People, the chief reason was the belief that the company / organisation was too small and / or lacked the resources. Of greater concern perhaps, a substantial minority indicated that they believed there would be no benefits. Thus although Non-Investors seem to be aware of the potentially wide range of benefits (see 2.5.2), many are not convinced enough to translate this into behaviour.

Table 2.7 Non-Investors who have formally considered pursuing the Standard, % (Non-Investors aware of Investors in People)

Yes, considered pursuing Investors in People	16
No, have not considered pursuing Investors in People	55
Don't know	29
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>148</i>

Source: Surveys of Non-Investors, PACEC

Table 2.8 Reasons for not considering Investors in People, % (Non-

¹² The 1998 Skills Needs in Britain report showed the same proportion.

Involvement with Investors in People

Investors aware)

Company / organisation too small / not enough resources	49
Don't think it can be beneficial to us	24
No time / too time consuming	15
Not relevant to industry	15
Already hold another HR accreditation	8
Financial or operational difficulties	6
Decision carried out elsewhere	4
Structural changes being undertaken in the organisation	4
Organisations brought up or merged	1
Other	20
Don't know	2
No particular reason	2
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	84

Source: Surveys of Non-Investors, PACEC

2.6.2 It was also found from the Non-Investors surveyed that:

- Amongst the relatively few organisations that had formally considered pursuing Investors in People, about one-third had taken no steps towards commitment, although a similar proportion had met a TEC advisor or consultant to discuss the possibility, and the same proportion again had obtained relevant literature.
- Roughly one in ten of the Non-Investors that had formally considered pursuing the Standard said that they had previously made a commitment.
- The factors which militated most strongly against commitment amongst those that had formally considered the possibility were a lack of time and concerns about the cost. Uncertainty or scepticism about benefits to be derived were also relatively widespread; and some also mentioned lack of external advice and lack of sufficient understanding or knowledge of human resource management.
- A quarter of the organisations that had formally considered pursuing the Standard in the past said that it was very or quite likely that they would commit to Investors in People in the future, but the majority said that it was not very likely or not at all likely.

Summary of key findings

- Amongst both Recognised and Committed Organisations, the main objectives in pursuing the Standard were 'Efficiency gains', 'Increased quality products and services' and 'Staff retention and easier recruitment' (Table 2.1). Comparison with the findings of previous research indicates that the objectives in pursuing Investors are widening i.e Investors in People has assumed a wider role within organisations in recent years.
- Many Recognised and Committed Organisations indicated that they faced no particular barriers to the implementation of HR best practices before their involvement in Investors in People; and that they already pursued best practice. The most frequently mentioned barrier (lack of time) was mentioned by only 6% of Recognised Organisations and 10% of Committed Organisations (Table 2.2).
- A majority of both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations received financial or in-kind support from public sources to help them pursue the Standard. Many organisations suggested that they would have pursued the Standard anyway without this support, but support is important to smaller organisations (Tables 2.3 and 2.4, Paragraph 2.4.3).
- Nearly half of the Non-Investors surveyed were previously unaware of Investors in People, and only one fifth claimed to understand what it is about (Table 2.5).
- Although Non-Investors who are aware of Investors in People believe that there is a wide range of benefits associated with reaching the Standard, few have formally considered committing (Tables 2.6 and 2.7).
- The principal reason for not committing was the belief that the company / organisation was too small and / or lacked the resources. A minority indicated believed there would be no benefits (Table 2.8).
- Amongst those who had considered, but decided against, committing to the Standard, the main concerns were lack of time and concerns about the cost. Uncertainty or scepticism about benefits to be derived were also relatively widespread (Paragraph 2.6.1).

3. Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

3.1. Introduction

3.1.1. Chapter 2 showed what objectives Recognised and Committed Organisations had in pursuing the Investors in People standard. It was shown that these were relatively wide compared to the objectives of organisations of a few years ago. This chapter starts by reporting the extent to which these objectives were, or have been, satisfied (and by implication, whether the wider objectives of recent years have been realised). It then examines whether, and in what ways, Recognised and Committed Organisations' human resource plans, systems, practices and processes have been affected. The durability and additionality of effects, regarded as 'wider benefits' as part of this research, are then considered. Lastly, it explores the impacts of the Standard on organisations' cash expenditure on, and other resource inputs to, HR development.

3.2. Achievement of objectives in participating

3.2.1. Table 3.1 reveals an interesting contrast between Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations in terms of the extent to which they have achieved their objectives in pursuing the Investors in People Standard. The majority amongst both groups said that they had achieved their objectives to some extent. However, whereas more than five times as many Recognised Organisations said that they had achieved their objectives to a great extent as said they had not achieved their objectives at all, more of the Committed Organisations said they had not achieved their objectives at all (to date) than said they had achieved them to a great extent.

3.2.2 It is likely that the situation will change amongst the Committed Organisations surveyed as they get nearer to reaching the Standard. Nonetheless, it is possible that a significant proportion will never achieve their objectives fully, especially if (for the sorts of reasons to be examined in Chapter 7) they cease to make progress, or make only slow progress, towards the Standard. These findings suggest either that the wider objectives of the sort sought by organisations take longer to accrue and that they are more difficult to attain without pursuing full accreditation

Table 3.1 Extent to which organisations have (to date) achieved their broad objectives in pursuing the Standard, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
To a great extent	37	12
To some extent	56	61
Not at all	7	25
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>507</i>	<i>328</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.2.3 Table 3.2 relates the extent to which the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations combined have achieved their broad objectives in pursuing the Standard to the particular objectives they specified (see Table 2.1)¹³. Almost perversely, it shows that the objective most frequently specified (i.e. Efficiency gains) was the least likely to be achieved to a great extent, whereas the objective least frequently mentioned (i.e. Change in corporate culture) was the most likely to be achieved to a great extent. However, it is possibly the case that 'harder' objectives are rather more difficult to achieve than 'softer' objectives, such as cultural change.

3.2.4 It may well also be that as Investors in People has become embedded within organisations that the wider impacts have become apparent and that these have in turn come to be anticipated and actively sought on the part of new participants. Certainly, comparison of the anticipated benefits that have been realised between the current and 1995 surveys reveals a greater realisation of wider benefits in the current survey. For example, over 90% of those anticipating increased profitability thought that they had achieved this at least to some extent - this compares with the findings of the 1995 survey in which just 43% of those anticipating improved financial performance said this had been realised.

Table 3.2 Extent to which organisations have achieved the

¹³ The table shows combined results for Recognised and Committed Organisations for the sake of brevity. However, as might be imagined on the basis of the findings in Table 3.1, for any particular objective cited, Recognised Organisations were more likely than Committed Organisations to say that they had achieved the objective to a great extent.

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

objectives they stated, (% of Recognised and Committed Organisations combined - see footnote)

Objective:	Proportion citing objective	of which, proportion saying objective has been satisfied ...		
		... to a great extent	... to some extent	... not at all
Efficiency gains	50	17	74	9
Increase in quality of products / services	46	25	67	7
Staff retention and easier recruitment	42	28	62	10
Business growth	26	26	68	6
Increase in profitability	26	18	74	7
Change in corporate culture	12	42	52	6
All objectives	100	27	58	14
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	835			

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.2.5 Nearly two-thirds of the Recognised Organisations surveyed (63%) said that they had evaluated the impact that Investors in People has had on the way in which they operated and performed. However, even during the course of face-to-face interviews relatively few of the Recognised Organisations (i.e. fewer than four in ten) could describe what the impacts had been. Nonetheless, some of the impacts on operations and performance reported were:

"Staff turnover down / Improved staff satisfaction"

"Help with business growth / stability"

"Better internal and external communications"

"Improvement in customer satisfaction"

"More business development opportunities"

"Increased efficiency"

"Improved image"

"More structured approach to training and development"

"Improved products / services".

3.2.6 All of the Recognised and Committed Organisations were then invited to indicate the extent to which they had felt they had achieved each of a specified set of possible effects of reaching or working towards the Standard. Their responses are summarised in Table 3.3 and, not unsurprisingly, it shows that the Recognised Organisations were more likely than the Committed Organisations to acknowledge a great or fair effect in every case.

Table 3.3 Extent to which Investors in People has affected

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

organisations to date, % saying they have been affected in the ways shown to a great or fair extent

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
More effective training and development	62	50
Improved external perception of the organisation	58	40
Improved recruitment and retention of staff	56	30
Improved quality of products and services	53	34
More formal HR / personnel systems	50	48
Improved customer satisfaction	50	24
Improved productivity	47	26
Improved business growth and performance	45	26
Improved business development opportunities	43	25
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>505</i>	<i>215</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.2.7 Interestingly, there appears to be a strong relationship between organisations' broad objectives in pursuing the Standard (see Table 2.1) and the extent to which they had experienced the effects shown in Table 3.3. Thus, the proportion of Recognised Organisations saying that the effects shown in Table 3.3 had happened to a great or fair extent was always larger amongst organisations that specified 'change in corporate culture' as a broad objective in pursuing the Standard than amongst organisations specifying any other broad objective. Precisely the opposite was true of organisations that had specified 'efficiency gains' as a broad objective.

3.2.8 Unfortunately, however, this finding does not have a clear interpretation, although it will be recalled from Table 3.2 that 'change in corporate culture' and 'efficiency gains' were at opposite ends of the scale in terms of the extent to which they had been satisfied as broad objectives. This might mean that satisfaction of broad objectives was equated with the experience of a wide range of intermediate effects, whereas failure to satisfy broad objectives was equated with the absence of effects. Or it may be that some broad objectives may not be associated with such intermediate effects. One would also have to take into account the 'starting point' of organisations pursuing particular objectives. Clearly, the relationship between cause and effect here is difficult to disentangle.

3.2.9 Another interesting feature of Table 3.3 is that it strongly suggests that some effects are felt earlier than others along the road to achieving the Standard. Amongst the Recognised Organisations the proportion of respondents saying that they had been affected to a great or fair extent did not vary substantially according to type of effect. However, there was more clear variation according to type of effect amongst the Committed Organisations (who committed to the Standard at

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

different dates and who are likely to have made differing progress). Thus, the Table suggests that more formal HR and personnel systems and more effective training and development are relatively early stage effects, whereas wider benefits such as improved business performance and improved client satisfaction come later.

3.3. Effects on Recognised Organisations' HR management and practices

3.3.1. Table 3.4 provides an especially clear view of the added value associated with Investors in People. The second column of numbers, for example, shows that just over half of the Recognised Organisations surveyed had a written HR or personnel plan in place before commitment, but then revised it. The third column shows that nearly a quarter of Recognised Organisations did not previously have a written HR or personnel plan of any kind before commitment, but then introduced one.

3.3.2 The final column shows that over half of the Recognised Organisations have further developed their HR or personnel plans since achieving the Standard, indicating that recognition has stimulated ongoing change within organisations, regarded as a 'wider benefit' of Investors in People for purposes of the current research. Overall, the table indicates that Investors in People has a profound across-the-board impact on organisations' HR plans, systems and processes. Appendix B also shows that micro- and small organisations (i.e. with fewer than 50 employees) were more likely than medium and large organisations to say that they did not have HR plans, systems and processes in place before their involvement with Investors in People, but that they introduced them as a result.

Table 3.4 Effect of Investors in People on HR plans, systems and processes, % (Recognised Organisations only, N=564)

	In place and not revised	Before commitment		Not applicable	Further developed since recognition
		In place but revised	Not in place but introduced		
Written HR/personnel plan	9	57	24	6	53
Formal training plan	12	59	26	2	59
System for identifying training needs	13	64	21	1	72
System for evaluating training	10	60	27	1	84
Communicating business plan to employees	11	57	32	4	71
Employee communication process or appraisal system	14	67	16	1	81
Benchmarking with other organisations	7	45	16	18	36
Other	2	16	4	1	6

Source: Survey of Recognised Organisations, PACEC

3.3.3 As might be expected in light of the findings in Table 3.4, it was also found that the barriers to further development of organisations' HR plans, systems and processes post-recognition do not seem to be especially strong or widespread. Indeed, the majority of interviewees said that there were no barriers. However, 27% mentioned lack of time as a barrier and 17% mentioned costs and finances more generally.

3.3.4 As might also have been predicted, the large majority of Recognised Organisations indicated that the amount of training and development they undertook or provided had increased while they were working towards the Standard (Table 3.5), and virtually none indicated that it had decreased. The table also indicates that changes in the amount varied little according to type and level of training and development.

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

Table 3.5 Effects of working towards the Standard on amounts of training and development, % (Recognised Organisations only, N=554)

<i>Amount of:</i>	Increased substantially	Increased slightly	No change	Decreased slightly	Decreased substantially
Training & development overall	28	45	27	1	0
Management training & development	25	43	30	1	0
Non-mgt. training & development	26	45	28	1	1
On-the-job training & development	27	44	28	0	0
Off-the-job training & development	25	44	30	1	0

Source: Survey of Recognised Organisations, PACEC

3.3.5 Table 3.6 also represents a key finding with respect to the wider role and benefits of Investors in People, in that it indicates that the effects and impacts on Recognised Organisations, as outlined earlier in this chapter, have often accumulated and have rarely faded.

Table 3.6 Changes in effects and impacts since recognition, % of Recognised Organisations acknowledging effects and impacts

Effects and impacts have accumulated	39
Effects and impacts have stayed the same	46
Effects and impacts have faded	5
Don't know / not sure	10
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>556</i>

Source: Survey of Recognised Organisations, PACEC

3.4. Effects on Committed Organisations' HR management and practices

3.4.1. Table 3.7 shows the effect of Investors in People on Committed Organisations' HR plans, systems and processes to date. The table is directly comparable to Table 3.4, and the comparison shows that there are few significant differences between the Committed Organisations and Recognised Organisations in terms of the frequency with which they reported effects. This tends to confirm the earlier conclusion (see paragraph 3.2.6) that impacts on organisations' systems and activities associated with Investors in People tend to be felt relatively soon after commitment. In contrast with the findings for Recognised Organisations, the effects of involvement in Investors in People on Committed Organisations' HR plans, systems and processes did not appear to be clearly size-related.

Table 3.7 Effect of Investors in People on HR plans, systems and processes, % (Committed Organisations only, N=276)

	In place and not revised	In place but revised	Not in place but introduced	Not in place Not applicable
Written HR/personnel plan	10	52	30	7
Formal training plan	11	56	26	5
System for identifying training needs	11	64	21	4
System for evaluating training	10	59	26	5
Communicating business plan to employees	10	56	28	5
Employee communication process or appraisal system	12	71	14	4
Benchmarking with other organisations	7	40	11	33
Other	1	3	1	2

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from the equivalent for Recognised Organisations

Source: Survey of Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.5. HR practices in Non-investor organisations

3.5.1. Table 3.8, showing the extent to which Non-Investors have HR plans, systems and processes, and whether they review them, should be compared with the similar tables for Recognised Organisations (Table 3.4) and Committed Organisations (Table 3.7). The comparison reveals that Non-Investors are much less likely than Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations to say that they have particular plans, systems and processes in place. For example, less than half of the Non-Investors have written HR / personnel plans, but more than 90% of both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations have them. Similarly, fewer than half of the Non-Investors, but virtually all of the Recognised and Committed Organisations, have systems for evaluating training. Overall, it is clear that Non-Investors are rather less formal than Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations in their management of human resources (if they manage them at all).

3.5.2 A key question relates to the extent to which the adoption and use of HR plans etc. have come about as a result of increasing awareness of HR practices and/or competition with Investors in People organisations. Comparison with previous surveys on Investors and non-Investors specifically is difficult and the only evidence is from successive surveys of employers generally¹⁴. These show large increases in the use of written training plans and training budgets amongst employers generally between 1995 and 2001 (for example, amongst employers with

¹⁴ See for example, 'Skill Needs In Britain 1995'. Public Attitude Surveys 1995 and 'Learning and Training At Work 2000'. IFF Research Ltd. 2001.

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

more than 25 employees¹⁵, use of training plans has increased from 47% in 1995 to 73% in 2000). It seems more than likely that this reflects, at least in part, a wider awareness and adoption of the types of plans and strategies advocated under Investors in People as a result of the diffusion of Investors in People itself, even though only 20% of non-Investors purport to be aware of and fully understand what Investors in People is about (see Table 2.5).

Table 3.8 HR plans, systems and processes amongst Non-Investor organisations, %

	In place & reviewed regularly	In place, not reviewed	Not in place	Don't know
Written HR/personnel plan	13	12	56	19
Formal training plan	21	17	46	17
System for identifying training needs	23	19	43	15
System for evaluating training	21	17	46	13
Communicating business plan to employees	20	9	50	21
Employee communication process or appraisal system	22	16	46	16
Benchmarking with other organisations	10	8	58	24
Other	0	11	89	0

Source: Survey of Non-Investors, PACEC

3.6. Additionality

3.6.1. It was implied earlier in this chapter that committing to and achieving the Investors in People Standard causes changes in, and effects on, organisations' practices and processes (see, for example paragraph 3.3.1 and table 3.4, and paragraph 3.3.4 and table 3.5). The issue of causation, or additionality, was explicitly addressed by asking the Recognised and Committed Organisations surveyed whether they would have taken alternative steps to achieve the same effects and changes they had referred to, if they had not committed to or achieved the Investors in People Standard.

3.6.2. Table 3.9 summarises the responses of the two groups to this question. It shows that Committed Organisations were less likely than the Recognised Organisations to say 'Probably' or 'Possibly', and rather more likely to say 'Probably not'. Nevertheless, on a balance of probabilities basis, it indicates that, even amongst the Recognised Organisations, around a half of those surveyed would not have taken alternative actions to achieve the same effects and changes that they reported.

¹⁵ Skill Needs In Britain surveys excluded employers with fewer than 25 employees. Learning and Training at Work has since 1999 covered all sizes of employers.

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

Attaching weights of 0.0 to 'Definitely' responses, 0.25 to 'Probably', 0.5 to 'Possibly', 0.75 to 'Probably not' and 1.0 to 'Definitely not' would mean that additionality amongst Recognised Organisations was 45%, compared to 52% amongst Committed Organisations.

3.6.3. Using the same weighting system, it was found that estimated additionality was size-related amongst Recognised Organisations, but not amongst Committed Organisations. Thus, it was estimated that additionality decreased from 58% for recognised micro-organisations and 50% for recognised small organisations, to 43% for both medium and large recognised organisations. However, estimated additionality varied only from 57% for committed micro-organisations to 52% for committed large organisations.

Table 3.9 Likelihood of alternative steps to achieve the same effects without Investors in People, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Definitely	9	10
Probably	23	13
Possibly	45	37
Probably not	17	34
Definitely not	4	5
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>543</i>	<i>337</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.6.4. It seems intuitively reasonable to assume that those additional changes and effects that organisations would have sought in the absence of Investors would be those relating to measures within their capacity to control such as on training and HR systems and strategies (see Table 3.3). It may therefore be that the real 'additionality' of Investors in People lies more with the wider impacts and benefits listed.

3.6.5 There was also evidence of some additionality even amongst the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations which said that they would Definitely or Probably have taken alternative steps, in the absence of Investors in People, to obtain the same changes and effects they reported. Table 3.10 shows that many of the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations who would have Definitely or Probably acted anyway would have done so later. It also shows that the majority of those who would have Definitely or Probably acted anyway would have done so on a smaller scale. In other words, even where Investors in People does not make organisations take actions they otherwise would not, it often causes them to act earlier and / or on a larger scale than they would otherwise.

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

Table 3.10 Likely timing and scale of alternative steps (% of respondents who would definitely or probably have taken alternative steps)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
In the absence of Investors, alternative steps would have been taken:		
sooner	2	10
later	38	41
at the same time	59	49
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	133	68
In the absence of Investors, alternative steps would have been:		
on a greater scale	4	0
on a smaller scale	64	74
no different	32	26
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	50	27

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.6.6 Furthermore, the Recognised and Committed Organisations which said that they would Definitely or Probably have taken alternative steps often gave unclear or unconvincing replies when they were asked to specify what the alternative steps would have been, as Table 3.11 indicates. It might be questioned, for example, whether those which said that they would have acted independently and alone to implement best practices and systems in HR would have been as steadfast and disciplined in their approach as working towards the Investors in People Standard actually requires.

Table 3.11 Likely alternative steps taken (% of respondents who would definitely or probably have taken alternative steps)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Self-adoption of best practices / systems in HR	53	66
Would work towards other accreditation (eg: EFQM)	19	25
Would improve position with other accreditations	9	0
Would employ consultants to implement HR practices	2	3
Would recruit in HR / strengthen the HR team	2	0
Don't know / Not sure	19	9
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	58	32

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.6.7 It should be emphasised that an important implication of Tables 3.10 and 3.11 is that, even if organisations would really have taken alternative steps to obtain the same changes and effects they associated with Investors in People, these alternative steps would not necessarily have produced the same outputs as

Intermediate Effects of Investors in People

Investors in People. This is because the alternative steps would often have been later and / or on a smaller scale than the steps actually taken in pursuit of the Investors in People standard, and because they would often have been taken in the absence of a framework for action.

