Fair, safe and productive workplaces

Labour











A Profile of Federal Labour **Jurisdiction Workplaces**

Results from the 2008 Federal **Jurisdiction Workplace Survey**



You can order this publication by contacting:

Publishing Services

Human Resources and Skills Development Canada 140 Promenade du Portage Portage IV, 10th Floor Gatineau, Québec K1A 0J9

Fax: 819-953-7260

Online: http://www12.rhdcc.gc.ca

This document is available on demand in multiple formats (large print, Braille, audio cassette, audio CD, e-text diskette, e-text CD, or DAISY), by contacting 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a teletypewriter (TTY), call 1-800-926-9105.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2011

Paper

Cat. No.: HS24-89/2011E ISBN: 978-1-100-19046-4

PDF

Cat. No.: HS24-89/2011E-PDF ISBN: 978-1-100-19047-1

For information regarding reproduction rights, please contact Public Works and Government Services Canada at: 613-996-6886 or droitdauteur.copyright@tpsgc-pwsgc.gc.ca



A Profile of Federal Labour Jurisdiction Workplaces:

Results from the 2008 Federal Jurisdiction Workplace Survey

Research and Data Development Division
Strategic Policy, Analysis and Workplace
Information Directorate
Labour Program
Human Resources and Skills
Development Canada

June 2010

Table of Contents

Hi	ghlig	hts	1
In	trodu	ction	3
1.	The	survey	4
	1.1	Survey coverage	4
	1.2	The sampling unit	4
	1.3	FJWS industry classification	5
	1.4	Note on the 2004 FJWS	5
2.	The	distribution of employees and employers within federal jurisdiction	7
	2.1	Employees	7
	2.2	Companies and work sites	9
3.	Gen	der and occupation	10
4.	Wor	king time	12
	4.1	Hours of work	12
	4.2	Work schedule	14
5.	Colle	ective bargaining	16
6.	Wag	ges, leave and benefits	19
	6.1	Wage distribution	19
	6.2	Paid vacation	20
	6.3	Other leave	22
	6.4	Other benefits	23
7.	Agin	ng and retirement policies and programs	25
	7.1	Age distribution	25
	7.2	Workplace arrangements for employees near or at retirement age Error! Book	mark not
	defir		
8.	The	working environment and workplace practices	
	8.1	Top three concerns with respect to the working environment	
	8.2	Programs to improve working conditions	
		ductivity	
M		dological Annexdological Annex	
		arget Population and Survey Frame	
	Sa	ampling Strategy	34
		ollection	
		stimation Process	
		uality Assurance	
		on-response	
		onfidentiality	36
St	atistic	cal Annex	40

List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Distribution of employees, employers and work sites	. 8
Table 2.2:	Distribution of employees by size within industry	. 9
Table 3.1:	Distribution of employees by gender	10
Table 3.2:	Distribution of female and male employees by occupation	11
Table 4.1:	Distribution of working hours (not including overtime) by gender	13
Table 4.2:	Distribution of work schedules by gender	14
Table 5.1:	Collective bargaining coverage	16
Table 5.2:	Proportion of employees in companies by labour-management relations rating	18
Table 6.1:	Distribution of hourly wage rates	19
Table 6.2:	Proportion of employees in companies providing at least three weeks of paid vacation entitlement after 1, 3, 5 and 10 years to full-time, permanent employees	20
Table 6.3:	Proportion of employees in companies where the selected leave is frequently give to full-time, permanent employees	
Table 6.4:	Proportion of employees in companies with pension and insurance plans available for full-time, permanent employees	
Table 7.1:	Age distribution of employees	25
Table 7.2:	Proportion of employees in companies with arrangements to retain workers past the eligible retirement age	
Table 7.3:	Proportion of employees in companies with retirement preparation arrangements	27
Table 8.1:	Proportion of employees in companies that identify the working environment issu as one of three most important for the success of the business	
Table 8.2a:	Proportion of employees in companies with a program in place	30
Table 8.2b:	Proportion of employees in companies with a program in place (Continued)	31
Table 9.1:	Proportion of employees in companies using productivity-related practices	32
Table 9.2:	Productivity rating compared with the previous year	32
Table A-1:	Survey response rates (proportion of regional companies responding)	35
Table A-2:	2008 FJWS sector groupings	37
Table A-3:	Number of employees (women, men and total), employers and work sites	40

Highlights

Employees

- There are approximately 820,000 employees covered by Part III of the Canada Labour Code, accounting for 6% of all non-public administration employees (as of September 2008).
- Ninety percent of Federal Jurisdiction (FJ) employees work for companies with 100 or more employees.

Companies and work sites

- There are 8,220 companies within FJ with 80% of them having fewer than 20 employees.
- Employers with 100 or more employees account for only 7% of companies but 63% of the 29,890 work sites within FJ.

Gender

- Comprising 43% of employees, women are more likely to work in large companies, especially banks.
- Women comprise the majority of employees in marketing and sales and in clerical and administrative occupations, but form only a minority of managers or supervisors.
- Women were more likely to work part-time and more likely to work a regular work schedule—working between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday—compared with men.

Collective bargaining

- Two out of five employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement.
- About 8% of companies have some of their employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

Wages, leave and benefits

- Sixty-six percent of workers earn \$20 or more per hour; just 1% earn less than \$10 per hour.
- Not all companies give three weeks of paid vacation after six years of service as required by the Canada Labour Code.
- Two in five employees work in companies where there is retirement-preparation training and an opportunity to take early retirement without affecting their pension benefits.

Working environment and productivity

• The majority of employees within FJ work in companies where there is a program in place for workplace health and safety (88%), prevention of harassment (87%) and physical health or fitness promotion (65%).

- A large proportion of employees work in companies using productivity-enhancing work practices such as performance evaluation (90%), progressive disciplinary evaluation (88%), individual incentives (83%) and information-sharing (79%).
- Employers representing 41% of FJ employees report that productivity is better or much better in their current fiscal year compared with the previous one.

Introduction

The 2008 Federal Jurisdiction Workplace Survey (FJWS) covers the portion of federal labour jurisdiction (FJ) that falls under Part III of the Canada Labour Code. It is an employer survey that, according to survey instructions, is to be completed by someone responsible for human resources in the company.

Section 1 of this report provides some background on the survey, including details on coverage, the sampling unit for the survey, the industry classification used in the survey, and finally, an explanation of why the first edition of the survey, FJWS 2004, is not used in this report to, for example, make comparisons over time. The FJWS 2008 is the second edition of the survey.

The remaining sections of the report examine the survey results. Section 2 provides some information on the distribution of employers and employees; Section 3 examines gender and occupation; Section 4, working time; Section 5, collective bargaining coverage and labour-management relations; Section 6, wages, leave and benefits; Section 7, aging and retirement; Section 8, working environment and programs to improve it; and Section 9, productivity.

This report does not address all of the results from the 2008 survey. For example, information on training offered to employees, wage-setting methods, hiring and separations and company characteristics such as gross operating revenue has been omitted.

1. The survey

1.1 Survey coverage

The Canada Labour Code consists of three parts: Part I concerns industrial relations; Part II, occupational health and safety; and Part III, labour standards. Sectors that come under the jurisdiction of all three parts of the Code include the following:

- interprovincial and international pipeline and transport services (e.g. railways; highway transport; telephone, telegraph and cable systems; canals; ferries, tunnels and bridges; shipping and shipping services);
- air transport, aircraft operations and aerodromes;
- radio and television broadcasting, including cablevision;
- banking;
- undertakings for the protection and preservation of fisheries as a natural resource;
- undertakings declared by Parliament to be for the general advantage of Canada such as most grain elevators; flour and seed mills, feed warehouses and grain-seed-cleaning plants; uranium mining and processing; and certain individual undertakings such as Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company; and
- First Nations' governments and social services.

Part III of the Code is restricted to organizations undertaking these types of activities. Parts I and II include additional areas: Part I extends to local governments in the three northern territories as well as to private-sector firms not already covered in the above list, and Part II extends to employees in the federal public service.

