Overview of the Perpetual Guardian 4-day (paid 5) Work Trial
By Professor Jarrod Haar
Auckland University of Technology

Note: this is only a brief summary to provide preliminary data and results. However, the data and associated analysis is robust and findings are conclusive. The layout will follow the approach of: (1) detailing a set of related constructs, (2) indicating the expected relationships (hypotheses) and (3) what was found. Finally, (4) grounding the results in the context of other New Zealand data on the same constructs. Most of these constructs (except mainly the team data and some supervisor data – this is rarer). I have data on 6000+ equivalent employees from 2017/18, so I am confident that the findings provide initial levels within range of other context/comparison group.

The data is presented in three groups: (1) employee respondents, (2) supervisor respondents, and (3) engagement data. The employee section relates to their own experiences, while section 2 on supervisors have their own ratings of their teams. The engagement data (n=182) reflects the PG data pre-trial (November 2017), and this is compared with ALL employee respondents from pre-trial (n=155) and post-trial (n=183).

Methods

Employee data was collected by surveys in the week preceding the trial and the week directly after the trial completed (which lasted eight weeks).
We had n=155 usable survey responses for the pre-trial data.
We had n=183 usable survey responses for the post-trial data.
Ultimately, we want to match respondents to gain the best understanding of effects. From team location and demographics, I was ultimately able to match 122 respondents. This provides sufficient statistical power for analysis.

Supervisor data was collected by surveys in the week preceding the trial and the week directly after the trial completed (which lasted eight weeks).
We had n=28 usable survey responses for the pre-trial data.
We had n=34 usable survey responses for the post-trial data.
From team location and demographics, I was able to match 27 respondents. This provides relatively sufficient statistical power for analysis because we are comparing their own scores. I also used a survey technique to extend the scale of these survey items to pronounce the variance and thus statistical ability to detect change. However, it should be acknowledged that this is a low number of respondents.

I will not detail the measures and associated statistics however, the data was very robust and I am happy that the constructs reflect the terminology I detail below.
Most scales range from and are indicated as 1 (low) to 5 (high), although a few have different scoring – which is typical. All of the supervisor data was 1 (low) to 6 (high). This is indicated on the scoring part of the tables below.

SECTION 1: EMPLOYEE DATA

Findings: Support Perceptions

Two types were selected: (1) *Perceived Organizational Support* (**POS**) which reflects the way an employee see's their organisation caring about their wellbeing. A high score reflects strong perceptions. There is a host of data showing this construct heavily influences employee job outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, performance, retention), and some effect on wellbeing. (2) *Psychosocial Safety Climate* (**PSC**) reflects worker perceptions of the way their organisation cares for their psychological health and safety, and is related to psychological wellbeing and engagement.

Expectation? We would expect employees to report higher perceptions due to the focus of the 4-day trial.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
POS	3.78	3.91	Yes (p=.01)
PSC	3.53	3.72	Yes (p=.01)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.0.			
The findings provide support for an increase in these perceptions across the trial. While statistically significant, the increases are modest. However, this *might* reflect that these perceptions had already begun to be influenced (increased) around notification of the trial. That seems quite feasible to me.			
In comparison to other NZ data (especially POS) the usual range would be around 3.3 to 3.6 – so your starting point (3.78) was very high to begin with! The score of 3.91 post-trial reflects a great positive perception by employees! The score for PSC again is quite high (by international comparison) at pre-trial and the growth post-trial is significant and high. In summary, employees really think PG cares about their wellbeing and their psychological health and safety.			

Findings: Team Work

Two types were selected: (1) *Team Psychological Capital* (**TeamPC**) which reflects the strength of the team in regard to having Hope, Confidence, Resilience and Optimism. A high score reflects strong perceptions of these strengths within/amongst the team – not just the individual. There is a host of data showing this construct heavily influences employee job outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, performance, retention), and some effect on wellbeing. (2) *Team Cohesion* (**TeamCoh**) reflects worker perceptions of the way their team operates together – how they get on and are a cohesive unit. Strongly related to performance and job outcomes (commitment, job satisfaction etc.).