3.7. Effects on internal resources

3.7.1. The opportunity was taken during the face to face interviews with Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations to examine the effect of the Standard on the allocation of organisations' resources for HR development. Table 3.12 suggests that working towards the Standard has a widespread positive effect on the amount of management time spent on HR development and a lesser, but still positive, effect on the amount of cash expenditure. It was also found that much of the extra management time was spent on formalising, setting up and 'putting on paper' practices, processes and systems.

Table 3.12 Effect of working towards the Standard on resources for HR Development, % (Face to face interviews only)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Cash expenditure on HR development		
Increased	43	61
No change	53	39
Decreased	4	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>56</i>
Management time spent on HR development		
Increased	74	79
No change	26	18
Decreased	0	4
<i>No. Respondents</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>56</i>
Other resource inputs for HR development		
Increased	28	27
No change	72	69
Decreased	0	4
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>52</i>

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

3.7.2. It was also found from the organisations interviewed face-to-face that there tends to be a decrease in management and other resource inputs into HR development, once the Standard has been reached. However, this is taken to signify that there is a reduced need for resource inputs following recognition, rather than a case of organisations resting on their laurels. The basis for this conclusion is that, as Table 3.4 made clear, the majority of Recognised Organisations continue to develop their HR plans, systems and processes after they have achieved the Standard.

Summary of key findings

- An overwhelming majority of Recognised Organisations and a large majority of Committed Organisations have achieved their broad objectives in pursuing the Investors in People standard at least to some extent (Table 3.1). However, it appears that 'hard' performance-related objectives, such as efficiency gains and increased profitability, are more difficult to achieve than 'softer' objectives, such as cultural change (Table 3.2)
- Comparison with earlier surveys suggests that wider benefits are anticipated, sought and achieved more than was the case a few years ago (para. 3.2.4)
- The pursuit of the Standard affects organisations in a wide variety of ways, but it appears that some types of effect (e.g. more formal HR systems and more effective training and development) occur earlier than others e.g. improved business performance and client satisfaction (Table 3.3 and paragraph 3.2.9).
- Investors in People has a clear impact on organisations' HR management and practices, especially amongst organisations with fewer than 50 employees (Table 3.4 and paragraph 3.3.1).
- The effects and changes identified by Recognised Organisations tend to persist post-recognition, and they are more likely to accumulate than to fade (Table 3.6).
- Non-Investors are less formal in their HR management than both Recognised and Committed Organisations (Table 3.8). The increase in adoption of formal training plans, structures etc. across all organisations since the mid 1990s seems at least in part to have been due to the growing awareness of Investors in People (albeit that most non-Investors do not fully understand what Investors involves) (paragraph 3.5.2)
- The wider changes and effects associated with the pursuit of the Standard seem to be largely 'additional'. In the absence of the Investors in People framework, most organisations would not have taken alternative steps to achieve the same changes or effects, or they would have acted later and / or on a smaller scale, or they would have acted without a framework (Tables 3.9-3.11).
- Management and other resource inputs into HR development increase as organisations pursue the Standard (Table 3.12). They tend to decrease again once the Standard had been reached, but this is taken to signify a reduced need, rather than an increase in complacency (paragraph 3.7.2).

4. Business Performance Effects

4.1. Introduction

4.1.1. Whereas the previous chapter was concerned with the extent and the ways in which involvement with Investors in People changed, or has changed, Recognised Organisations' and Committed Organisations' approaches to HR development, this chapter is concerned with whether and to what extent the Standard affects organisations' performance, a key wider benefit of involvement with the Standard. The effect is measured in terms of organisations' turnover, employment and turnover per employee, although the key indicators organisations themselves use to measure their performance are also shown. The difference that Investors in People makes to performance is assessed by means of several different comparisons between Recognised Organisations', Committed Organisations' and Non-Investors' growth.

4.2. Comparison of business performance

4.2.1. As Table 4.1 implies, the organisations interviewed face to face were asked which indicators they use to measure their performance, and which of these was the main indicator. Amongst Recognised Organisations the number of clients served was mentioned most frequently as one of the indicators, reflecting the substantial proportion of public service organisations in the sample. Sales turnover (for businesses) and income (for voluntary and public sector organisations) combined were mentioned more frequently than anything else as one of the indicators, but these two individually did not match the number of clients served or profits as the main indicator used. The pattern was broadly similar to Recognised Organisations amongst the Committed Organisations, but (reflecting the relative lack of voluntary and public sector organisations in the sample) the Non-Investors used the number of clients served as a performance indicator comparatively infrequently, and profits and turnover comparatively frequently.

4.2.2 Table 4.1 clearly indicates differing business strategies and objectives on the part of Investors in People organisations, which are more likely to compete on non-price factors than non-Investors. It is difficult to say to what extent these differences have arisen as a result of involvement in Investors were sought prior to that involvement, with involvement sought as a means to furthering those objectives.

4.2.3 What is interesting from Table 4.1 is the contrast in experience of Investors organisations and perceptions of non-Investors - thus, despite the relative lack of focus on profits and sales on the part of Investors organisations as objectives (Table 2.1), virtually all those that sought improved profitability thought they had done so to at least some extent (Table 3.2). And

Business Performance Effects

amongst non-Investors there is a clear distinction between their perceptions of potential benefits of Investors in People (Table 2.6) and their focus on profits and sales.

4.2.4 Amongst the other indicators specified were customer satisfaction (mentioned by both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations), local authority and other public sector performance measures, and health and safety record.

Table 4.1 Indicators used to measure performance, (% of organisations interviewed face to face)

	Recognised Organisations		Committed		Non-Investors	
	Used as indicator	Main indicator	Used as indicator	Main indicator	Used as indicator	Main indicator
No. of clients (firms / people served)	47	34	45	28	20	5
Profits	40	36	52	28	70	47
Sales turnover	30	7	52	12	60	37
Income	28	11	31	20	40	11
Market penetration in UK	17	5	14	0	15	0
Total employment	11	0	14	0	0	0
Share value	9	2	3	0	0	0
Total value of assets	6	0	3	0	0	0
Exports	2	0	3	0	0	0
No. of new products/services	2	0	3	0	0	0
Other	15	5	14	12	0	0
Nothing	2	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	5	0
No. of Respondents	94		58		40	

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

4.2.5 All three types of organisation surveyed were asked for information on their turnover and employment during their latest financial year; and for the same information three years previously. As one of the ways of examining to what extent Investors in People affects business performance, Tables 4.2 - 4.4 compare average turnover, employment and turnover per employee growth rates for the three groups. Voluntary and public sector organisations are excluded from this analysis because they are not necessarily free to grow in the same way that businesses are.

4.2.6 Taken at face value, the tables suggest that Investors in People does not contribute towards business growth. Table 4.2 indicates that, regardless of whether the turnover growth rates are based on the means or medians, Non-Investors grew faster during the last three years than both Recognised and Committed Organisations. Table 4.3 indicates that the Non-Investors also

Business Performance Effects

grew faster than both the Recognised and Committed Organisations in terms of employment. Table 4.4, however, indicates that the Non-Investors were out-performed by the Recognised and Committed Organisations in terms of turnover per employee.

4.2.7 It is emphasised that the data in Tables 4.2 - 4.4 should be interpreted with caution, for two reasons. First, it is clear that the Non-investor sample was extremely skewed, as compared with the Recognised and Committed Organisation samples (i.e. mean Non-investor turnover and employment were larger than the equivalents for Recognised and Committed Organisations, but the Non-investor medians were lower than for the other two groups). Secondly, it will be noted that the response rates were relatively low (especially in relation to turnover data and amongst Non-Investors as compared with the other groups).

4.2.8 It is also worth mentioning that the results in Tables 4.2 - 4.4 conflict with the findings from research for the DfEE by the Hambleton Group¹⁶, which found that organisations that had achieved the Investors in People standard out-performed their Non-investor peers across a range of measures. However, in contrast with the current research, the Hambleton research excluded organisations with fewer than 50 employees.

Table 4.2 Changes in Turnover

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Mean in latest year, £m	14.2	12.1	34.2
Mean 3 years previously, £m	10.7	10.9	24.4
% change	33	11	40
Median in latest year, £m	2.0	1.8	1.0
Median 3 years previously, £m	2.0	1.5	0.8
% change	0	20	25
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>Response rate, %</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>33</i>

Note: Uses data only from businesses which could provide information for both years.

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

¹⁶ Hambleton Group (2000), 'Corporate Financial Performance Observed Before and After Investors in People Recognition' DfEE RR222

Business Performance Effects

Table 4.3 Changes in Employment

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Mean in latest year, Jobs	164.4	183.9	287.4
Mean 3 years previously, Jobs	146.0	178.3	220.4
% change	13	3	30
Median in latest year, Jobs	50.0	40.0	15.0
Median 3 years previously, Jobs	45.0	36.5	12.0
% change	11	10	25
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>141</i>
<i>Response rate, %</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>58</i>

Note: Uses data only from businesses which could provide information for both years.

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

Table 4.4 Changes in Turnover per Employee

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Mean in latest year, £k/head	93.0	90.0	134.4
Mean 3 years previously, £k/head	84.8	76.3	122.4
% change	10	18	10
Median in latest year, £k/head	52.6	54.2	62.5
Median 3 years previously, £k/head	48.3	50.0	66.7
% change	9	8	-6
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Response rate, %</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>33</i>

Note: Uses data only from businesses which could provide information for both years.

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

4.2.9 As is shown in Appendix B, measured rates of change in business turnover were not closely related to size of organisation, although it appears that large organisations (250+ employees) grew faster than other sizes combined. However, rates of change in employment were size-related, with the smallest organisations growing fastest and the largest organisations growing slowest.

4.2.10 Multiple regression was also used to examine whether involvement in Investors in People affects growth; and, in summary, it was found that involvement has neither a positive or negative effect on turnover / income. In fact, the only significant variables explaining growth, in the case of both turnover / income and employment, were 'established after 1989' (showing that young organisations tend to grow more rapidly) and 'overall objective is to grow' (showing that organisations which want to grow generally do so)¹⁷.

¹⁷ Alongside 'established after 1989' and 'overall objective is to grow' in an equation to explain

Business Performance Effects

4.2.11 It is, of course, possible in a statistical analysis to control for only a limited range of variables which may affect performance. It is an important complementary step, therefore, to combine univariate and multivariate analysis of objective outcomes (i.e. as reported in paragraphs 4.2.3 - 4.2.7 and Tables 4.2 - 4.4 above) with the more subjective and comprehensive evaluation of the next section, which is intended to show what might have happened, if the companies surveyed had not reached or committed to the Investors in People standard.

4.3. Subjective views of the impact of Investors in People on performance

4.3.1. On the grounds that only the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations themselves would have a complete picture of all the factors and variables which affected their performance alongside their involvement in Investors in People, the organisations surveyed were asked (again in terms of turnover and employment) how much larger or smaller Investors in People had made them. Their responses are summarised in Tables 4.5 and 4.6, and it should be explained that the findings shown in these tables are preferred to those shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 because they implicitly isolate the Investors in People effect, taking into account all factors which may have had a bearing on business performance.

4.3.2. Table 4.5 shows that, although almost all Committed Organisations thought that the Standard had made them no different in terms of turnover, a total of 27% of Recognised Organisations thought that Investors in People had made them larger, if only marginally. Amongst the organisations which were able to quantify the Investors in People effect, the mean increase in turnover / income attributable to Investors in People was just over £20,000 amongst Recognised Organisations and just under £4,000 amongst Committed Organisations. It should be understood, however, that these mean quantified impacts are skewed towards zero (i.e. misleadingly low) because it was easier for those perceiving no impact to quantify (i.e. to say there was zero difference in turnover) than it was for those perceiving some positive impact to do the same. Nonetheless, the impact of Investors in People on turnover appears to be very small, especially when it is recalled (from Table 4.2) that Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations had mean turnovers of £14.2 million and £12.1 million, respectively, in their latest financial years.

4.3.3. Table 4.6 paints a very similar picture with respect to the perceived employment impact of Investors in People. Very few Committed Organisations, but a sizeable minority of Recognised Organisations thought that the Standard had made a

turnover / income growth, a dummy variable representing Investor status had a negative coefficient (implying a negative impact on growth, but an insignificant t-ratio, and a dummy variable representing Committed status had a positive coefficient and an insignificant t-ratio. In an similar equation to explain employment growth both dummy variables had negative coefficients and extremely low t-ratio.

Business Performance Effects

positive difference to their employment. Again, however, the size of impact, where quantified appears to be very small, especially in relation to the latest mean employment size of the organisations (see Table 4.3).

4.3.4. Organisations' perceptions of how Investors in People had affected their turnover and employment did not appear to vary according to size of organisation.

Table 4.5 Perceptions of effect of Investors in People on turnover (Businesses only)

% saying Investors in People has made turnover in current year....	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
... much larger	3	0
... a little larger	8	0
... marginally larger	16	3
... no different	72	96
... marginally smaller	0	0
... a little smaller	0	0
... much smaller	0	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	277	272
Mean change, where quantified, £k	20.6	3.6
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	226	264

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 4.6 Perceptions of effect of Investors in People on employment (Businesses only)

% saying Investors in People has made employment in current year....	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
... much larger	2	0
... a little larger	8	1
... marginally larger	14	3
... no different	72	95
... marginally smaller	2	1
... a little smaller	1	0
... much smaller	0	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	284	270
Mean change, where quantified, Jobs	3.6	0.0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	226	264

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, and of Committed Organisations, PACEC

Summary of key findings

- A simple comparison of changes in business turnover, employment and turnover per employee in the last three years indicates that, if anything, Non-Investors grew faster than Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations (Tables 4.2 - 4.4).
- The survey revealed an interesting contrast in the experiences and perceptions of Investors and non-Investors organisations with regard to bottom-line performance (paragraph 4.2.3)
- Regression analysis of changes in turnover and employment suggests that involvement in Investors in People has neither a positive or negative effect on growth (Paragraph 4.2.8).
- The subjective views of respondents showed that a quarter of Recognised Organisations, but very few Committed Organisations, thought that Investors in People had made them larger in terms of turnover and employment, if only marginally (Tables 4.5 and 4.6).

5. Wider Effects

5.1. Introduction

5.1.1. Although noting that the role and benefits of Investors in People seems to have widened and become more persistent in recent years in terms of impacts on organisations, little has hitherto been said about the role and benefits beyond the level of the organisation. The examination in this chapter of the wider effects of Investors in People therefore focuses initially on the effects of the Standard on the employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, principally to consider whether the Standard contributes towards the broad policy objective of creating a 'learning society'. It then considers whether the customers, suppliers and competitors of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations have been affected by the Standard.

5.1.2. As was implied by the research issues set out in Chapter 1 (see paragraph 1.2.3), the wider effects of Investors in People also encompass effects on recognised organisations that occur or accumulate post-recognition. However, this type of wider effect was explored in Chapter 3, which showed that, amongst other things:

- The majority of organisations do continue to develop their HR plans, systems and processes post-recognition (Table 3.4); and that
- The various intermediate effects of pursuing the Standard are most frequently maintained post recognition, but they accumulate more often than they fade (Table 3.6).

5.2. Findings from the Surveys of employees

Characteristics of Employees Surveyed

5.2.1. As was stated in Chapter 1 self-completed questionnaires were received from 193 employees of Recognised Organisations and 85 employees of Committed Organisations. Tables 5.1 to 5.4 summarise the background characteristics of the respondents; and they show that, occupational group apart, there were few major differences between the two samples. Amongst the employees of both Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, the modal (i.e. 'typical') respondent was:

- a permanent employee
- employed at the same workplace for 2-5 years
- female¹⁸
- in the 30-49 year old age group

¹⁸ Although it is known that just over half of all employees are female, it is not clear whether the finding that around two-thirds of respondents were female means that the samples were untypical of all organisations involved with Investors in People.

Wider effects

- educated to O-level (or equivalent) and with a recognised professional or vocational qualification.

5.2.2. However, Employees of Recognised Organisations were most likely to be in the Clerical and secretarial occupations, whereas the Employees of Committed Organisations were most likely to describe themselves as being in one of the Managerial or senior administrative occupations. The Employees of Recognised Organisations were also less likely than the Employees of Committed Organisations to be in one of the Personal and protective service occupations.

Table 5.1 Job status and length of work at the same workplace, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Job status		
Permanent job	93	93
Temporary job	2	1
Fixed-term job	5	6
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>85</i>
Time at the same workplace		
Less than a year	12	11
1 to less than 2 years	16	18
2 to less than 5 years	32	35
5 to less than 10 years	24	29
10 years or more	15	8
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>84</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 5.2 Sex and age group, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Sex:		
Male	36	33
Female	64	67
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>85</i>
Age group:		
Less than 20 years old	2	5
20-29 years old	26	34
30-49 years old	53	44
50 or more years old	19	18
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>85</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Wider effects

Table 5.3 Qualifications, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Highest educational qualification:		
CSE or equivalent / GCSE (grade D-G)	6	8
O level or equivalent / GCSE (grades A-C)	31	26
A level or equivalent	27	20
Degree or equivalent	19	25
Postgraduate degree or equivalent	8	14
None	9	7
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	192	85
Hold recognised professional or vocational qualifications?:		
Yes	64	55
No	36	45
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	192	84

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 5.4 Occupational groups, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Managers and senior administrators	18	33
Professional	21	15
Associate professional and technical	14	11
Clerical and secretarial	36	21
Craft and skilled service	4	0
Personal and protective service	3	14
Sales	1	0
Operative and assembly	1	0
Other occupations	4	5
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	188	84

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Employees of Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Training and development

5.2.3. Table 5.5 shows that the two groups of employees were similar to one another in terms of the extent to which they were satisfied with different aspects of their jobs. However, the more interesting finding is that both groups (but especially the Employees of Recognised Organisations) were less satisfied with the amount of training they received than with other aspects, apart from pay. Table 5.6 shows that, despite this relatively lukewarm satisfaction with the amount of training received, both sets of employees were more likely to have discussed their performance and training needs with their supervisors / line managers during the last 12 months than to have discussed their pay and promotion prospects.

Wider effects

Table 5.5 Satisfaction with aspects of the job, % satisfied or very satisfied

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Amount of influence over own job	66	65
Amount of pay received	34	32
Amount of training received	52	60
Sense of achievement from the job	67	68
Respect from supervisors / line managers	63	68
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>85</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 5.6 Proportion of employees who have discussed the following with their supervisor / line manager in the last year, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
How they get on with their job	86	93
Their chances of promotion	30	31
Their training needs	78	84
Their pay	42	59
None of these	6	2
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>85</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.2.4. As is shown in Appendix B, the more highly qualified employees of Recognised Organisations were generally slightly more satisfied with different aspects of their jobs than were their lower qualified colleagues¹⁹. The more highly qualified employees of Committed Organisations were more satisfied than their lower qualified colleagues with the amount of training they received and with the respect they received from their supervisors / line managers. These findings might reflect the fact that the more highly qualified employees of both types of organisation were generally more likely than their less qualified colleagues to have discussed their performance, pay etc. with their supervisors / line managers during the last year.

5.2.5. It is also interesting to note that the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS) found that 52% of employees of Recognised Organisations had discussed their training needs with their supervisor during the last year, as compared with 78% in the current research (see Table 5.6). However, it is not clear whether this difference is due to inherent differences between the two samples, or whether it reflects an upward trend between 1998 and the latter part of 2001 (when the current research was carried

¹⁹ In this context, a more highly qualified employee is one whose highest educational qualification is A-level / equivalent or higher, and a lower qualified employee is one whose highest educational qualification is GCSE / O-level or lower.

Wider effects

out).

5.2.6. Table 5.7 shows that (perhaps reflecting the extra effort required to reach the Standard) the Employees of Committed Organisations were more likely than the Employees of Recognised Organisations to have received off-the-job training in the last year. It also shows that they were less likely to say that they had received no training at all. However, for both groups the modal and median amount of training was in the 3-5 day range.

5.2.7. It is also shown in Appendix B that higher qualified employees of Recognised Organisations were less likely than their less qualified colleagues to say that they received no training during the last year. They were also more likely to say that they had received 3 days or more training.

5.2.8. It should also be noted that the Learning and Training at Work survey for 2000 found that 26% of all employees had received some off-the-job training during the last 12 months, as compared with the 62% of employees of Recognised Organisations shown in Table 5.7. However, a special run of data from the Labour Force Survey (LFS) for employees with the same sex, age, employment etc. characteristics as those captured by the current research found that the proportion that had received off-the-job training during the last 12 months was exactly the same for LFS subjects as amongst employees of Recognised Organisations. The effect of Investors in People on the amount of off-the-job training individuals receive is, therefore, not entirely clear.

Table 5.7 Method and amount of training received in last year, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Method of training:		
On the job training	63	71
Off the job training	62	76
None	12	6
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>85</i>
Amount of training:		
None	17	4
Less than 1 day	4	0
1-2 days	22	13
3-5 days	30	40
6-10 days	16	22
More than 10 days	15	22
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>83</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Employees of Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.2.9. Table 5.8 reveals that employees of Recognised

Wider effects

Organisations and employees of Committed Organisations were equally likely (or, rather, unlikely) to have trained towards a recognised qualification in the last year. Table 5.9 shows that a quarter of both groups of employees had undergone education or training unrelated to their jobs in the last 12 months; and that this was organised, or paid for, by the employer in a substantial minority of cases. The disaggregated data from the survey of employees of Recognised Organisations also show that more highly qualified employees were more likely than their less qualified colleagues both to have trained towards a recognised qualification during the previous 12 months and to have undergone education or training unrelated to their jobs.

