

NCVER

Employers' use and views of the VET system 2021: technical notes

National Centre for Vocational Education Research

This document was produced as an added resource for the report Employers' use and views of the VET system 2021 for further information. The report is available on NCVER's Portal: https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/collections/employers-use-and-views-of-the-vet-system.

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of NCVER and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or state and territory governments.

© Commonwealth of Australia, 2021



With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, the Department's logo, any material protected by a trade mark and where otherwise noted all material presented in this document is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au licence.

The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the CC BY 3.0 AU licence http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/legalcode.

The Creative Commons licence conditions do not apply to all logos, graphic design, artwork and photographs. Requests and enquiries concerning other reproduction and rights should be directed to the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER).

This document should be attributed as NCVER 2021, *Employers'* use and views of the VET system 2021: technical notes — support document, NCVER.

This work has been produced by NCVER on behalf of the Australian Government, and state and territory governments, with funding provided through the Australian Government Department of Education, Skills and Employment.

The views and opinions expressed in this document are those of NCVER and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or state and territory governments.

Contents

| Tables | 3 |
|--------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 4 |
| Scope | 4 |
| Questionnaire | 5 |
| Questionnaire design | 5 |
| Survey data | 6 |
| Reference periods | 7 |
| Survey methodology | 8 |
| Sample design and frame | 8 |
| Fieldwork | 9 |
| Weighting | 9 |
| Survey response | 10 |
| Privacy | 12 |
| Reliability of estimates | 13 |
| Data comparability | 13 |
| Appendix A | 14 |

Tables

| 1 | Desired accuracy levels of key indicators from the 2021 survey | 9 |
|----|--|----|
| 2 | Key survey indicators used in the design of the 2021 sample | 9 |
| 3 | Survey response summary, all employers, 2021 | 10 |
| 4 | Survey response rates by state, all employers, 2021 | 10 |
| 5 | Survey response rates by employer size, all employers, 2021 | 11 |
| 6 | Survey response rates by industry, all employers, 2021 | 11 |
| Α1 | List of data items available from the 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 | |
| | and 2021 surveys | 14 |

Introduction

This document provides information about the 2021 Survey of Employers' Use and Views of the VET System, including how data are reported. The survey collects information on the various ways employers meet their skill needs. Through accredited training this may include hiring staff with vocational qualifications, employing apprentices and trainees, or providing staff with nationally recognised training other than through apprenticeships and traineeships. Employers can also utilise or provide unaccredited and other forms of training. The results relate to employers' training experiences over the previous 12 months.

The 2021 survey was conducted both online and using computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) between February and June 2021. Wallis Social Research conducted the survey on behalf of the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER). A total of 5615 responses were achieved, with telephone interviews averaging 12.9 minutes in length and online completion taking 9.6 minutes on average.

Scope

All organisations in Australia with at least one employee are in scope of the survey. For this survey, an employee is defined as "a person working in, or operating from, this organisation including full time, part time and casual employees." An owner/operator is not classed as an employee, regardless of whether they pay themselves a wage.

The following organisations are out of scope of the survey:

- self-employed and not employing staff
- private households employing staff
- foreign diplomatic missions
- consulates in Australia
- defence force establishments
- superannuation funds.

The survey respondent was generally the manager responsible for staff training at the workplace. If there was more than one manager then the most senior manager was asked to respond, and if there was no manager responsible for training, personnel, staff development or human resources, then the manager of the organisation was asked to respond.

Questionnaire

Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was designed to measure the engagement and satisfaction of employers with three key areas of the VET system, namely the requirement that employees have a vocational qualification, apprenticeships and traineeships, and nationally recognised training other than apprenticeships and traineeships. Data on employers' use and satisfaction with unaccredited training were also collected for comparative purposes.

On initial contact, employers were asked a series of screening questions to determine whether they were in-scope of the survey. Only those in-scope of the survey were asked to complete it.