The survey was designed to target companies that come under the jurisdiction of Part III and thus are subject to the provisions of all three parts of the Code. There was one exception: First Nations governments and social services employers were excluded from the survey because of the need for a different methodology to obtain meaningful results. Otherwise, response rates would likely have been low.

1.2 The sampling unit

The sampling unit for the survey—i.e. the entity being sampled and studied—is the "regional company," a construct designed for the purposes of the survey. A regional company is that part or parts of a company, namely all establishments or installations, that is located in one region, of which there are four: Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario and the West (including the territories).¹ For the purposes of this survey, a company that has establishments in only one region constitutes one regional company; a company with establishments in two regions constitutes two separate regional companies and so forth.

One alternative to this construct would have been to use the company itself (i.e. not just the regional portion of the company) as the sampling unit. The regional company concept has two advantages: i) it allows for regional breakdowns; and ii) it increases the sample size. In respect to the latter, some industries have relatively few companies (e.g. banking and rail). If the

-

¹ However, where possible, data was collected by surveying all of a company's establishments.

company as a whole were used instead as the sampling unit, the number of sampling units would have been significantly less in some industries, reducing survey reliability and increase the potential for confidentiality issues. Because of this concern for confidentiality, the *Statistics Act* does not permit the publication of data based on a small number of underlying observations.

Because some companies span more than one region, one disadvantage of the regional company concept is that some companies are represented more than once in the survey—one for each of their regional components. This does not allow a proper count of the number of companies. Another disadvantage of the regional company concept relates to size. Some regional companies are counted as having 20 to 99 employees, for example, when the company itself has 100 or more employees. In effect, classification by *regional company* size, according to the survey data, provides different results than classification by *company* size.

For ease of reading, this report henceforth refers to "regional companies" as simply "companies." However, there are a few instances where statistics presented are actually based on the company concept as opposed to that of the regional company, namely in Tables 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and A-3 of the Statistical Annex. This is noted in the discussion.

The Methodological Annex provides more information on the sampling methodology, including survey response rates.

1.3 FJWS industry classification

The FJWS sampling frame is divided into nine industry groupings, each of which includes specific North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes related to the underlying activity. These groupings and their associated NAICS (2007) codes are shown in Table A-2 in the Methodological Annex.

Two industry groupings are of note: "pipelines and postal services" and "miscellaneous industries." The pipeline industry is composed of a relatively small number of companies and employees. It was not feasible to have it as a separate industry, so a decision was made to merge it with postal services. The miscellaneous industries group includes companies that do not fit into the other eight industries—for example, companies with activities in the protection and preservation of fisheries as a natural resource, mining, and nuclear power generation. The miscellaneous industries group also includes Crown corporations not classified elsewhere (e.g. museums).

1.4 Note on the 2004 FJWS

Statistics Canada conducted the first edition of this survey in 2004. It would seem valuable to compare the results of the earlier survey to this new version.

However, a comparison of the two surveys showed that the total number of FJ employees decreased from 840,103 in 2004, to 820,216 in 2008, just as economic growth was bringing about an expansion in employment. The analysis done by the Research and Data Development (RDD) Division using, among other sources, data from the Survey of Employment, Payroll and Hours (SEPH), confirmed that employment should have increased from 2004 and 2008 in most individual FJ industries and for all FJ industries as a whole. Yet, a comparison of the two editions of the FJWS showed a decline in employment from 2004 to 2008 in many key industries: telecommunications, banking, road transport and air transport. There were other anomalies such as the fact that the proportion of employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement was 41% in 2008, but only 32% in 2004. Further analysis using SEPH and data from the Employment Equity program suggested that the problems lay in the 2004 survey.

Statistics Canada's subsequent analysis of the 2004 survey showed that the underlying methodology used to conduct the 2008 survey was more sound than that used for the 2004 survey. For example, the 2004 non-response rate was abnormally high in all nine industry groups. The unweighted response rate was 23% for the entire in-scope² population and 26% for the in-scope population with 100+ employees. In addition, some of the dominant companies in each industry grouping had not responded: of the 39 companies in the 2004 sample that had 2,500 or more employees (representing 121 regional companies), 30 (representing 81 regional companies) did not respond to the survey. This represents 77% of companies with 2,500 or more employees that did not respond to the survey. Based on this information, it is clear that the 2004 survey is deeply flawed. Moreover, any attempt to improve the survey quality is pointless (a point argued by Statistics Canada).

A comparison between the 2004 and 2008 surveys will therefore not yield meaningful results.

² The "in-scope population" refers to units that are part of the target population, i.e. the population that the survey aims to cover.

2. The distribution of employees and employers within federal jurisdiction³

2.1 Employees

There were 820,000 employees covered by Part III in September 2008.⁴ By comparison, in the same month, there were 13,666,000 employees in Canada as a whole (outside of public administration).⁵ Thus, Part III covers 6% of all non-public administration employees in Canada.⁶ If we consider only the business sector—i.e. exclude health care and social assistance, educational services and public administration—Part III covers 7.6% of employees in Canada.

Companies with 100 or more employees employ 90% of employees covered by the survey (Table 2.1). Just 4% work in companies with less than 20 employees.

The largest industry is banking with 27% of employees, followed by telecommunications and broadcasting (18%), postal and pipeline services (17%), air transport (12%) and road transport (11%).

In air transport, banks and telecommunications and broadcasting, companies with 100 or more employees comprise close to 90% or more of employees in the industry (Table 2.2). Postal services and pipelines and rail transport are likely similar but the figures are not available due to confidentiality reasons. Two industries—road transport and feed, flour, seed and grain—have around 35% of their employees in companies with between 6 to 99 employees. Further, in maritime transport, 25% of employees are in this size grouping.

We can also examine the distribution of employees by industry within each size category. Road transportation dominates the three size categories with less than 100 employees, comprising 41% of employees in companies with one to five employees, 48% in companies with 6 to 19 and 42% in companies with 20 to 99 (no table shown for these figures). Amongst companies with 100 or more employees, banks comprise 30%. Postal and pipelines and telecommunications and broadcasting comprise 19% each.

Considering the distribution of FJ employees across the region, 39% of employees are in Ontario, 32% in the West and territories, 20% in Quebec and 8% in the Atlantic region (Table 2.1). Compared with the distribution of all employees in Canada (FJ and provincial jurisdiction, henceforth PJ), FJ is overrepresented by two to three percentage points in the Atlantic region and underrepresented by a similar amount in Quebec. ⁷ The proportion of FJ employees in Ontario and the West and territories is similar to that in Canada as a whole.

_

³ Note that the statistics presented in Section 2 are all based on the company concept rather than the regional company concept except for the column showing the distribution of work sites in Table 2.1.

⁴ The survey question asks: "How many federal full-time and part-time employees did you have on September 30th 2008?"

⁵ Source: Labour Force Survey (unadjusted for seasonality; Cansim Table 282-0011).

⁶ LFS coverage excludes people living on First Nations reserves. FJWS coverage only excludes First Nations government and social services employers. It covers businesses on reserves, but response rates may be low. This discrepancy means that FJ coverage will be slightly less than the 6% reported.

⁷ Based on the September 2008 Labour Force Survey (unadjusted for seasonality; Cansim 282-0011).