Table 5.8 Proportion of employees training towards a recognised qualification in the last year, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Yes	34	33
No	65	63
Don't know	2	4
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>84</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 5.9 Proportion of employees undergoing education or training unrelated to their job in the last year, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Yes	24	25
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>190</i>	<i>84</i>
of which:		
Organised / paid for by the employer	47	35
Organised / paid for by the employee	53	65
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>23</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Awareness of Investor in People and perceptions of its effects

5.2.10. Table 5.10 shows that almost all Employees of Recognised Organisations and the large majority of Employees of Committed Organisations were aware that their organisation had achieved, or was working towards the Investors in People standard. Table 5.11 suggests that there is imperfect understanding of what Investors in People is about amongst employees aware that their organisation was involved. However, this would not be considered a critical problem, especially as the table also shows that the proportion of employees with no understanding of what the Standard aims to achieve is small. It was also found that less highly qualified employees of Committed Organisations were considerably less likely than their more highly qualified colleagues to indicate that they were aware of, and understood, Investors in People. Again, however, it does not

Wider effects

follow that this is a critical problem.

Table 5.10 Awareness of Investors in People, %

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Aware before receiving questionnaire that organisation has achieved / is working towards Investors in People standard?		
Yes	91	83
Vaguely	6	15
No	3	1
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>84</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Table 5.11 Understanding of Investors in People, % of employees aware of their organisation's involvement with Investors in People

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Understand what the Investors in People standard aims to achieve?		
Yes	56	59
Vaguely	36	34
No	8	7
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>187</i>	<i>82</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.2.11. The upper part of Table 5.12 indicates that employees were most likely to be unaware of any change in the amount of training they had received (or were receiving) as their organisation progressed (or was progressing) towards achieving the Standard. However, virtually all employees who thought there had been a change believed that there had been an increase. The lower part of the table also suggests that Employees of Recognised Organisations were often unaware of any post-accreditation effect on the amount of training they received. However, those aware of some change, on balance, perceived a slight increase.

Wider effects

Table 5.12 Effect of Investors in People on the amount of training received, % of employees aware of their organisation's involvement with Investors in People

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
	(How did amount of training you received change while organisation was working towards the Standard?)	(How has amount of training you receive changed since organisation has been working towards the Standard?)
Increased substantially	8	8
Increased a little	24	24
Stayed the same	45	58
Decreased a little	0	1
Decrease substantially	0	2
Don't know	22	6
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>83</i>
	(How has amount of training you receive changed since organisation achieved the Standard?)	
Increased substantially	6	
Increased a little	15	
Stayed the same	51	
Decreased a little	6	
Decrease substantially	2	
Don't know	20	
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>178</i>	

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Employees of Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.2.12. Table 5.13 indicates that, amongst both groups of employees, half or more thought that their organisation's involvement in Investors in People had had no impact on their attitude towards training related to their job or towards training and education unrelated to their job. However, amongst those who believed that there had been some impact, very large majorities indicated that the impact had been positive. There was no significant difference in the responses of the two groups of employees, but within both groups it was found that more highly qualified employees were more likely than less qualified employees to acknowledge an effect.

Table 5.13 Influence of Investors in People standard on employees' attitudes towards training and education, % of employees aware of their organisation's involvement in Investors in People

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Effect of Investors in People on attitude towards training related to their job:		
Positive impact	37	41
No impact	52	49
Negative impact	4	1
Don't know / not sure	7	8
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>83</i>
Effect of Investors in People on attitude towards training & education unrelated to their job:		
Positive impact	23	25
No impact	65	66
Negative impact	2	0
Don't know / not sure	10	8
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>83</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.2.13. Similarly, the first part of Table 5.14 shows that the majority of both groups of employees thought that their organisation's involvement in Investors in People had had no effect on their performance in their job. However, around 40% of both groups thought that Investors in People had led them to perform a little or substantially better, whereas almost none thought it had led them to perform worse. The second and third parts of the table show broadly the same pattern of response, albeit slightly less positive overall, with respect to motivation in the job and staying on with the same employer. Interestingly, and in contrast to many of the other survey results, it was found that less highly qualified employees of Recognised Organisations were more likely than their more highly qualified colleagues to say that they had become more motivated towards their jobs because of Investors in People.

Wider effects

Table 5.14 Effects of Investors in People on employees' performance, motivation and commitment to their employer, % of employees aware of their organisation's commitment to Investors in People or Investors in People accreditation

	Employees of Recognised Organisations	Employees of Committed Organisations
Effect of Investors in People on performance in their job:		
Substantially better	15	7
A little better	23	34
No better or worse	61	58
A little worse	1	1
Substantially worse	0	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>83</i>
Effect of Investors in People on motivation towards their job:		
Substantially more motivated	10	4
A little more motivated	19	29
Stayed the same	69	66
A little less motivated	3	0
Substantially less motivated	0	1
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>83</i>
Effect of Investors in People on likelihood of staying with current employer:		
Substantially more likely	9	10
A little more likely	23	22
No more or less likely	62	66
A little less likely	4	1
Substantially less likely	1	1
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>83</i>

Source: Surveys of Employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.3. Employers' perceptions of wider effects

5.3.1. The Recognised and Committed Organisations surveyed were also asked for their views on how they thought their involvement in Investors in People had affected their employees. Table 5.15 indicates that both sets of organisations felt that the greatest impact had been on staff morale, and the least had been on absenteeism (although many organisations explained that absenteeism was not really a problem anyway). It is noteworthy that, unlike the employees, there was a difference in the responses according to whether the organisation had achieved, or was still working towards, the Standard. Recognised Organisations were more likely than Committed Organisations to indicate that each of the impacts shown had been felt to a great extent. Conversely, they were less likely to report that there had

Wider effects

been no impact at all. However, it should also be noted that many Committed Organisations commented that it was too early for impacts to be felt. It was also found (see Appendix B) that smaller Recognised Organisations (i.e. with fewer than 50 employees) were more likely than their larger counterparts to say that Investors in People had impacted on their staff to a great or fair in the ways shown in the table.

Table 5.15 Organisations' view of the impact on employees, % replying as shown

	Great extent	Fair extent	Small extent	Not at all	N=
Recognised Organisations					
Increased staff morale	21	40	26	12	544
Reduced absenteeism	12	18	22	49	530
Higher self esteem	18	34	34	15	537
Increased well being	17	33	34	16	528
Committed Organisations					
Increased staff morale	13	33	26	28	222
Reduced absenteeism	4	14	23	59	203
Higher self esteem	11	29	28	33	218
Increased well being	11	32	26	31	218

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations
Source: Surveys of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.3.2. Table 5.16 shows, qualitatively, a very similar pattern of response to Table 5.15. A clear majority of Recognised Organisations reported that involvement in Investors in People had had a great or fair impact on: staff involvement in, and commitment to, business objectives; the organisation's culture, and; working relationships. Around half reported a great or fair impact on returns to investment in HR and the organisation's position relative to the leading edge in HR development. However, in each case, Committed Organisations were less likely, by a margin of between 11 and 24 percentage points respectively, to report a great or fair impact. Again, however, a number of Committed Organisations commented that it was simply too early to expect much of an impact on the factors in question. It was also found that smaller Recognised Organisations were more likely than others to acknowledge the effects shown.

Wider effects

Table 5.16 Other internal wider effects, % of organisations saying effect has occurred to a great or fair extent

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Staff more involved & committed to business objectives	64	48
Positive change in organisation's culture	61	42
Improved working relationships	59	48
Improved returns on investment in HR	52	33
Became leading-edge with respect to HR development	47	23
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>533</i>	<i>217</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

5.3.3. Lastly, the Recognised Organisations were asked whether there had been any effect of their involvement in Investors in People on their customers, suppliers and competitors. Table 5.17 suggests that there had been very little by way of transmission or demonstration effects. However, those interviewed face to face tended to say that they could not tell what these effects might have been, rather than to say that these effects had been absent.

Table 5.17 External effects of Investors in People, % of Recognised Organisations only

The organisation's customers have improved their.....	
.....HR practices	7
.....products / services	3
.....processes	5
.....business performance	8
The organisation's suppliers have improved their.....	
.....HR practices	8
.....products / services	4
.....processes	5
.....business performance	8
The organisation's competitors have improved their.....	
.....HR practices	12
.....products / services	4
.....processes	5
.....business performance	10
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>553</i>

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, PACEC

Summary of key findings

- More than half of the employees of organisations involved in Investors in People surveyed were satisfied with the amount of training they received, but they were less satisfied with training than with most other aspects of their job (Table 5.5).
- It is not clear whether Investors in People affects the amount of off-the-job training employees receive (Table 5.7, paragraphs 5.2.6-5.2.8).
- The surveys showed high levels of awareness of Investors in People amongst employees of organisations involved, but understanding of the Standard was not as great (Tables 5.10 and 5.11).
- Most frequently, employees felt that their organisation's involvement in Investors in People had no effect on the amount of training they received, but those who were aware of a difference generally indicated that the effect was positive (Table 5.12).
- The majority of employees said that Investors in People had not changed their attitude towards training and education, although a substantial minority said it had a positive impact (Table 5.13).
- Roughly four in ten employees thought Investors in People had improved their job performance; smaller proportions reported a positive effect on staying with their employer and job motivation (Table 5.14).. A higher proportion of less qualified employees thought Investors in People had improved their motivation.
- Employers felt the greatest impact of Investors in People had been on staff morale, although a range of other effects on staff were widely acknowledged. The effects had been felt more strongly by Recognised Organisations than Committed Organisations, and more by smaller organisations (Tables 5.15 and 5.16).
- Employers were generally unsure whether their involvement in Investors in People had had any effects on their customers, suppliers, and competitors (Table 5.17).

6. Investors in People Compared to Other Standards and Accreditations

6.1. Introduction

6.1.1. This chapter examines the relationship between Investors in People and other standards and other accredited and non-accredited practices Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors are using, if any. The purposes of doing this are chiefly to compare the usefulness of Investors in People with the usefulness of other standards and practices; and to see whether involvement with Investors in People is associated with a more general commitment to leading-edge HR practices.

6.2. Involvement with other standards and accreditations

6.2.1. Table 6.1 shows that half of the Recognised Organisations surveyed, compared to a third of both Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, had achieved, or were working towards, externally accredited standards other than Investors in People. It was also found (see Appendix B) that the larger the organisation, the more likely it was to indicate that it had achieved, or was working towards, other standards.

Table 6.1 Proportion of organisations achieving, or working towards, externally accredited standards other than Investors in People, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Yes	49	34	32
No	48	63	61
Don't know	4	3	7
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>594</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>261</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

6.2.2. Table 6.2 shows that, in most cases, the particular standard achieved or being worked towards was ISO 9000 / BS 5750. The other standards alluded to were most often BSI standards other than 5750, and industry standards / trade certificates. Smaller organisations (i.e. fewer than 50 employees) most frequently indicated that they had achieved ISO 9000 / BS 5750²⁰, whereas larger organisations were more likely to be

²⁰ It should be noted that accreditation with ISO 9000 / BS 5750 is often a necessary condition for approved supplier status to much of the public sector. See also paragraph 6.3.3.

Investors in People compared to other standards and accreditations

accredited with the Charter Mark or EQFM / EQA / BEM.

Table 6.2 Other standards achieved or being worked towards, % of those accredited with or working towards another standard,

	Recognised Organisations		Committed Organisations		Non-Investors	
	Achieved	Working towards	Achieved	Working towards	Achieved	Working towards
National Training Award	3	2	4	0	2	0
ISO 9000 / BS5750	75	49	73	60	39	20
EFQM /EQA / Business Excellence	8	22	2	0	0	0
Charter Mark	8	7	9	0	2	0
Partnerships with People	0	0	1	0	0	0
King's Fund (NHS)	0	2	1	0	5	0
Other	22	22	38	44	55	87
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>170</i>		<i>106</i>		<i>77</i>	

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

6.2.3. The Recognised and Committed Organisations interviewed face-to-face that said they had achieved, or were working towards, other standards were asked whether their involvement in Investors in People had led to their involvement with the other standards, or whether involvement in other standards had led to involvement in Investors in People. However, virtually all of them indicated that there was no causal relationship; and many of them said that they regarded Investors in People and other standards as serving different, but complementary purposes.

6.3. Relative usefulness of Investors in People

6.3.1. Although it later transpired that they tended to be seen as complementary, rather than substitutes for one another, an original intention of the survey work had been to compare, in the eyes of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, the overall usefulness of Investors in People with the overall usefulness of a range of other standards. However, as might be guessed from Table 6.2, a meaningful comparison was only possible in the case of ISO 9000 / BS 5750.

6.3.2. Table 6.3 shows that a large majority of Recognised Organisations also accredited with or working towards ISO 9000 / BS 5750 thought that the two standards were about the same in terms of usefulness, although those who thought that there was a difference were more likely to say that Investors in People was more useful than to say the opposite. However, the Committed Organisations were much less likely to say that there was no difference and much more likely to say that Investors in People

Investors in People compared to other standards and accreditations

was more useful.

6.3.3. Investors in People was most frequently described as more useful than ISO 9000 / BS 5750 because the latter was often a requirement of customers, rather than something the organisations in question would necessarily pursue of their own volition. Less frequently, Investors in People was described as being better at bringing about cultural change within organisations; and for formalising procedures and processes. On the other hand, ISO 9000 / BS 5750 was sometimes regarded as being better because it involved less paperwork.

Table 6.3 Comparison of overall usefulness of Investors in People with overall usefulness of ISO 9000 / BS 5750, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Investors in People is more useful	12	38
Investors in People is about the same	69	36
Investors in People is less useful	6	6
Don't know	13	20
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>66</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

6.4. Use of other good practices

6.4.1. As shown in Chapter 1, a specific research issue was whether Recognised Organisations are generally in the vanguard of 'leading-edge' HR practice. Chapter 3 demonstrated that Recognised Organisations (and Committed Organisations) were significantly more likely than Non-Investors to have formal HR plans, systems and processes in place. However, in order to explore the issue further, the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations were also asked if they used or followed a range of other specified 'good practices'.

6.4.2. Table 6.4 shows that the two groups were very similar to one another in terms of their responses, but it is probably fair to say that the practices most frequently adhered to (such as multi-skilling, flexi-time and job sharing) would no longer be regarded as 'leading edge'. Relatively few organisations identified other good practices not specifically identified in the table, but the one mentioned most often were interchange of secondees, focus groups on quality of service and home working.

Table 6.4 Use of other good practices, %

Investors in People compared to other standards and accreditations

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Multi-skilling	69	64
Flexi-time	53	54
Job sharing	46	48
Performance pay	38	33
Job rotation	33	25
Total Quality Management	27	23
Quality Circles	17	11
Other	8	5
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	362	174

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

Summary of key findings

- Half of Recognised Organisations, but only a third of Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, have achieved / are working towards other standards. The other standard most frequently used was ISO 9000 / BS 5750 accreditation (Tables 6.1 and 6.2).
- Investors in People and other standards are generally seen as complementary; and there is no clear evidence that Investors in People leads to the pursuit of other standards, or vice versa (Paragraph 6.2.3).
- A large majority of Recognised Organisations thought that Investors in People and other standards were of similar usefulness, but a substantial minority of Committed Organisations said Investors in People was more useful. (Table 6.3).
- A variety of other 'good practices' are followed by Recognised and Committed Organisations, but the practices they follow do not obviously mark them out as being at in the vanguard of leading edge HR practices (paragraph 6.4.2)

7. Maintaining and pursuing the standard

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. This chapter is chiefly concerned with ways in which the Investors in People standard could be, or might need to be, developed. It starts by showing how Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations view the overall usefulness of Investors in People to themselves. It then examines how they would approach Investors in People differently, if they were to start again; and the reasons why they would, or would not, recommend the Standard to others. Lastly, possible barriers to re-recognition amongst organisations that have already achieved the Standard, and to achievement of the Standard by organisations which are not yet Recognised Organisations, are considered.

7.1.2 These considerations are important in the context of achieving wider benefits of Investors in People given the findings previously that many of these benefits tend to occur later (Table 3.3 and paragraph 3.2.9) and often accumulate post-recognition.

7.2 Overall assessment of Investors in People

7.2.1 Table 7.1 shows that Investors in People was rated very highly by the Recognised Organisations surveyed, with two-thirds describing the Standard as extremely or very useful in relation to their organisation's objectives, compared to only one in twenty five describing it as not very or not at all useful. Understandably, given the fact that they are by and large still undergoing the changes that are intended to deliver benefits, the Committed Organisations were less likely than the Recognised Organisations to describe the Standard as extremely or very useful, and more likely to describe it as not very or not at all useful. Nonetheless, the Committed Organisations were, on balance, more positive than negative in their assessments.

Table 7.1 Usefulness of Investors in People in the light of organisations' overall objectives, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Extremely useful	17	7
Very useful	50	33
Fairly useful	30	43
Not very useful	3	15
Not at all useful	1	3
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>563</i>	<i>343</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

7.2.2 The Recognised and Committed Organisations

Maintaining and pursuing the Standard

interviewed face to face were asked whether, having experienced Investors in People, they would now approach the Standard differently. Just over a quarter of the Recognised Organisations said they would; and most frequently they specified that they would like to take a less paperwork-orientated approach and / or an assessment process that was more output-orientated. For their part, 40% of the Committed Organisations said that they would approach things differently and, of these, most mentioned the need to involve their whole organisation more fully in the processes. It should also be noted that a handful of the Committed Organisations said that, starting from scratch, they would not commit to Investors in People at all, but would implement changes and improvements independently of the Investors in People framework.

7.2.3 Table 7.2 shows that virtually all Recognised Organisations and the large majority of Committed Organisations interviewed face to face would recommend Investors in People to other organisations, and that none would actually recommend against the Standard. The reasons provided were diverse, but overall they suggest that the main reasons for recommending the Standard are that it brings business benefits and that it provides a disciplined framework for improvements and developments in HR management.

7.2.4 A striking feature of Tables 7.1 and 7.2 is that, in combination, they imply very high levels of satisfaction with Investors in People, even though, as was reported in Chapter 4, the business performance benefits of the Standard are muted. This in turn implies that the business benefits referred to are not 'bottom-line' benefits, but are more likely to be process or operational benefits. Nevertheless, the finding that the perceived objectives and impacts of Investors in People appear to have widened is also reflected in Table 7.2, with a focus on general business benefits rather than on HR systems specifically.

Table 7.2 Likelihood of recommending to others, and reasons, % of organisations interviewed face to face

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Yes, would recommend Investors in People	94	80
No, would not recommend	0	0
Not sure	6	20
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>60</i>
Reasons for recommending Investors in People :		
Good standard - beneficial to the business	39	26
Necessitates review of / changes to systems	20	9
Provides framework for developing HR	9	4
Good benchmarking - externally accredited	7	17
Give a framework / a focus	4	22
Helps staff development	4	22
Standard has recently improved	4	9
Small companies cannot ignore staffing issues	2	9
Only for organisations with no HR systems in place	2	4
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>46</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised and Committed Organisations, PACEC

7.2.5 On the subject of developing the Standard, around three in ten of both Recognised and Committed Organisations interviewed face to face indicated that there were areas of business development that should be covered by Investors in People other than those already covered (perhaps indicating further scope for Investors in People in playing a wider role within businesses). However, their supplementary explanatory comments were not always particularly helpful in identifying which particular areas of business development they had in mind, as distinct from more general suggestions for improvements. A few of the interviewees seemed to view Investors in People as being almost exclusively about HR development, with concerns about wider business objectives 'tacked on'. A few others suggested that if organisations wanted a model or standard covering the whole of the organisation they should opt for something like the Business Excellence Model. Some others also argued that the Standard should be more flexible, especially for small organisations.

7.3 Re-assessment amongst accredited organisations

7.3.1. When they were asked about their experiences of, or intentions towards, re-assessment against the Standard, more than half of the Recognised Organisations (see Table 7.3) indicated that they had been through the process at least once already; and most of the remainder said that they would seek re-accreditation in due course. The very small proportion indicating that they would not seek reassessment explained variously that they :

- believed they had already gained the benefits;
- thought the costs were too great;
- had undergone a change of ownership or management;
- had experienced no real benefits from involvement, or;
- were pursuing other standards.

Table 7.3 Re-assessment amongst Recognised Organisations, %

Have been through re-assessment process once	40
Have been through re-assessment process twice or more	18
Currently going through re-assessment process for the first time	3
Not yet re-assessed - but will seek re-accreditation in due course	31
Have chosen not to be reassessed	3
Other	2
Don't know	4
No. of Respondents	563

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, PACEC

7.3.2 Very few organisations that had been through the process said that re-accreditation *per se* had affected their operations and development, including HR and training practices²¹. However, where there had been changes, they were generally slight, involving only fine tuning. In addition, the large majority of organisations (80%) that had been re-assessed said that they were aware of recent changes to the Standard. The face to face interviews showed that these changes are generally welcomed; and that they may have a small positive influence on re-recognition decisions.