Expectation? We would expect employees to report higher perceptions due to the focus of the 4-day trial.

Term	Pre-Test score[b]	Post-Test score[b]	Sig Difference?
TeamPC	4.87	5.19	Yes (p=.000)
TeamCoh	4.49	4.84	Yes (p=.000)
[b] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 6 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.			
The findings provide VERY strong support for an increase in these perceptions across the trial.			
In comparison to other NZ data the usual range would be around 4.0-4.1 – so the starting points (4.87 and 4.49) are high to begin with! The post-trial score of 5.19 reflects an amazing perception by employees on their psychological strength, and this is fairly similar for their cohesion. In summary, employees report their teams have grown and strengthened through the trial and exhibit greater strength because of the trial.			

Findings: Readiness for Change

The change literature suggests change (like the trial) is more likely to succeed if people are positively ready (focused) on the change. I cast this at the team level for two reasons – better for people to reflect their team than just themselves (more reliable), and the trial was really team focused and made the team approach more appropriate. A high score reflects strong perceptions that their team is ready for the trial (pre-trial survey). The post-trial measure is the same but slightly tweaked around how ready they thought their team was (during the trial). Data shows readiness for change positively influences employee job outcomes (satisfaction, commitment, performance, retention), and wellbeing.

Expectation? We would expect employees to report higher perceptions due to the focus of the 4-day trial.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Readiness Change	4.26	4.46	Yes (p=.000)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.0.			
The findings provide strong support for an increase in these perceptions across the trial.			
In comparison to other NZ data the usual range would be around 3.5 (assuming a potentially positive change!) – so the starting point of 4.26 reflects a high level of readiness for the trail to begin with (but why wouldn't they!?). The post-trial score of 4.46 reflects a strong growth in readiness for this change – reflecting a willing to change to the 4-day program. In summary, employees report their teams were ready for the trial but afterwards are even more focused and prepared to adopt the change.			

Findings: Work Factors

Two types were selected: (1) *Work-Life Balance* (**WLBal**) reflects an employee's perception of how well they balance their work and non-work roles. A high score reflects stronger balance and there is a host of data showing this construct heavily influences employee job outcomes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment) and wellbeing (anxiety and depression). (2) *Work Demands* (**WkDemands**) reflects worker perceptions of their workload and the nature of over work. Linked strongly to detrimental outcomes such as job (e.g. satisfaction and performance) and wellbeing (more stress).

Expectation? We would expect employees to report higher work-life balance due to the focus of the 4-day trial. Work demands is tricky/interesting. On one hand, a positive increase might be expected. More work (5-days) now spread across 4-days, so this might increase. Alternatively, it might decrease, because the trial encourages employees to focus on what needs to be done and thus might potentially decrease or stay the same.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
WLBal	3.36	3.76	Yes (p=.000)
WkDemands	3.00	2.80	Yes (p=.05)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.0.			
The findings provide support for an increase in work-life balance perceptions across the trial. Interestingly, work demands are significantly lower after the trial. To me, this reflects the encouragement to get work (37.5 hours) done in 30 hours, and thus *psychologically* this has enabled them freedom to focus on work in the four days of work time.			
I have a lot of work-life balance data. The starting score of 3.36 is quite typical (around the usual range) although the score of 3.76 post-trial reflects a great positive perception by employees. They really feel a change in their work-life balance.			

The score for work demands is slightly higher than usual (around 2.8 on average) and thus the post-trial score of 2.80 reflect a lower score (for PG employees) and down to levels more typical of New Zealand employees. In summary, employees report enhanced work-life balance and lower work demands, reflecting positive effects from the trial on these work factors.

Findings: Team Performance

Two types were selected: (1) *Team Citizenship Behaviours* (**TCBehav**) reflects an employee's perception of how well their team engages in helpful work behaviours – typically one's not in their job description. These reflect roles that are not required but help the team. A high score reflects stronger team behaviours and this reflects an important team outcome – and this outcome also typically relates with overall job performance. (2) *Team Creativity Behaviours* (**TCreative**) reflects worker perceptions of how their team perform with regard to being innovative and creative. A high score reflects stronger team behaviours and this reflects an important workplace outcome.

