

Workplace Employment Relations Survey 2004

Introductory Note to Accompany Data Deposit

November 2005

This note provides a short introduction to a number of important features of the data files arising from the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) 2004. It should be read in conjunction with the WERS 2004 Technical Report, interview schedules and other associated documentation provided with the data files. The note covers both the Cross-Section and Panel elements of WERS 2004.

1. Survey components

The WERS 2004 Cross-Section Survey has the following components:

- Survey of Managers (comprising the Employee Profile Questionnaire and the Management Interview)
- Survey of Employee Representatives
- Survey of Employees
- Financial Performance Questionnaire

Wave 2 of the 1998-2004 Panel Survey has the following components:

- Screening Questionnaire
- Survey of Managers (comprising the Basic Workforce Data Sheet and the Management Interview)

Questionnaires for each component are included in the survey documentation. With the exception of the Panel Survey Screening Questionnaire, they are provided as individual PDF files. The Screening Questionnaire is provided in the Annex to the WERS 2004 Technical Report.

2. Unique identifiers

Each workplace in the Cross-Section Survey has a unique identifier (SERNO) that can be used to link responses from managers, employee representatives and employees at the same establishment. Each employee representative is uniquely identified by the combination of SERNO and WAREPTYP. Each employee is uniquely identified by the combination of SERNO and PERSID.

Each workplace in Wave 2 of the Panel Survey has a unique identifier, also called SERNO, which can be used to link the data to responses in Wave 1 of the Panel - the 1998 Cross-Section Survey (deposited separately; SN: 3955).

3. Weighting variables

The surveys in the WERS series are based on stratified samples in which the sampling fractions vary across the strata of the sampling matrix. The achieved samples are

therefore unrepresentative of the population and weights are required to produce unbiased estimates. Many of the weighting variables also correct for non-response biases.

The weights for the 2004 Cross-Section Survey are as follows:

- ESTWTNR – the standard establishment weight, which should be used to produce workplace-level estimates from the Survey of Managers and Survey of Employee Representatives (e.g. the proportion of all workplaces that recognise trade unions)
- EMPWTNR – an alternative weight for the Survey of Managers that can be used to produce analyses that indicate the proportion of all employees to whom a particular workplace characteristic applies (e.g. the proportion of all employees working in establishments with recognised trade unions). EMPWTNR is simply the product of ESTWTNR and ZALLEMPS (the total number of employees working at the establishment)
- SEQWTNR – the standard weight for the Survey of Employees, which accounts for variations in sampling fractions at both stages of the design (i.e. selection of the sample of establishments, and selection of the sample of employees within each establishment).

The weights for the 1998-2004 Panel Survey are as follows:

- ESTWTNR – establishment weight, which should be used to produce workplace-level estimates of the 2004 outcome for the full sample of 2,191 establishments from 1998.
- PQWQTNR – establishment weight, which should be used to produce workplace-level estimates for the sub-sample of 938 establishments that were interviewed in 2004. This weight should be used to produce estimates from either Wave 1 or Wave 2 among this sub-sample.

All weights are scaled so that the sum of weighted cases is 100.

Further information on the sample design and the methods used to construct the weights are provided in Section 7 of the WERS 2004 Technical Report. A general introduction to the use of sampling weights in the analysis of data from WERS is provided by Purdon and Pickering (2001).¹

Revised weights for WERS 1998:

Improvements to the methods used to construct the weights for WERS 2004, in comparison to those used in WERS 1998, mean that direct comparisons between the original 1998 Cross-Section (SN: 3955) and those establishments with 10 or more employees in the 2004 Cross-Section may be impaired by differences in the weighting strategies. However, ESTWTNR on the Panel Survey data file has been produced using the improved method. This weight can be matched onto the original data from

¹ Purdon S and Pickering K (2001) *The Use of Sampling Weights in the Analysis of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey*, London: National Centre for Social Research. [Available to download from the web-site of the WERS98 Data Dissemination Service at: <http://www.niesr.ac.uk/research/wers98/>]