²¹ It will be recalled from Chapter 3, however, that the majority of Recognised Organisations said that they had developed their HR plans, systems and processes further since recognition. Evidently, these developments occurred independently of re-recognition.

7.4 Progress of Committed Organisations

7.4.1 The survey of Committed Organisations found that nearly three in ten had either suspended their commitment for the time being²², or had abandoned it altogether²³ (Table 7.4). The face to face interviews revealed no dominant explanations for suspension or abandonment, but the most frequent explanations were: lack of time and resources; cost; and, the volume of paperwork required. Small proportions also indicated that: belief in the benefits had disappeared; the Standard was no longer required, and; the organisation was closing down or being taken over by a management less favourable to Investors in People.

Table 7.4 Progress towards achieving the Standard amongst committed organisations, %

Still progressing	70
Commitment suspended for the time being	14
Commitment abandoned	15
Don't know	1
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	355

Source: Survey of Committed Organisations, PACEC

7.4.2 Most of the Committed Organisations shown in Table 7.4 as still making progress towards the Standard indicated that they were progressing satisfactorily; and broadly according to the timetable they had set themselves. However, 15% indicated that they were making less or slower progress than they had hoped. Nearly half of these blamed pressure of time and work generally, and a sizeable minority blamed costs or financial problems.

7.4.3 Thus, while progress from commitment to recognition and beyond is important for the achievement of wider benefits, and the majority of employers report satisfactory progress, up to 45% of organisations seem to be, at best, making slower than expected progress.

²² Nearly half of these indicated that they would definitely or probably renew their commitment in due course, compared to fewer than one in five who indicated that they would definitely or probably not.

²³ Officially, there is no such thing as a suspended or abandoned commitment, but it is useful to distinguish these categories informally.

Summary of key findings

- Two thirds of Recognised Organisations said that Investors in People had been extremely or very useful to them in light of their business objectives (Table 7.1).
- Overwhelming majorities of Recognised and Committed Organisations would recommend Investors in People to others, mainly because it brings business benefits and provides a framework for human resources management (Table 7.2)
- There is a preference among Recognised Organisations for a more output-oriented process. A substantial proportion of Recognised and Committed Organisations also thought other areas of business development should be covered by the Standard (Paragraphs 7.2.2 and 7.2.5).
- Very few Recognised Organisations have chosen not to be reassessed (Table 7.3).
- Progress from commitment to recognition and beyond is important for the achievement of wider benefits, internal and external, and while the majority of employers report satisfactory progress, up to 45% of organisations had either abandoned or suspended their commitment or were making slower than expected progress (Table 7.4, paragraphs 7.4.1 and 7.4.2).

8. The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People

8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. It will be recalled from Chapter 1 (paragraph 1.2.2) that one of the two key underlying aims of the current research was to **serve as a precursor to a fuller cost-benefit analysis and / or to identification of returns and rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development.** The purpose of this chapter is to report how this aim was addressed and to show what was achieved. Before this, however, it might be useful to clarify what is meant by cost-benefit analysis and rates of return; and to discuss some of the inherent difficulties.

8.2. Definition of cost-benefit analysis and of rates of return

8.2.1. **Cost-benefit analysis** compares all social and private costs and benefits of a programme with a view to determining whether the benefits exceed the costs; and, if so, by how much. A key difficulty encountered in this approach is in the valuation of social costs and benefits. Social costs and social benefits usually have to be measured by some indirect means and converted into monetary values, so that a comparison can be made with private costs and benefits. Furthermore, it is often necessary to use shadow prices for cost and benefit items whose real value is not accurately represented by market prices. In addition, once monetary values for all private and social costs and benefits have been established, they all have to be discounted to a common point in time; and the appropriate interest rate which can be used to discount the various costs and benefits has to be chosen very carefully.²⁴

8.2.2. It should be emphasised that cost-benefit analysis differs from the more simple and more commonly used **cost-effectiveness analysis**, which seeks to quantify the costs and benefits associated with a programme without the requirement to transfer costs and benefits into the same monetary units. A cost-effectiveness analysis of Investors in People would be possible by comparing the business performance effects data from the current research (see Chapter 4) with data on the costs of the programme²⁵. This would yield information on cost per increment in turnover, employment and turnover per employee, but it would not provide a clear cost-benefit balance. Thus, whilst cost-effectiveness analysis would avoid the many practical and conceptual difficulties associated with cost-benefit analysis, it would fall some way short of satisfying the underlying aim. In any

²⁴ European Commission DG XIX: *Evaluating EU Expenditure Programmes: A guide.* 1997

²⁵ See for example: *Research on the costs of Investors in People and related activities*, DfES Research Report 274, 2001

The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People

case, the DfES has already reviewed a range of research and evaluation evidence which might feed into a cost-effectiveness analysis, or a more judgmental multi-criteria analysis, of Investors in People²⁶.

8.2.3. Measuring rates of return to individuals, employers, and society from workforce development comes closer, than cost-effectiveness analysis does, to the ideal of a cost-benefit balance implied by the aim; and it is more practicable than cost-benefit analysis, at least with reference to individuals and employers. The rate of return is derived by comparing discounted cost and benefit streams, where costs and benefits are expressed in the same monetary units. As part of the current research, PACEC therefore adopted an experimental approach to the measurement of rates of return associated with Investors in People.

8.3. The approach adopted

8.3.1. Although the research involved surveys of employees of Recognised and Committed Organisations, there was no direct contact with them; and the self-fill employee questionnaires were returned anonymously in order to encourage a greater response. Therefore, the additional information gathering necessary for estimation of rates of return needed to be focused on what could be obtained from the organisations interviewed. In light of this, it was decided that the costs to be taken into account should be the organisations' cash expenditure and value of in-kind expenditure associated with Investors in People. Benefits to employers (or more broadly, shareholders) were defined as increments of profits attributable to Investors in People. Benefits to individuals were defined as increments to income from employment per employee (i.e. wage / salary, plus pensions and other remuneration costs per employee). It was not considered possible to obtain data from the organisations surveyed which might define, or serve as a proxy for, social benefits. However, an attempt was made to assess whether benefits were externalised by asking organisations about the extent to which their customers benefited from their involvement in Investors in People, relative to the extent to which their employees and shareholders benefited.

8.3.2. Accordingly, a supplementary questionnaire was designed, which asked for information and data on:

- year of commitment / recognition
- cash expenditure, cost of staff time and cost of other inputs related to Investors in People, broken down by year since date of commitment
- value of any grants or other public support received
- all and main objectives in pursuing the Standard
- nature of business performance benefits derived

²⁶ Department for Education and Skills: *Review of Research and Evaluation on Investors in People*, Research Brief No:RBX 18-01, October 2001.

The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People

- extent to which customers, employees and shareholders benefited relative to one another
- increments to turnover, profits, employment and wage bill attributable to Investors in People, broken down by year since date of commitment
- nature and size of other benefits not covered elsewhere.

8.3.3 A year-by-year breakdown of costs and benefits was requested to enable discounting to produce net present values. The questions on the objectives in pursuing the Standard and the nature of performance benefits derived were included to focus attention on what might have monetary values attached. It was found from the earlier surveys of Recognised and Committed Organisations that 'bottom-line' and other performance effects (of the sort shown in Chapter 4) are often not directly sought and are often overlooked in favour of intermediate effects and changes (of the sort shown in Chapter 3).

8.3.4 It was also decided to request information only from Recognised Organisations because the earlier survey work clearly indicated that business performance effects tended to occur somewhat later than intermediate effects; and were, consequently, comparatively rare amongst Committed Organisations. In addition, because it was anticipated that organisations might find the supplementary information and data requests difficult to comply with, it was decided to restrict the requests to Recognised Organisations that had been amenable to face-to-face (i.e. more in-depth) interviews earlier in the research and that had been able to provide quantitative point-in-time information on their turnover and employment; and, at minimum, a qualitative indication of how Investors in People had affected these variables. In other words, only 'good prospects' were to be targeted for the supplementary research.

8.4. The results

8.4.1. Twenty 'good prospects' were identified from the 100 Recognised Organisations interviewed face-to-face as part of the earlier research. All were telephoned and asked to co-operate further, after it had been outlined what additional information and data would be requested from them. At this stage, nine organisations indicated that they could not assist, chiefly because they did not feel that they would be able to provide data in the form requested (especially the year-by-year cost and benefit data).

8.4.2. The remaining eleven organisations were then sent the questionnaires outlined above. Eight returned them partially completed, mainly after prompting and reassurances that approximations of the value of costs and benefits would be acceptable. The other three indicated that they had completed the questionnaires and had posted them, although none of the three was actually received.

The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People

8.4.3. On the issue of costs, six of the eight organisations that returned the questionnaires were able to identify cash expenditure on training related to Investors in People and they were able to show how the expenditure was spread over time. The amounts varied from just £1,600 in one year only, to an average of £109,000 a year over three years. None could estimate the cost or distribution of managerial and other staff time, although one estimated the cost of one director's time spent on re-accreditation at £8,000. Only two could identify other costs (mainly for consumables and other incidental expenses). Five were able to specify how much they had received in grants and other support (i.e. an average of £2,500).

8.4.4. All of the respondents indicated that there had been some business performance benefits, although two of them volunteered that they would find it impossible to provide hard evidence to prove this. However, only half were able to indicate how they thought the benefits had been distributed between employees, shareholders and customers. None actually indicated a shareholder benefit; but employees were thought to have benefited slightly more than customers.

8.4.5. It transpired that the provision of time series information on the value of benefits was highly problematic. Half of the respondents indicated that they did not wish to divulge information on turnover, employment costs and profits; and another said that a purchase and a sale affecting part of the business made meaningful data impossible to provide. Five showed how their employment numbers had changed over time, but only one attributed an effect on employment to Investors in People.

8.5. Lessons to be learned for future cost-benefit analysis and /or measurement of rates of return

8.5.1. On the face of it, the results of the attempt to measure rates of return from involvement in Investors in People using the approach adopted were very disappointing, especially as 'good prospects' were targeted for the experiment. However, potentially valuable lessons for any future attempts to compare the cost and benefits of the Standard can be identified.

8.5.2. The first is that time series costs seem to be more easily identifiable than time series benefits. However, this really only includes cash costs, rather than the 'in-kind' costs of management and other staff time devoted to the pursuit and maintenance of the Standard. Based on feedback from the organisations involved in the supplementary research, only cash costs can be reliably identified because, especially in the case of managerial input, time spent in relation to training and development for the purposes of pursuing or maintaining the Standard is not consciously distinguished from other training and development. This other training and development most commonly includes activities driven by legislation (e.g. on health and safety), which must occur if the organisation is to function at

all.

8.5.3. The second is that usable data on the distribution of business performance benefits over time was almost impossible to obtain. This might prompt the question of whether there were any performance benefits to measure, but this would be to misdiagnose the problem, given that three quarters of the organisations targeted for the supplementary research had earlier indicated that they had enjoyed business performance benefits. Nor is it because data on performance is inherently difficult to obtain using the methodology implemented, given that all the organisations targeted had earlier been able to provide at least some data on their performance in the latest financial year and three years previously. Rather, it appears from the feedback that there are two problems:

- (a) That organisations perceive performance benefits in the round (e.g. including such things as improved staff morale and easier recruitment), but not necessarily in a way that might be reflected in standard financial statements; and
- (b) That organisations find it difficult to trace how performance benefits unfold over time.

8.5.4. It is possible that the organisations selected as 'good prospects' for the supplementary research comprised a rogue sample, but this is unlikely. Both the problems discussed above, and the fact that some types of costs are difficult to separate and evaluate, therefore, seem to point towards the overall conclusion that any attempt to assess cost and benefit balances associated with Investors in People has a high probability of failure. However, this is not necessarily the case; and it is believed that an alternative to ex-post collection of data should be considered.

8.5.5. The alternative proposed is real-time data collection, based on a case study approach. This would involve engaging the co-operation of a number of organisations at, or around, the time of commitment. At the outset, the organisations would be told what type of information and data would be requested; and they would be given guidance on how to collect or identify what is needed. The organisations would also be interviewed on a regular basis (perhaps annually) up to the time of recognition and beyond. The interviews would comprise structured discussions, designed to enable costs and benefits to be defined, measured and ultimately converted into monetary units. In particular, the discussions would be vital in exploring the link between performance benefits 'in-the-round' (of the variety alluded to above) and benefits that are reflected in financial statements. The key problems encountered in the current research (i.e. separating and valuing costs and benefits and identifying their distribution over time) would be circumvented.

The Costs and Benefits of Investors in People

- Full cost-benefit analysis of Investors in People would be fraught with conceptual and practical problems (Paragraph 8.2.1).
- Cost-effectiveness analysis of the programme would be simpler, but it would not clarify the cost-benefit balance (Paragraph 8.2.2).
- An experimental approach to measuring rates of return associated with Investors in People was adopted (Paragraphs 8.3.1-8.3.3).
- It proved to be especially difficult to obtain time series data on the benefits of involvement with the Standard (Paragraph 8.4.5).
- Although the results of the experiment seemed disappointing, important lessons for future attempts to compare the costs and benefits of Investors in People could be learned (Paragraphs 8.5.1-8.5.4).
- An alternative approach based on real-time data collection from case study organisations should be considered (Paragraph 8.5.5).

9. Conclusions

9.1. General conclusions

9.1.1. This report has confirmed the finding from previous research that Investors in People has a clear and positive impact on Recognised and Committed Organisations' approaches and dedication to training and development. It has shown that participating organisations generally achieve their objectives in pursuing the standard; and are largely satisfied with their experiences of the Standard and the benefits it provides. It has also shown that the changes organisations make in pursuit of the Standard and after they have reached it, and the other intermediate effects and performance benefits they experience as a result, are additional to a large extent. Nonetheless, it is still not entirely clear whether, or to what extent, Investors in People has a significant impact on 'hard' business performance measures that might be included in standard financial statements and economic impact research.

9.1.2. However, as was intended, this research has gone beyond previous research into Investors in People. In particular, it has demonstrated that there has been an increased focus and growing awareness on the wider effects of organisations' participation:

- comparison with the findings of previous research indicates that the objectives in pursuing Investors are widening. For instance, only 10% of organisations involved with Investors at the time of IES 1995 survey *"The Return on Investors"* anticipated increased quality of goods and services as a result of their involvement. The current (2001) survey found that nearly a half of organisations pursued this as a broad objective. Likewise, only 8% saw Investors improving their financial performance in 1995, compared with 25-30% that now see Investors as a means to increased profitability and/or business growth;
- comparison based on the current and 1995 surveys of the anticipated benefits that have been realised reveals a greater realisation of wider benefits in the current survey. For example, over 90% of those anticipating increased profitability thought that they had achieved this at least to some extent - this compares with the findings of the 1995 survey in which just 43% of those anticipating improved financial performance said this had been realised;
- the increase in adoption of formal training plans, structures etc. across all organisations since the mid 1990s seems at least in part to have been due to the growing awareness of Investors in People, albeit that most non-Investors do not fully understand what Investors actually involves;
- the results of the survey would indicate that progress from

Conclusions

commitment to recognition and beyond is important for the achievement of wider benefits, internal and external, and while the majority of employers report satisfactory progress towards recognition, up to 45% of organisations had either abandoned or suspended their commitment or were making slower than expected progress;

- the majority of organisations continue to develop their HR plans, systems and processes post-recognition (and not simply in order to gain re-recognition). There is also evidence that the effects of the Standard persist and, if anything, accumulate rather than fade over time. However, the research suggests that involvement in Investors in People creates its own momentum and that it is not the process of re-recognition *per se* that prompts ongoing changes.;
- It is unclear to what extent employees benefit from organisations' participation in Investors in People in terms of the net additional amount of training received. However, employees of organisations involved in Investors in People indicate that there is a net positive impact on their attitudes towards education and training (both related and unrelated to their jobs) and their performance at work. Employers tend to share these views;
- a few organisations recognise that their involvement affects their customers, suppliers and competitors (but it has to be admitted that most do not know whether there has been any effects).

9.1.3 In terms of the overall 'position' of Investors in People, this research has also suggested that the Standard appeals to organisations which are relatively ambitious to grow, and which already attach relatively great importance to human resource management and development. These factors should be taken into account in the assessment of the wider role and benefits of the Standard and its marketing.

9.1.4 Recognised Organisations are more likely than other organisations to have achieved other externally accredited standards. However, Investors in People and other standards are generally seen as complementary; and there is no clear evidence that Investors in People leads to the pursuit of other standards, or vice versa. Recognised and Committed Organisations tend to use other good practices, but the practices they follow do not obviously mark them out as being in the vanguard of the leading edge in HR management and development.

9.1.5 The experimental approach towards the measurement of rates of return associated with Investors in People adopted by this research proved to have disappointing outcomes, but it did cast light on what might be a feasible (albeit longer-term) method of identifying the cost-benefit balance.

9.2. Conclusions on the specified research issues

9.2.1. A number of specific research issues were listed in

Conclusions

Chapter 1. Several of the questions have already been answered in the general conclusions above, but for the sake of clarity the questions and answers are as follows. The key point summaries at the end of the chapters referred to will be helpful in finding precise evidence required.

9.2.2. ***To what extent has Investors in People impacted on organisations involved with the Standard?***

Chapter 3 pointed to a range of widely occurring intermediate effects. However, Chapter 4 showed that these did not necessarily translate into clear business performance impacts.

9.2.3. ***Has the process of achieving the Standard stimulated ongoing changes and development within the organisations, with regard to HR practices, structure and culture?***

Chapter 3 (see especially Table 3.4) indicated that ongoing changes and developments very frequently continue post-recognition. Chapter 7 implied that involvement in Investors in People creates its own momentum and that it is not the process of re-recognition that prompts ongoing changes.

9.2.4. ***Have the benefits persisted and widened, or has Investors in People had one-off effects?***

Chapter 3 (see especially Table 3.6) showed that the effects and benefits generally persist; and that they accumulate more often than they fade. Wider impacts within the organisation are felt, but wider impacts external to involved organisations are difficult to discern (Chapter 5).

9.2.5. ***Was Investors in People a necessary condition for these changes?***

Investors in People can be described as a necessary condition for these changes in the majority of cases. Chapter 3 showed that around half of the Recognised and Committed Organisations would not have taken alternative actions in the absence of the Standard to achieve the same effects. Furthermore, many organisations that claimed they would have taken alternative actions would have acted later and / or on a smaller scale; and some could not say what they would have done otherwise.

9.2.6. ***Do the changes differ across sectors and types of organisation?***

It does not appear from Appendix B that the changes vary across sectors and types of organisation in a clear and consistent fashion. However, Chapter 2 indicated that smaller organisations are less likely than larger organisations to become involved in Investors in People without public sector support. Chapter 3 indicated that the Standard had a greater effect on smaller organisations', than on larger organisations', HR plans systems and processes. Estimated additionality of effects was also greater amongst smaller organisations than amongst larger organisations.

9.2.7. ***Are Recognised Organisations generally in the vanguard of 'leading-edge' HR practice?***

Recognised Organisations tend to use other good HR practices in addition to conforming with the Standard, but the other good practices used are not such as to mark out the Recognised Organisations as being leading edge (Chapter

Conclusions

6).

9.2.8. *What do employers generally now expect from HR initiatives?*

It is not clear from the research findings what employers generally now expect from HR initiatives. However, it is clear (see chapter 7) that the organisations involved with Investors in People are generally satisfied with the Standard the way it is. Relatively few of them indicated that they would like to see changes to the Standard per se.

9.2.9. *And where and how large are the gaps between practices and expectations on the part of Recognised Organisations and organisations more generally?*

Recognised Organisations attach greater importance than other organisations to HR management and development (Appendix A), although it is not clear whether this is the result of their involvement with the Standard or whether their attitudes pre-dispose them to it.

9.2.10. *What has been the impact of Investors in People on employees of Recognised Organisations?*

Chapter 5 showed that employees of Recognised Organisations tend to become more positive in their attitudes towards education and training generally (i.e. not just directly related to their jobs). They also perform better at work and are more motivated.

Appendix A: Backgrounds and Characteristics of Organisations Surveyed

A1 Introduction

A1.1 Largely as an aid to the analysis in the main body of the report, this appendix describes the backgrounds and characteristics of the Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors surveyed. As far as possible, survey findings from the three groups are shown alongside one another and statistically significant differences are highlighted.

A2 Type, sector, age etc

A2.1 Table A.1 reveals that the Recognised Organisations surveyed were less likely than the Committed Organisations and the Non-Investors to be businesses; and that they were, correspondingly, more likely to be public sector bodies / organisations. Recognised Organisations were also more likely than Non-Investors to be voluntary / non-profit organisations. The fact that relatively many Recognised Organisations are in the public sector might reflect the fact that these organisations are more amenable than private businesses to influence or encouragement to 'sign-up' to what is, after all, a flagship public policy measure.