Expectation? We would expect employees to report higher team performance due to the nature of the 4-day trial. Social exchange theory (repaying a positive) means employees are likely to work harder in 'exchange' for better treatment and benefits from their organisation (4-day trial).

Term	Pre-Test score[b]	Post-Test score[b]	Sig Difference?
TCBehav	4.60	4.92	Yes (p=.000)
TCreative	4.40	4.77	Yes (p=.000)
[b] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 6 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.			
The findings provide support for an increase in work behaviours across the trial.			
The starting score of 4.60 and 4.40 is quite high (typical average around 3.8-4.0) and might reflect the preparation done by employees and their teams to prepare for the trial. That said, the post-trial scores reflect a positive increase in team creativity behaviours and helpful behaviours, as we would theoretically expect. In summary, employees report enhanced team performance reflecting positive effects from the trial on work performance (at the team-level).			

Findings: Job Attitudes

Three types were selected: (1) *Job Satisfaction* (**JobSat**) reflects an employee's attitude towards their satisfaction with their job. A high score reflects stronger satisfaction with the job and this factor is the strongest predictor of job performance (around 30%); (2) *Work Engagement* (**Engagement**) reflects worker psychological engagement – how switched on and attuned they are to their work. A high score reflects that an employee is more engaged and willing to put in that extra effort. Also strong links with job performance; (3) *Employee Retention* (**Retention**) reflects employee attitudes towards staying with the organisation.

Expectation? We would expect employees to report improved job attitudes due to the nature of the 4-day trial. Social exchange theory (repaying a positive) means employees are likely to report improved attitudes in 'exchange' for better treatment and benefits from their organisation (4-day trial).

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
JobSat	3.86	4.07	Yes (p=.001)

Engagement	3.97	4.21	Yes (p=.000)
Retention	3.94	4.15	Yes (p=.010)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.0.			
The findings provide support for an increase in attitudes across the trial.			
The starting score of these job attitudes is VERY high at 3.86 (job satisfaction), 3.97 (work engagement) and retention (3.94). Again, this *might* reflect that these perceptions had already begun to be influenced (increased) around notification of the trial. That seems quite feasible to me. That said, they all significantly increased post-trial and these scores are very high (easily the highest I have seen in my NZ data!). This reflects a very positive increase in job attitudes as we would expect. In summary, employees report enhanced job attitudes reflecting positive effects from the trial.			

Findings: Wellbeing

Five types were selected and these all use a percentage score (0-100%) – higher is better, except on job stress: (1) *Life Satisfaction* (**LifeSat**) reflects an employee's overall view of their life satisfaction; (2) *Health Satisfaction* (**HealthSat**) reflects an employee's overall view of their personal health satisfaction; (3) *Leisure Satisfaction* (**LeisureSat**) reflects an employee's overall satisfaction with their leisure time; (4) *Community Satisfaction* (**CommunitySat**) reflects an employee's overall satisfaction with their involvement with their local community; and (5) *Job Stress* (**Stress**), reflecting on an employee's assessment on how stressful their job makes them. On the first four, a high score reflects better wellbeing, while job stress – lower is better. There are strong links between wellbeing and job performance, turnover and absenteeism.

Expectation? We would expect employees to report stronger wellbeing – through stronger satisfaction outcomes and lower job stress.

Term	Pre-Test score[c]	Post-Test score[c]	Sig Difference?
LifeSat	74.1%	79.0%	Yes (p=.001)
HealthSat	67.0%	74.3%	Yes (p=.000)
LeisureSat	63.3%	74.2%	Yes (p=.000)
CommunitySat	66.1%	73.4%	Yes (p=.000)
Stress	45.3%	38.3%	Yes (p=.002)
[c] = percentage score – 0% (extremely low) to 100% (extremely high). Midpoint is 50%.			
The findings provide support for an increase in attitudes across the trial.			
The starting score of these wellbeing outcomes are high for life satisfaction (slightly higher than the NZ average around 79%). The other outcomes are slightly lower than we might expect from the NZ data (more around 70%). The job stress score is similar to the NZ average (around 45%). The post-trial scores reflect a solid increase in all wellbeing scores (reduction in job stress!). Worth highlighting the strong increases in leisure satisfaction. In summary, employees report enhanced wellbeing reflecting positive effects from the trial.			