The 2021 questionnaire included a module to determine the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on training requirements. To ensure the length of the survey was not too onerous for employers, a number of existing questions were removed to make space for this module.

All employers were asked a set of core questions of approximately five minutes in length on their engagement and satisfaction with the VET system. These employers were then split into two groups, and each asked a different set of questions. The first group answered questions on their choice of provider, the second group provided information on employers' training choices and reasons for dissatisfaction. The COVID-19 module was asked of all employers, with questions on employers' future intentions split with half asked reasons why training priorities are different in the next 12 months, and the other half asked reasons why the amount of training would change in the next 12 months.

All key questions remained unchanged from the 2019 survey to allow for time series analysis.

Ouestions that were removed in 2021 were:

- whether the organisation had recruitment difficulties and reasons for any difficulties
- whether the organisation has employees with higher education qualifications and other types of qualifications (not including formal vocational qualifications)
- reasons why jobs require formal vocational qualifications
- the following forms of training assistance: provided or arranged relevant training whenever new technology or equipment installed; provided employees with training manuals or software to assist them with self-directed study; contributed to the costs for employees to undertake higher education or vocational education training
- reasons organisation had apprentices or trainees in last 12 months
- types of organisations who conducted the formal training for apprentices or trainees
- reasons for choosing main type of training provider for apprenticeships or traineeships
- reasons organisation had employees undertake nationally recognised training in last 12 months
- types of organisations who conducted the nationally recognised training for employees
- reasons for choosing main type of training provider for nationally recognised training

- reasons organisation had employees undertake unaccredited training in last 12 months
- types of organisations who conducted the unaccredited training for employees
- main provider who conducted the unaccredited training for employees
- reasons for choosing main type of training provider for unaccredited training
- satisfaction with various aspects of unaccredited training from main training provider
- overall satisfaction with unaccredited training from main training provider.

New questions added were:

- whether the number of employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships differed from previous years
- whether the organisation had employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships in previous years
- whether the changes in the number of employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships was due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- whether the number of employees undertaking nationally recognised training differed from previous years
- whether the organisation had employees undertaking nationally recognised training in previous years
- whether the changes in the number of employees undertaking nationally recognised training was due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- reasons for organisation not providing any training in last 12 months
- whether organisation had new training requirements due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- why organisation had new training requirements
- key areas of training that new requirements covered
- types of training used to meet new requirements due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- reasons for choosing types of training to meet new requirements
- whether training priorities for the next 12 months are different to those of the last 12 months due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- reasons training priorities different for the next 12 months due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic
- whether the organisation expects the amount of training they will provide in the next 12 months to change
- reasons organisation expects the amount of training to change in the next 12 months.

Survey data

The 2021 survey collected information from employers about:

- Organisational characteristics (Part A)
- Skill needs and formal vocational qualifications (Part C)
- Training requirements (Part D)

- Apprenticeships and Traineeships (Part E)
- Nationally Recognised Training (Part F)
- Unaccredited training (Part G)
- COVID-related questions (Part K)
- Anything further (Part H)

For each type of training (Parts E, F, G) employers were asked:

- Types of training providers used to conduct the majority of training
- Satisfaction with aspects of training from the main provider (not Part G)
- Overall satisfaction with training
- Reasons for dissatisfaction (not Part G)

A copy of the questionnaire can be found at https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/publications/all-publications/employers-use-and-views-of-the-vet-system-2021.

Appendix A lists all data that is available from the 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2021 surveys.

Note that the standard industry classification (ANZSIC) changed in 2006. Data from the 2005 survey is only available using the old industry classification (ANZSIC93). Data from both the 2007 and 2009 surveys are available using both the old and new industry classifications. Data from the 2011 survey onwards are only available using the new industry classification (ANZSIC06).

Reference periods

Employers were asked to provide information with respect to three reference periods.

The first period was the *last 12 months*. Employers were asked to supply information on whether they had employees who required vocational qualifications as a job requirement, whether they had used apprentices or trainees and whether they had provided or arranged any nationally recognised training or unaccredited training.