Table A.1 Status of the organisations surveyed, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Businesses	76	84	92
Public sector bodies / organisations	12	7	2
Voluntary / non-profit organisations	9	7	5
Other	2	1	1
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>594</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>262</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A2.2 Table A.2 shows, for businesses only, date of start-up. Interestingly, it reveals that, aside from the fact that relatively few Committed businesses started-up pre-war, the three types of organisations surveyed were not significantly different from one another in terms of their age distribution.

Table A.2 Starting date of businesses, % (businesses only)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Pre 1940	15	9	11
1940-59	7	6	6
1960-79	19	21	24
1980-89	32	31	26
1990 onwards	27	32	32
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	423	290	235

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A2.3 Table A.3, however, shows that the three groups were different from one another in terms of their broad sectoral distribution. As compared with Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations were more likely to be in one of the production industries and, correspondingly, less likely to be in the mainly private services (e.g. distributive trades and financial and business services). Also compared to Recognised Organisations, Non-Investors were considerably more likely to be in the mainly private services and considerably less likely to be in the mainly public services (i.e. education, health and public administration).

Table A.3 Organisations' main products and services, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Production industries (SIC A-E)	18	28	20
Mainly Private services (SIC F-K & O)	49	38	68
Mainly Public services (SIC L-N)	33	34	12
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	269	160	99

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A2.4 Table A.4 indicates that Recognised Organisations were less likely than both Committed Organisations and Non-Investors to be single site entities and, as a consequence of this, less likely to say that the site covered by the interview performed all corporate or organisational functions. Non-Investors, in particular, were more likely to say that they were simply a branch of a larger organisation. It was also found that, amongst the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations which were part of a multi-site operation, the accreditation or commitment covered the whole organisation in just over six in ten cases (62% amongst Recognised Organisations and 63% amongst Committed Organisations).

Table A.4 Status and function of sites surveyed, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Status of site:			
Single-site organisations	45	53	57
Part of multi-site organisation	55	47	43
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>587</i>	<i>350</i>	<i>258</i>
Function of site:			
All functions (i.e. single site)	48	56	58
Head office	22	21	17
Regional or divisional office	17	9	3
Branch	9	13	22
Other	3	1	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>547</i>	<i>335</i>	<i>252</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A2.5 Table A.5 reveals that the Recognised Organisations were larger, in terms of number of employees, than the Committed Organisations; and that the latter were, in turn, larger than the Non-Investors.

Table A.5 Average size of organisations surveyed

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Mean No. of employees	350	234	218
Median No. of employees	60	40	18
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>453</i>	<i>316</i>	<i>221</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A3 Growth objectives and culture

A3.1 The businesses amongst the organisations surveyed were asked about their overall growth objectives, in part to examine whether ambition to grow is particularly associated with involvement with Investors in People. Table A.6 shows the businesses' responses and it contains several notable features. First, it shows that the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations were almost identical in terms of their overall growth objectives, but that they were different in terms of the particular aspects of the business they wanted to grow. The Committed Organisations were more likely than Recognised Organisations to specify that they wanted to grow market share and profits, whereas the Recognised Organisations were more likely to say that they wanted to grow all aspects of the

businesses. The reasons for this are not immediately clear. However, it might be speculated that during the process of working towards the Standard organisations tend to focus on just one or two particular objectives, whereas they feel able to widen their objectives once they have become Recognised Organisations.

Table A.6 Growth objectives, % (businesses only)

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
At the time of commitment:			
Grow smaller	1	1	n/a
Stay the same size	27	27	n/a
Grow moderately	64	66	n/a
Grow rapidly	8	6	n/a
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	420	294	n/a
Now:			
Grow smaller	2	4	3
Stay the same size	27	26	36
Grow moderately	64	63	50
Grow rapidly	7	7	11
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	422	298	240
Particular aspects businesses want to grow: (more than one answer possible)			
Sales	30	34	28
Market share	36	50	13
Profits	33	47	17
Patients / clients / contracts	1	2	1
Other	7	8	10
All aspects	50	22	57
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	309	206	141

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A3.2 The second key feature of Table A.6 is that it shows that the Non-Investors were more likely than the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations to indicate that they aimed to stay the same size. In addition, those Non-Investors indicating that they wanted to grow were less likely than growth-orientated Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations to specify market share and profits as the focus of their ambitions.

A3.3 All organisations, regardless of type, were asked to rate possible factors in their success, in order to gauge how they perceived the relative importance of human resource management and development. Table A.7 shows that Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations assigned greater importance than Non-Investors to each organisational function rated. The table also suggests that Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations implicitly

ranked human resource management and development more highly than Non-Investors. Moreover, it appears that, in the eyes of Non-Investors, human resource management and development is of considerably less importance than the top-rated functions, whereas there is less of a gap in the case of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations.

Table A.7 Rating of factors in organisations' success, mean ratings on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1= not important at all 10= crucially important

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Financial management	9.7	9.5	8.9
Operational management	9.7	9.2	8.5
HR management and development	9.6	9.3	7.5
Marketing	8.6	8.1	7.7
Design, innovation and creativity	8.4	7.4	6.9
Corporate and internal communications	9.2	8.7	6.8
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>554</i>	<i>349</i>	<i>248</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A3.4 The organisations interviewed face to face were also asked why human resource management and development was important to them; and, for the most part, the broad pattern of response was the same for Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors. All three groups most frequently associated organisational success and good business performance with a motivated and satisfied workforce. All three groups also tended to make a connection between staff development and client satisfaction. However, the Non-Investors did not directly associate human resource management and development with staff retention, whereas the other two groups did. The Non-Investors were also notable for implying simply that staff development was something that had to be done without associating it with any particular outputs or benefits.

A3.5 The results in Table A.7 indicating the importance attached to HR management and development by Recognised and Committed Organisations might be taken to signify that these organisations are pre-disposed to the implementation of good practices in this field; and that they did not need Investors in People to introduce the sort of changes described in Chapter 3 of the main part of the report (e.g. new or improved HR plans, systems and practices). However, the same chapter showed that many of the changes in question were additional (i.e. would not have happened without the Standard). Moreover, it is possible that the importance attached to HR management and development by Recognised and Committed Organisations is partly an effect of involvement with Investors in People (i.e. is in itself an effect of involvement, rather than simply a cause).

A4 Management of training and development

A4.1 All three groups were then asked a number of questions to examine how they approached human resource management and development; and some major differences were found. Table A.8 indicates that Non-Investors were very dissimilar from Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, even allowing for the fact that they were smaller in terms of employment (see Table A.5). Most notably, the Non-Investors were considerably less likely than the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations to have an HR department or an HR manager. Almost as notably, nearly one-fifth of Non-Investors said that no one in their organisation was responsible for the function because it was not necessary²⁷.

Table A.8 Responsibility for HR management and development, %

	Recognised Organisation s	Committed Organisation s	Non-Investors
Part of MD / director / manager's job	46	53	56
Separate HR department	28	22	4
Employ HR manager(s) but no separate HR dept.	17	15	2
Responsibility of the Head Office	4	4	17
Use other approach to HR management	5	6	3
No one responsible - HR management not necessary	n/a	n/a	18
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>562</i>	<i>349</i>	<i>259</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A4.2 As Table A.9 shows, the Non-Investors were very much less likely than the Recognised Organisations to have a specific budget for training and HR development. However, it will be noted that a sizeable proportion of the Committed Organisations also lacked a budget. Organisations that indicated they had a budget were rather more likely to say that it had increased than to say it had decreased during the last three years, but in all three groups the budget was most likely not to have changed. A surprisingly large proportion of the Non-Investors claiming to have a budget for training and HR development did not know how the budget had changed.

²⁷ It was assumed that, almost by definition, Investors and Committed Organisations would have designated responsibility for HR management and development.

Table A.9 Budgets for training and HR development, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations	Non-Investors
Have a specific budget for training and HR development?			
Yes	80	59	31
No	18	38	58
Don't know	2	3	11
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>356</i>	<i>257</i>
If Yes, changes in budget over the last 3 years:			
Increased by 10% or more	39	35	29
Stayed the same -within 10% either way	53	57	43
Decreased by 10% or more	3	4	0
Don't know	4	3	29
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>471</i>	<i>209</i>	<i>77</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations, Committed Organisations and Non-Investors, PACEC

A4.3 Lastly, the Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations were also asked questions intended to help to gauge how deeply embedded Investors in People had become. Table A.10 reveals that relatively few Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations had dedicated Investors in People champions or Investors in People managers. Rather, responsibility for Investors in People tended to rest with the managing director, another director or the general manager; or with the HR manager, if there was one. Interestingly, it was also found that 7% of the Committed Organisations said that no one was responsible; and this may be related to the finding in the main part of the report (Chapter 7) that a substantial proportion of the Committed Organisations had suspended or abandoned their commitment.

Table A.10 Person responsible for Investors in People, %

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Dedicated Investors in People champion / Investors in People manager	9	7
Part of HR manager's job	39	36
Part of MD / director's / manager's job	43	45
Responsibility of the Head Office	2	1
Other	6	3
No one responsible	1	7
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>343</i>

We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations

Source: Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC

A4.4 Previous research by PACEC for the TECs had revealed that a key reason for Committed Organisations failing to reach the Standard, and for Recognised Organisations failing to maintain the Standard, was that there was one person chiefly responsible for Investors in People, who was not necessarily replaced when he or she left the organisation. Accordingly, those organisations which indicated that they had a dedicated Investors in People champion or manager were asked whether they had considered what would happen if this individual left for whatever reason. As Table A.11 shows, the majority of such organisations had given the matter some thought and generally suggested that the Investors in People champion or manager would be replaced by external or internal recruitment. However, the table also suggests that a large minority of the Recognised Organisations had not given the matter much thought, implying that maintenance of the Standard was not necessarily guaranteed.

Table A.11 What would happen without the Investors in People champion or manager, % of organisations employing an Investors in People champion/manager

	Recognised Organisations	Committed Organisations
Considered what would be done if Investors in People champion / manager were to leave?		
Yes	71	89
No	19	11
Don't know	10	0
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	31	9
If Yes, What would happen?		
Re-appointment	69	17
Role taken over by another member of staff	15	67
Responsibility shared across organisation	0	17
HR systems /practices embedded in the organisation	23	17
<i>No. of Respondents</i>	13	6
We can be 95% certain that figures in bold are different from those for Recognised Organisations		
<i>Source:</i> Surveys of Recognised Organisations and Committed Organisations, PACEC		

APPENDIX B: DISAGGREGATED RESULTS FROM THE SURVEY OF RECOGNISED ORGANISATIONS

Table B.1 Which of the following best describes your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
A business	76	75	76	85	81	74	62	97	90	63	100	0	0
A public sector body/organisation	12	13	12	4	8	14	26	0	3	20	0	100	0
A voluntary/non-profit organisation	9	8	11	12	10	9	8	1	2	15	0	0	100
Other	2	5	1	0	1	3	4	2	5	1	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>593</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>235</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>56</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv6, Com6, Non6)

Table B.2 (Businesses only) When did your business start trading?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Pre war	36	38	36	17	27	42	55	16	25	46	15	100	100
40s, 50s	5	4	6	0	4	6	6	14	2	3	7	0	0
60s, 70s	14	15	14	8	15	15	11	23	24	8	19	0	0
80s	24	26	23	29	30	21	15	27	29	21	32	0	0
1990+	20	18	22	46	25	16	12	20	20	21	27	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>566</i>	<i>224</i>	<i>340</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>249</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>327</i>	<i>423</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>56</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv7, Com7, Non7)

Table B.3 What is your organisation's main product or service?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Production	17	20	15	4	14	20	21	100	0	0	22	0	2
Private services	25	25	25	24	23	25	28	0	100	0	29	5	5
Public services	58	55	61	72	62	55	51	0	0	100	49	95	93
Respondents	583	231	350	25	231	253	72	100	144	339	442	73	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv8, Com8, Non8)

Table B.4 Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
One of a no of different sites within a larger org'n	55	58	53	17	33	72	79	56	58	54	52	72	53
Single independent site not part of a larger org'n	45	42	47	83	67	28	21	44	42	46	48	28	47
Respondents	587	236	349	24	234	255	72	99	144	335	447	71	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv9, Com9, Non9)

Table B.5 (If more than one site) Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Single site	48	46	50	83	70	32	21	44	45	51	51	33	48
The head office	22	23	22	4	17	25	39	19	22	23	20	37	26
A regional or divisional office	17	20	16	4	9	25	20	27	16	15	17	18	15
A branch (incl. warehouse, and call centre)	9	7	10	8	3	13	17	8	14	8	9	8	7
Other	3	4	2	0	0	5	3	1	3	3	2	3	4
<i>Respondents</i>	547	218	327	24	223	228	70	99	136	304	424	60	54

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv10, Com10, Non10)

Table B.6 How would you describe the overall growth objectives of your business at the time of commitment to liP?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Grow smaller	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Stay same size	27	24	28	68	34	16	22	19	20	33	27	0	0
Grow moderately	64	70	61	26	59	73	62	71	69	59	64	0	0
Grow rapidly	8	6	10	5	5	10	15	10	11	6	8	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>420</i>	<i>158</i>	<i>260</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>171</i>	<i>188</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>203</i>	<i>420</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table B.7 How would you describe the overall growth objectives of your business now?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Grow smaller	2	2	2	0	3	1	5	3	2	1	2	0	0
Stay same size	27	23	29	58	34	18	22	24	22	31	27	0	0
Grow moderately	64	68	61	32	58	72	63	68	64	61	64	0	0
Grow rapidly	7	7	8	11	5	9	10	4	12	6	7	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>422</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>259</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>188</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>203</i>	<i>422</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table B.8 What particular aspect(s) of your business do you especially want to grow?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Sales	32	20	40	38	26	36	30	31	43	25	32	0	0
Market share	39	14	55	25	29	48	27	30	36	44	39	0	0
Profits	35	20	45	25	26	43	30	25	42	36	35	0	0
Other	4	2	5	12	6	1	7	3	7	2	4	0	0
All	52	76	35	62	50	49	67	64	42	51	52	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>283</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>146</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>126</i>	<i>283</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table B.9 Can you indicate on a scale of 1-10, where 1 is not at all important and 10 is crucially important, how you see the following in terms of their importance to the success of your organisation? (Mean ratings)

	Average of all respondents												
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Financial management	9.7	9.7	9.7	9.8	9.7	9.7	9.5	9.6	9.6	9.7	9.7	9.7	9.5
Operational management	9.7	9.6	9.8	9.7	9.7	9.8	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.9	9.8	9.6	9.4
Human resource management and development	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.4	9.6	9.6	9.5	9.3	9.5	9.7	9.5	9.7	9.7
Marketing	8.6	8.9	8.4	9.4	8.6	8.5	8.8	8.8	9.2	8.3	9.0	7.0	7.3
Design, Innovation and Creativity	8.4	8.7	8.2	8.8	8.2	8.5	9.0	8.6	8.9	8.2	8.6	7.5	7.6
Corporate and internal communications	9.2	9.1	9.3	9.1	9.2	9.2	9.1	8.9	9.3	9.2	9.3	9.1	8.9
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>554</i>	<i>221</i>	<i>331</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>219</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>423</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>54</i>

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv12, Com12, Non12)

Table B.10 Which of the following applies to your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
HR management part of the MD/Director/Manager's job	46	51	42	83	70	30	10	42	40	50	49	23	49
Separate HR department	28	27	30	4	14	31	76	30	35	25	25	55	24
Employ own HR manager(s) without separate HR department	17	12	20	4	10	28	4	20	18	15	18	9	16
HR management is the responsibility of the Head Office	4	4	4	0	3	4	6	3	3	4	4	5	2
Use other approach to HR management	5	6	5	9	3	7	4	5	4	5	4	8	9
Respondents	562	224	336	23	230	237	70	97	139	316	432	64	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv13, Com13, Non13)

Table B.11 Who is the person responsible for liP in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Dedicated liP champion/liP Manager	9	14	5	8	5	13	6	5	11	7	7	15	8
Part of HR manager's job	39	31	46	17	23	51	62	43	44	37	40	40	31
Part of the MD / Director / Manager's job	43	44	42	71	65	26	19	39	38	47	45	32	45
Responsibility of Head Office	2	3	2	4	2	1	6	2	4	2	2	2	6
Other	6	8	4	0	5	8	4	9	3	6	5	10	8
No one responsible	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	2
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>230</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>141</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>418</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>51</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv14 Com14)

Table B.12 Does your organisation have a specific budget for training and human resource development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	80	79	81	65	74	84	93	76	79	81	76	96	88
No	18	18	18	31	25	15	4	21	19	17	22	3	12
Don't know	2	3	1	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	1	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>237</i>	<i>352</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>256</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>337</i>	<i>449</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>56</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv16 Com16 Non14)

Table B.13 How has your organisation's expenditure on training and human resources development changed during the last three years?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased by 10% or more	39	44	36	12	40	41	37	30	49	37	40	26	47
Same - within 10% either way	53	46	58	76	53	54	44	63	45	54	55	51	47
Decreased by 10% or more	3	4	2	0	3	2	7	1	4	3	3	7	2
Don't know	4	6	4	12	4	2	12	5	2	6	2	15	4
Respondents	471	186	283	17	171	213	68	76	114	271	342	68	49

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv17 Com17 Non15)

Table B.14 Does your organisation's commitment to achieving the liP standard cover the entire organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	62	64	60	100	72	57	60	52	66	62	64	51	75
No	30	26	33	0	23	32	35	31	26	32	29	38	25
Don't know	8	10	7	0	4	11	5	17	8	6	7	11	0
Respondents	303	130	173	4	69	173	57	54	80	166	218	47	28

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv18 Com18)

Table B.15 What were your organisation's broad objective(s) in pursuing liP recognition?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Business growth	23	12	29	29	19	27	12	27	23	21	27	10	8
Efficiency gains	48	38	53	24	35	63	36	42	42	52	47	41	51
Increase in profitability	23	20	24	6	18	29	16	32	18	22	26	10	12
Increase quality of products / services	46	43	47	24	28	64	38	33	37	54	43	55	49
Staff retention and easier recruitment	41	46	38	12	44	38	48	38	35	43	42	39	29
Change of corporate culture	13	8	16	6	12	12	20	14	15	12	14	8	12
Other	35	38	34	59	47	19	52	36	47	30	35	45	33
Respondents	461	178	282	17	176	211	56	81	130	243	351	49	49

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv19 Com19)

Table B.16 What, if anything, prevented your organisation from working towards best practices in human resources management outside the Investors in People framework?	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
At least one	22	18	25	25	25	20	20	25	28	19	21	20	36
Lack of skill	2	1	3	8	3	1	3	4	1	2	3	2	2
Lack of time	6	4	7	8	7	4	6	3	8	5	5	5	9
Risks involved	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
High cost / low return	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cost / finance generally	3	3	4	8	6	0	1	2	6	3	3	2	4
Lack of financial support from local TEC / BL	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unaware of financial support from local TEC / BL	1	1	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
No clear / tangible rewards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uncertainty about the benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservatism / traditionalism / reluctance to change	4	1	5	0	2	6	0	7	2	3	3	8	5
Lack of understanding / knowledge of HR management	4	3	4	0	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	5
Lack of external advice and support	2	1	2	0	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	2
Lack of awareness of liP	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	6	1	3	0	7
Other	7	5	9	8	8	6	12	9	7	7	7	3	13
None - already pursued best practice	59	59	60	42	53	69	52	53	54	63	59	62	49
None - wanted to consider alternative to liP	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	0	0
None- other	4	6	2	0	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	6	4
Don't know	15	19	13	33	19	8	23	20	14	15	16	14	13
<i>Respondents</i>	563	221	341	24	224	245	69	96	140	317	432	64	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv20 Com20)

Table B.17 Did your organisation receive any financial support from public funds (mainly your local TEC or Business Link) to help it to achieve the liP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	56	51	59	62	63	55	37	57	54	56	56	53	57
No	29	30	28	19	22	32	42	31	29	29	29	30	29
Don't know	15	19	13	19	15	14	21	12	17	16	15	16	14
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>591</i>	<i>237</i>	<i>352</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>256</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>143</i>	<i>338</i>	<i>448</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>56</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv21 Com21)

Table B.18 Did your organisation receive any financial support from public funds (mainly your local TEC or Business Link) to help it to achieve the liP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
<1k	98	98	98	100	97	98	99	99	94	99	98	100	96
1-19k	2	2	2	0	3	2	0	1	4	1	2	0	4
20-49k	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Respondents	593	238	353	26	235	257	73	100	144	339	450	73	56

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv21 Com21)

Table B.19 Would your organisation have pursued the standard without the financial support it received?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Definitely	20	19	19	13	19	17	37	25	17	20	20	26	16
Probably	36	41	34	20	32	43	37	38	31	38	35	39	31
Possibly	29	23	32	13	28	33	22	31	30	25	29	24	34
Probably not	13	13	14	53	18	6	4	5	19	14	14	8	12
Definitely not	2	4	1	0	3	2	0	0	3	3	2	3	6
Respondents	315	118	196	15	145	127	27	55	70	181	235	38	32

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv22 Com22)

