

# An Introduction to WERS and REPONSE

Thomas Amossé and John Forth<sup>1</sup>

January 2016

## 1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide a short introduction to both the **2011/12 Workplace Employment Relations Survey** (the 2011 WERS) and the **2010/11 Enquête Relations Professionnelles et Négociations d'Entreprises** (the 2011 REPONSE). The paper discusses the origins, methods and content of each survey, presenting this information side by side for ease of comparison.

The paper focuses on the Cross-Sectional surveys within WERS and REPONSE. However the Panel components of either survey are discussed towards the end of the paper. The final section of the paper provides links to sources of further information.

## 2 Origins and aims

**The 2011 WERS** was the sixth in a series of surveys which aims to provide a nationally representative account of the state of employment relations and working life inside British workplaces. Previous surveys were conducted in 1980, 1984, 1990, 1998 and 2004.

The 2011 WERS had six sponsors or funders representing a range of constituencies within the policy-making and research communities in Britain (see Appendix A for full details). A Steering Committee comprising representatives from each sponsoring organisation oversaw the development and administration of the survey. A research team comprising researchers from BIS, Acas, NIESR and the University of Sheffield took executive responsibility for the design and analysis of the survey. Fieldwork was carried out by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), who have undertaken the fieldwork for every survey in the WERS series.

**The 2011 REPONSE** was the fourth in a series of surveys that aims to map the nature and state of employment relations inside French workplaces. The first survey in the REPONSE series was conducted in 1992/93 and was strongly influenced by the early surveys in the WERS series. A second REPONSE was conducted in 1998/99 and a third in 2004/5. The survey series is sponsored by the Department for Research and Statistical Studies (DARES) within the French Ministry of Labour. The 2011 REPONSE was overseen by a Steering Committee comprising representatives from DARES and the broader research community. Fieldwork was undertaken by GfK-ISL.

The **purpose of each survey** in the WERS and REPONSE series has been to provide large-scale, systematic and dispassionate evidence about numerous aspects of employment relations across almost every sector of the economy in Britain and in France respectively. In both cases, this evidence is collected with the following objectives:

- to provide a mapping of employment relations practices in workplaces, and to monitor changes in those practices over time;
- to inform policy development, and to stimulate and inform debate and practice;
- to provide a comprehensive and statistically reliable dataset on workplace employment relations that is made publicly available for research.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Amosse is a Researcher at the Centre d'Etudes de l'Emploi (CEE), Paris, France. John Forth is a Principal Research Fellow at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR), London, UK. This overview of the WERS and REPONSE surveys was produced with funding from the Leverhulme Trust under Grant RPG-2013-399. The financial support of the Trust is gratefully acknowledged.

To meet these various objectives, both WERS and REPOSE have sought to survey managers, employee representatives and employees in samples of workplaces drawn from the official registers of businesses in either country. The collection of data from various actors within the same workplace aims to provide a comprehensive and coherent account of employment relations at those workplaces. Primary analysis of these data is then undertaken and published by the respective research teams. The data from both surveys are also made available for secondary analysis.

### 3 Units and coverage

The **principal unit of analysis** for both **WERS** and **REPOSE** is the establishment or workplace. A workplace is defined as comprising the activities of a single employer at a single set of premises. Examples include a single branch of a bank, a car factory or a shop. The survey questionnaires include some questions on the broader enterprise, but the focus of both surveys is firmly on the *local site*. Head offices may appear in the survey samples, however, as they are also workplaces in their own right.

The **scope** of the **2011 WERS Cross-Section Survey** extended to cover all workplaces with 5 or more employees, located in Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) and engaged in activities within Sections C (Manufacturing) to S (Other Service Activities) of the UK's *Standard Industrial Classification (2007)*. This is equivalent to Sections C-S of the European Commission's *Statistical Classification of Economic Activities (NACE Rev. 2)* or Sections C-S of the United Nations' *International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC Rev.4)*. The survey covered both private and public sectors. The scope of the 2004 WERS was the same.