WERS 1998 and used to produce Cross-Section estimates for 1998 that are weighted on a comparable basis to estimates derived from the 2004 Cross-Section. ESTWTNR can be used directly to weight data from the 1998 Survey of Managers and Survey of Worker Representatives. A weight for the 1998 Survey of Employees can be derived by multiplying the original SEQ weight variable (EMPWT_NR) by a factor that is equal to the ratio between the original and revised establishment weights. A further scaling factor equal to 100/1084 is used to scale the sum of the weights to 100. The syntax is as follows:

```
SPSS: compute seqwtnr=((empwt_nr*(estwtmr/est_wt))*100/1084) .
```

```
Stata: gen seqwtmr=((empwt_nr*(estwtmr/est_wt))*100/1084)
```

4. Multiple-response sets

In the Cross-Section Surveys of Managers and Employee Representatives, and the Panel Survey of Managers, a number of questions permitted multiple responses (e.g. CFACTORS in the Cross-Section Survey of Managers). These questions are identified with the symbol ^ in the questionnaires. In the data files, the responses to these questions are stored in successive variables (e.g. CFACTOR1, CFACTOR2 and so on). The first variable in the set contains the first response mentioned in the interview, the second variable holds the second response, etc.

Some multiple-response questions allowed the respondent to give answers other than those included on the pre-specified code frame. In such cases, the 'other' answers provided by the respondent have been coded into additional variables beginning with the letter X (e.g. XCFACT1, XCFACT2, XFACT3). These additional variables follow the main set on the data file. The original 'other' code remains present in the main set of variables. A respondent using the 'Other, please specify' item on CFACTORS (code 9) will thus have a value of 9 in one of the variables CFACTOR1-CFACTOR9 *plus* a set of values in XFACT1-XFACT3 which correspond to the codes assigned to their verbatim answers during the data coding and editing process. The original 'other' code should be ignored during analysis to prevent double-counting.

In the Cross-Section Survey of Employees, a small number of questions in Section E of the questionnaire were designed to accommodate multiple-responses (i.e. E4, E7, E8, E9). In these cases, the primary variable indicates the number of responses given by each respondent at that question, and subsequent variables indicate whether each of the available response categories was chosen. For example, the variable E4 indicates the number of responses given by each respondent at question E4, whilst codes indicating whether each of the six possible were chosen are contained in E4_1 ("No dependent children") to E4_6 ("Children aged 12-18").

In addition, a number of questions in the Survey of Employees attracted multiple responses from small numbers of employees, despite the questionnaire indicating that the respondent should tick only one box. In these cases, the main variable is coded to a specific missing value (-6). For questions that attracted multiple responses from more than 20 employees (B2, D2, E10 and E14), the multiple responses have been made available on the dataset adjacent to the main variable.

5. Overcodes

Overcodes are variables that serve two purposes in the WERS 2004 datasets. They identify cases where a major change has been made to the interview data during data editing, or where the research team had reason to be concerned about the validity of a particular set of responses. A list of overcodes is provided in Section 6 of the WERS 2004 Technical Report.²

~~6. Restricted data~~



~~The data have been anonymised to protect the identity of individual respondents and participating establishments. To add further protections, region identifiers and a detailed industry classification are also being withheld from general release until April 2007 and, prior to that date, data from the Financial Performance Questionnaire will be available only via the Micro-Data Laboratory operated by the Business Data Linking section at the Office for National Statistics (<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/bdl/>).~~

~~Broad industry classifications, coded at Section level of the *Standard Industrial Classification*, have been provided on the general release files. In the data file for the Cross-Section Survey of Managers, these are NSICODE and NSICOD92. In the Panel Survey data file the variable is YSICODE.~~

7. Further information

Further information about WERS 2004 is provided on the web-site of the Department of Trade and Industry at: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/emar/wers5.htm>

Secondary analysis of WERS 2004 is being supported by the establishment of an information and advice service at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research. This service is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council.

WERS 2004 Information and Advice Service

E-mail: wers2004@niesr.ac.uk

Web-site: <http://www.wers2004.info>

~~8. Users' conditions of access to the WERS 2004 data prior to publication of the WERS sourcebook~~

~~The WERS sourcebook of main findings is due to be published in July 2006. During your application to access the data from WERS 2004, you will have accepted certain conditions relating to access prior to the publication of the sourcebook. These are repeated in Annex A for reference purposes.~~

² The exceptions are XCODE12 and XCODE13 on the Employee Representatives data file, and XCODE12 on the Panel Survey data file. These overcodes were added after the Technical Report had been finalised.