Findings: Confidence Testing

One issue with such trials is that everyone is happy and inspired and therefore **everything** increases. Which makes determining the positive effects slightly confounded. Consequently, I included two types of constructs to test for the confidence of the data. These are variables where it is theoretically unlikely for them to be improved across the 4-day trial. These were (1)

Proactive Personality (**Personality**), which reflects an individual's dispositional ability to initiate and maintain actions that directly alter their surrounding environment; and (2) *Job Complexity* (**Complexity**), which simply reflects the complexity of the tasks an employee does in their job. A high score reflects this personality trait around proactivity being more prevalent, while a high score on job complexity reflects more complexity in their role.
Expectation? The first is a personality type and likely to remain unchanged overtime, and thus we would expect employees to report no change in personality over this short time. Similarly, while the nature of the 4-day trial means work might have changed somewhat, the type of work undertaken is unlikely to change, and thus I expect job complexity to be similar pre- and post-trial. In effect, these two constructs are a quality or confidence check on the employee respondents, the data and the conclusions based on them.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Personality	3.76	3.82	No (p=.265)
Complexity	3.88	3.90	No (p=.850)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.0.			
The findings provide support for no significant increase across the trial.			
These findings provide confidence in the previous analysis, and support the notion that the responses are genuine and not biased (or flawed). In summary, employees report the same personality and job complexity pre- and post-trial.			

Findings: Additional Analysis

As a final check, I also examined the change over time scores by demographic variables available: (a) age, (b) gender, and (c) tenure.
Thus, it might be that older employees were less likely to report positive changes?
Perhaps longer tenure employees have literally 'seen it all' and thus report fewer benefits from the trial?
Here I run t-tests (for gender) and ANOVA (age and tenure) to test for differences.

- Overall, there are no significant gender differences across all the variables explored above. Thus, men and women provide statistically similar scores between pre- and post-trial.

- ANOVA uncovered only one significant difference. This was towards the *Psychosocial Safety Climate* (reflects worker perceptions of the way their organisation cares for their psychological health and safety). The age group 41-50 years (made up of 31 respondents) reported significantly lower levels of this psychosocial safety climate than those aged up to 30 years (32 respondents) and the 51-60 year aged group (30 people in this group). So, this group thought the change towards enhancing PG and caring about *psychological health and safety* was less effective across the trial – but only compared to these other two age groups.
- Overall, there are no significant differences across tenure groups with all the variables explored above. Thus, new, old, and all those in between (on tenure) provide statistically similar scores between pre- and post-trial.

Again, apart from a single difference – which might be a statistical anomaly(?) – this analysis suggests the findings of positive change found occurred broadly across all employees.

Findings: Qualitative Comments

I briefly provide some insights from the qualitative comments made by employees.

How have your leisure activities changed over the trial period? Please provide a brief detail below (use N/A if nothing changed for you).

- While a few commented that there was little change in this area, many comments were around time and were very positive. A lot of people mentioned spending more time on family, e.g. "I have had more time over the weekends to spend with my young family", or with partners "Lunch-dates with my partner", or with friends e.g., "More time with friends and family", "looking after a sick friend".
- Many also spoke of doing more activities for themselves, such as "swimming", "I have had more time and energy to do my leisure activities", "more baking" and "Born again golfer. The aim however (should the trial become permanent) is to use excess time also to give back to community and others."
- Many showed multiple improvements, such as this "More walking, completing more housework (wife works full time), cooking, work around the house (projects), gardening projects and motorbike riding but relaxing as well." Quite a few mentioned they were studying and the extra day off gave them adequate time to devote to their studies.

What do you think the biggest challenge of the pilot programme WAS for your team? Did you overcome it? or has it become apparent now its ended? Please provide as brief or detailed response as you'd like.