This population accounted for 35 per cent of all establishments in Britain in 2011 with one or more employees (747,000 establishments out of a total of 2.1 million). Those outside the scope of the survey comprised: establishments engaged in primary industries and private households with domestic staff (3 per cent of all workplaces); and establishments in Sections C-S of the *Standard Industrial Classification (2007)* with fewer than five employees (62 per cent of all workplaces). In total, the population of workplaces in scope for WERS 2011 employed 23.2 million employees (90 per cent of all employees in Britain in 2011).

The **scope** of the **2011 REPOSE Cross-Section Survey** was narrower than that of WERS. Specifically, the 2011 REPOSE extended to cover all private sector workplaces with 11 or more employees, located in mainland France (i.e. excluding Corsica and overseas territories) and operating in activities within NACE Rev. 2 Sections C (Manufacturing) to S (Other Service Activities), with the exception of Section O (Public administration). The survey therefore did not cover the smaller establishments (5-10 employees) covered by WERS and did not attempt to cover the public sector. The coverage for the 2004 REPOSE was narrower still, extending only to private sector workplaces with 21 or more employees. In 2011, the population of workplaces in scope for REPOSE accounted for 55 per cent of all employees in mainland France (12.6m employees from a total population of 22.7m).

It is feasible to restrict the sample of workplaces in the 2011 WERS to match the eligibility criteria used in 2011 REPOSE, so that one arrives at two analysis samples that are **defined identically**. Further details are provided in Section 6.

## 4 Methods

### 4.1 *The primary sampling unit:*

Both the **2011 WERS** and the **2011 REPONSE** surveys took the workplace as their **primary sampling unit**. The sample of workplaces for the 2011 WERS was drawn from the Inter-Departmental Business Register (IDBR) – a comprehensive register of businesses in the UK that is maintained by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and which is used by the UK government for a variety of statistical purposes. The sample of workplaces for the 2011 REPONSE was drawn from the SIRENE database – the French equivalent of the IDBR which is maintained by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE).

In both cases, the surveys drew a sample of 'local units' from the register. A 'local unit' is the term used by Eurostat to refer to the activities of an enterprise that take place in a geographically identified location. The individual factories or offices of a multi-site enterprise are therefore all separate local units.

In both WERS and REPONSE, the samples of local units were drawn from the business register using a 'variable probability' design that gives higher chances of selection to workplaces with larger numbers of employees and to workplaces from small industry sectors. Such workplaces are thus over-represented in the final achieved samples, when compared with the profile of the survey population. Sampling weights are then computed and used in the analysis to ensure that the published results from the survey are representative of the underlying survey populations. A short discussion of the survey weights is provided in Section 4.8.

Having drawn samples of workplaces, both WERS and REPONSE then sought to collect data from a manager at the workplace, from at least one employee representative (if one was present at the workplace) and from a sample of employees. The sampling procedures for each element of the survey are described separately in the sections which follow.

### 4.2 *The Surveys of Managers:*

The core element of both the **2011 WERS** and **2011 REPONSE** Cross-Section Surveys was a face-to-face interview with the senior person at the workplace who had day-to-day responsibility for industrial relations, employee relations or personnel matters. The management questionnaires in both WERS and REPONSE averaged 90 minutes in length.

In the WERS survey only, this face-to-face interview was preceded by the mailing of a short self-completion questionnaire to the sampled workplace. This self-completion questionnaire comprised questions about the composition of the workforce, for which the management respondent may have had to refer to records in order to provide an accurate answer. The answers to this self-completion questionnaire were collected during the course of the face-to-face interview.

The central focus of the management questionnaires in both the WERS and REPONSE survey series has been the formal and structured relations that take place between management and employees at the workplace. The management questionnaires therefore seek both to ask about how employment relations and personnel issues are handled at the workplace and about the nature of the personnel practices that operate there. There are thus many areas of common ground between the two survey questionnaires, although some themes are covered in more detail in one than in the other, and relatively few questions use precisely the same wording. A detailed comparison of the content of the two questionnaires is provided in Appendix B (Table B1).