WERS 2004 Cross-Section: Management data file

Revisions to survey data

March 2007

A small number of errors have become apparent in the deposited data file (XS04_MQ.*). The associated syntax file (XS04_MQfix.*), which is available in SPSS and Stata formats, corrects those errors which are amenable to recoding. The syntax writes out a revised version of the data file (XS04_MQv2.*) that incorporates the recoded data.

Outstanding issues are documented in the WERS 2004 Variable Notes, which can be downloaded from the web-site of the WERS 2004 Information and Advice Service: <http://www.wers2004.info>.

Revisions made in XS04_MQfix.sps:

ZTOTMEN, ZTOTWOM:

The original data file contained 11 workplaces for which ZTOTMEN and ZTOTWOM (total males and total females at the establishment respectively) were both equal to zero. In 10 of these cases, this was due to missing values on the component variables (ZMALFULL, ZFEMFULL, ZMALPRT, ZFEMPRT). The syntax file sets ZTOTMEN and ZTOTWOM to missing in these cases. In the final case, the four component variables are each equal to zero.

IMATWKS:

In the original data file, one workplace (SERNO 31458) reports a value of 97 for this variable: the number of weeks of maternity leave that would be paid at the employee's normal, full rate of pay. This was an error and the value should have been recorded as missing (-8). The syntax file recodes this value.

JSTIME, JCLTIME (Stata version only):

These variables contain the usual opening and closing times of workplaces, where applicable. In the SPSS version of the management dataset, these variables are displayed in time format; for example, if a business begins operating at 8am this appears as 8:00:00 in the data file. For those workplaces where this question was not applicable, this is shown as -0:00:01 in the dataset.

In the original Stata data file, these variables appeared in a different format, with the time displayed as a proportion of 24 hours (e.g. 0.3333 instead of 08:00). The revisions syntax converts these values back into time format (hh:mm, albeit stored as strings). It also creates two new variables (JSTIMEN and JCLTIMEN), which hold the data as numeric values (e.g. 8.5 for 08:30am). The advantage of the numeric format is that this allows users to work out the number of hours for which the workplace operates each day (i.e. JCLTIMEN-JSTIMEN where JTIME=3).

Users should note that the revisions syntax requires separate installation of the 'stimeofday.ado' file (this can be downloaded by entering 'time of day' into Stata's help function, and choosing the option 'Speaking Stata: Time of Day').

SEQPLACE:

In the original data file, this variable contained a value of 3 for four workplaces, indicating that the SEQ was still to be placed. This was an error and these cases should have been coded to value 2 “no – cannot place”. The syntax file recodes these values. Variables that use the information contained in SEQPLACE (i.e. NSEQYLD, NSEQRR, NNUMSEQ and NUMSEQ) require no revision as they were correctly coded in the original data file.

WERS 2004 Cross-Section: Management data file

Additions to survey data

March 2007

This note outlines a set of additional variables (XS04_MQextra.*) that may be matched onto the WERS 2004 Cross-section Management data file using the unique workplace identifier (**SERNO**). This dataset of additional variables contains two regional identifiers, three variables identifying the economic activity of the establishment and a variable that identifies the month of the interview with the main management respondent.

Regional Identifiers

This dataset of additional variables includes two variables to identify the region in which the workplace is located:

1. **GOR** – Government Office Region
2. **SSR** – Standard Statistical Region

Details on these regional classifications can be found on the Office for National Statistics website:

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/geography/gor.asp>

Standard Industrial Classification

This dataset of additional variables includes three versions of the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC):

1. **ASIC2003** – Standard Industrial Classification 2003 (SIC2003)
2. **ASIC92** – Standard Industrial Classification 1992 (SIC92)
3. **ASIC80** – Standard Industrial Classification 1980 (SIC80)

Each variable is coded to the four digit level.