It is worth noting that almost all respondents had comments to make here! There are many and I will only briefly detail these. Worth remembering that in the context of the above findings, this represents that the 4-day trial was not without challenges (as you might expect). Comments were around:

- "Lack of interchangeability of job tasks and work".
- "An inability for team members to pick up tasks 'downstream' but not for others 'upstream'."
- Small time – one off and one sick- "can be very stressful getting all the work done"
- A couple of times a query arose that the person who knew where the information was were on their day off.
- "No lessening of the amount of time demanded in internal meetings, emails, internal reporting and schedules to complete…a little more stressed by the internal tasks than normal".

Note: there is more to be detailed here and this is worth its own briefing.

Are there any additional comments you'd like to make regarding the pilot programme? How was your experience (positive/negative/neutral)? Can you offer any suggestions for improvements?

- The majority of comments were positive. The following two quotes summarise this "Our experience was positive. Staff felt like giving more of themselves to their job in a natural human reaction to being shown a kindness (being given the gift of some extra time!). Thanks Andrew and team", and "Trial has been amazing, everyone is working harder and morale is definitely higher".
- Some were strictly neutral, e.g., "My experience was neutral. I liked the fact that I had the flexibility to have three days off, however my workload was still worth 37.5 hours, so I made up the time on the 4 days that I worked. This resulted in longer days when I was working, which wasn't so conducive to a balanced work-life." [note: this is not borne out

by the empirical data BUT reminds us that the quantitative data tells us the influence 'on average' – there will always be outliers!].

- A few negative comments, mainly about fairness – with other staff having it easier than them. But no one made any critical or negative comments. This one might summarise things nicely "Generally positive in providing a break or flexible hours. Negative in that some teams did not appear to spread the absences across the week. Neutral in that did not see increased productivity. Improvements: a company-wide roster to have company overview. Teams not taking 4 day weekends. Technological ideas. People with IT access still checking emails".
- Finally, two comments to sum the overwhelming comments on the trial: "Can't think of anything better to be honest. An extra day off to focus on yourself is what everyone needs. Work should come second in life. This is how it felt" and "I can't stress how good the pilot programme has made me personally feel about things. Yes, during the four other working days you're busier and more concentrated on your work but by taking a midweek day off I feel I come back in on the Thursday reenergised and refreshed for the last two in the office, ready to get stuff done!"

SECTION 2: SUPERVISOR DATA

Findings: Job Performance

Job performance was examined using a very standard construct: *in-role performance*, which basically reflects the way the supervisor see's their employee team/s doing their job. A high score reflects strong or better performance. This type of construct is very useful when there is a host of job's being done. It allows comparisons for comparing teams 'doing their work'.

Expectation? We would expect supervisor's to NOT see job performance go up over the 4-day trial. Why? Because in effect they are working less days to do the same work. If they can maintain the same score (ie not drop) then that would be very positive. Theoretically, there is a chance that performance could increase – as workers in effect, work harder! But, given they have 20% less time to do their jobs, I think it is likely there will be no increase in performance.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Job Performance	4.91	4.93	No (p=.885)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 6 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.			
The findings provide support for no change in job performance. This would suggest that supervisors saw their team/s doing their jobs the same before and after the trial. This would support the notion that employees managed to do their jobs sufficiently and successfully across the 4-day trial.			
I have very limited comparison NZ data. While the raw score (M=4.9) appears high, that is quite typical of such constructs. That is because we'd 'manage' (out) those employees who were unable to do their job.			

Findings: Other Team Performance

While job performance was not expected to increase, others forms of performance (broadly speaking) should increase. We look at four different forms: (1) *attendance behaviours*, which relates to being on time (start and end of day, and before/after breaks etc.). A high score reflects better attendance behaviours from the team. (2) *Organisational Citizenship Behaviours* (OCBs) refer to employee behaviours that typically are not expected/required (outside of one's

job description) but are viewed as positive behaviours; (3) service performance, which is the way employees behave when engaging customers, and (4) creativity behaviours – which reflect supervisor perceptions of how their team/s perform with regard to being innovative and creative. All four forms of performance are also related to job performance, thus teams whose attendance is better, who help each other more, provide better customer service, and are more creative, typically perform better.