Table 2.1: Distribution of employees, employers and work sites

	Distribution of employees	Distribution of employers	Distribution of work sites
Size			
1 to 5 employees	1%	54%	14%
6 to 19 employees	3%	25%	11%
20 to 99 employees	6%	14%	12%
100 or more employees	90%	6%	63%
Industry			
Air transport	12%	11%	9%
Rail transport	5%	<1%	1%
Road transport	11%	45%	16%
Maritime transport	2%	4%	3%
Postal services and pipelines	17%	5%	21%
Banks	27%	1%	24%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	2%	6%	5%
Telecom. and broadcasting	18%	9%	11%
Miscellaneous industries	6%	19%	9%
Region			
Atlantic	8%	9%	10%
Quebec	20%	21%	22%
Ontario	39%	29%	33%
West and the territories	32%	41%	35%
All employers (FJ)	100%	100%	100%

Table 2.2: Distribution of employees by size within industry

	1 to 5 employees	6 to 19 employees	20 to 99 employees	100 or more employees
Air transport	1%	2%	8%	89%
Rail transport	x	Х	Х	x
Road transport	6%	12%	25%	59%
Maritime transport	2%	5%	20%	73%
Postal services and pipelines	1%	<1%	Х	x
Banks	x	Х	Х	99%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	3%	14%	22%	61%
Telecom. and broadcasting	<1%	2%	4%	94%
Miscellaneous industries	5%	4%	9%	82%
All employers (FJ)	1%	3%	6%	90%

Note: All rows sum to 100% aside from rounding error. The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the *Statistics Act*.

See the Statistical Annex for the number of employees by size, industry and region covered by the FJWS (2008).

2.2 Companies and work sites

The survey shows that there are 8,220 companies within FJ. Recall that this is the number of regional companies; it slightly over-counts the actual number of companies.

Almost 80% of companies have less than 20 employees: companies with one to five employees make up 54% of all companies; another 25% are companies having 6 to 19 employees (Table 2.1).

Road transport accounts for 45% of all companies, followed by miscellaneous industries (19%) and air transport (11%).

Even though employers with 100 or more employees account for only 6% of companies, about 60% of all work sites⁸ are in such companies. There is a particularly large proportion of work sites in banking (24%), postal and pipelines (21%) and road transport (16%). Altogether, there are 29.890 work sites within FJ.

See the Statistical Annex (Table A-3) for the number of companies and work sites by size, industry and region.

-

⁸ We use the term "work site" instead of "workplace" because the survey specifically uses the former term. It asks, "During the last complete fiscal year, what was the maximum number of work sites in operation?"

3. Gender and occupation

Women are under-represented within FJ: 43% of employees are women, compared with 50% of employees amongst PJ employers, excluding public administration. If we consider the business sector only—namely, all industries except public administration, health and social services and education services—the proportion of women among PJ employers is 46% (Table 3.1).⁹

Companies with 100 or more employees employ 94% of women within FJ, but just 87% of men. The preponderance of women in larger companies is to some extent related to their prevalence in banking: 43% of all women within FJ work in banking.

Women form the majority of employees in just one industry, banking, where they account for 70% of all employees. In postal and pipeline, 43% of employees are women and in telecommunications and broadcasting, 42% are women. Just 16% of employees in road and 12% in rail transport are women.

Table 3.1: Distribution of employees by gender

	Distribution of women	Distribution of men	Proportion of women
Size			
1 to 5 employees	1%	1%	37%
6 to 19 employees	2%	3%	26%
20 to 99 employees	3%	8%	22%
100 or more employees	94%	87%	45%
Industry			
Air transport	9%	13%	35%
Rail transport	1%	8%	12%
Road transport	4%	16%	16%
Maritime transport	1%	3%	26%
Postal services and pipelines	17%	17%	43%
Banks	43%	14%	70%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	1%	3%	26%
Telecom. and broadcasting	18%	19%	42%
Miscellaneous industries	5%	7%	34%
Region			
Atlantic	9%	8%	48%
Quebec	21%	20%	44%

⁹ The statistics presented in Table 3.1 are all based on the company concept rather than the regional company concept.

_

	Distribution of women	Distribution of men	Proportion of women
Ontario	39%	39%	43%
West and the territories	31%	33%	42%
All employers (FJ)	100%	100%	43%
PJ (non-public administration) ^a	100%	100%	50%
PJ (business sector only) ^a	100%	100%	46%

^a Source: Labour Force Survey, September 2008 (unadjusted for seasonality; Cansim 282-0011)

In respect to the occupational distribution, 42% of women are in administrative and clerical positions (Table 3.2). Other occupations comprise no more than 15% women. Amongst men, 32% are labourers; another 20% are in technical and trade occupations.

Women are the majority in clerical and administrative occupations (74%) and in marketing and sales occupations (64%). Women represent 47% of professionals, 40% of managers and 37% of supervisors.

Table 3.2: Distribution of female and male employees by occupation

	Distribution of women	Distribution of men	Proportion of women
Occupation			
Managers	9%	10%	40%
Supervisors	4%	5%	37%
Professionals	15%	14%	47%
Technical/Trades	5%	20%	15%
Marketing/Sales	9%	4%	64%
Clerical/Administrative	42%	12%	74%
Labourers	15%	32%	26%
Other	2%	4%	28%
All employers (FJ)	100%	100%	43%

4. Working time

4.1 Hours of work

Overall, 21% of women work part-time (less than 30 hours per week) compared with 9% of men (Table 4.1). By contrast, just 2% of women work over 40 hours a week, compared with 11% of men, excluding overtime hours. These figures refer to the last full week of September and may fluctuate over the year.

The bulk of these employees working over 40 hours per week are likely excluded from the overtime pay provisions within Part III of the Canada Labour Code. Excluded groups include managers, superintendents and employees who exercise management functions; members of architectural, dental, engineering, legal and medical professions; commission-paid salespersons in the banking and broadcasting industries; certain categories of employees in the rail industry (such as locomotive engineers, train conductors and yardmen); and employees of Ontario Hydro Nuclear facilities. In addition, employees on ships and motor vehicle drivers are subject to special regulations. In these cases, the threshold for overtime hours may be higher than 40 hours a week. For example, for highway truck drivers, it is 60 hours per week.

By contrast, among PJ employers (outside of public administration), 32% of women work part-time and 17% of men work over 40 hours per week (usual hours of work, excluding overtime). Therefore, both men and women working for PJ employers are more likely to work part-time and work over 40 hours a week than those within FJ.

Amongst employers with one to five employees, 43% of women are part-time compared with 21% or less in the larger size categories. About 37% of men in companies with less than 100 employees work over 40 hours, compared with just 7% in companies with 100 or more employees.

By industry, 42% of women in air transport and 39% in postal and pipeline services and 22% in maritime transport are part-time; in miscellaneous industries, it is 16% or less. The proportion of men working 40 hours or more is particularly high in road (48%) and in maritime transport (34%); in the miscellaneous industries, 15% or less of men work these long hours.

The high proportion of employees working over 40 hours per week in road and maritime transport is explained by the special regulations that extend the threshold of overtime hours for many employees. ¹⁰

¹⁰ Provisions of the Code related to the averaging of hours where industrial establishment necessitates that hours of work are irregularly distributed and provisions related to modified work schedules may lead to some employees working over 40 hours per week without overtime payment. It is possible that in the reference period, the last full week in September, there is a concentration of longer hours in particular industries.

Table 4.1: Distribution of working hours (not including overtime) by gender

	W	omen		Men		
-	Part-time	Full-t		Part-time	Full-ti	
<u>-</u>	hours	hou	rs	hours	hours	
	Less than 30	30 to 40	Over 40	Less than 30	30 to 40	Over 40
Size						
1 to 5 employees	43%	49%	8%	12%	50%	38%
6 to 19 employees	20%	74%	6%	10%	51%	39%
20 to 99 employees	13%	78%	9%	8%	56%	36%
100 or more employees	21%	77%	2%	9%	84%	7%
Industry						
Air transport	42%	56%	2%	12%	83%	5%
Rail transport	6%	90%	4%	2%	95%	3%
Road transport	15%	74%	11%	6%	47%	48%
Maritime transport	22%	64%	13%	12%	54%	34%
Postal services and pipelines	39%	60%	2%	19%	77%	4%
Banks	16%	83%	1%	5%	94%	1%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	10%	85%	5%	6%	79%	15%
Telecom. and broadcasting	11%	86%	2%	8%	89%	3%
Miscellaneous industries	9%	87%	4%	5%	91%	4%
All employers (FJ)	21%	77%	2%	9%	79%	11%
PJ (non-public administration) ^a	32%	63%	5%	14%	69%	17%
PJ (business sector only) ^a	32%	62%	6%	13%	69%	18%

Note: All rows sum to 100% for women and men respectively, aside from rounding error. Employees registering no time worked are excluded from the Public Sector Universe in this table.