These three variables have been derived from the verbatim answers to question **ASICDESC**. These verbatim responses were first coded to SIC2003. Look-up tables were then used to derive the SIC80 and SIC92 classifications from the SIC2003 codes. SIC2003 does not differ greatly from SIC92, but differs more extensively from SIC80. Consequently, one should not expect the variable **ASIC80** to be as precise as the other variables.

Details on SIC80 may be found in Central Statistical Office (1981) *Indexes to the Standard Industrial Classification: Revised 1980*, HMSO: London.

Details on SIC92 may be found at the Office for National Statistics website:

http://www.statistics.gov.uk/methods_quality/sic/default.asp

Details on SIC2003 may be found at the Office for National Statistics website:
<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/Product.asp?vlnk=14012>

Month of management interview

The variable **NINTDATE** identifies the month in which the interview with the main management respondent took place. This variable is in 'date' rather than 'numeric' format.

WERS 2004 Cross-Section: Employee Representative data file

Revisions to survey data

March 2007

A small number of errors have become apparent in the deposited data file (XS04_ERQ.*). The associated syntax file (XS04_ERQfix.*), which is available in SPSS and Stata formats, corrects those errors which are amenable to recoding. The syntax writes out a revised version of the data file (XS04_ERQv2.*) that incorporates the recoded data.

Outstanding issues are documented in the WERS 2004 Variable Notes, which can be downloaded from the web-site of the WERS 2004 Information and Advice Service: <http://www.wers2004.info>.

Revisions made in XS04_ERQfix.sps:

XCODE12 (SPSS version only):

In the original data file, the print format in the SPSS dataset was set to F1.0. The data was then illegible when using the LIST command. The revisions syntax sets the print format to F2.0

XCODE13:

In the original data file, this variable was mistakenly coded 1 for SERNOs 32465 and 33641. In neither case was there a discrepancy between the eligible and interviewed representatives. The revisions syntax recodes the values to system missing.

WERS 2004 Cross-Section: Survey of Employees

Revisions to survey weighting

March 2007

It has come to our attention that the weight provided to users on the WERS 2004 Cross-Section Survey of Employees data file, and used in the primary analysis of the data, is not exactly as described in Section 7.4 of the Technical Report (Chaplin et al, 2005). Specifically, the adjustment for differential response rates by gender, which is discussed on p.102 of the Technical Report, is not included in the current version of SEQWTNR. This note outlines this issue in more detail and describes the impact on survey estimates of revising the weight to include the gender adjustment.

The issue

The purpose of the weight variable on the SEQ data file is to adjust for the fact that employees had different probabilities of selection into the final achieved sample. To have the opportunity of participating in the SEQ, an employee had to work in an establishment that was selected for, and participated in, the Cross-Section Management Interview, and which also agreed to participate in the Survey of Employees. If these conditions were met, a random sample of 25 employees was selected at workplace. These criteria combined to create variations in the probability of selection between employees in different establishments. The existing weight (SEQWTNR) - provided to users on the WERS 2004 Cross-Section Survey of Employees data file and used in the primary analysis of the data (Kersley et al. 2005, 2006; Forth et al. 2006) - accounted for these variations in selection probabilities and removed the associated sample biases that would otherwise have been introduced into estimates produced from the Survey of Employees.

There remains the possibility that response rates vary according to employee characteristics, such as gender or hours of work. This is difficult to identify because the survey did not collect background information on the characteristics of employees selected for the survey within each workplace. However, the Employee Profile Questionnaire (EPQ) provided some information on the workforce in each establishment and hence, the survey population as a whole (i.e. all employees working in establishments that participated in the Management Interview). In the absence of response bias within the Survey of Employees itself, one would expect the achieved sample to reflect this wider population (notwithstanding the natural effect of sampling error). As gender is perhaps the employee characteristic least prone to misclassification on the EPQ, the WERS Technical Report (p. 102) described a final stage of SEQ weighting which compared the gender profile of the total achieved SEQ sample with the profile of the total workforce in WERS workplaces, derived from the EPQ.¹ This comparison suggested that women were over-represented in the achieved sample of employees: after weighting for establishment-level variations in selection probabilities, 53.0 per cent of employees in the achieved SEQ sample were female (E2=2), whereas the EPQ data indicated that the proportion of female employees in

¹ One might also expect the achieved sample of employees within each workplace to match the workforce profile indicated by that individual workplace's Employee Profile Questionnaire. However, sampling errors at this level can be substantial.