The second period was the *next 12 months*. Employers were asked whether their training priorities would be change in the next 12 months compared to the last 12 months due to the impacts of COVID-19 and whether the amount of training in the next 12 months would be different.

The third period was the *last pay period*. Employers were asked to supply the total number of employees working in or operating from the organisation that received pay in the last pay period.

Survey methodology

Sample design and frame

The sample for the 2021 survey was sourced from a commercial provider of business sample, namely illion. illion (formerly Dunn and Bradstreet) is a provider of credit checking and business intelligence. Its database of businesses covers almost 500,000 organisations in Australia and is constantly updated using automated and personalised techniques. Their database is drawn from a variety of sources which broadly fall under three core categories: customer-sourced, commercially sourced and public record data.

This was a change in sampling frame compared with the 2005 to 2019 surveys, which used the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Business Register. For these previous iterations, the sample was provided by the ABS, drawn from the ABS Business Register (ABR).

Organisations in-scope of the survey were randomly selected and stratified by:

- state (each of the 8 states and territories)
- industry (19 ANZSIC divisions)
- employer size (small = 1-9 employees, medium = 10-99 employees, large = 100 or more employees).

NCVER designed the survey sample to include only in-scope organisations; that is organisations in Australia with one or more employees. The sample was designed to achieve the accuracy levels shown in table 1 for seven key survey indicators (table 2). It was expected these levels of accuracy could be achieved if 9016 employers responded from a list of 49 725 businesses supplied from illion.

Table 1 Desired accuracy levels of key indicators from the 2021 survey

| Level | Desired standard errors (SEs) on estimates of proportions |
|----------------------|---|
| Australia | 0.010 |
| State | 0.025 |
| Industry (ANZSIC 06) | 0.050 |
| Employer size group | 0.015 |

Table 2 Key survey indicators used in the design of the 2021 sample

| Key survey indicator |
|--|
| Engagement with vocational education and training system |
| Engagement with formal vocational qualifications |
| Engagement with apprenticeships/traineeships |
| Engagement with nationally recognised training |
| Satisfaction with formal vocational qualifications |
| Satisfaction with apprenticeships/traineeships |
| Satisfaction with nationally recognised training |

Fieldwork

Fieldwork was conducted in two phases. All sampled employers were sent a personalised letter and brochure approximately two weeks before initial telephone contact to allow enough time for the letter to reach the appropriate person and to give time for those who wanted to complete the survey online to do so. The letter and brochures were sent in four separate batches throughout the fieldwork period to ensure that employers were contacted in a timely manner. A copy of the letter and brochure can be found at https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/publications/all-publications/employers-use-and-views-of-the-vet-system-2021.

The letter provided login details for the employer to complete the survey online. The letter and brochure were also used to reassure potential respondents of the legitimacy of the survey, provide definitions of the terms used in the survey, and ultimately maximise the response rate. A 1800 (free call) number was also set up and details printed on the letter and brochure for respondents to call to obtain further information about the survey, make an appointment for interview, or opt out of the survey. The survey was open between February and June 2021. Reminder emails and SMSs were sent to encourage employers to complete the survey. In 2021, refusal conversion, which is where a respondent who initially refuses to participate is recontacted to try and gain an interview, was carried out. These interviews were carried out by interviewers experienced in refusal conversion.

Weighting

All percentages published have been derived based on stated responses. As the survey was undertaken as a sample rather than a census, responses have been weighted to represent population benchmarks of inscope organisations from the ABS Business Register at the time of sampling. In order to represent the ABS population benchmarks, the data were first weighted back to the illion population (used as the sampling

frame) to adjust for non-response and then raked to the ABS population benchmarks using the following stratification variables:

- state (each of the 8 states and territories)
- industry (19 ANZSIC divisions)
- employer size (small = 1-9 employees, medium = 10-99 employees, large = 100 or more employees).