^a Source: Labour Force Survey (September, 2008); based on the Public Use Microdata Files (PUMF). The question asks respondents the following: "excluding overtime, on average, how many paid hours does [name of person] usually work per week?"

4.2 Work schedule

Amongst women, 71% have a regular work schedule (i.e. between 6:00am and 6:00pm, Monday to Friday) compared with only 54% of men (Table 4.2). Of the remaining 46% of men, half have an "other regular" schedule, namely one that includes hours outside of the 6 to 6, Monday to Friday period and half have an irregular schedule (e.g. rotating shifts).

Table 4.2: Distribution of work schedules by gender

		Women			Men	
	Regular (6 to 6, M to F)	Other regular	Non- regular	Regular (6 to 6, M to F)	Other regular	Non- regular
Size						
1 to 5 employees	66%	7%	27%	50%	8%	42%
6 to 19 employees	82%	5%	13%	49%	11%	40%
20 to 99 employees	79%	7%	14%	48%	16%	36%
100 or more employees	71%	17%	12%	55%	25%	21%
Industry						
Air transport	27%	29%	43%	21%	40%	39%
Rail transport	70%	24%	7%	32%	37%	31%
Road transport	71%	7%	22%	39%	16%	45%
Maritime transport	44%	х	х	32%	х	х
Postal services and pipelines	55%	25%	20%	57%	30%	12%
Banks	86%	10%	4%	89%	9%	2%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	90%	х	х	69%	х	Х
Telecom. and broadcasting	70%	20%	10%	66%	22%	13%
Miscellaneous industries	84%	3%	13%	65%	7%	29%
All employers (FJ)	71%	16%	13%	54%	23%	23%

Note: All rows sum to 100% for women and men respectively, aside from rounding error. The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the *Statistics Act*.

Non-regular schedules are common for certain company size categories and for certain industries, with some variation by gender. For example, 27% of women working in companies with one to five employees are non-regular, compared with 12% to 14% in other size categories. For men, non-regular schedules are much more common in companies with less than 100 employees compared with companies with more than 100 employees.

Non-regular schedules are common in air transport and road transport for both men and women: in rail transport and postal and pipeline services for women only; and in miscellaneous industries for men only. Moreover, although the data is missing, non-regular schedules are likely

also common for both women and men in maritime transport given that respectively only 44% and 32% work a regular schedule in that industry.

5. Collective bargaining

Overall, 41% of employees within federal jurisdiction are covered by a collective bargaining agreement (Table 5.1). About 8% of companies have some of their employees covered.

Collective bargaining coverage is quite high within FJ compared with PJ companies in Canada. If we consider PJ employers (excluding public administration), 28% of employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement. In the PJ business sector just 18% of employees are covered.

Slightly more than one-half (52%) of companies with 100 or more employees have some coverage. Altogether, 45% of employees in these companies are covered by a collective bargaining contract. In companies with 20 to 99 employees, just 12% of employees are covered with even smaller percentages in the lower categories.

Table 5.1: Collective bargaining coverage

	Proportion of covered employees	Proportion of companies with some unionization
Size		
1 to 5 employees	1%	1%
6 to 19 employees	4%	5%
20 to 99 employees	12%	16%
100 or more employees	45%	52%
Industry		
Air transport	66%	13%
Rail transport	78%	80%
Road transport	27%	4%
Maritime transport	63%	24%
Postal services and pipelines	84%	12%
Banks	х	х
Feed, flour, seed and grain	х	х
Telecom. and broadcasting	40%	14%
Miscellaneous industries	41%	2%
Region		
Atlantic	41%	11%
Quebec	43%	11%
Ontario	42%	6%

	Proportion of covered employees	Proportion of companies with some unionization
West and the territories	39%	6%
All employers (FJ)	41%	8%
PJ (non-public administration) ^a	28%	Not available
PJ (business sector only) ^a	18%	Not available

Note: The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the Statistics Act.

Union coverage of employees is high in postal services and pipelines (84%), rail transport (78%), air transport (66%) and maritime transport (63%). Coverage in banking and feed, flour, seed and grain was suppressed for confidentiality reasons. Nevertheless, union coverage is very low in banking. Most other industries, with the exception of road and banks have about 40% of employees covered.

If we exclude the banking industry, where it is assumed that 1% of employees are covered, we find that overall 56% of employees within FJ are covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

The survey asks respondents—namely, someone responsible for human resources in the firm—how they would rate their labour-management relations. Overall, companies comprising 42% rate their labour-management relations as very good and 43% rate the relations as good (Table 5.2). Most of the remaining employees (15%) are in companies rating their relations as fair.

A very good rating is more common with smaller size companies. By industry, one notable figure is the fact that 72% of employees in postal services and pipelines work in companies where labour-management relations are related as fair. This may reflect the assessment of just one or a handful of large companies.

Lower union coverage is also associated with a better labour-management relations rating. Comparing companies with less than 20% of employees covered against those with 60% or more of employees covered, 69% of employees in the former are in workplaces where labour-management relations are rated as very good versus just 35% of employees in the latter.

^a Source: Labour Force Survey, September 2008 (unadjusted for seasonality; Cansim 282-0073)

Table 5.2: Proportion of employees in companies by labour-management relations rating

	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
Size					
1 to 5 employees	69%	27%	3%	0%	<1%
6 to 19 employees	58%	34%	7%	<1%	<1%
20 to 99 employees	50%	46%	5%	0%	0%
100 or more employees	41%	43%	17%	0%	0%
Industry					
Air transport	61%	24%	15%	0%	0%
Rail transport	Х	97%	X	0%	0%
Road transport	49%	45%	6%	<1%	0%
Maritime transport	Х	63%	X	0%	0%
Postal services and pipelines	18%	10%	72%	0%	0%
Banks	61%	39%	<1%	0%	0%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	32%	64%	3%	0%	<1%
Telecom. and broadcasting	35%	64%	1%	0%	0%
Miscellaneous industries	36%	60%	5%	0%	<1%
Collective agreement coverage					
Less than 20% of employees	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%
20% to 60% of employees	56%	44%	0%	0%	0%
60% or more of employees	35%	22%	43%	0%	0%
All employers (FJ)	42%	43%	15%	<1%	<1%

Note: The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the *Statistics Act*.

6. Wages, leave and benefits

6.1 Wage distribution

Just 1% of employees within FJ earn less than \$10 per hour, compared with 17% within PJ excluding public administration (Table 6.1). The proportion of employees earning \$10 to \$12.49 is 4%, less than half of what it is for PJ as a whole. Conversely, in the upper half of the wage distribution (\$20 to \$39.99 and \$40 or more), FJ contains proportionately more employees than for PJ.

By size, low wage earners are much more common in smaller companies. For example, 9% of employees in companies with one to five employees earn less than \$10 per hour compared with just 1% in companies with 100 or more employees. In general, employees making less than \$20 per hour become relatively more common as the size of the company decreases; conversely amongst those earning \$20 or more.

Table 6.1: Distribution of hourly wage rates

	Less than \$10	Between \$10 and \$12.49	Between \$12.50 and \$19.99	Between \$20 and \$39.99	\$40 or more
Regional company size					
1 to 5 employees	9%	17%	34%	30%	10%
6 to 19 employees	4%	8%	44%	36%	8%
20 to 99 employees	2%	8%	38%	43%	9%
100 or more employees	1%	3%	28%	50%	18%
Industry					
Air transport	1%	6%	19%	53%	22%
Rail transport	0%	0%	5%	74%	21%
Road transport	2%	6%	45%	45%	2%
Maritime transport	2%	3%	15%	66%	13%
Postal services and pipelines	<1%	2%	24%	47%	26%
Banks	<1%	5%	43%	40%	12%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	3%	7%	41%	41%	8%
Telecom. and broadcasting	2%	3%	26%	56%	12%
Miscellaneous industries	0%	0%	9%	50%	41%
All employers (FJ)	1%	4%	30%	49%	17%
PJ (non-public administration) ^a	17%	9%	31%	37%	7%
PJ (business sector only) ^a	20%	10%	31%	33%	6%

Note: All rows sum to 100%, aside from rounding error.

a Source: Labour Force Survey (September, 2008); based on the PUMF.