WERS workplaces was 49.7 per cent.² Female employees were therefore over-represented in the achieved sample by a factor of 6.6 per cent.

The WERS Technical Report indicated that the weight variable computed for use with the SEQ data (SEQWTNR) incorporated an adjustment for this small gender bias. In fact, the adjustment was inadvertently omitted when the WERS Research Team computed the final weight variable for the SEQ. This omission has now been rectified by making available a revised weight (SEQWTNR2) which incorporates the gender adjustment.

What is the impact of the revision?

The revision inflates the weights for male employees and deflates the weights for female employees so that, under the revised weighting, the proportion of female employees (E1=2) equals 49.7 per cent. The new weight is derived from the old by use of the following syntax:

In SPSS:

```
compute seqwtmr2=seqwtmr .  
if e1=1 seqwtmr2=seqwtmr*1.0702 .  
if e1=2 seqwtmr2=seqwtmr*0.9377 .
```

In Stata:

```
gen seqwtmr2=seqwtmr  
replace seqwtmr2=seqwtmr*1.0702 if e1==1  
replace seqwtmr2=seqwtmr*0.9377 if e1==2
```

The original and revised weights are strongly correlated ($r=0.993$) and so the impact on existing analyses that utilise the original weighting scheme is small. The greatest impact is on data items that are strongly correlated with gender. To indicate the impact of the revision to the weighting, estimates of every data item in the publicly-available Survey of Employees data file under the original weighting scheme (SEWTNR) and the revised weighting scheme (SEQWTNR2) have been compared. Appendix A lists all the data items for which the weighted estimate differed after moving to SEQWTNR2. Only the gender item itself (E1) changed by more than one percentage point after rounding, as a result of using the revised weight.

The impact on estimates published in the primary analysis of WERS 2004 (Kersley et al. 2005, 2006) is less extensive. This is because the degree of apparent gender bias in the achieved SEQ sample is slightly smaller among the subset of workplaces with 10 or more employees, which formed the basis of those publications. Specifically, in the subset of workplaces with 10 or more employees, the EPQ data indicated that 49.9 per cent of employees were female whilst the proportion of female employees in the SEQ achieved sample was 52.2 per cent per cent (prior to any gender adjustment). Female employees were therefore over-represented in this subset of workplaces by a factor of 4.6 per cent. Appendix B lists all of the estimates published in the First Findings booklet (Kersley et al. 2005) in which the weighted estimate changes after rounding, as a result of moving to SEQWTNR2.

² The SEQ estimate is computed from E2=2, after excluding cases where E2 is missing and weighting by the existing SEQWTNR. The EPQ estimate is computed as the mean of $((ZFEMFULL + ZFEMPRT)/ZALLEMPS)$ after excluding cases where ZFEMFULL or ZFEMPRT are missing and weighting by EMPWTNR.

In the case of Forth et al. (2006), which is based on the subset of workplaces belonging to private-sector enterprises with fewer than 250 employees, females were over-represented in the achieved SEQ sample by a factor of 9.5 per cent (the EPQ data indicates that 45.0 per cent of employees were female whilst the proportion of female employees in the SEQ achieved sample was 49.3 per cent). Yet, again, the impact of moving to the revised weights is relatively small. Appendix C lists all of the changes occurring in Table 9.1 of Forth et al (2006) after moving to the new weight; once again, none of the published estimates change by more than one percentage point after rounding.

Further information and advice

If you have further questions about this note or the revision to the SEQ weighting scheme, please contact the WERS Information and Advice Service:

E-mail: wers2004@niesr.ac.uk
Phone: +44 (0) 20 7654 1933
Web-site: <http://www.wers2004.info>

References

- Chaplin J, Mangla J, Purdon S and Airey C (2005) *The Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) 2004: Technical Report (Cross-Section and Panel Surveys)*, London: National Centre for Social Research. [Available on-line at: <http://www.wers2004.info/wers2004/wers2004.php>]
- Forth J, Bewley H and Bryson A (2006) *Small and Medium-sized Enterprises: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, London: Department of Trade and Industry. [Available on-line at: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/publications/index.html> (URN 06/1008)].
- Kersley B, Alpin C, Forth J, Bryson A, Bewley H, Dix G and Oxenbridge S (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, London: Routledge.
- Kersley B, Alpin C, Forth J, Bryson A, Bewley H, Dix G and Oxenbridge S (2005) *Inside the Workplace: First Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, London: Department of Trade and Industry. [Available on-line at: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/publications/index.html> (URN 05/1057)].