Weighting removes sample bias with respect to state, industry and employer size and so all survey estimates should be based on weighted counts when tabulations are produced.

Survey response

Details of the response rate achieved at the national level for the 2021 survey are shown in table 3. The response rate is calculated as the number of responses achieved divided by the number of in-scope organisations.

Table 3 Survey response summary, all employers, 2021

| | Employers | 3 |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Survey response | n | % |
| Employers selected | 49 727 | NA |
| Sample issued to field | 49 437 | NA |
| Total determined in-scope | 10 844 | 100.0 |
| Responded | 5615 | 51.8 |
| Did not respond | 5229 | 48.2 |
| Refused | 3104 | 28.6 |
| Relevant person not available | 2125 | 19.6 |

The response rates by state (table 4), employer size (table 5), and industry (table 6) are shown below.

Table 4 Survey response rates by state, all employers, 2021

| State | Telephone responses | Online responses | Total responses | Response rate |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | n | n | n | % |
| New South Wales | 958 | 679 | 1637 | 51.4 |
| Victoria | 655 | 499 | 1154 | 46.4 |
| Queensland | 553 | 403 | 956 | 52.7 |
| South Australia | 237 | 192 | 429 | 55.8 |
| Western Australia | 267 | 226 | 493 | 51.3 |
| Tasmania | 196 | 182 | 378 | 62.8 |
| Northern Territory | 121 | 88 | 209 | 57.9 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 177 | 182 | 359 | 53.7 |
| Australia | 3164 | 2451 | 5615 | 51.8 |

Table 5 Survey response rates by employer size, all employers, 2021

| Employer size | Telephone responses | Online responses | Total responses | Response rate |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| (Number of employees) | n | n | n | % |
| 1 – 9 | 2430 | 1653 | 4083 | 49.8 |
| 10 – 99 | 595 | 577 | 1172 | 59.7 |
| 100 + | 139 | 221 | 360 | 53.3 |
| Australia | 3164 | 2451 | 5615 | 51.8 |

Table 6 Survey response rates by industry, all employers, 2021

| Industry | Telephone responses | Online responses | Total responses | Response rate |
|---|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| (ANZSIC06) | n | n | n | % |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 109 | 66 | 175 | 63.2 |
| Mining | 42 | 31 | 73 | 52.5 |
| Manufacturing | 198 | 167 | 365 | 57.9 |
| Electricity, gas, water and waste services | 39 | 39 | 78 | 54.9 |
| Construction | 471 | 263 | 734 | 52.7 |
| Wholesale trade | 165 | 120 | 285 | 45.0 |
| Retail trade | 307 | 178 | 485 | 52.9 |
| Accommodation and food services | 230 | 165 | 395 | 49.9 |
| Transport, postal and warehousing | 137 | 106 | 243 | 51.6 |
| Information media and telecommunications | 58 | 40 | 98 | 45.4 |
| Finance and insurance services | 94 | 69 | 163 | 36.5 |
| Rental, hiring and real estate services | 118 | 85 | 203 | 37.3 |
| Professional, scientific and technical services | 395 | 344 | 739 | 49.1 |
| Administrative and support services | 89 | 105 | 194 | 53.2 |
| Public administration and safety | 47 | 56 | 103 | 63.2 |
| Education and training | 98 | 109 | 207 | 67.9 |
| Health care and social assistance | 245 | 209 | 454 | 53.1 |
| Arts and recreation services | 116 | 88 | 204 | 59.5 |
| Other services | 206 | 211 | 417 | 58.7 |
| Australia | 3164 | 2451 | 5615 | 51.8 |

Compared with previous years, it was much more difficult to find the right person to complete the survey, impacting both the number of telephone interviews completed and telephone-prompted online surveys completed. We suspect this is because much of the workforce was working from home at the time of the survey, with work colleagues reluctant to forward calls to personal phones or disclose personal numbers, and employees reluctant to answer calls from unknown numbers on their personal phones. This resulted in a dramatic spike in voicemail recordings, rather than getting to speak to the actual person. The number of calls needed to achieve a response increased by approximately 50% compared with the 2019 survey.