The distribution of wages by industry is, to some extent, driven by the proportion of employees in smaller companies in the industry. This is evident for road transport and the feed, floor, seed and grain industry, two industries with a high proportion of employment in smaller employers (Table 2.2). Just over 50% of employees in these two industries earn less than \$20 per hour. The only other industry that is close to this is banking where 48% of employees earn less than \$20 per hour, even through it is overwhelmingly dominated by large companies (99% of employees work in companies with 100 or more employees). Banking is anomalous. Telecommunications, another industry with a high proportion of employees in large companies, has just 31% earning less than \$20 per hour. In other industries dominated by large companies such as rail and postal and pipelines, this proportion is even smaller.

It is also notable that wages in other industries tend to be quite high, with 91% of employees earning more than \$20 per hour and 41% earning \$40 per hour or more. In this industry, 76% of all employees are managers, supervisors, professionals or technical and trades persons, the bulk of whom earn more than \$20 per hour.

There are just 416 employees within FJ who earn the legal minimum wage, with 44% of these employees in companies with 100 or more employees (no table shown).

6.2 Paid vacation

Overall, 44% of employees work in companies where full-time, permanent employees are eligible for three weeks of paid vacation after one year of continuous service; 83% are in companies where three weeks are provided after three years; and 95% are in companies where it is after five years (Table 6.2).

The figures count all employees, including temporary and part-time employees, in each company where the employer reports providing three weeks of paid vacation after a certain period for its full-time, permanent employees. Yet, temporary or part-time employees may not have the same eligibility. This would mean that the figures overstate the proportion of employees actually receiving three weeks by the specified time period.

Table 6.2: Proportion of employees in companies providing at least three weeks of paid vacation entitlement after 1, 3, 5 and 10 years to full-time, permanent employees

	Years of continuous service					
	After 1 year	After 3 years	After 5 years	After 10 years or more		
Size						
1 to 5 employees	11%	20%	36%	40%		
6 to 19 employees	11%	25%	65%	78%		
20 to 99 employees	16%	31%	78%	92%		
100 or more employees	47%	89%	98%	100%		
Industry						
Air transport	12%	77%	95%	98%		
Rail transport	77%	100%	100%	100%		
Road transport	13%	23%	71%	92%		

Maritime transport	52%	73%	89%	93%
Postal services and pipelines	79%	82%	99%	100%
Banks	30%	100%	100%	100%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	15%	50%	91%	95%
Telecom. and broadcasting	55%	94%	98%	99%
Miscellaneous industries	63%	89%	94%	95%
All employers (FJ)	44%	83%	95%	98%

Companies with 100 or more employees are significantly more generous with their paid vacation than companies in other size categories. For example, 47% of employees work in companies where three weeks after one year of continuous service is common compared with 16% of employees in those with 20 to 99 employees. In companies with 20 or less, the proportion is just 11%.

Many companies with less than 100 employees report not providing three weeks of paid vacation by 10 years or more of continuous service. Amongst companies with one to five employees, only 40% of employees work in companies offering three weeks by 10 years or more; even amongst companies with 20 to 99 employees, the figure is just 92%.

The Canada Labour Code (Part III) stipulates that employees must receive three weeks of paid vacation after six years of continuous service. Thus, assuming the accuracy of the survey results, the results suggest a degree of non-compliance with the Code amongst firms with less than 100 employees and a substantial degree of non-compliance for firms with fewer than 20 employees.

Nevertheless, to be confident in this judgement we must consider the possibility of response error. First, we can rule out the possibility that the question is ambiguous. The survey question asks the respondent: "Considering permanent employees working 30 or more hours per week only, how many days of paid annual vacation leave are employees entitled to? Please report the most frequently given number of days (e.g. given to the largest number of employees) for each of the following categories of years of continuous service." It is a clear question. However, it is possible that some companies have mainly seasonal employees. The paid annual vacation of such employees will be pro-rated and respondents may be answering on the basis of this prorated figure. However, it is unlikely that there are many such companies. Another possibility is that the person responding is not sufficiently aware of company policies. It is difficult to answer this question, but the survey does instruct the company that it must be completed by "the human resources director, a personnel manager or someone familiar with the human resources and personnel operations." Overall, it seems that these other explanations may have some merit, but are unlikely to explain much of the non-compliance.

¹¹ The question then lists the following categories: employees with one year of continuous service, employees with three years, employees with five years, employees with 10 years and employees with 20 years.

6.3 Other leave

Overall, 56% of employees are in companies where paid sick leave is frequently given to full-time, permanent employees; 36% of employees are in companies where paid family or personal leave is given; and 71% for parental leave as an EI top-up (Table 6.3). Just 11% are in companies where eligibility for either unpaid or paid education leave is common.

Separate analysis suggests that the majority of permanent, part-time employees are also eligible for each paid leave, but only a minority of non-permanent employees.¹²

Table 6.3: Proportion of employees in companies where the selected leave is frequently given to full-time, permanent employees

		B.:1		
	Sick	Family/ personal	Parental (El top-up)	Paid or unpaid education leave
Size				
1 to 5 employees	28%	15%	5%	10%
6 to 19 employees	35%	19%	6%	12%
20 to 99 employees	50%	23%	13%	9%
100 or more employees	58%	38%	78%	11%
Industry				
Air transport	39%	22%	56%	15%
Rail transport	Х	х	58%	х
Road transport	34%	10%	11%	5%
Maritime transport	63%	45%	16%	12%
Postal services and pipelines	95%	72%	78%	19%
Banks	Х	х	98%	X
Feed, flour, seed and grain	47%	16%	29%	6%
Telecom. and broadcasting	47%	15%	79%	16%
Miscellaneous industries	81%	55%	79%	16%
All employers (FJ)	56%	36%	71%	11%

Note: The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the Statistics Act.

Companies with 100 or more employees tend to be more generous than smaller companies. Nevertheless, even amongst these such larger companies, just 58% of employees are in companies that commonly offer paid sick leave to their full-time, permanent employees. These

_

¹² This is based on a question in the survey that asks about eligibility for leave amongst permanent part-time employees and amongst non-permanent employees.

large companies more commonly provide an EI top-up when on parental leave: 71% of employees are in these companies. Presumably, this is less costly for employers than paid sick leave.

By industry, the postal services and pipelines and miscellaneous industries tend to be more generous with paid sick leave than most of the remaining industries. Unfortunately, information on banking and rail industries is suppressed due to confidentiality reasons.

6.4 Other benefits

About 92% of employees within FJ work in companies where full-time, permanent employees commonly have access to a pension plan, namely a defined benefit plan, a defined contribution plan, a group RRSP or a combination of them (Table 6.4). Even higher figures are reported for life, disability, supplementary health care and dental insurance: between 96% and 98%.

Table 6.4: Proportion of employees in companies with pension and insurance plans available for full-time, permanent employees

	A pension plan ^a	Life insurance	Disability insurance	Health care	Dental care
Size					
1 to 5 employees	16%	28%	26%	31%	28%
6 to 19 employees	27%	63%	57%	63%	56%
20 to 99 employees	≤95%	92%	87%	94%	85%
100 or more employees	≥95%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Industry					
Air transport	91%	96%	96%	97%	96%
Rail transport	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Road transport	65%	89%	85%	90%	82%
Maritime transport	91%	95%	94%	95%	95%
Postal services and pipelines	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Banks	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	82%	94%	93%	94%	89%
Telecom. and broadcasting	94%	99%	99%	99%	98%
Miscellaneous industries	87%	95%	94%	96%	93%
All employers (FJ)	92%	98%	97%	98%	96%

^a Figures based on whether the entitlement is frequently given or not to full-time, permanent employees.