Appendix A: List of items affected by revision to weighting scheme (full 5+ sample)

Question	Sub-item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
A1	Less than a year	18	17
A3		35.78	36.09
A4		3.54	3.61
A5	Less often than once a month	17	18
A5	Never	54	53
A6a	Strongly agree	27	26
A7a	A lot	35	36
A7a	A little	15	14
A7c	Some	34	33
A8b	Very satisfied	20	21
A8c	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28	27
A8e	Satisfied	31	30
A8g	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	18	19
A9c	Most of the time	23	22
B1b	No	44	45
B1c	Yes	32	31
B1c	No	37	38
B2 (including multi-coding)	Use special paid leave	25	26
B2 (including multi-coding)	Take sick leave	22	23
B2 (including multi-coding)	Some other way	14	15
B3a	Yes	14	13
B3a	No	57	58
B5	Much higher	21	22
B5	About the same	42	41
B7e	Not used here	11	12
B9	Dissatisfied	15	16
C1a	Neither agree nor disagree	32	31
C1a	Strongly disagree	2	3
C2b	Strongly disagree	5	6
C2c	Strongly agree	14	13
C2d	Strongly agree	14	13
C2d	Agree	44	43
D2a (including multi-coding)	Myself	49	48
D2a (including multi-coding)	Trade union	56	55

Question	Sub-item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
D2a (including multi-coding)	Another employee	25	26
D2a (including multi-coding)	Somebody else	8	9
D2b (including multi-coding)	Myself	75	76
D2b (including multi-coding)	Trade union	24	25
D2b (including multi-coding)	Employee rep (non-union)	41	40
D3	Not in favour of union membership	12	13
D5	Don't know	19	18
E1	Male	47	50
E1	Female	53	49
E4 (including multi-coding)	Children aged 5-7 years	9	10
E7 (including multi-coding)	GCSE grades A-C or equivalent	55	54
E7 (including multi-coding)	Higher degree	6	7
E7 (including multi-coding)	No academic qualifications	17	18
E8 (including multi-coding)	Completion of trade apprenticeship	10	11
E9 (including multi-coding)	Sending or receiving email	57	56
E9 (including multi-coding)	Controlling or monitoring processes or machinery	8	9
E10 (including multi-coding)	Only by men	17	18
E10 (including multi-coding)	Mainly by men	26	27
E10 (including multi-coding)	Equally by men and women	40	41
E10 (including multi-coding)	Mainly by women	23	22
E10 (including multi-coding)	Only by women	17	16
E14 (including multi-coding)	Any other white background	32	31
E14 (including multi-coding)	White and Asian	13	12
E14 (including multi-coding)	Indian	10	9
E14 (including multi-coding)	Pakistani	8	9
E14 (including multi-coding)	Any other ethnic group	8	7
E15	£431-£540 per week	10	11
E15	£681-£870 per week	4	5
E16	£15.00 or more per hour	11	12