Expectation? We would expect these forms of performance to increase after the 4-day trial. Or at least not fall! Why? Social exchange theory (repaying a positive) means employees are likely to work harder in 'exchange' for better treatment and benefits from their organisation (4-day trial). While job performance per se is harder to achieve when you have less time, these performance factors are perhaps easier to achieve.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Attendance Behaviours	4.57	4.94	Yes (p=.013)
OCBs	4.76	5.09	Yes (p=.021)
Service Performance	4.76	5.15	Yes (p=.002)
Creativity Behaviours	4.06	4.46	Yes (p=.081)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 6 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.			
The findings provide support for enhanced performance around aspects that are typically outside the realm of one's exact job description. This would suggest that supervisors saw their team/s doing aspects of their jobs better ie being more punctual, being more helpful, giving better customer service and being more creative (as a result of the trial). This would support the notion that employees managed to do their jobs sufficiently and successfully across the 4-day trial.			
I have very limited comparison NZ data. The raw (pre-trial) score are relatively high (except creativity behaviours) but quite typical. The after-trial scores appear very good and reflect a psychological drive to 'repay PG' for the extra trust and day-off around the trial. This also aligns well with what the teams also reported themselves around performance and creativity, so some nice linkages there.			

Findings: Confidence Test

Here I used a single item around testing for confidence in the data, although the supervisor data is quite different in that they are reporting on their teams and not themselves. The question was: "Your team/s - Has prepared for the productivity aspect of the trial well". Theoretically it is unlikely for this to improve across the 4-day trial. A high score reflects they have seen their team prepare well for the trial.

Expectation? This type of construct around preparing for the trial should not change (or at least not increase) across the trial. In effect, this is used as a quality or confidence check on the supervisor perceptions, the data and the conclusions based on them.

Term	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Personality	4.81	4.85	No (p=.864s)
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 6 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.			
This finding provide support for no significant increase across the trial – as expected.			
This finding provides confidence in the previous analysis, and support the notion that the supervisor responses are genuine and not biased or flawed.			

In summary, supervisors rated their teams as well prepared for the trial pre- and post-trial.

Findings: Qualitative Comments

I briefly provide some insights from the qualitative comments made by supervisors. This related to (1) challenges they experienced through the trial and (2) positive aspects.

From your experience of the teams you rated above, did any experience any challenges/issues specific to the trial period? Please detail below.

While there were clearly timing issues (e.g., Marketing Dept.) overall most of the challenges and issues appeared to relate to 'teething' issues. Interestingly, some saw having a small sized team as problematic, while for others it was easier to manage the trial. Some general comments were:

- Challenge was to measure productivity
- Challenges relating to getting responses and accessibility to absent staff and slower responses. Some days were busier due to having a day out of the office (either getting work completed prior to day off or clearing backlog on their return).
- Resourcing in some of the smaller teams was a challenge. For example, in a team of 3, a person had to fit their work into 4 days, and cover for others to an extent too. Particularly notable in FM for example, with reception cover and a few big items happening at the same time. The need for more focus on managing pressure in work relationships was a challenge, but good we saw it in a trial period, and work on mechanisms to address.
- Initially getting focus on the trial and understanding expectations for time at work. Visible evidence of extra time commitment ahead of day off to conclude tasks.

From your experience of the teams you rated above, did any experience positive aspects specific to the trial period? Please detail below.

Overall, the comments were largely positive and appeared to home in on focus. Sample responses were:

- It appears that staff felt more energised and happy
- I noticed that everyone was more willing to help each other and everyone was very committed to being more productive.
- Some people said they were more focused, completed one task before going on to the other and managed their time better. They also didn't mind longer hours if it meant having a day off. Savings in expenses (e.g. parking) and less stress in getting to work for those who trialled flexible hours. From my observations - productivity didn't drop and targets were met.
- I think the staff all did pull together to make it work, the trial was a good insight into areas that would need to be managed differently if a 4-day week became more permanent. As a general comment I think all staff felt fortunate to be part of the trial, and working for PG - a company which really was the talk of the town.