Just about all companies with 100 or more employees offer all of the shown non-wage benefits. Note that the exact proportion of employees in companies with 100 or more employees offering a pension plan is unknown due to confidentiality reasons. We can, however, infer that at least

95% of employees of these companies are in companies offering a plan to their full-time, permanent staff.¹³

Even amongst companies with 20 to 99 employees, 85% or more are in companies where it is common to have access to life, disability, health and dental insurance. In companies with one to five employees, less than one-third has access to these benefits and only 16% to a pension plan.

By industry, the proportion of employees where non-wage benefits other than a pension plan are frequently given is 93% or more with the exception of road transport. In road transport, between 82% and 90% have access, depending on the benefit.

Just 62% of employees in road transport work in companies that frequently offer a pension plan to their full-time permanent employees. In each of the remaining industries, the figure is 82% or higher.

_

¹³ This is a lower bound because it is based on the assumption that the proportion of employees in companies with 20 to 99 employees is the same that have access to a pension plan as in companies with 100 or more employees. The proportion for the latter should be greater than for the former.

7. Aging and retirement policies and programs

7.1 Age distribution

Just 8% of employees within FJ are under 25 compared with 18% for PJ employers (outside of public administration) (Table 7.1). Only 1% of employees are age 65 or older, compared with 2% amongst PJ employers excluding public administration. FJ has a significantly greater proportion of employees in some of their prime working years (45 to 54).

Overall, there is not an appreciable amount of variation in the age distribution of employees amongst the various size categories and industries. Nevertheless, it is notable that 4% of employees in very small firms (one to five employees) are age 65 or older compared with just 1% or 2% in other size categories. Moreover, 10% of employees in banking and 12% in feed, flour, seed and grain are aged under 25, higher than in miscellaneous industries, most of which tend to be close to the FJ average of 8%.

Table 7.1: Age distribution of employees

					GE and
	Under 25	25 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 and older
Size					
1 to 5 employees	8%	41%	34%	13%	4%
6 to 19 employees	12%	48%	26%	11%	2%
20 to 99 employees	11%	47%	27%	13%	2%
100 or more employees	7%	47%	32%	13%	1%
Industry					
Air transport	8%	47%	33%	13%	1%
Rail transport	6%	33%	49%	12%	<1%
Road transport	7%	42%	31%	16%	3%
Maritime transport	8%	39%	34%	18%	2%
Postal services and pipelines	4%	41%	37%	16%	2%
Banks	10%	50%	28%	11%	<1%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	12%	42%	31%	14%	2%
Telecom. and broadcasting	8%	55%	25%	11%	1%
Miscellaneous industries	7%	50%	31%	12%	1%
All employers (FJ)	8%	47%	31%	13%	1%
PJ (non-public administration) ^a	18%	46%	23%	12%	2%
PJ (business sector only) ^a	21%	45%	21%	11%	2%

Note: All rows sum to 100%, aside from rounding error.

^a Source: Labour Force Survey (September, 2008); based on the PUMF.

7.2 Workplace arrangements for employees near or at retirement age

The survey asks employers about arrangements to help retain workers past the eligible age of retirement. The most popular is to work a shorter week without penalty in future pension benefits: 32% of employees are in companies with such an arrangement (Table 7.2). Companies offering arrangements to transfer to more desirable shift schedules, arrangements to transfer to less demanding jobs and arrangements to work part time while collecting a partial pension comprise about 10% of employees each.

Compared with their level of use, a relatively high proportion of employees are in companies planning to implement within the next 12 months two of the arrangements: enabling transfers to less demanding jobs (6%) and enabling transfers to more desirable shift schedules (5%). Some respondents may be too optimistic in regard to these timelines.

Table 7.2: Proportion of employees in companies with arrangements to retain workers past the eligible retirement age

	In use	Plan to implement ^a
Work shorter week without penalty in future pension benefits	32%	2%
Transfer to more desirable shift schedules	10%	5%
Transfer to less demanding jobs	10%	6%
Work part-time while collecting a partial pension	9%	4%
Additional paid sick leave	4%	<1%
Additional paid vacation	<1%	<1%
Other arrangements	3%	2%

^a The survey question asks whether there is "a plan to put in place within 12 months."

Employers were also asked about arrangements that help employees prepare for retirement. A significant minority of employees work in companies where there is retirement preparation training (41%), the opportunity to take early retirement without penalty in pension benefits (40%) and an arrangement to work a shorter week without penalty (32%) (Table 7.3). Note, as indicated in Tables 7.2 and 7.3, there was overlap in the available responses between this survey question and the question about arrangements to encourage workers to keep working past the age at which they would normally retire.

Table 7.3: Proportion of employees in companies with retirement preparation arrangements

	In use	Plan to implement ^a
Retirement preparation training	41%	15%
Early retirement without penalty in pension benefits	40%	1%
Work shorter week without penalty in future pension benefits	32%	5%
Work part-time while collecting partial pension	9%	8%
Other arrangements	<1%	<1%

^a The survey question asks whether there is "a plan to put in place within 12 months".

8. The working environment and workplace practices

8.1 Top three concerns with respect to the working environment

Based on a list of issues related to working conditions, the survey asks employers: "Which are the three most important for the success of your business?" The most common issues cited are workplace health and safety (60% of employees work in companies citing the issue), disability management/return-to-work support (50%) and work-life balance (40%) (Table 8.1). Other issues only garnered enough responses to cover at most one-quarter of employees.

Concerns related to disability management/return-to-work issues in particular become more important with increases in company size. For small companies, the issue tends not to be a top three concern: just 8% of employees in companies between six and 19 employees have this concern. By contrast, 54% of employees in companies with 100 or more employees express the issue as one of the top three concerns.

Except for a couple of industries, employers are highly likely to cite workplace health and safety as an important issue. The exceptions include banking where just 6% of employees are in companies where this is one of their top three concerns and in telecommunications and broadcasting where 43% of employees are in such companies. For miscellaneous industries, the figure is 81% or higher.

Work-life balance issues are particularly important in rail (89% of employees) and in banking (73% of employees). In postal services and pipelines, 91% work for employers where disability management/return-to-work is one of the top three concerns.

8.2 Programs to improve working conditions

The survey asks about implementation of a variety of workplace programs and policies to improve working conditions (aside from the leave and benefits already discussed).

With the exception of child-care support, for each program identified in Tables 8.2a and 8.2b, the majority of FJ employees work in companies where there is one in place. The most common programs include those for work-place health and safety (88%), prevention of harassment (87%) and physical health or fitness promotion (65%).

Companies with 100 or more employees are more likely to have each of the different types of programs in place compared with smaller companies. In fact, aside from programs for workplace health and safety, the proportion of employees covered declines quite significantly when moving from companies with 100 or more employees to companies with between 20 and 99 employees.

Industries where employee coverage tends to be high include rail, postal services and pipelines, banking, and telecommunications and broadcasting. It is notable that with the exception of air transport, at just 48%, all industries have at least 84% of employees covered by a workplace health and safety program.