Appendix B: Impact on estimates published in First Findings

Page / Table	Item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
Table 4: final row	Aggregate union density in workplaces where management are not in favour of union membership	5 per cent	6 per cent
Page 28: first line	Employees usually working more than 48 hours per week	11 per cent	12 per cent
Page 28: 2 nd new para	Employees that had not worked above 48 hours in any one week in the previous year	54 per cent	53 per cent
Page 28: 2 nd new para	Employees that had worked above 48 hours/week every week in the previous year	10 per cent	9 per cent
Page 29: 1 st new para	Employees citing the opportunity to reduce working hours	32 per cent	31 per cent
Page 32: 1 st new para	Employees agreeing that managers were understanding about work/life balance	58 per cent	57 per cent
Page 32: 2 nd new para	Employees agreeing that managers were understanding about work/life balance, in workplaces with recognised unions	55 per cent	54 per cent
Table 11: 2 nd row	Employees 'satisfied' with scope for using initiative	52 per cent	51 per cent
Table 11: final row	Employees 'very dissatisfied' with involvement in decision-marking	6 per cent	7 per cent
Table 12: 3 rd row	Employees feeling relaxed 'most of the time'	23 per cent	22 per cent
Table 12: 3 rd row	Employees 'never' feeling relaxed	18 per cent	19 per cent
Table 12: 6 th row	Employees feeling content 'most of the time'	33 per cent	32 per cent
Table 13: 1 st row	Employees viewing management-employee relations as 'very good'	19 per cent	18 per cent

Page / Table	Item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
Table 13: 3 rd row	Employees viewing management-employee relations as 'neither good nor poor'	24 per cent	25 per cent

Appendix C: Impact on estimates published in Table 9.1 of SMEs report

Row	Item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
6	Employees across all SMEs 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with job security	9 per cent	10 per cent
6	Employees in large firms 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with job security	15 per cent	16 per cent
7	Employees in large firms 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with the work itself	10 per cent	11 per cent
8	Employees in private sector 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with amount of involvement in decision-making	20 per cent	21 per cent
12	Employees in small firms saying managers 'poor' or 'very poor' at keeping employees informed about financial matters	25 per cent	26 per cent
12	Employees in large firms saying managers 'poor' or 'very poor' at keeping employees informed about financial matters	26 per cent	27 per cent
13	Employees in medium-sized firms saying managers 'poor' or 'very poor' at seeking the views of employees or their representatives	26 per cent	27 per cent
15	Employees in medium-sized firms saying managers 'poor' or 'very poor' at allowing employees or their representatives to influence final decisions	32 per cent	33 per cent
16	Employees in medium-sized firms saying relations between managers and employees 'poor' or 'very poor'	16 per cent	17 per cent
17	Employees in private sector disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers can be relied upon to keep their promises	22 per cent	23 per cent
18	Employees in medium-sized firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers are sincere in attempting to understand employees views	19 per cent	20 per cent
18	Employees in large firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers are sincere in attempting to understand employees views	22 per cent	23 per cent
19	Employees in private sector disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers deal with employees honestly	17 per cent	18 per cent
19	Employees in small firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers deal with employees honestly	9 per cent	10 per cent

Row	Item	Original estimate using SEQWTNR	Revised estimate using SEQWTNR2
19	Employees in medium-sized firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers deal with employees honestly	16 per cent	17 per cent
21	Employees in small firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers encourage people to develop their skills	12 per cent	13 per cent
21	Employees in medium-sized firms disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that managers encourage people to develop their skills	18 per cent	19 per cent
23	Index score for employees in private sector	4.38	4.41
23	Index score for employees across all SMEs	3.50	3.53
23	Index score for employees in small firms	2.90	2.93
23	Index score for employees across all medium-sized firms	4.39	4.40
23	Index score for employees across all large firms	4.87	4.90

WERS 2004 Cross-Section: Financial Performance Questionnaire data

Introductory Note

March 2007

The WERS 2004 Financial Performance Questionnaire was a four-page questionnaire issued at the end of the Cross-Section Management interview. It aimed to collect a small number of 'accounts-based' indicators that could be used to derive measures of productivity and financial performance. The questionnaire and its administration are further described by Chaplin et al (2005). Initial investigations of the data are presented by Kersley et al (2006: 286-301) and by Forth and McNabb (2007).