Another significant issue in 2021 was the increase in the return-to-sender (RTS) mail rate. Return-to-sender rates are a good proxy for business health, as a major proportion of return-to-sender mail is indicative of a business no longer operating. In 2021, there were 4626 letters return-to-sender compared to 2550 in 2019. This represents an 81% increase in RTS from 2019 to 2021.

Privacy

All employers were assured of complete confidentiality. No information has or will be released in a way that will enable the identification of any individual employer or respondent. Name and address details of the employer and respondent were used only by the fieldwork contractor during the process of the initial mail out and the interview and have not and will not be given to any other persons, organisations or departments. The fieldwork contractor worked with a small number of external service providers to administer the survey. Companies providing printing and collation services were provided with the employers' contact details for the purpose of administering the survey. Any contact details of employers and respondents held by the fieldwork contractor or their external service providers for the purpose of this survey were destroyed upon conclusion of the project.

Reliability of estimates

Two types of error are possible in an estimate based on a survey: sampling error and non-sampling error. Non-sampling error may occur as a result of errors in the reporting, recording or processing of data. Sampling error is a measure of the variability that occurs because a sample, rather than the entire population, responds to a survey.

Estimates from the Survey of Employers' Use and Views of the VET System are subject to sampling variability. This is because they are based on information provided by a sample rather than a population. The estimates may differ from those produced if all employers had been included and responded to the survey. The standard error is one measure of the likely difference. Standard errors enable us to calculate confidence intervals, or significance levels, for the estimates. By convention, a 95% confidence interval is applied in judging the reliability of survey estimates. That is, there are 19 chances in 20 that the estimate obtained from the sample will be within two standard errors of the true population value (i.e. the value if the whole population is surveyed).

Data tables include information on each type of training by state, industry and employer size, as well as the margin of error. The margin of error allows data users to view the amount of certainty (or error) in a reported measure sourced from information provided by a sample rather than a population. Please refer to https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/collections/employers-use-and-views-of-the-vet-system.

Data comparability

This is the ninth time the survey has been conducted in this form. Previous surveys were conducted in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017 and 2019. The majority of data items between these earlier surveys and the 2021 survey are directly comparable. A review of the survey content and methodology was conducted in 2011. The review resulted in a number of changes to data items collected in the 2013 survey and subsequent surveys closely mirror that survey. However, a set of core data items (employer engagement and satisfaction with various aspects of the VET system) remained the same to allow for time series comparisons across the surveys. The data items collected across the nine surveys can be found in Appendix A.

Previous employer surveys conducted in 1995, 1997, 1999 and 2001 focussed on employer satisfaction with recently hired VET graduates. Because of this difference in focus, there are no comparative data available between these earlier surveys and the 2005 and subsequent surveys. Further details regarding the history of the survey can be found at: https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/publications/all-publications/employers-use-and-views-of-the-vet-system-history-of-employer-survey.

Appendix A

Table A1 List of data items available from the 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2021 surveys