Table 8.1: Proportion of employees in companies that identify the working environment issue as one of three most important for the success of the business

	Workplace health and safety	Work- life balance	Options for employees on work schedules	Disability mgmt/ return-to- work	Mental health promotion	Physical health promotion	Prevention of harassment
Size							
1 to 5 employees	52%	32%	33%	1%	16%	17%	10%
6 to 19 employees	68%	39%	38%	8%	17%	27%	12%
20 to 99 employees	83%	32%	28%	27%	14%	16%	23%
100 or more employees	59%	40%	23%	54%	22%	22%	24%
Industry							
Air transport	92%	12%	14%	24%	54%	3%	20%
Rail transport	100%	89%	47%	53%	X	<1%	11%
Road transport	89%	29%	21%	41%	10%	16%	29%
Maritime transport	94%	13%	14%	62%	7%	23%	18%
Postal services and pipelines	99%	4%	2%	91%	5%	16%	2%
Banks	6%	73%	49%	45%	Х	48%	5%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	88%	49%	30%	28%	14%	17%	34%
Telecom. and broadcasting	43%	36%	7%	47%	18%	15%	59%
Miscellaneous industries	81%	46%	37%	30%	8%	9%	52%
All employers (FJ)	60%	40%	24%	50%	21%	22%	23%

Note: Besides those identified in the columns, the question presented additional options to respondents: child care support (0%), an appeal process for decisions related to harassment (1%), appeal process against dismissal (0%), dispute or grievance review process (10%), employee counselling services (12%), other (22%), and none of the above (2%). The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the Statistics Act.

Table 8.2a: Proportion of employees in companies with a program in place

	Workplace health and safety	Physical health or fitness promotion	Mental or psychological health promotion	Work-life balance	Child care support	Options for employees on work schedules
Size						
1 to 5 employees	29%	5%	5%	7%	1%	17%
6 to 19 employees	56%	9%	5%	5%	1%	20%
20 to 99 employees	80%	18%	14%	14%	1%	25%
100 or more employees	90%	70%	63%	63%	42%	62%
Industry						
Air transport	48%	10%	17%	19%	Х	24%
Rail transport	100%	64%	x	64%	0%	41%
Road transport	84%	29%	20%	16%	Х	28%
Maritime transport	84%	29%	53%	18%	0%	36%
Postal services and pipelines	99%	98%	94%	91%	Х	78%
Banks	99%	85%	x	83%	Х	90%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	87%	38%	28%	28%	Х	35%
Telecom. and broadcasting	84%	65%	64%	45%	х	36%
Miscellaneous industries	89%	70%	50%	49%	20%	76%
All employers (FJ)	88%	65%	57%	57%	38%	58%

Note: The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the Statistics Act.

Table 8.2b: Proportion of employees in companies with a program in place (Continued)

	Prevention of harassment	Employee counselling	Disability management	Appeal process against decision related to harassment	Appeal process against dismissal	Dispute or grievance review process
Size						
1 to 5 employees	11%	5%	3%	4%	3%	4%
6 to 19 employees	23%	10%	13%	10%	7%	9%
20 to 99 employees	59%	35%	43%	35%	23%	33%
100 or more employees	92%	88%	87%	83%	69%	82%
Industry						
Air transport	42%	32%	33%	x	Х	29%
Rail transport	Х	100%	x	x	Х	х
Road transport	66%	44%	60%	x	Х	34%
Maritime transport	78%	Х	70%	x	52%	х
Postal services and pipelines	99%	98%	98%	х	X	93%
Banks	х	х	x	х	87%	95%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	75%	х	x	х	Х	35%
Telecom. and broadcasting	96%	92%	93%	х	х	89%
Miscellaneous industries	88%	84%	74%	82%	х	65%
All employers (FJ)	87%	82%	81%	77%	64%	76%

Note: The "x" indicates that the data has been suppressed due to confidentiality concerns as required by the Statistics Act.

9. Productivity

The survey also asks about a variety of other workplace policies or programs that help improve productivity. A large proportion of employees are in companies using employee performance evaluation (90%), progressive disciplinary evaluation (88%), individual incentives (83%) and information-sharing with employees (79%) (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1: Proportion of employees in companies using productivity-related practices

	Policy in use	Plan to implement ^a
Employee performance evaluation	90%	2%
Progressive disciplinary evaluation	88%	2%
Individual incentives	83%	1%
Information-sharing with employees	79%	2%
Employee suggestion program	62%	3%
Joint labour-management committees	56%	1%
Problem solving teams	51%	1%
Flexible job design	37%	8%
Using more temporary and part-time labour	31%	2%
Self-directed work groups	20%	<1%

^a The survey question asks whether there is "a plan to put in place within 12 months."

Respondents were asked to rate productivity for the last complete fiscal year compared with the previous year. Overall, 19% of employees are in companies that report much better productivity and 32% are in companies that report better productivity (Table 9.2).

Table 9.2: Productivity rating compared with the previous year

	Much better	Better	About the same	Worse or much worse ^a	Don't know
Size					
1 to 5 employees	7%	27%	42%	15%	9%
6 to 19 employees	12%	33%	42%	9%	5%
20 to 99 employees	12%	32%	45%	6%	5%
100 or more employees	20%	32%	19%	24%	5%
Industry					
Air transport	4%	17%	73%	2%	3%
Rail transport	0%	89%	11%	0%	0%
Road transport	9%	29%	45%	14%	3%

Maritime transport	5%	14%	74%	6%	0%
Postal services and pipelines	72%	3%	2%	19%	3%
Banks	4%	26%	9%	62%	0%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	10%	33%	34%	6%	17%
Telecom. and broadcasting	14%	63%	7%	1%	15%
Miscellaneous industries	21%	45%	21%	11%	3%
All employers (FJ)	19%	32%	21%	23%	5%

Note: All rows sum to 100%, aside from rounding error. ^a No company with 100 or more employees stated that productivity was much worse.

Methodological Annex

Target Population and Survey Frame

The target population for the FJWS (2008) comprises all Canadian companies that had at least one establishment under Part III of the Canada Labour Code (see the discussion of survey coverage in Section 2 of the report).

As a basis for the survey frame, Statistics Canada used its Business Register and its Public Sector Universe – Federal Government Business Enterprises frame. All companies classified in the Business Register with appropriate NAICS codes (as identified below in Table A-2: FJWS Sector Groupings) and all federal Crown corporations in the Public Sector Universe (i.e. the Federal Government Business Enterprises frame) were included in the survey frame. The frame contained about 39,000 regional companies.

Sampling Strategy

The FJWS has a cross-sectional design. A census was taken of all companies with 100 or more employees and all federal Crown corporations. ¹⁴ For the rest of the population, a stratified sampling strategy was used in order to divide the population into homogeneous, mutually exclusive groups called strata. The stratification keys are nine economic sectors defined by groups of NAICS codes, four regions and four company sizes defined by number of employees. For the road transport sector only there was a fifth size category: one employee.

A total of 296 strata were created, ¹⁵ with a random sample drawn within each stratum and these were put together to form the global survey sample. The sample of companies pre-contacted by telephone comprised 12,000 companies, representing an even larger number of regional companies.

Collection

Prior to the start of the collection period for the 2008 survey, all companies in the sample were pre-contacted to determine through a series of filter questions whether they were federally regulated and to identify the contact person best placed to respond to the questionnaire. The pre-contact phase was done by computer-assisted telephone interview.

Printed questionnaires were then mailed to those companies found to be federally regulated during the pre-contact phase. Telephone follow-up was undertaken with companies that did not respond within a month. Data capture of the completed questionnaires was done electronically.

Responding to this survey is mandatory (i.e. required by law). To this effect, the survey states that "completion of this questionnaire is a legal requirement under the *Statistics Act*."

Response rates are shown in the table below. For the whole population of regional companies, 35.6% returned the questionnaire. This is an unweighted measure. Using instead the initial weights from the sample design (i.e. before adjusting for survey non-response), the response

_

¹⁴ For companies with 100 or more employees, the sampling frame was identified using administrative data collected as per the requirements of the Employment Equity Act.

¹⁵ Based on the industry, region and size groupings, there should be 148 strata. However, each of these strata was split into two categories: a sub-stratum with high probability of finding units under federal jurisdiction and a sub-stratum with low probability of finding units under federal jurisdiction. This makes for 296 (= 148 * 2) strata.

rate was 59.5%. Using instead the employment figures from the Business Register as the weight, the response rate was 56.6%.