#### **4.3 The Surveys of Employee Representatives:**

Both WERS and REPONSE followed up the main management interview with further surveys of employee representatives. In the **2011 WERS** the main management respondent was asked, at the end of their face-to-face interview, for permission to interview the senior representative of the largest trade union (by workplace membership) recognized for collective bargaining on behalf of employees at the site (or the largest non-recognized union if no unions had recognition). They were also asked for permission to interview the senior non-union representative on the joint consultative committee that covers the broadest range of issues or, if there was no consultative committee, the most senior stand-alone non-union representative. In the minority of workplaces where union and non-union representatives were both present, one interview was sought with each type of representative and so two employee representative interviews may have been conducted. Conversely, there were many workplaces which had no union / non-union representatives and, naturally, no employee representative interviews took place in such establishments. The employee representative interviews in WERS 2011 were conducted either face-to-face or by telephone (depending on the respondent's availability) and averaged 30 minutes in duration.

In the **2011 REPONSE**, an interview was conducted with one employee representative (only) in each surveyed establishment that had either a union or non-union representative. The interviewed representative was selected at random (by the CAPI program) from among those belonging to one of the majority institutions (either unions or elected representatives). As in WERS, the selection procedure was based on the responses given by the main management respondent during his/her interview as to the types of employee representative that were present in the establishment. He/she was then asked at the end of the face-to-face interview, for permission to interview either the senior representative of the largest trade union (by number of representatives) recognized at the site, or the senior elected representative belonging to the "comité d'entreprise" or elected as an employee delegate. The employee representative interviews in REPONSE were conducted face-to-face and averaged one hour in duration.

The aim of the employee representative questionnaire in both surveys was to investigate the role and activities of the selected representatives, and also to provide a counterpoint to the manager's account of the state of employment relations at the workplace. The WERS and REPONSE employee representative questionnaires thus cover similar types of issues (e.g. time spent on representative activities, engagement with constituents, engagement with the employer, views about the workplace). However, the differences in the institutional frameworks for employee representation in Britain and France, and the different selection criteria used for employee representatives in the two surveys, mean that it is not straightforward to make direct comparisons between the responses given in these two surveys. The Surveys of Employee Representatives were thus not used in the analytical phase of our project.

#### **4.4 The Surveys of Employees:**

WERS and REPONSE also include surveys that are conducted among the employees of the workplaces that provide a management interview. In the **2011 WERS**, sampling was conducted at the workplace after obtaining the manager's consent, with the interviewer drawing a random sample of 25 employees from a complete list of those employees on the payroll at that workplace. If there were fewer than 25 employees at the workplace, then a census was attempted. The employee survey instrument comprised a twelve - page self-completion questionnaire that was distributed to the specified employees by a nominated person at the establishment (commonly the management respondent or their personal assistant) and which, once completed, was returned by each surveyed employee either to a central collection point at the workplace or, more commonly, by post to the survey agency.

The sampling procedure in the **2011 REPONSE** was rather different. At the time of drawing the sample of workplaces from SIRENE, that database was matched with the "Déclaration Annuelles de Données Sociales" (DADS) database – a register of all employee spells declared in France, also maintained by the INSEE. Accordingly, the surveyed workplace had no role in sampling: something which, all other things being equal, was expected to avoid the 'social climate' bias which might otherwise have arisen if managers chose not to distribute questionnaires to dissatisfied employees. A corollary of this sampling

approach is that only those employees who were employed in the workplace on the 31st December 2009 were eligible for the Survey of Employees (i.e. those with 15-18 months' tenure at the time of the 2011 REPOSE). The sample selection criteria also differed from WERS, since 10 employees were selected in workplaces with 21 or more employees, and half of the employees were selected in workplaces with 11-20 employees (with a stratification between managers and non-managers). Employees that were selected for the REPOSE survey were sent a six-page questionnaire at their home address, to be completed and returned by post to the survey agency. In 2011 REPOSE, weights have been calculated by taking into account their variable probability of selection, correcting for workplace and individual non-response and post-stratifying to population totals taken from the DADS database (on the size and industry of workplace; sex, age, occupation and working hours).

The employee questionnaires in WERS and REPOSE have a dual focus. On the one hand, they seek to obtain factual information about the employee and their job. On the other hand, they also seek to obtain the employee's subjective evaluations of certain aspects of their job and broader working life at the establishment. A detailed comparison of the content of the two questionnaires is provided in Appendix B (Table B2).