SECTION 3: ENGAGEMENT SURVEY DATA

The engagement data is as follows:
Respondent data (n=182) reflecting the PG data pre-trial (November 2017).
Then ALL employee respondents from pre-trial (n=155).
ALL employee respondents from post-trial (n=183).
This analysis is not a strict comparison by individuals, so I am able to lump all respondents together (not matched pairs as in the earlier employee respondent analysis). This is because we are only interested in the 'global' scores and not any individual scores. This will be sufficient to tell us if pre-trial data was potentially inflated (see more below).

Findings: Engagement Constructs

Here I used a selection of items from the PG Engagement survey. I did not use all items to minimize the size of the survey and keep the focus on more relevant (to me) constructs. Specifically, I used the following:

1. *Rewards Fairness*: how fair compensation is perceived. A fundamental employee attitude.
2. *Empowerment*: how resources and confident employees feel towards doing their job.
3. *Leadership*: how well employees perceive leaders communicate and their confidence in the leadership team
4. *Work-life balance*: how well they manage work and non-work roles.
5. *Work Stimulation*: how stimulating employees find their work.
6. *Organisational Commitment*: how committed employees are to PG.
7. *Retention Intention*: employee behaviour towards staying with PG.

The main focus of this analysis is that while data was collected pre-trial and post-trial, employees were (obviously) aware of the change. Thus, there was the potential that employees were already positively shaping their perceptions of PG due to the forthcoming trial. This analysis allows us to test this. In effect, if we find significant changes between the PG engagement survey in November 2017 and the pre-trial data (end February 2018) then this suggests the data from 2018 (pre-trial) is likely to be inflated. However, given that after the trial there is still significant effects found, these are likely to represent modest comparisons. In reality, the increase is likely higher! However, such was the analysis of the trial this could not be avoided.
Expectation? I think it is very likely that some (if not all) these factors might have increased from 2017 to pre-trial to then post-trial. In effect, come the pre-trial survey, employees might have already shifted in their commitment and retention behaviours.

Term	Nov 2017 Survey	Pre-Test score[a]	Post-Test score[a]	Sig Difference?
Rewards Fairness	2.4	3.1	3.3	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
Empowerment	3.4	4.0	4.3	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
Leadership	3.2	3.8	4.1	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
Work-life balance	2.7	3.5	3.9	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
Work Stimulation	3.3	3.9	4.2	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
Organisational Commitment	3.4	4.1	4.4	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial

Retention Intention	3.1	3.9	4.2	Yes: Nov < Pre-trial < Post-trial
[a] = scoring range is 1 (low) to 5 (high). Midpoint is 3.5.				
These findings provide support for significant increases from the November 2017 PG engagement survey data. This increase is significant compared to both pre- and post-trial AND the post-trial is significantly higher than the pre-trial data, as we might expect.				
These findings provide confidence in ALL the previous analysis, and support the notion that employees started reacting and consider PG a better place to work once the announcement had been made. I think this reflects human nature and is fine! In summary, employees across the whole organisation (and here we are able to compare a much larger group of employees, up to 183) and find there are indeed increases across all engagement factors examined.				

OVERALL SUMMARY

Overall, the empirical (survey) data from both employees and supervisors is very promising. Clearly the 4-day week is doable. There appears to be much interest in it from employees (positively) and many suggestions from employees and supervisors around 'tweaking' the approach to ensure its long-term applicability.

While the empirical evidence is strong, one caveat is clearly not all employees did both surveys. Interesting, the spike in responses at time 2 show that there is strong interest! That said, the PG engagement data does provide very similar findings: employees were getting 'excited' about the trial at the pre-trial data stage and then followed through with higher engagement levels post-trial. That should definitely be seen as confirming (and sealing!) the findings. Overall, the analysis looks positive and supportive of the 4-day trial.

All the best,

Jarrod Haar
Professor of HRM
Auckland University of Technology
jarrod.haar@aut.ac.nz
6-6-2018