The FPQ data file:

The deposited version of the Financial Performance Questionnaire document indicates the variable names that are used for the raw data in the deposited data file. The raw data is held in the following variables (following the ordering of items in the questionnaire):

SCOPE	EMPFT	CAPDISP
ESTABN	EMPPT	PURCHASE
SHARTURN	OWNBLD	EMPCOST
PERIOD	RENTBLD	ANYRDEST
YRSTART	OWNOTH	RDESTPC
YREND	RENTOTH	ANYRDORG
TURNOVER	CAPACQ	

The WERS Research Team undertook some editing of this raw data during the primary analysis, which included some imputation of missing data. The edits they conducted are recorded in the SPSS syntax file (WERS 2004 Macro Edits.sps) which has been deposited along with the FPQ data file. The edited data is held in the following variables:

NSCOPE	NEMPPT	NCAPDISP
NPERIOD	NOWNBLD	NPURCHASE
NESTABN	NRENTBLD	NEMPCOST
NSHARTURN	NOWNOTH	NTOTEMP
NTURNOVER	NRENTOTH	NTOTOWN
NEMPFT	NCAPACQ	

Some of the imputations can be considered speculative, and so the user is left to decide which imputations they wish to accept. The imputed cases can be identified by means of flag variables, as follows:

LATEFPQ	XCODE4	XCODE8
XCODE1	XCODE5	XCODE9
XCODE2	XCODE6	
XCODE3	XCODE7	

Alongside these core variables, the deposited data file also includes a number of additional derived variables. The derivations are set out in an SPSS syntax file (WERS 2004 FPQ derived variables.sps) which has again been deposited along with the FPQ data file.

The weight variable for the FPQ data file is named FPQWTNR. The derivation of this weight is described by Chaplin et al (2005).

Additional data on workplace performance:

The WERS 2004 Cross-Section and 1998-2004 Panel Surveys have also been linked to performance data collected in the Office for National Statistics' (ONS) Annual Business Inquiries. Data from the Annual Business Inquiry is not made publicly available by the ONS. However, the linked WERS-ABI data may be accessed (along with the FPQ data) within the ONS Virtual Micro-data Laboratory (VML). See Forth and McNabb (2007) for a description of the linked data and VML access procedures.

References:

Chaplin J, Mangla J, Purdon S and Airey C (2005) *The Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) 2004: Technical Report (Cross-Section and Panel Surveys)*, London: National Centre for Social Research. [Available on-line at: <http://www.wers2004.info/wers2004/wers2004.php>]

Forth J and McNabb R (2007) "Innovations in WERS 2004: The collection of objective data on financial performance", Technical Paper No. 1, London: WERS 2004 Information and Advice Service. [Available on-line at: <http://www.wers2004.info/technicalpapers.php>]

Kersley B, Alpin C, Forth J, Bryson A, Bewley H, Dix G and Oxenbridge S (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*, London: Routledge.

WERS 1998-2004 Panel Survey: 2004 data file

Additions to survey data

March 2007

This note outlines a set of additional variables (PS9804_PQ04extra.*) that may be matched onto the 2004 Panel data file using the unique workplace identifier (**SERNO**). This dataset of additional variables contains two regional identifiers and three variables identifying the economic activity of the establishment. These data items are observed for the 938 workplaces that were re-interviewed in 2004.

Regional Identifiers

This dataset of extra variables includes two variables to identify the region the workplace is in:

1. **GOR** – Government Office Region
2. **SSR** – Standard Statistical Region

Details on these regional classifications can be found at the Office for National Statistics website:

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/geography/gor.asp>

Standard Industrial Classifications

This dataset of extra variables includes three variables of Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC):

1. **ASIC80** – Standard Industrial Classification 1980 (SIC80)
2. **ASIC92** – Standard Industrial Classification 1992 (SIC92)
3. **ASIC2003** – Standard Industrial Classification 2003 (SIC2003)

Each variable is coded to the four digit level.

These three variables have been derived from the verbatim answers to question **ASICDESC**. These verbatim responses were first coded to SIC2003. Look-up tables were then used to derive the SIC80 and SIC92 classifications from the SIC2003 codes. SIC2003 does not differ greatly from SIC92, but differs more extensively from SIC80. Consequently, one should not expect the variable **ASIC80** to be as precise as the other variables.

Details on SIC80 may be found in Central Statistical Office (1981) *Indexes to the Standard Industrial Classification: Revised 1980*, HMSO: London.

Details on SIC92 may be found at the Office for National Statistics website:

http://www.statistics.gov.uk/methods_quality/sic/default.asp

Details on SIC2003 may be found at the Office for National Statistics website:

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/Product.asp?vlnk=14012>