Table A-1: Survey response rates (proportion of regional companies responding)

	Unweighted	Using initial survey design weights ^a	Using the employment (from the Business Register)
Size			<u> </u>
1 to 5 employees	30.1%	57.3%	74.1%
6 to 19 employees	38.3%	64.9%	69.4%
20 to 99 employees	38.4%	61.8%	65.0%
100+ employees	42.4%	57.9%	53.8%
Industry			
Air transport	33.3%	61.6%	63.7%
Rail transport	36.4%	66.7%	45.9%
Road transport	41.3%	49.6%	56.0%
Maritime transport	39.7%	65.9%	76.1%
Postal services and pipelines	31.7%	61.9%	86.8%
Banks	56.0%	69.5%	50.5%
Feed, flour, seed and grain	51.1%	71.3%	66.1%
Telecom. and broadcasting	55.9%	67.2%	36.1%
Miscellaneous industries	18.2%	31.3%	58.1%
Region			
Atlantic	36.0%	61.2%	64.4%
Quebec	35.4%	66.2%	51.4%
Ontario	35.9%	58.8%	62.9%
West and territories	35.2%	56.4%	48.2%
All employers	35.6%	59.5%	56.6%

^a The weights derived are based on the initial ones from the sample design (i.e. before taking account of non-response).

Estimation Process

Adjustment for non-response was based on the results of the pre-contact and on the final survey results. The adjustment was made at the level of the sample stratum, or at a more aggregated level as required. The estimates and variances were calculated using Statistics Canada's Generalized Estimation System for a stratified sample.

Quality Assurance

Data validation was performed to detect and adjust inconsistent or unusual numbers. The Research and Data Development Division of the Labour Program (HRSDC) and Business Special Surveys and Technology Statistics group (Statistics Canada) conducted the data validation.

Non-response

There are two types of non-response in the FJWS: unit non-response and item non-response. Unit non-response (i.e. a non-responding record) occurs if it is not possible to obtain the survey information for all variables of a selected unit (regional company) due to a refusal or the impossibility to make a contact. The unit non-responses were dealt with by adjusting the weights assigned to the responding records.

On the other hand, item non-response occurs if Statistics Canada is able to obtain only partial information from a selected sampling unit. This stems from respondents who may refuse to answer a particular question, are unable to respond or are too late in reporting. In these cases, data is imputed.

In general, imputation was used to replace partially missing data and invalid or inconsistent entries. Imputation was done using the hot deck method with Banff software and other auxiliary data. Overall, 4.36% of all data cells resulting from all the various questions and sub-questions in the questionnaire were imputed.

Measures have been taken to minimize processing errors that occur at various stages of data processing including data entry, editing and tabulation.

Confidentiality

Statistics Canada is prohibited by law from releasing any data that can identify an individual, business or organization without their prior knowledge or consent in writing. Various confidentiality rules are applied to all data that is released or published to prevent the publication or disclosure of any information deemed confidential. If necessary, data is suppressed to prevent direct or other disclosure of identifiable data.

Table A-2: 2008 FJWS sector groupings

Industry	NAICS (2007)		
Air Transport			
Scheduled Passenger Air Transportation	481110		
Non-Scheduled Chartered Air Transportation	481214		
Non-Scheduled Specialty Flying Services	481215		
Air Traffic Control	488111		
Other Airport Operations	488119		
Other Support Activities for Air Transportation	488190		
Security Guard and Patrol Services	561612		
Technical and Trade Schools	611510		
Air Ambulance Services	621912		
Rail Transport			
Short-Haul Freight Rail Transportation	482112		
Mainline Freight Rail Transportation	482113		
Passenger Rail Transportation	482114		
Road Transport			
General Freight Trucking, Long-Distance, Truckload	484121		
General Freight Trucking, Long-Distance, Less Than Truckload	484122		
Used Household and Office Goods Moving	484210		
Bulk Liquids Trucking, Long Distance	484231		
Dry Bulk Materials Trucking, Long Distance	484232		
Forest Products Trucking, Long Distance	484233		
Other Specialized Freight (except Used Goods) Trucking, Long Distance	484239		
Urban Transit Systems	485110		
Interurban and Rural Bus Transportation	485210		
Charter Bus Industry	485510		
Other Transit and Ground Passenger Transportation	485990		
Armoured Car Services	561613		
Maritime Transport			
Deep Sea, Coastal and Great Lakes Water Transportation (except ferries)	483115		
Deep Sea, Coastal and Great Lakes Water Transportation by Ferries	483116		
Inland Water Transportation (except ferries)	483213		

Inland Water Transportation by Ferries	483214
Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation, Water	487210
Port and Harbour Operations	488310
Marine Cargo Handling	488320
Marine Salvage Services	488331
Ship Piloting Services	488332
Other Navigational Services to Shipping	488339
Other Support Activities for Water Transportation	488390
Postal Services and Pipelines	
Postal Service	491110
Couriers	492110
Pipeline Transportation of Crude Oil	486110
Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	486210
Pipeline Transportation of Refined Petroleum Products	486910
Banks	
Monetary Authorities – Central Bank	521110
Personal and Commercial Banking Industry	522111
Corporate and Institutional Banking Industry	522112
Feed, Flour, Seed and Grain	
Other Animal Food Manufacturing	311119
Flour Milling	311211
Rice Milling and Malt Manufacturing	311214
Wet Corn Milling	311221
Oilseed and Grain Wholesaler-Distributors	411120
Seed Wholesaler-Distributors	418320
Farm Product Agents and Brokers	419120
Farm Product Warehousing and Storage	493130
Telecommunications and Broadcasting	
Radio Broadcasting	515110
Television Broadcasting	515120
Pay and Specialty Television	515210
Wired Telecommunications Carriers	517110
Cable and Other Program Distribution	517112
Wireless Telecommunications Carriers (except Satellite)	517210

Satellite Telecommunications	517410
Other Telecommunications	517910
Miscellaneous industries	_
Uranium Ore Mining	212291
Nuclear Electric Power Generation	221113
Conventional Oil and Gas Extraction	211113
Surveying and Mapping (except Geophysical) Services	541370
Testing Laboratories	541380
Environmental Consulting Services	541620
Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	541690
Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering and Life Sciences	541710
All other Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	541990
Other Federal Protective Services	911290
Federal Crown corporations that do not come under any of the other eight industries	Various

Statistical Annex

Table A-3: Number of employees (women, men and total), employers and work sites

	Number of employees			Number of	Number of	
	Women	Men	Total	companies	work sites ^a	
Size						
1 to 5 employees	3,700	6,200	9,900	4,470 ^b	4,200°	
6 to 19 employees	5,500	15,300	20,800	2,080	3,350	
20 to 99 employees	11,100	38,300	49,400	1,180	3,530	
100 or more employees	335,700	404,400	740,000	480	18,820	
Industry						
Air transport	33,400	61,700	95,100	870	2,680	
Rail transport	4,700	35,800	40,500	10	440	
Road transport	14,200	73,400	87,600	3,700	4,900	
Maritime transport	4,600	13,300	17,800	340	860	
Postal services and pipelines	60,200	80,600	140,700	390	6,390	
Banks	153,900	66,600	220,500	90	7,240	
Feed, flour, seed and grain	4,100	11,900	16,000	520	1,390	
Telecom. and broadcasting	63,900	87,700	151,700	720	3,350	
Miscellaneous industries	17,000	33,400	50,400	1,580	2,650	
Region ^b						
Atlantic	33,200	36,400	69,700	740	3,020	
Quebec	73,900	93,300	167,200	1,760	6,650	
Ontario	138,400	183,000	321,400	2,490	9,860	
West and the territories	110,500	151,500	261,900	3,480	10,370	
All employers (FJ)	356,000	464,200	820,200	8,210	29,890	

^a This table is based on the company concept except for the number of work sites column which is based on the regional company concept.

^b The number of companies across regions sums to 8,470. This differs from the sum of all companies at the national level (8,210) because some companies are present in more than one region.

^c The fact that the number of work sites for companies with one to five employees is lower than the number of companies means that some companies in this category responded that they had no work sites. A particularly high proportion of companies in road transportation reported no work sites.