#### **4.5 Extending the Surveys by Linking with External Data Sources**

In some cases, a particular type of data is collected in only one of the two surveys (i.e. in only WERS or REPOSE), but linking to external data sources makes it possible to arrive at a situation where data items covering the issue are present in both surveys. This is feasible in respect of data on financial performance, wages, employee demographics and employment change (worker flows).

In practical terms, for the 2011 WERS, such data linking is done by using the IDBR Enterprise or Local Unit reference numbers for each workplace; these reference numbers are present on the WERS workplace sample and are also present on many of the business surveys and administrative datasets maintained by the UK's Office for National Statistics (ONS).

For the 2011 REPOSE, data linking is done using the SIRENE reference numbers that are present on the REPOSE workplace sample and which are also present on many of the surveys and datasets maintained by INSEE. Unlike WERS, some data linking is also possible at the level of the employee, using the employee reference numbers that are present on the DADS database, which provided the employee sample for REPOSE.

In each case, the linking of the surveys to external sources requires explicit approval from the data custodians (see Sections 7 and 8 for further details).

##### ***Data on Financial Performance:***

Both Management Questionnaires included questions seeking to obtain the manager's subjective evaluation of the workplace's financial performance. However the **2011 WERS** also included a four-page Financial Performance Questionnaire (FPQ) which collected quantitative data on the performance of the surveyed establishment over the year preceding the survey. The questionnaire was given to the main management respondent at the end of the management interview, to be completed by someone with relevant knowledge and posted back to the survey agency. The questionnaire covered the following topics:

- Turnover
- Value of assets
- Capital expenditure
- Purchases of goods, materials and services
- Employment costs
- Research and development activity

The **2011 REPONSE** did not include a financial performance questionnaire. However, it is possible to link each of the sampled workplaces in REPONSE with the return made by its parent enterprise to the annual business survey in France (the EAE, named Esane ou Fare since 2009). The survey provides data on the enterprise's turnover, value of assets, capital expenditure, employment costs and profits.

Similarly, it is possible to link a subset of the WERS sample to quantitative data on enterprise performance that is collected by the UK's Office for National Statistics in its Annual Business Survey (ABS). This allows the analyst to extend the sample of workplaces with financial performance data beyond the group which responded to the Financial Performance Questionnaire.

#### ***Wages and employee demographics:***

The 2011 WERS Survey of Employees collected data on the wages of surveyed employees through a question (E11) which asked the employee to report their gross wage within one of 14 intervals, ranging from '£60 or less per week' to '£1,051 or more per week'. It also included questions to ask about the employee's gender, age and occupation.

The 2011 REPONSE Survey of Employees did not collect any of these data items within the employee questionnaire. Instead, it is possible to match these items into the survey data by linking each sampled employee in the survey to the administrative data that is held for them on the DADS database. This linking has already been done and so these data items form part of the basic REPONSE dataset.

#### ***Employment change (worker flows):***

The 2011 WERS Survey of Managers collected information on employee turnover at the workplace for the year preceding the survey (i.e. total employment one year ago, plus the total number of dismissals, redundancies, voluntary quits and other departures over the intervening period). The 2011 REPONSE did not collect quantitative data of this type but, for all workplaces with 50 or more employees, and for some of those with 11-49 employees, it is possible to match in data on employee turnover from the DMMO-EMMO annual datasets.

#### **4.6 *Dates of fieldwork:***

Fieldwork for the **2011 WERS** began in February 2011 and came to a close in June 2012. Overall 64% had been conducted before the end of December 2011 (i.e. within the 2011 calendar year) and 74% had been conducted by the end of January 2012 (i.e. within 12 months of the start of fieldwork).

For the **2011 REPONSE** survey, fieldwork took place between January and June 2011.

#### **4.7 *Achieved samples and response rates:***

The table below provides a summary of the achieved samples and response rates for each component of the WERS and REPONSE surveys. Successful completion of the main management interview was a requirement of participation in either survey. The response rates shown for the other components (e.g. employee representative questionnaire) are conditional upon completion of the main management interview.