Table B.20 Did your organisation receive any non-financial support from public sources to help it achieve the IIP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Yes	62	55	67	81	69	56	56	58	61	63	62	62	65
No	21	21	21	8	16	27	21	26	21	20	22	17	25
Don't know	17	24	12	12	15	17	24	16	19	16	16	21	9
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>579</i>	<i>231</i>	<i>346</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>252</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>334</i>	<i>440</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>55</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv23 Com23)

Table B.21 Would your organisation have pursued the standard without the non-financial support it received?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Definitely	20	24	17	14	19	19	28	22	13	23	17	33	26
Probably	41	48	37	24	38	45	50	43	49	36	43	40	20
Possibly	24	15	30	38	25	24	18	24	25	24	25	12	34
Probably not	12	11	12	24	14	10	2	7	9	14	10	14	17
Definitely not	3	2	4	0	5	2	2	4	4	3	4	0	3
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>154</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>35</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv24 Com24)

Table B.22 To what extent has working towards and achieving the liP standard helped your organisation to achieve the broad objectives you mentioned earlier?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
To a great extent	37	35	38	57	46	23	49	31	39	38	38	31	34
To some extent	56	56	57	43	47	69	44	64	52	55	54	63	62
Not at all	7	9	6	0	7	7	7	5	8	7	8	7	4
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>507</i>	<i>198</i>	<i>307</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>199</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>127</i>	<i>290</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv25 Com25)

Table B.23 Was a formal training plan in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	2	2	1	12	1	2	0	3	2	1	2	1	0
In place and not revised	12	14	10	12	11	9	24	12	13	11	11	19	5
In place, but revised	59	52	63	42	50	69	56	49	55	63	59	64	53
Not in place but introduced	26	27	25	35	36	19	19	32	29	23	27	14	38
Not in place, not applicable	2	4	0	0	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	1	4
Respondents	564	223	339	26	220	248	68	93	141	321	426	69	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.24 Was a system for identifying training needs in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it

have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	2	3	1	8	2	2	0	3	2	1	2	1	0
In place and not revised	13	18	9	12	14	8	26	12	14	12	13	20	5
In place, but revised	64	57	69	42	56	75	57	51	61	69	62	64	69
Not in place but introduced	21	20	21	38	28	14	15	30	22	17	22	13	24
Not in place, not applicable	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	0	1	1	2
Respondents	564	223	339	26	220	248	68	93	141	321	426	69	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.25 Was a system for evaluating training in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	2	3	1	8	3	1	0	3	2	1	2	1	0
In place and not revised	10	17	6	8	11	6	24	8	11	11	10	14	11
In place, but revised	60	53	64	42	49	72	57	54	58	63	59	62	60
Not in place but introduced	27	26	28	42	37	19	19	34	27	25	28	22	29
Not in place, not applicable	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Respondents	564	223	339	26	220	248	68	93	141	321	426	69	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.26 Was your business plan communicated to employees in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did this have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If this was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	4	6	2	15	4	3	0	4	6	2	4	4	2
In place and not revised	11	18	7	8	12	7	25	8	15	10	10	17	11
In place, but revised	57	49	63	27	47	71	53	52	54	61	55	67	56
Not in place but introduced	23	22	24	38	32	15	19	31	21	22	25	12	27
Not in place, not applicable	4	4	4	12	5	3	3	5	4	4	5	0	4
Respondents	564	223	339	26	220	248	68	93	141	321	426	69	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.27 Was an employee communication process or appraisal system in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	2	3	1	8	1	2	0	2	3	1	2	3	0
In place and not revised	14	20	11	12	15	8	34	11	16	15	13	25	15
In place, but revised	67	58	73	54	64	74	54	59	70	69	68	64	62
Not in place but introduced	16	17	15	27	20	13	12	26	11	15	17	7	22
Not in place, not applicable	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	2
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>564</i>	<i>223</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>141</i>	<i>321</i>	<i>426</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>55</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.28 Was benchmarking with other organisations in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	13	19	10	35	18	8	12	10	14	14	14	14	7
In place and not revised	7	10	5	15	5	6	13	5	9	7	7	7	9
In place, but revised	45	40	49	19	32	62	40	47	43	46	45	48	44
Not in place but introduced	16	11	19	23	16	12	21	19	13	16	16	17	15
Not in place, not applicable	18	21	17	8	29	11	15	18	21	17	18	13	25
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>564</i>	<i>223</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>141</i>	<i>321</i>	<i>426</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>55</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table B.29 Which of these processes, if any, have been further developed since your organisation achieved the standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
A written HR personnel plan	53	62	46	39	68	36	74	55	57	50	55	48	47
A formal training plan	59	73	49	78	71	45	67	57	63	57	60	51	60
A system for identifying training needs	72	84	65	83	76	66	78	71	78	70	74	63	64
Systems for evaluating training	84	88	82	70	84	87	79	90	85	83	85	81	82
Communicating business plan to employees	71	76	67	48	72	72	72	77	75	67	72	73	60
Employee communication process or appraisal system	81	81	80	87	85	77	81	82	80	81	81	86	73
Benchmarking with other organisations	36	47	28	43	35	34	45	33	35	37	37	38	29
Other	6	8	6	9	6	7	5	6	5	7	6	3	9
Respondents	502	199	302	23	191	229	58	82	126	286	370	63	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv29/27)

Table B.30 What effects has working towards the standard had on the amount of training and development overall in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased substantially	28	35	23	24	27	30	25	29	27	28	28	24	24
Increased slightly	45	41	47	43	38	53	40	46	41	46	43	46	59
No change	27	24	28	33	35	16	35	24	30	26	28	29	17
Decreased slightly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Decreased substantially	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>554</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>337</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>222</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>317</i>	<i>418</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv31/28)

Table B.31 What effects has working towards the standard had on the amount of management training and development in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased substantially	25	34	19	24	21	30	22	27	27	24	26	22	13
Increased slightly	43	41	45	33	41	48	40	45	39	45	41	41	63
No change	30	25	33	43	36	21	37	25	32	31	31	35	22
Decreased slightly	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0
Decreased substantially	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>551</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>335</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>221</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>314</i>	<i>415</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv31/28)

Table B.32 What effects has working towards the standard had on the amount of non-management training and development in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased substantially	26	33	22	24	23	28	28	28	25	26	27	24	20
Increased slightly	45	43	46	43	39	54	34	47	42	45	43	44	56
No change	28	24	30	33	36	17	38	24	32	27	29	31	22
Decreased slightly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Decreased substantially	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>213</i>	<i>335</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>315</i>	<i>414</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv31/28)

Table B.33 What effects has working towards the standard had on the amount of on-the-job training and development in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased substantially	27	33	24	24	26	29	26	30	27	27	28	24	19
Increased slightly	44	43	45	43	38	52	37	44	41	46	42	46	61
No change	28	23	30	33	35	18	37	25	31	27	29	29	19
Decreased slightly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Decreased substantially	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Respondents	550	214	334	21	220	239	68	88	138	314	414	68	54

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv31/28)

Table B.34 What effects has working towards the standard had on the amount of off-the-job training and development in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Increased substantially	25	33	19	25	22	28	21	25	24	24	25	23	17
Increased slightly	44	42	45	35	38	51	43	47	42	44	43	42	58
No change	30	25	34	40	39	19	37	26	32	31	31	34	25
Decreased slightly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	2	0
Decreased substantially	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Respondents	542	212	328	20	216	236	68	85	139	308	410	65	53

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv31/28)

Table B.35 Has your organisation evaluated the impact that lIP has had on the way it operates and performs?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Yes	63	64	63	37	63	70	55	68	60	63	64	65	55
No	25	19	28	42	28	19	22	15	30	25	24	25	36
Don't know	12	18	8	21	9	11	23	16	10	12	12	11	10
Respondents	461	188	271	19	191	189	60	79	120	256	353	57	42

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv32/29)

Table B.36 Has your organisation evaluated the impact that liP has had on the way it operates and performs?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	9	13	7	15	11	7	10	12	8	8	10	7	4
Some benefit	84	79	88	69	82	89	77	82	84	85	83	79	95
To early to say	5	5	4	4	4	3	11	4	4	5	4	12	0
No benefit	2	4	1	12	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	1	2
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>593</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>235</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>450</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>56</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Non18)

Table B.37 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of more formal HR/Personnel systems?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	13	14	12	24	8	15	13	10	9	15	13	9	16
Small extent	27	23	30	5	20	38	20	27	22	30	26	36	33
Fair extent	37	42	35	38	42	32	45	41	37	37	38	43	27
Great extent	23	22	23	33	30	14	22	23	32	19	24	12	24
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>486</i>	<i>182</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>281</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>51</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.38 To what extent has participating in IiP affected your organisation in terms of more effective training and development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	8	9	7	24	7	6	14	8	9	8	9	3	11
Small extent	30	24	35	5	27	37	29	29	24	34	29	38	34
Fair extent	40	44	37	48	41	39	33	41	41	38	40	43	36
Great extent	22	22	22	24	26	18	24	22	26	20	23	16	19
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>505</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>311</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>228</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>291</i>	<i>382</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.39 To what extent has participating in IiP affected your organisation in terms of improved quality of products and services?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	14	16	12	19	14	9	25	22	15	10	14	9	17
Small extent	34	28	38	24	32	38	27	27	28	39	33	42	31
Fair extent	39	41	37	43	38	39	39	41	40	38	39	39	39
Great extent	14	15	13	14	16	13	9	10	17	13	14	11	13
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>500</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>307</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>289</i>	<i>378</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.40 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved recruitment and retention of staff?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	16	15	16	24	18	13	18	17	12	17	15	18	28
Small extent	28	25	30	14	21	37	21	21	19	34	26	36	32
Fair extent	39	43	37	43	37	39	47	48	47	34	40	38	34
Great extent	17	17	17	19	24	12	14	14	22	15	19	9	6
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>500</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>306</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>286</i>	<i>379</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.41 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved business growth performance?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	20	22	18	21	19	14	42	20	22	18	16	25	37
Small extent	35	31	38	11	34	44	16	29	32	39	36	40	35
Fair extent	33	33	33	53	32	32	32	37	34	31	36	22	23
Great extent	12	14	11	16	15	10	11	13	11	12	12	13	6
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>493</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>224</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>374</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>52</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.42 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of external perception of the organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	10	12	9	15	10	9	12	16	11	8	10	15	8
Small extent	32	26	35	10	28	39	25	22	32	35	31	41	31
Fair extent	37	43	34	40	34	39	42	42	37	36	38	31	38
Great extent	21	19	22	35	29	12	21	20	19	21	22	13	23
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>493</i>	<i>190</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>280</i>	<i>375</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>52</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.43 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved customer satisfaction?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	16	17	14	20	12	17	22	16	17	15	14	23	19
Small extent	35	31	37	15	32	40	33	37	33	35	34	34	42
Fair extent	40	41	39	50	43	36	38	39	38	41	41	36	32
Great extent	10	11	9	15	13	8	7	9	11	10	10	8	8
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>490</i>	<i>190</i>	<i>298</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>224</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>279</i>	<i>372</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.44 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved business development opportunities?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	23	32	17	25	23	19	41	18	25	23	20	36	29
Small extent	34	22	41	10	32	41	20	33	30	37	34	30	37
Fair extent	33	35	31	50	30	34	30	40	31	31	34	28	31
Great extent	10	11	10	15	15	6	9	9	14	9	12	6	4
<i>Respondents</i>	483	187	294	20	185	222	54	82	122	273	372	50	49

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.45 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of improved productivity?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Not at all	16	22	12	20	15	14	28	14	18	15	13	22	32
Small extent	36	33	39	15	33	44	30	31	37	39	36	42	40
Fair extent	38	33	41	50	40	37	31	44	36	38	41	28	25
Great extent	9	11	8	15	12	6	11	10	9	8	10	8	2
<i>Respondents</i>	450	183	265	20	170	204	54	77	117	250	348	50	40

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table B.46 Effects of the impacts

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Accumulated	39	40	39	30	42	40	30	40	37	40	39	34	45
Stayed the same	46	42	48	52	42	51	39	48	47	45	47	42	47
Faded	5	6	4	9	6	2	9	3	5	5	5	4	4
Don't know	10	13	9	9	11	7	22	9	11	11	10	19	4
Respondents	556	217	337	23	216	248	67	93	133	321	420	67	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv34/31)

Table B.47 If it had not committed to lIP, would your organisation have taken alternative steps to achieve the same effects we have just been talking about?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Definitely	9	10	9	10	10	9	10	7	12	9	9	13	9
Probably	23	23	23	19	23	24	22	28	21	23	23	23	28
Possibly	45	46	45	10	34	57	49	49	43	45	45	51	40
Probably not	17	17	18	57	25	8	16	14	17	19	18	13	19
Definitely not	4	3	5	5	8	2	1	2	8	4	5	1	4
Respondents	543	210	331	21	207	246	67	90	136	309	406	71	53

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv35/32 Com38/37)

Table B.48 In the absence of liP, the steps would have been taken..

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Sooner	2	2	2	0	0	3	7	4	0	3	2	0	6
Later	38	33	40	100	37	36	43	60	23	37	36	24	62
At the same time	59	65	57	0	63	61	50	36	77	60	62	76	31
<i>Respondents</i>	133	43	89	1	43	74	14	25	31	75	99	17	16

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv36/33 Com39/38)

Table B.49 In the absence of liP, the steps would have been..

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Greater	2	0	3	0	5	1	0	0	3	3	2	0	7
Smaller	30	28	31	0	32	28	36	42	29	26	33	7	36
No different	68	72	66	100	62	70	64	58	68	71	65	93	57
<i>Respondents</i>	127	39	87	1	40	74	11	24	31	70	97	15	14

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv36/33 Com39/38)

Table B.50 What alternative steps would your organisation have taken?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Self-adoption of best practices / systems in HR	53	53	51	0	50	57	50	64	54	45	56	25	62
Would employ consultants to implement HR practices	2	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0
Would recruit in HR / strengthen the HR team	2	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	2	0	0
Would work towards other accreditation (eg: EFQM)	19	11	23	50	18	14	33	9	18	25	14	25	38
Would improve position with other accreditations	8	5	10	0	9	11	0	9	7	10	9	12	0
Don't know / Not sure	20	32	15	50	23	18	17	18	18	25	19	50	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>8</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv37/34 Com40/39)

Table B.51 Turnover (last financial year)

	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Median	2,000	2,000	2,000	400	900	4,500	25,000	6,000	2,000	1,200	2,000	2,000	800
Mean	18,423	21,086	17,446	494	4,983	27,064	53,310	21,115	18,579	17,923	12,846	0	4,781
Min	31	250	31	31	140	250	1,500	750	250	31	31	250	135
Max	0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Responses	265	78	185	18	105	119	21	48	67	145	216	19	25

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table B.52 Employment (last financial year)

	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Median	60	60	59	7	24	100	400	86	62	45	52	160	32
Mean	352	425	321	8	90	370	1,322	212	394	383	176	1,829	79
Min	2	5	2	2	5	3	12	13	4	2	3	7	2
Max	24,000	21,500	24,000	20	6,000	21,500	24,000	4,000	13,000	24,000	6,000	24,000	550
Responses	450	141	307	19	168	212	49	79	114	252	347	51	40

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table B.53 Looking at your organisation today, how much larger or smaller do you think being an Investor in People has made you in terms of turnover or income?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Much larger	2	3	2	0	4	2	0	3	0	3	3	0	0
A little larger	10	18	5	0	12	10	3	12	6	9	8	12	8
Marginally larger	15	16	15	24	14	15	18	17	19	13	16	7	18
No different	72	62	78	76	71	72	79	68	74	75	72	81	74
A little smaller	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	367	131	234	17	137	177	34	65	90	204	277	42	38

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv41/37 Com44/42)

Table B.54 Change due to IIP - mean

	Average of all respondents												
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
How much Change in Turnover/Income (œ000s)	17.1	36.4	7.8	0.0	3.0	32.3	0.0	56.9	8.7	6.0	20.6	0.0	5.0
Change in employment (including part time)	2.3	2.4	2.3	0.0	0.3	4.0	1.9	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.8	1.0	0.3
<i>Respondents</i>	299	101	197	13	105	151	29	51	80	165	226	34	32

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv41/37 Com44/42)

Table B.55 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of increased staff morale?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Great extent	21	21	21	39	29	12	21	19	26	20	23	16	18
Fair extent	40	44	38	43	43	38	38	38	37	43	40	36	42
Small extent	26	21	30	9	19	36	20	29	27	26	26	31	29
Not at all	12	13	11	9	8	13	21	14	10	11	11	17	11
<i>Respondents</i>	544	214	328	23	217	241	61	90	134	311	411	64	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table B.56 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of reduced absenteeism?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	12	9	13	32	17	4	14	12	15	10	13	7	8
Fair extent	18	19	17	18	16	21	10	18	16	18	18	13	12
Small extent	22	21	23	18	12	33	15	26	22	21	23	18	23
Not at all	49	50	47	32	55	42	61	44	47	51	46	62	58
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>530</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>235</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>52</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table B.57 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of higher self-esteem?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	18	17	18	30	27	8	15	17	21	16	19	10	13
Fair extent	34	35	33	35	33	37	22	34	33	34	36	23	30
Small extent	34	31	35	22	28	39	37	31	33	35	31	44	43
Not at all	15	17	13	13	11	16	25	18	13	14	14	24	15
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>537</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>323</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>308</i>	<i>407</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table B.58 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of increased well-being?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	17	15	19	35	27	8	16	17	20	17	19	10	13
Fair extent	33	35	32	35	32	38	19	34	35	32	36	23	23
Small extent	34	31	35	17	28	39	39	31	32	36	31	44	42
Not at all	16	19	14	13	14	15	26	18	13	16	14	23	21
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>528</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>235</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>303</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>52</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table B.59 Summary of effects

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Too early to say	6	7	6	12	4	5	16	7	6	6	6	15	2
No effect	3	6	2	12	4	3	1	1	6	3	4	1	4
Some effect	90	87	92	76	92	92	83	92	89	91	91	83	95
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>345</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>249</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>326</i>	<i>432</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>55</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table B.60 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of becoming a leading-edge organisation with respect to HR development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	15	14	16	36	22	7	17	15	17	15	18	3	10
Fair extent	32	39	28	18	35	31	36	32	36	31	33	29	36
Small extent	31	24	36	27	21	40	34	37	22	34	29	46	28
Not at all	21	23	20	18	23	22	14	16	25	21	21	22	26
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>520</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>314</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>130</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>398</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>50</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table B.61 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved returns on your investment in HR?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Great extent	17	13	19	43	25	6	17	19	19	15	19	5	9
Fair extent	35	43	29	19	35	36	36	33	32	36	34	34	40
Small extent	37	30	41	24	28	46	36	42	36	36	36	43	34
Not at all	12	14	11	14	11	12	12	6	13	14	11	17	17
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>527</i>	<i>205</i>	<i>320</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>209</i>	<i>236</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table B.62 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Great extent	23	21	25	50	30	13	29	20	24	24	25	16	17
Fair extent	38	44	34	36	40	36	36	48	38	35	38	31	45
Small extent	21	18	23	0	14	31	19	21	21	21	20	33	15
Not at all	18	17	18	14	15	20	17	11	17	20	17	20	23
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>529</i>	<i>206</i>	<i>321</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>232</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>303</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table B.63 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	19	20	19	50	25	12	15	18	20	19	21	12	9
Fair extent	40	43	38	18	43	40	36	42	42	37	40	33	43
Small extent	32	27	34	18	21	40	41	33	30	32	29	45	35
Not at all	9	10	9	14	11	8	8	7	8	11	9	10	13
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>533</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>323</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>235</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>303</i>	<i>406</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table B.64 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	21	19	22	50	28	11	20	19	21	21	22	11	12
Fair extent	43	47	40	18	43	47	32	47	45	40	44	38	48
Small extent	29	22	34	14	22	36	36	28	26	31	27	44	29
Not at all	8	12	5	18	7	6	12	6	9	7	7	7	12
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>526</i>	<i>206</i>	<i>318</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>212</i>	<i>231</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>52</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)



B65 – Which, if any, of the following have been the external effects of your organisation achieving the standard ?	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Customers' HR practices	7	9	6	4	5	11	3	8	9	6	7	6	6
Customers' products	3	6	1	4	2	4	3	2	4	3	3	1	2
Customers' processes	5	9	2	0	4	7	3	6	5	4	5	4	6
Customers' business performance	8	10	6	8	5	12	3	8	9	7	8	6	4
Suppliers' HR practices	8	10	7	8	4	12	6	11	11	7	8	4	11
Suppliers' products	4	7	2	4	3	5	5	9	5	2	4	4	2
Suppliers' processes	5	9	3	4	4	7	5	9	8	4	6	3	6
Suppliers' business performance	8	12	6	4	3	15	5	9	12	7	10	4	6
Competitors' HR practices	12	13	11	0	9	18	3	8	13	12	11	10	11
Competitors' products	4	8	2	0	3	7	2	6	6	3	4	4	4
Competitors' processes	5	9	2	0	3	8	3	9	6	3	5	4	4
Competitors' business	10	12	10	0	7	17	3	8	11	11	11	9	9

performance													
Any of the above	20	20	21	17	15	29	8	19	22	20	20	16	23
None of the above	80	80	79	83	85	71	92	81	78	80	80	84	77
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>553</i>	<i>219</i>	<i>333</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>242</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>321</i>	<i>417</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>53</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv45/40)

Table B.65 If your firm were to cease trading tomorrow, what proportion of its sales would be taken by its competitors in the following areas?