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | 2021 | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Organisation characteristics: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Industry (ANZSIC 93) | √ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Industry (ANZSIC 06) | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| State of operation | ✓ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | |
| Sector | √ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number of employees | ✓ | √ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | |
| Number of permanent employees | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of full-time employees | √ | √ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupational distribution of organisation | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation is a registered training organisation (RTO) | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | |
| If RTO, whether mainly provide training to own employees or to other organisations | √ | √ | √ | | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | |
| Training strategy: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation has business plan | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff training part of business plan | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Importance of training to overall business strategy | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ways organisation currently determines training needs of staff | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rating of current skill level of employees relative to needs of the organisation | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation experienced any difficulties recruiting staff in past 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | | 2021 | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Reasons for recruitment difficulties | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Occupations of recruitment difficulties | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What has organisation done to address these difficulties | √ | ✓ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proficiency of staff | | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| Reasons staff not fully proficient | | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| Impact on organisation performance if staff not fully proficient | | | | | | √ | | √ | | | | √ | | | | | | | |
| Effect on organisation if staff not fully proficient | | | | | | √ | | √ | | | | √ | | | | | | | |
| What organisation has done to cope with lack of staff proficiency | | | | | | ✓ | | √ | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| Whether talk to anyone external to the business about skill needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Types of organisations or individuals talked to about skill needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Informal training: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organisation done any of following in last 12 months: • supervisors provided informal training as | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | √ | √ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | |
| requiredprovided/arranged for relevant training for new technology/equipment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| provided training manuals or software for self-directed study | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| contributed to cost of university studycontributed to cost of VET study | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Whether organisation provided informal, or on- the-job training as required in the last 12 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | 2021 | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Data item | 2003 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Reasons for not providing any training to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| employees in last 12 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vocational qualifications as a job requirement: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation ever had jobs that require vocational qualifications | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | |
| Reasons organisation (does not have/no longer has) specific jobs that require vocational qualifications | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of employees in organisation that had jobs requiring vocational qualifications in last 12 months | √ | √ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether jobs require full or part qualification | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupations of employees that had jobs requiring vocational qualifications in last 12 months | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons organisation has specific jobs that require vocational qualifications in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | | |
| Importance of employing people with vocational qualifications | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with vocational qualifications in providing employees with skills required for job | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction | √ | √ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Suggestions for improvements | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Apprenticeships/traineeships: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation ever had employees undertaking apprenticeships/traineeships in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | 2021 | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | , | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Reasons organisation does not have apprentices/trainees | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | < | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether the number of employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships in organisation has differed from previous years | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| Whether organisation had employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships in previous years | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| Whether the changes in the number of employees undertaking apprenticeships or traineeships was due to the impacts of COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| Whether know where to look for information about recruiting apprentice/trainee | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of apprentices/trainees who undertook formal training in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expect number of apprentices/trainees to increase, stay the same, decrease in next three years | | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether number of apprentices/trainees increased, stayed the same, decreased in last 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expect number of apprentices/trainees to increase, stay the same, decrease in next 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupations of apprentices/trainees in last 12 months | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons organisation has had apprentices/trainees in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | | |
| Method of hiring apprentices/trainees | √ | √ | √ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 9 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | 2019 | | | 2021 | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Data item | 2003 | | 2009 | 2011 | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Reasons for using a group training | ✓ | ✓ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| organisation to hire apprentices/trainees | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Types of organisations used to conduct formal training for apprentices/trainees | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | |
| Types of organisations used to conduct MAJORITY of formal training for apprentices/trainees | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ |
| Reasons for using main type of training provider | ✓ | √ | √ | | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with various aspects of training for apprentices/trainees from main provider | | | | | | | √ |
| Overall level of satisfaction with training for apprentices/trainees from main provider | | | | | | | | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Level of satisfaction with the quality of training from main training provider | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Importance of apprenticeships/traineeships in meeting skill needs | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with apprenticeships/traineeships in meeting skill needs | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Suggestions for improvements | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nationally recognised training: | | | | | | | | | | | | l | l | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation ever arranged or provided for employees to undertake nationally recognised training in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | \ | | |
| Reasons organisation does not have employees who have undertaken nationally recognised training | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | 2019 | | | 2021 | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Whether the number of employees undertaking nationally recognised training in organisation has differed from previous years | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| Whether organisation had employees undertaking nationally recognised training in previous years | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| Whether the changes in the number of employees undertaking nationally recognised training was due to the impacts of COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| Whether know where to look for information about nationally recognised training | | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of employees provided with nationally recognised training in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | ✓ | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether nationally recognised training was for full qualification or for specific subjects/modules | | ✓ | \ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| If both, was the majority for a full qualification or for specific subjects/modules | | √ | √ | √ | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | |
| Expect amount of nationally recognised training to increase, stay the same, decrease in next three years | | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether amount of nationally recognised training increased, stayed the same, decreased in last 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expect amount of nationally recognised training to increase, stay the same, decrease in next 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupations of employees provided with nationally recognised training in last 12 months | √ | √ | | | | , | | | , | | | , | | | , | | | | |
| Reasons organisation arranged for employees | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | 2015 | | | | 2017 | | 2019 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 2000 | 2001 | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| to undertake nationally recognised training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Who conducted MAJORITY of nationally recognised training (external provider or internally) | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | ✓ |
| Types of organisations used to conduct nationally recognised training | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Types of organisations used to conduct MAJORITY of nationally recognised training | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ |
| Reasons for using main type of training provider | √ | √ | √ | | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with various aspects of nationally recognised training from main provider | | | | | | | √ |
| Overall level of satisfaction with nationally recognised training from main provider | | | | | | | | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ |
| Level of satisfaction with the quality of training from main training provider | ✓ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Importance of training leading to a nationally recognised qualification | ✓ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with nationally recognised training in providing employees with required skills | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction | √ | √ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | |
| Suggestions for improvements | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unaccredited training: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation ever arranged or provided for employees to undertake unaccredited training in last 12 months | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| Percentage of employees provided with unaccredited training in last 12 months | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 09 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | 2021 | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| Expect amount of unaccredited training to increase, stay the same, decrease in next three years | | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether amount of unaccredited training increased, stayed the same, decreased in last 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expect amount of unaccredited training to increase, stay the same, decrease in next 12 months | | | | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupations of employees provided with unaccredited training in last 12 months | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons organisation arranged for employees to undertake unaccredited training | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | | |
| Who conducted MAJORITY of unaccredited training (external provider or internally) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | ✓ |
| Types of organisations used to conduct unaccredited training | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Types of organisations used to conduct MAJORITY of unaccredited training | √ | ✓ | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ |
| Reasons for using main type of training provider | √ | √ | √ | | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with various aspects of unaccredited training from main provider | | | | | | | √ | | | ✓ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Overall level of satisfaction with unaccredited training from main provider | | | | | | | | | | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with the quality of training from main training provider | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether comparable nationally recognised training available when choosing unaccredited training | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | √ | | √ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | √ | |
| Reasons for choosing unaccredited training | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | √ | | | <u> </u> | | | √ | | | √ | | | ✓ | _ |