	Average of all respondents												
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Same region	70.7	73.3	69.5	76.4	75.5	68.6	58.4	45.7	74.9	78.5	70.7	0.0	0.0
Elsewhere in UK	24.1	22.3	24.9	19.9	21.6	25.4	29.5	38.6	21.7	19.6	24.1	0.0	0.0
Overseas	4.6	4.2	4.9	3.7	1.9	5.7	12.2	15.2	2.8	1.4	4.6	0.0	0.0
Total	99.5	99.7	99.3	100.0	99.0	99.7	100.0	99.5	99.4	99.5	99.5	0.0	0.0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>380</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>236</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>162</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>380</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv46/41)

Table B.66 In terms of your organisation's overall objectives, how useful would you say the IIP standard has been?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all useful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Not very useful	3	3	2	10	4	1	3	3	5	1	4	0	0
Fairly useful	30	24	33	5	23	39	25	36	24	31	29	28	41
Very useful	50	55	47	71	53	44	56	46	48	51	49	61	44
Extremely useful	17	17	17	14	19	16	15	13	22	16	18	12	15
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>563</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>335</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>223</i>	<i>247</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>317</i>	<i>426</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>54</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv51/46 Com52/49)

Table B.67 Has your organisation been through reassessment?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes, been through process once	40	48	34	38	36	47	31	40	36	41	39	35	49
Yes, been through process twice	18	30	9	12	20	16	24	20	18	17	18	22	9
Yes, currently going through process for the first time	3	3	3	0	3	3	4	2	1	4	3	7	2
No, but will seek re-accreditation in due course	31	8	46	38	34	26	32	27	31	32	31	31	35
No and have chosen not to be reassessed	3	3	2	0	4	2	3	2	6	2	4	1	0
Don't Know	4	5	4	4	3	5	6	6	6	3	4	3	4
Other	2	2	2	8	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	0	2
Respondents	563	233	328	26	225	238	72	96	136	321	427	68	55

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv52/47)

Table B.68 Did going through the re-accreditation process affect your organisation's operations and development, including changes in its HR and training practices?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	36	36	35	20	39	35	37	38	48	31	36	32	33
No	58	54	63	80	56	60	50	56	45	63	59	59	59
Don't know	6	9	2	0	5	5	13	6	7	6	5	8	7
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of recognised organisations (Inv53/48)

APPENDIX C: DISAGGREGATED RESULTS FROM THE SURVEY OF COMMITTED ORGANISATIONS

Table C.1 Which of the following best describes your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
A business	84	81	88	83	85	89	78	100	92	76	100	0	0
A public sector body/organisation	7	9	4	0	9	4	11	0	0	11	0	100	0
A voluntary/non-profit organisation	8	9	7	15	5	7	8	0	5	11	0	0	100
Other	1	1	2	2	1	0	3	0	3	1	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>357</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv6, Com6, Non6)

Table C.2 (Businesses only) When did your business start trading?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Pre war	24	28	19	20	22	17	48	15	25	27	9	100	100
40s, 50s	5	3	7	4	6	4	3	11	0	4	6	0	0
60s, 70s	18	23	16	15	12	28	27	38	11	13	21	0	0
80s	26	28	24	26	28	26	12	18	37	25	31	0	0
1990+	27	19	34	35	31	24	9	18	28	30	33	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>346</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>289</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv7, Com7, Non7)

Table C.3 What is your organisation's main product or service?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Production	21	23	21	11	20	30	26	100	0	0	25	0	0
Private services	18	19	12	15	16	12	17	0	100	0	20	0	11
Public services	60	58	67	74	64	58	57	0	0	100	55	100	89
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>356</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>299</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv8, Com8, Non8)

Table C.4 Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
One of a no of different sites within a larger org'n	47	48	43	20	38	55	85	51	44	46	46	78	33
Single independent site not part of a larger org'n	53	52	57	80	62	45	15	49	56	54	54	22	67
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>350</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>294</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv9, Com9, Non9)

Table C.5 (If more than one site) Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Single site	56	56	58	80	64	49	15	51	57	57	56	24	72
The head office	21	20	20	13	13	25	45	21	29	19	22	24	20
A regional or divisional office	9	7	11	4	9	8	15	12	5	9	8	19	4
A branch (incl. warehouse, and call centre)	13	17	9	2	13	15	18	15	10	13	13	24	4
Other	1	1	2	0	1	2	6	0	0	3	1	10	0
Respondents	335	137	171	46	142	87	33	72	63	199	283	21	25

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv10, Com10, Non10)

Table C.6 How would you describe the overall growth objectives of your business at the time of commitment to IIP?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Grow smaller	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	4	2	0	1	0	0
Stay same size	27	34	23	39	22	33	19	27	32	26	27	0	0
Grow moderately	66	62	68	50	70	62	78	68	56	68	66	0	0
Grow rapidly	6	3	7	11	6	4	4	1	11	6	6	0	0
Respondents	293	118	154	38	122	85	27	75	57	160	293	0	0

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table C.7 How would you describe the overall growth objectives of your business now?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Grow smaller	4	4	4	3	2	7	4	7	7	2	4	0	0
Stay same size	26	31	22	41	24	22	26	24	29	26	26	0	0
Grow moderately	63	63	64	49	67	65	67	66	54	65	63	0	0
Grow rapidly	7	2	10	8	6	6	4	4	10	7	7	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>154</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table C.8 What particular aspect(s) of your business do you especially want to grow?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Sales	34	35	32	32	26	39	53	36	39	31	34	0	0
Market share	52	44	59	50	65	39	47	36	50	60	52	0	0
Profits	47	51	47	41	45	60	42	55	42	45	47	0	0
Other	7	5	6	5	6	5	11	4	8	7	7	0	0
All	23	21	24	23	26	18	26	34	28	17	23	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>198</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>198</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table C.9 Can you indicate on a scale of 1-10, where 1 is not at all important and 10 is crucially important, how you see the following in terms of their importance to the success of your organisation? (Mean ratings)

	Average of all respondents												
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Financial management	9.5	9.6	9.5	9.5	9.6	9.4	9.6	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.6	9.7
Operational management	9.2	9.3	9.2	9.3	9.1	9.4	9.4	9.2	9.0	9.3	9.3	9.0	9.1
Human resource management and development	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.3	9.5	9.6	9.1	9.2	9.5	9.3	9.1	9.4
Marketing	8.1	8.1	8.0	8.6	7.8	8.2	8.4	8.7	8.5	7.7	8.3	6.3	7.4
Design, Innovation and Creativity	7.4	7.6	7.3	7.6	7.3	7.6	7.9	8.3	7.4	7.1	7.6	6.7	6.5
Corporate and internal communications	8.7	8.7	8.8	8.6	8.7	8.7	9.2	8.4	8.7	8.8	8.8	8.5	8.7
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>349</i>	<i>146</i>	<i>175</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>293</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>27</i>

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv12, Com12, Non12)

Table C.10 Which of the following applies to your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
HR management part of the MD/Director/Manager's job	53	45	59	64	64	42	19	47	50	56	56	18	50
Separate HR department	22	33	14	13	13	33	50	24	17	23	19	64	23
Employ own HR manager(s) without separate HR department	15	15	14	13	13	14	25	24	17	11	15	5	19
HR management is the responsibility of the Head Office	4	4	5	0	3	9	3	3	3	5	5	5	0
Use other approach to HR management	6	3	8	11	8	2	3	3	12	5	5	9	8
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>349</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>143</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>26</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv13, Com13, Non13)

Table C.11 Who is the person responsible for liP in your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Dedicated liP champion/liP Manager	7	5	6	4	7	4	3	5	10	6	6	18	4
Part of HR manager's job	36	48	28	23	29	46	66	41	39	35	34	55	50
Part of the MD / Director / Manager's job	45	41	49	53	50	41	26	45	39	47	48	18	42
Responsibility of Head Office	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
Other	3	1	6	4	5	2	3	0	3	5	3	9	0
No one responsible	7	6	9	13	9	5	3	9	8	5	8	0	4
Respondents	343	143	172	47	141	92	35	74	62	205	290	22	26

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv14 Com14)

Table C.12 Does your organisation have a specific budget for training and human resource development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	59	60	54	47	51	64	76	55	62	60	56	79	70
No	38	38	42	51	46	34	18	41	37	38	40	21	30
Don't know	3	3	3	2	3	2	6	4	2	3	3	0	0
Respondents	356	149	178	47	149	97	34	75	65	215	299	24	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv16 Com16 Non14)

Table C.13 How has your organisation's expenditure on training and human resources development changed during the last three years?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Increased by 10% or more	35	35	34	36	33	34	38	29	42	35	35	16	53
Same - within 10% either way	57	61	57	59	62	55	58	61	48	59	57	74	42
Decreased by 10% or more	4	3	5	0	4	6	4	5	8	3	5	5	0
Don't know	3	1	4	5	1	5	0	5	2	3	3	5	5
Respondents	209	89	97	22	76	62	26	41	40	128	168	19	19

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv17 Com17 Non15)

Table C.14 Does your organisation's commitment to achieving the liP standard cover the entire organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	63	61	61	62	56	62	69	47	70	67	60	62	100
No	24	21	26	12	24	27	21	32	26	20	27	12	0
Don't know	14	18	13	25	20	11	10	21	4	13	13	25	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>7</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv18 Com18)

Table C.15 What were your organisation's broad objective(s) in pursuing liP recognition?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Business growth	29	25	34	30	28	34	24	32	26	28	32	12	15
Efficiency gains	54	60	54	53	58	56	59	52	39	59	55	62	38
Increase in profitability	31	34	31	26	28	40	41	34	23	32	35	8	8
Increase quality of products / services	45	45	47	49	39	52	59	49	24	50	43	50	65
Staff retention and easier recruitment	44	48	42	44	45	45	44	38	42	46	46	29	27
Change of corporate culture	11	9	11	12	11	8	9	15	11	10	11	12	8
Other	24	20	22	21	23	23	6	27	37	18	22	29	31
Any of the above	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Respondents</i>	334	138	167	43	137	91	34	71	62	200	278	24	26

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv19 Com19)

Table C.16 What, if anything, prevented your organisation from working towards best practices in human resources management outside the Investors in People framework?	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
At least one	26	18	31	26	23	28	22	30	26	23	25	21	38
Lack of skill	2	1	3	4	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	0	0
Lack of time	10	8	12	9	9	15	6	8	11	11	11	0	12
Risks involved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High cost / low return	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost / finance generally	5	4	6	7	4	5	8	4	8	5	5	0	19
Lack of financial support from local TEC / BL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unaware of financial support from local TEC / BL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No clear / tangible rewards	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uncertainty about the benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Conservatism / traditionalism / reluctance to change	2	2	2	4	3	1	0	3	2	2	2	4	4
Lack of understanding / knowledge of HR management	5	1	8	0	7	4	3	5	8	4	5	0	8
Lack of external advice and support	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0
Lack of awareness of liP	5	3	7	7	4	8	3	7	8	4	6	4	4
Other	4	3	4	2	3	4	6	7	5	2	3	8	4
None - already pursued best practice	51	48	52	52	57	41	47	37	43	59	48	71	50
None - wanted to consider alternative to liP	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None- other	4	3	5	4	3	6	3	7	5	2	4	8	0
Don't know	20	31	13	15	18	27	28	27	26	16	23	4	12
<i>Respondents</i>	349	146	174	46	145	93	36	73	65	209	293	24	26

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv20 Com20)

Table C.17 Did your organisation receive any financial support from public funds (mainly your local TEC or Business Link) to help it to achieve the liP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	36	34	34	30	32	35	44	36	38	36	32	55	59
No	42	39	48	54	45	43	31	41	37	43	45	36	22
Don't know	22	27	18	15	23	22	25	23	25	20	23	9	19
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>350</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv21 Com21)

Table C.18 Did your organisation receive any financial support from public funds (mainly your local TEC or Business Link) to help it to achieve the IIP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
<1k	97	99	100	100	99	99	100	99	89	99	98	96	96
1-19k	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	11	0	2	0	4
20-49k	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv21 Com21)

Table C.19 Would your organisation have pursued the standard without the financial support it received?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Definitely	27	25	24	15	26	20	38	32	25	27	26	89	7
Probably	35	45	27	46	44	20	38	24	38	38	35	11	36
Possibly	26	27	29	31	21	43	15	32	25	23	28	0	29
Probably not	12	2	20	8	10	17	8	12	12	12	12	0	29
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>14</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv22 Com22)

Table C.20 Did your organisation receive any non-financial support from public sources to help it achieve the liP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	61	59	60	57	53	66	74	57	60	64	59	75	68
No	22	19	26	32	26	17	14	24	18	21	23	10	20
Don't know	17	22	14	11	22	17	11	20	22	14	18	15	12
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>348</i>	<i>143</i>	<i>176</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>205</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>25</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv23 Com23)

Table C.21 Would your organisation have pursued the standard without the non-financial support it received?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Definitely	20	23	16	33	18	8	38	12	11	25	18	64	19
Probably	41	52	34	33	41	46	46	44	45	38	44	18	25
Possibly	26	17	36	21	26	34	17	34	13	28	26	18	38
Probably not	11	8	12	8	13	12	0	10	29	6	12	0	12
Definitely not	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	6
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>197</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>118</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>16</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv24 Com24)

Table C.22 To what extent has working towards and achieving the IIP standard helped your organisation to achieve the broad objectives you mentioned earlier?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
To a great extent	12	11	11	18	11	12	0	8	12	14	10	26	32
To some extent	61	62	61	57	62	60	72	60	53	64	63	63	48
Not at all	25	25	28	25	26	27	28	31	34	21	26	11	20
Don't know	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
Respondents	328	133	167	44	135	89	32	72	59	196	278	19	25

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv25 Com25)

Table C.23 Please explain any increase or decrease (in resource inputs for HR development)

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes, still progressing	70	70	69	70	70	72	60	57	65	76	68	87	81
No, commitment suspended for the time being	14	16	13	15	14	10	26	24	6	13	14	13	11
No, abandoned	15	13	17	13	16	16	14	18	26	10	16	0	7
Don't know	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	0
Respondents	355	148	178	46	148	97	35	76	65	212	299	23	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Com27/26)

Table C.24 Please explain any increase or decrease (in resource inputs for HR development)

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
No target	12	22	3	17	9	12	15	10	16	12	12	6	21
Don't know	17	20	14	10	13	23	25	13	5	21	18	11	5
1999	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	5
2000	4	6	3	3	3	6	5	3	5	5	4	11	0
2001	28	27	30	31	33	23	25	28	32	27	28	33	21
2002	35	24	44	38	39	32	25	36	42	33	34	33	47
2003	2	0	3	0	2	2	5	8	0	1	2	6	0
Respondents	228	94	115	29	95	65	20	39	38	151	190	18	19

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Com31/30)

Table C.25 Please explain any increase or decrease (in resource inputs for HR development)

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	71	59	80	88	82	58	45	69	55	76	71	79	65
No, will be reached later than planned	21	34	12	12	14	33	25	25	39	15	21	14	24
Not sure	8	7	9	0	4	9	30	6	6	9	8	7	12
Respondents	190	74	103	24	78	55	20	36	33	121	159	14	17

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Com32/31)

Table C.26 Please explain any increase or decrease (in resource inputs for HR development)

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
<6 months	93	89	97	96	97	88	89	93	85	95	93	96	85
6-11 months	4	9	0	2	2	8	6	7	8	3	5	0	0
12-17 months	2	1	3	2	1	3	6	0	6	1	1	0	15
18-23 months	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	4	0
Respondents	358	150	179	47	149	97	36	76	65	215	301	24	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Com33/32)

Table C.27 Please explain any increase or decrease (in resource inputs for HR development)

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	15	17	11	12	13	16	15	19	19	12	16	8	7
No	85	83	89	88	87	84	85	81	81	88	84	92	93
Respondents	163	65	87	24	70	45	13	31	31	101	136	13	14

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Com34/33)

Table C.28 Was a written HR or personnel plan in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0
In place and not revised	10	11	10	3	14	5	20	12	6	10	9	14	7
In place, but revised	52	54	53	54	54	50	56	42	49	56	48	71	70
Not in place but introduced	30	32	29	31	24	42	20	35	37	27	34	10	15
Not in place, not applicable	7	4	8	11	7	3	4	8	8	6	8	5	7
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>276</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>136</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>226</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.29 Was a formal training plan in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	5	0
In place and not revised	11	12	10	3	13	8	20	15	8	10	11	10	11
In place, but revised	56	59	56	60	60	52	60	42	53	61	52	71	81
Not in place but introduced	26	28	24	29	20	36	20	35	33	22	31	10	4
Not in place, not applicable	5	0	9	9	5	4	0	6	6	5	6	5	4
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>275</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.30 Was a system for identifying training needs in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
In place and not revised	11	11	10	3	14	7	16	13	8	10	9	14	11
In place, but revised	64	72	59	60	62	68	76	58	71	64	64	62	74
Not in place but introduced	21	16	24	29	18	23	8	27	16	20	22	24	11
Not in place, not applicable	4	1	7	9	5	3	0	2	4	5	5	0	4
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>275</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.31 Was a system for evaluating training in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
In place and not revised	10	11	9	0	14	7	16	13	6	10	9	14	7
In place, but revised	59	65	59	57	61	63	68	48	63	62	58	67	67
Not in place but introduced	26	23	25	34	21	28	12	35	27	23	27	19	22
Not in place, not applicable	5	1	7	9	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	0	4
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>275</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.32 Was your business plan communicated to employees in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did this have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If this was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	2	1	2	0	2	3	0	4	0	2	2	0	4
In place and not revised	10	12	9	3	14	9	8	13	4	10	9	14	11
In place, but revised	56	57	56	49	59	52	72	46	57	58	54	67	63
Not in place but introduced	28	30	24	43	20	32	20	33	31	25	30	19	19
Not in place, not applicable	5	0	8	6	5	4	0	4	8	5	6	0	4
Respondents	275	114	135	35	114	75	25	52	49	173	225	21	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.33 Was an employee communication process or appraisal system in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the

standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
In place and not revised	12	11	10	3	13	8	16	15	8	12	12	10	11
In place, but revised	71	78	68	71	70	75	80	60	80	72	69	71	81
Not in place but introduced	14	10	16	20	11	15	4	21	8	13	15	19	4
Not in place, not applicable	4	1	7	6	5	3	0	4	4	4	4	0	4
Respondents	275	114	135	35	114	75	25	52	49	173	225	21	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.34 Was benchmarking with other organisations in place in your organisation before it committed to achieving the standard? If so, did it have to be revised as a result of your commitment? If it was not in place, has it had to be introduced?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	9	11	8	6	11	5	16	13	8	8	8	19	11
In place and not revised	7	7	6	0	7	7	12	6	8	8	7	14	7
In place, but revised	40	41	41	44	49	29	36	29	39	43	39	52	37
Not in place but introduced	11	6	13	12	10	12	4	17	4	10	10	10	19
Not in place, not applicable	33	35	31	38	23	47	32	35	41	31	37	5	26
Respondents	274	113	135	34	114	75	25	52	49	172	224	21	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table C.35 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation overall?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Don't know	6	10	4	4	7	7	8	1	5	8	6	17	0
Some benefit	51	55	45	55	41	61	47	47	51	53	50	50	74
To early to say	33	27	39	30	43	20	36	37	28	33	33	33	19
No benefit	10	8	12	11	9	12	8	14	17	7	11	0	7
Respondents	358	150	179	47	149	97	36	76	65	215	301	24	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.36 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of more formal HR/Personnel systems?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	22	19	26	19	26	22	20	33	27	16	23	17	18
Small extent	30	26	35	39	32	25	35	28	16	35	30	33	23
Fair extent	35	45	26	32	28	45	35	30	36	37	35	33	32
Great extent	13	10	12	10	14	9	10	9	20	12	11	17	27
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>99</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.37 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of more effective training and development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	20	15	25	20	22	20	15	33	32	10	22	0	14
Small extent	30	29	32	23	35	29	30	27	14	37	28	50	32
Fair extent	36	47	27	40	28	41	50	27	39	38	36	33	41
Great extent	14	9	16	17	15	10	5	13	16	14	15	17	14
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.38 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved quality of products and services?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	26	19	33	28	26	26	21	39	34	18	28	17	16
Small extent	40	53	28	28	38	44	58	34	30	47	39	58	42
Fair extent	24	21	25	31	23	22	16	18	30	24	24	8	37
Great extent	10	7	14	14	13	7	5	9	7	12	10	17	5
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>207</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>118</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>19</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.39 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved recruitment and retention of staff?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	38	31	44	37	43	36	26	45	45	32	37	50	43
Small extent	32	40	25	20	26	39	47	31	29	33	32	30	29
Fair extent	22	23	19	23	23	18	21	17	21	24	21	20	29
Great extent	8	7	12	20	8	7	5	7	5	10	10	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>202</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>21</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.40 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved business growth performance?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	34	32	38	40	38	30	32	33	43	32	33	45	43
Small extent	39	43	34	23	37	45	47	42	36	40	40	36	33
Fair extent	20	20	18	20	18	21	16	21	17	20	20	18	19
Great extent	6	4	10	17	7	3	5	5	5	8	7	0	5
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>203</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>21</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.41 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of external perception of the organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	36	23	46	33	42	30	26	44	42	30	37	44	24
Small extent	24	28	22	20	24	27	26	28	23	23	24	33	24
Fair extent	30	39	21	23	28	30	42	21	26	35	30	11	33
Great extent	10	10	12	23	6	12	5	7	9	12	9	11	19
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>202</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>21</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.42 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of improved customer satisfaction?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	43	34	53	45	53	35	37	45	43	43	41	60	52
Small extent	33	41	22	17	26	40	42	31	36	33	34	20	24
Fair extent	19	20	19	28	15	22	16	21	19	17	20	10	19
Great extent	5	4	7	10	6	3	5	2	2	7	5	10	5
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>167</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>21</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.43 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved business development opportunities?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	39	34	44	53	38	35	37	37	50	35	38	30	52
Small extent	37	44	27	17	36	42	37	44	34	35	38	50	19
Fair extent	20	20	20	20	23	17	21	16	16	22	19	20	24
Great extent	5	2	9	10	3	6	5	2	0	8	5	0	5
<i>Respondents</i>	204	91	93	30	69	66	19	43	44	116	171	10	21

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.44 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of improved productivity?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all	30	27	33	35	30	25	37	35	35	26	31	20	30
Small extent	44	51	39	29	45	51	47	44	40	46	44	60	30
Fair extent	21	18	21	23	23	17	11	14	26	21	20	20	35
Great extent	5	4	7	13	2	6	5	7	0	6	5	0	5
Respondents	199	89	90	31	66	63	19	43	43	112	167	10	20

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table C.45 If it had not committed to liP, would your organisation have taken alternative steps to achieve the same effects we have just been talking about?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Businesses	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Definitely	10	7	11	9	11	7	9	8	8	12	9	9	26
Probably	13	12	13	16	12	11	11	12	10	14	12	26	15
Possibly	37	36	40	29	39	40	46	42	32	38	38	30	37
Probably not	34	38	32	36	33	38	31	31	40	33	36	30	22
Definitely not	5	7	4	11	5	4	3	7	10	3	5	4	0
Respondents	337	137	173	45	140	90	35	72	62	201	282	23	27

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv35/32 Com38/37)

Table C.46 Turnover (last financial year)

	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Median	1,500	2,000	1,500	700	1,000	3,000	36,000	3,000	2,000	1,000	2,000	5,000	500
Mean	17,025	18,779	7,031	1,369	3,672	5,561	74,129	13,351	6,378	22,955	11,017	0	2,920
Min	15	15	17	100	17	15	75	17	75	15	17	60	15
Max	0	0	0	5,000	25,000	25,000	0	0	81,500	0	0	0	32,000
Responses	173	66	89	24	69	44	18	48	33	91	143	7	20

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table C.47 Employment (last financial year)

	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Median	40	65	32	10	26	70	350	74	25	35	40	130	25
Mean	234	298	187	40	146	107	1,363	403	48	230	176	1,296	95
Min	1	1	4	1	4	2	8	8	2	1	1	4	6
Max	14,000	5,000	14,000	420	5,000	1,200	14,000	14,000	300	5,000	14,000	5,000	1,500
Responses	316	129	160	42	130	89	28	68	56	191	265	19	26

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table C.48 Looking at your organisation today, how much larger or smaller do you think being an Investor in People has made you in terms of turnover or income?

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Much larger	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
A little larger	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Marginally larger	4	5	2	9	3	3	0	3	4	4	3	5	12
No different	95	94	97	88	97	95	100	97	96	95	96	95	88
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>322</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>161</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>136</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>272</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>25</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv41/37 Com44/42)

Table C.49 Effect on staff

	Percentage of all respondents												
		Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
	Total	Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Too early to say	34	29	40	30	43	25	36	41	31	33	36	30	15
No effect	17	16	18	24	17	15	12	20	25	14	18	9	19
Some effect	49	55	42	46	40	60	52	39	44	53	46	61	65
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>340</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>203</i>	<i>285</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>26</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table C.50 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of increased staff morale?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Productio n	Private service s	Public service s	Busines s	Public sector	Voluntary/ non-profit
Great extent	13	11	14	25	11	10	10	7	7	16	11	19	27
Fair extent	33	38	27	9	30	43	38	34	37	32	36	12	27
Small extent	26	27	26	28	25	25	33	23	17	29	23	56	18
Not at all	28	24	33	38	33	22	19	36	39	22	30	12	27
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>222</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>136</i>	<i>182</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table C.51 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of reduced absenteeism?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	4	4	5	7	4	5	5	2	0	7	4	14	5
Fair extent	14	13	14	10	10	18	15	19	8	14	14	7	21
Small extent	23	33	15	20	19	30	25	21	21	24	22	36	21
Not at all	59	49	67	63	67	47	55	57	72	55	61	43	53
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>205</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>19</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table C.52 To what extent has participating in liP affected your organisation in terms of higher self-esteem?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	11	9	11	16	10	9	5	7	5	13	8	27	18
Fair extent	29	29	27	19	28	36	19	28	35	27	31	7	32
Small extent	28	32	25	25	23	31	48	26	15	32	27	40	18
Not at all	33	29	36	41	38	24	29	40	45	28	34	27	32
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>134</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table C.53 To what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of increased well-being?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	11	10	13	22	10	10	5	5	7	14	9	27	14
Fair extent	32	36	28	12	32	43	24	35	29	31	33	13	36
Small extent	26	27	26	25	23	25	43	26	22	28	26	33	18
Not at all	31	27	34	41	34	22	29	35	41	27	31	27	32
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv43/38 Com46/43)

Table C.54 Summary of effects

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Too early to say	34	28	40	25	43	27	37	38	32	34	35	35	12
No effect	13	13	14	16	13	13	14	19	18	9	15	0	8
Some effect	53	59	46	59	44	60	49	42	50	57	50	65	81
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>337</i>	<i>136</i>	<i>173</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>201</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>26</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.55 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in IiP affected your organisation in terms of becoming a leading-edge organisation with respect to HR development?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	6	5	6	6	5	6	5	2	2	8	4	7	18
Fair extent	17	18	18	28	13	20	14	14	19	17	18	7	18
Small extent	39	43	33	31	35	44	41	40	21	44	37	67	32
Not at all	39	34	43	34	47	30	41	44	57	31	41	20	32
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>217</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.56 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in IiP affected your organisation in terms of improved returns on your investment in HR?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	8	6	10	13	8	7	5	5	5	11	7	7	22
Fair extent	25	29	21	35	17	30	24	21	21	27	27	7	22
Small extent	41	45	37	29	42	42	52	37	33	44	37	87	39
Not at all	26	19	33	23	34	21	19	37	41	18	30	0	17
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>175</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>23</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.57 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	12	9	15	26	9	9	14	7	5	15	11	7	23
Fair extent	30	39	19	19	23	39	29	26	39	28	31	27	23
Small extent	29	25	31	23	29	28	33	30	20	32	26	53	36
Not at all	29	26	36	32	39	24	24	37	37	24	32	13	18
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>216</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.58 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	12	9	14	30	8	7	14	7	7	15	11	7	24
Fair extent	36	40	28	13	33	49	19	30	34	37	37	27	33
Small extent	29	29	29	23	32	24	48	30	24	29	26	60	29
Not at all	24	21	28	33	28	19	19	33	34	19	27	7	14
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>99</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>21</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.59 Looking at the wider impacts, to what extent has participating in IIP affected your organisation in terms of

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Great extent	14	11	15	26	9	10	14	7	10	18	12	13	32
Fair extent	34	43	26	26	30	45	29	23	32	37	34	33	32
Small extent	31	28	35	26	36	27	38	37	29	31	30	53	27
Not at all	21	18	25	23	25	18	19	33	29	15	24	0	9
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>216</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv44/39 Com47/44)

Table C.60 Has your organisation achieved or has it been working towards any [other] externally accredited standards?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Yes	34	32	37	28	38	28	47	53	27	29	32	41	50
No	63	66	60	65	62	70	47	45	68	68	65	55	50
Don't know	3	2	3	7	1	2	6	1	5	3	3	5	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>345</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>207</i>	<i>291</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>26</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv47/42 Com48/45 Non17)

Table C.61 Which standards has your organisation achieved?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onwards	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
National Training Award	4	3	2	0	6	0	0	0	10	5	3	17	0
ISO 9000 / 9002 / BS5750	73	81	66	57	66	90	70	100	80	50	79	50	20
EFQM / EQA / Business excellence	2	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	33	0
Charter mark	9	9	2	0	6	0	20	3	30	8	6	33	20
Partnerships with People	1	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	0
King's Fund (NHS)	1	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0
Respondents	81	32	41	7	35	21	10	31	10	40	68	6	5

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv47/42 Com48/45 Non17)

Table C.62 Which, if any, of the following practices does your organisation use?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Total Quality Management	23	19	24	28	20	30	10	37	14	21	27	10	14
Quality Circles	11	8	11	0	9	13	19	20	6	9	11	14	7
Job rotation	25	27	26	24	25	20	43	24	17	28	22	43	21
Performance pay	33	35	28	24	33	27	38	37	43	28	36	24	14
Multi-skilling	64	63	64	60	68	57	62	76	51	63	66	57	50
Job sharing	48	53	44	44	45	43	67	37	46	54	39	86	57
Flexi-time	54	55	54	52	57	40	67	29	57	64	47	81	79
Other	5	6	3	8	5	3	0	0	3	8	4	10	14
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>134</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>14</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv50/45 Com51/48)

Table C.63 In terms of your organisation's overall objectives, how useful would you say the liP standard has been?

	Percentage of all respondents												
	Total	Year of recognition		Employment				Sector			Organisation type		
		Pre-1998	1998 onward	<10	10-49	50-249	250+	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary/non-profit
Not at all useful	3	3	4	7	3	2	3	4	2	2	3	0	0
Not very useful	15	16	14	2	15	19	20	21	27	9	16	4	7
Fairly useful	43	42	44	48	41	45	37	41	35	45	45	42	22
Very useful	33	35	31	36	32	30	40	27	31	35	30	50	48
Extremely useful	7	5	7	7	8	4	0	6	5	8	6	4	22
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>343</i>	<i>146</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>209</i>	<i>287</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>27</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of committed organisations (Inv51/46 Com52/49)

APPENDIX D: DISAGGREGATED RESULTS FROM THE SURVEY OF NON-INVESTORS

Table D.1 Which of the following best describes your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
A business	93	100	94	71	100	0	0
A public sector body/organisation	2	0	0	16	0	100	0
A voluntary/non-profit organisation	5	0	5	13	0	0	100
Other	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Respondents	261	59	170	31	242	5	12

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv6, Com6, Non6)

Table D.2 (Businesses only) When did your business start trading?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Pre war	18	16	17	30	11	100	100
40s, 50s	6	7	5	7	6	0	0
60s, 70s	22	26	23	10	24	0	0
80s	24	24	23	30	26	0	0
1990+	30	28	32	23	32	0	0
Respondents	254	58	165	30	235	5	12

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv7, Com7, Non7)

Table D.3 What is your organisation's main product or service?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Production	23	100	0	0	24	0	0
Private services	65	0	100	0	66	0	67
Public services	12	0	0	100	9	100	33
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>260</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv8, Com8, Non8)

Table D.4 Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
One of a no of different sites within a larger org'n	43	32	49	34	43	75	25
Single independent site not part of a larger org'n	57	68	51	66	57	25	75
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv9, Com9, Non9)

Table D.5 (If more than one site) Is the place where you work...?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Single site	58	68	53	66	58	25	75
The head office	17	19	15	17	18	25	0
A regional or divisional office	3	2	3	7	2	25	17
A branch (incl. warehouse, and call centre)	22	12	28	10	22	25	8
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>252</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>163</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv10, Com10, Non10)

Table D.6 How would you describe the overall growth objectives of your business now?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Grow smaller	3	5	3	0	3	0	0
Stay same size	36	37	35	41	36	0	0
Grow moderately	50	49	51	45	50	0	0
Grow rapidly	11	8	11	14	11	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>158</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table D.7 What particular aspect(s) of your business do you especially want to grow?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Sales	28	21	32	15	28	0	0
Market share	13	6	13	23	13	0	0
Profits	17	9	20	15	17	0	0
Other	9	6	6	38	9	0	0
All	57	79	54	31	57	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv11, Com11, Non11)

Table D.8 Can you indicate on a scale of 1-10, where 1 is not at all important and 10 is crucially important, how you see the following in terms of their importance to the success of your organisation? (Mean ratings)

	Average of all respondents						
	Total	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Financial management	8.9	8.9	9.0	8.2	9.0	7.0	8.1
Operational management	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6	7.0	8.0
Human resource management and development	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.9	7.6	7.0	6.8
Marketing	7.7	8.0	8.0	5.9	7.9	4.7	5.3
Design, Innovation and Creativity	6.9	7.3	7.0	5.6	6.9	5.7	6.4
Corporate and internal communications	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.9	7.7	5.3
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>162</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>231</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>12</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv12, Com12, Non12)

Table D.9 Which of the following applies to your organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
HR management part of the MD/Director/Manager's job	56	63	52	66	58	0	42
Separate HR department	4	2	4	7	3	50	0
Employ own HR manager(s) without separate HR department	2	3	2	0	2	0	0
HR management is the responsibility of the Head Office	17	14	19	10	17	25	0
Use other approach to HR management	3	3	4	3	2	25	17
No one responsibility - HR not necessary	18	15	19	14	17	0	42
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>259</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv13, Com13, Non13)

Table D.10 Does your organisation have a specific budget for training and human resource development?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Yes	31	21	28	60	29	75	33
No	58	70	59	33	59	25	67
Don't know	11	9	13	7	12	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv16 Com16 Non14)

Table D.11 How has your organisation's expenditure on training and human resources development changed during the last three years?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Increased by 10% or more	29	27	21	44	28	0	50
Same - within 10% either way	43	45	40	50	44	67	25
Don't know	29	27	38	6	28	33	25
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv17 Com17 Non15)

Table D.12 Is a written HR or personnel plan in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	19	22	18	17	20	0	17
In place and not reviewed	12	7	15	3	13	0	0
In place, but reviewed	13	7	12	30	11	75	8
Not in place, not applicable	56	64	54	50	56	25	75
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.13 Is a formal training plan in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	17	21	17	7	18	0	8
In place and not reviewed	17	7	20	20	18	0	0
In place, but reviewed	21	19	18	40	20	75	8
Not in place, not applicable	46	53	45	33	44	25	83
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.14 Is a system for identifying training needs in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	15	17	16	7	16	0	8
In place and not reviewed	19	14	21	20	21	0	8
In place, but reviewed	23	17	20	43	21	100	17
Not in place, not applicable	43	52	42	30	43	0	67
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.15 Is a system for evaluating training in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	16	17	17	7	17	0	8
In place and not reviewed	17	16	16	27	18	0	0
In place, but reviewed	21	16	20	37	20	75	8
Not in place, not applicable	46	52	47	30	45	25	83
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.16 Is your business plan communicated to employees in your organisation? If so, is this policy reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	21	19	21	23	21	25	17
In place and not reviewed	9	9	10	3	9	0	0
In place, but reviewed	20	21	20	20	21	50	8
Not in place, not applicable	50	52	49	53	50	25	75
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.17 Is an employee communication process or appraisal system in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	16	19	17	10	17	0	8
In place and not reviewed	16	9	19	13	16	0	0
In place, but reviewed	22	17	21	30	21	75	17
Not in place, not applicable	46	55	43	47	45	25	75
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
 Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.18 Is benchmarking with other organisations in place in your organisation? If so, is it reviewed on a regular basis?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	24	21	26	23	24	0	17
In place and not reviewed	8	5	10	3	8	25	0
In place, but reviewed	10	10	8	17	10	50	8
Not in place, not applicable	58	64	57	57	58	25	75
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv28/26 Com36/35 Non16/16)

Table D.19 Before I called, had you heard of Investors in People?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Yes	58	63	53	70	58	75	33
No	42	37	46	30	41	25	67
Don't know	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>252</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Non18)

Table D.20 Do you feel you understand what liP is about??

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Yes	34	34	31	45	35	67	0
Partially / vaguely	52	54	54	45	51	33	100
Not at all	13	11	15	10	14	0	0
Respondents	143	35	87	20	134	3	4

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Non19)

Table D.21 In your opinion, are there any potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Don't know	5	5	4	5	4	25	0
Some benefit	52	42	51	68	51	50	50
No benefit	44	53	45	27	45	25	50
Respondents	155	38	94	22	145	4	4

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.22 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of more formal HR/Personnel systems?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	85	83	88	76	86	33	75
Yes	15	17	12	24	14	67	25
Respondents	149	36	91	21	140	3	4

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.23 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of more effective training and development?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	69	72	69	62	70	67	75
Yes	31	28	31	38	30	33	25
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.24 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved quality of products and services?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	81	89	79	76	81	100	100
Yes	19	11	21	24	19	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.25 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved recruitment and retention of staff?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	79	81	80	67	80	33	75
Yes	21	19	20	33	20	67	25
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.26 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved business growth performance?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	86	89	84	90	86	100	100
Yes	14	11	16	10	14	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.27 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of external perception of the organisation?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	77	81	79	67	77	33	100
Yes	23	19	21	33	23	67	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.28 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved customer satisfaction?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	78	86	79	62	79	67	100
Yes	22	14	21	38	21	33	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.29 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved business development opportunities?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	95	97	92	100	94	100	100
Yes	5	3	8	0	6	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.30 In your opinion, are there potential benefits arising from achieving the Investors in People standard in terms of improved productivity?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No	95	97	95	95	97	67	100
Yes	5	3	5	5	3	33	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv33/30 Com37/36 Non20)

Table D.31 Has your organisation ever considered pursuing the IiP standard?

	Percentage of all respondents (by type of scheme)						
	Total	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Yes	16	19	10	33	14	67	25
No	55	47	59	52	58	33	25
Don't know	29	33	31	14	28	0	50
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>139</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Non21)

Table D.32 (If no to Q21) Would you mind saying why not?

	Percentage of all respondents (by type of scheme)						
	Total	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
No time / too time consuming	15	18	11	27	15	0	100
Company too small / not enough resources	49	47	49	55	49	0	100
Not relevant to industry	15	6	18	9	16	0	0
Decision carried out elsewhere (eg: Head office)	4	0	4	0	4	0	0
Already hold other HR accreditation	8	12	9	0	9	0	0
Don't think it can be beneficial to us	24	47	20	9	24	0	0
Financial or operational difficulties	6	12	2	18	6	0	0
Organisation bought out or merged	1	0	0	9	1	0	0
Structural changes being undertaken in the organisation	4	0	5	0	4	0	0
Other	20	29	18	18	20	100	0
Don't know	4	6	4	0	4	0	0
No particular reason	2	0	2	9	2	0	0
Respondents	84	17	55	11	82	1	1

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Non22)

Table D.33 Turnover (last financial year)

	Total	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Median	1,000	800	1,000	400	1,000	0	350
Mean	26,764	4,350	38,625	1,014	28,049	0	6,224
Min	5	5	30	100	5	0	50
Max	0	60,000	0	3,500	0	0	30,000
Responses	106	29	70	7	100	0	5

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table D.34 Employment (last financial year)

	Total	Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Median	18	24	15	24	18	30	12
Mean	218	163	267	82	227	412	16
Min	1	1	1	3	1	5	3
Max	16,000	6,000	16,000	1,200	16,000	1,200	40
Responses	221	56	138	26	206	3	10

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv39-40/35-36 Com42-43/40-41 Non28-29/27-28)

Table D.35 What other performance effects have there been?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Information covers just one site	72	78	67	80	71	0	100
Information covers whole organisation	28	22	33	20	29	100	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (N30/29)

Table D.36 Has your organisation achieved or has it been working towards any [other] externally accredited standards?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
Yes	32	31	29	52	31	33	25
No	61	66	62	48	62	67	67
Don't know	7	3	10	0	7	0	8
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>12</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation

Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv47/42 Com48/45 Non17)

Table D.37 Which standards has your organisation achieved?

	Percentage of all respondents						
	Total	Sector			Organisation type		
		Production	Private services	Public services	Business	Public sector	Voluntary / non-profit
National Training Award	3	0	7	0	4	0	0
ISO 9000 / 9002 / BS5750	83	100	73	50	89	0	0
EFQM / EQA / Business excellence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charter mark	3	0	7	0	4	0	0
Partnerships with People	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King's Fund (NHS)	10	0	13	50	4	0	0
<i>Respondents</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

A bold figure indicates a 95% confidence that that category differs from the other categories in that particular disaggregation
Source: PACEC survey of non-investors (Inv47/42 Com48/45 Non17)