| Data item | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2011 | | 2013 | | | 2015 | | | 2017 | | | 2019 | | | 2021 | |
|---|----------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B | Core | Non- core A | Non- core B |
| over nationally recognised training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of satisfaction with unaccredited training | ✓ | \checkmark | \checkmark | ✓ | \checkmark | | | ✓ | | | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | |
| in providing employees with required skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons for dissatisfaction | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Overall improvements to the VET system: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Suggestions for improvements to the VET | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| system | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| COVID related questions: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Whether organisation had new training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| requirements due to the impacts of COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons organisation had new training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| requirements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Key areas of training that new training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ | | |
| requirements covered | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Types of training used to meet new | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \checkmark | | |
| requirements due to the impacts of COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Reasons for choosing types of training to meet | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \checkmark | | |
| new requirements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Whether training priorities for the next 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ * | | |
| months are different to those of the last 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| months due to the impacts of COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reasons training priorities are different for the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \checkmark | | |
| next 12 months due to the impacts of COVID- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Whether expect the amount of training the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | √ * | | |
| organisation will provide in the next 12 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to change | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> |
| Reasons expect the amount of training to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| change in the next 12 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

^{*}These questions in 2021 were randomly assigned to employers; that is the employer would either be asked if their training priorities would be different in the next 12 months compared with the last 12 months <u>OR</u> whether the amount of training they would provide in the next 12 months would be different.