**Table 1: Achieved samples and response rates for the 2011 WERS and 2011 REPOSE**

|   | Achieved samples |                     | Response rates |                |
|---|------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
|   | 2011<br>WERS     | 2011<br>REPOSE      | 2011<br>WERS   | 2011<br>REPOSE |
| Management interview                    | 2,680            | 4,023               | 46.5%          | 61.7%          |
| Employee representative<br>interview(s) | 1,002            | 2,433               | 63.9%          | 76.6%          |
| Survey of employees                     | 21,981           | 11,350 <sup>a</sup> | 54.3%          | 33.9%          |
| Financial performance questionnaire     | 545              | -                   | 31.8%          | -              |

Notes: (a) A further 6,550 employee questionnaires were returned from workplaces that did not generate a management interview.

Section 6 identifies the numbers of cases that are available for comparable analysis, once the survey samples have been harmonized to account for differences in coverage (this primarily involves removing public sector workplaces and employees from the WERS sample).

#### 4.8 Survey weights:

The **workplaces samples** for WERS and REPOSE are each stratified by workplace size and industry sector, with sampling fractions then set to vary across these strata. As a result, the achieved samples of workplaces in each country over-represent small workplaces and those from small industries when compared with the workplace population in that country. In addition to this, differential rates of non-response across the workplaces included in each survey also cause further deviations between the profile of the achieved sample and that of the workplace population that it is intended to represent.

In order to address these ‘biases’, survey weights have been devised in each country for the purpose of returning the profile of the achieved sample to that of the workplace population. In the WERS survey, these weights first remove the biases introduced at the point of sampling, and then seek to remove any observed non-response biases by post-stratifying the achieved sample to match the IDBR population on the basis of workplace size and industry. In the REPOSE survey, the weighting scheme also first removes sampling biases. It then seeks to remove any observed non-response biases survey that are apparent from a comparison with the SIRENE and DADS databases on the basis of workplace size, industry and region. The REPOSE workplace-level weights also then include a third stage, in which comparisons are made between the employee questionnaires received from surveyed workplaces and the employee questionnaires received from non-responding workplaces; this stage is used to adjust for any apparent bias in the workplace sample away from workplaces with a poor social climate.

The **employee samples** in WERS and REPOSE use sampling procedures that necessarily build on the selection probabilities at workplace level, and then additionally give a higher probability of selection to employees from small workplaces. In order to address this sample bias, the survey weights for the employee samples multiply the workplace-level weight by an adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the employee’s probability of selection from within the workplace. In WERS, an additional stage is then added whereby the achieved employee sample is adjusted to match the gender profile of the population of employees, as reported for the whole WERS sample in the Survey of Managers. In REPOSE, a similar post-stratification is undertaken after comparing the achieved sample with the profile of the population as indicated on the DADS database.

## 5 Panel Surveys

Both the **2011 WERS** and the **2011 REPOSE** included a panel element in which they returned to those workplaces that participated in the 2004 Cross-Section surveys, with the express purpose of investigating the changes that took place in those workplaces in the intervening six or seven years. In both WERS and REPOSE, the full suite of cross-section questionnaires were issued in these panel workplaces in 2011;

both surveys thus offer two waves of rich data. It should be noted, however, that the respondents at each wave are not necessarily the same, as no attempt was made to re-contact specific respondents (managers, employees or employee representatives) from 2004.

In **REPONSE** the achieved sample from the 2005 Cross-Section was traced on the SIRENE database, using the workplace's SIRET identifier, and all those that could be identified on the database in 2010 were pursued for interview. The most common reason for a change in the SIRET identifier is a change of ownership; the REPONSE panel therefore does not include any workplaces that changed ownership between 2005 and 2011. The panel comprises 872 workplaces that had 21+ employees in 2005 and which also had 11+ employees in 2011 (around 840 of which had 21+ employees at both time points). The response rate was around 60 per cent among those workplaces pursued for re-interview in 2011.

In **WERS** the panel sample was traced 'in the field', using updated contact details for the workplace in cases where it could still be identified on the IDBR in 2011. Field interviewers were provided with these updated contact details (or the original address details from WERS 2004 in cases where the workplace could not easily be found on the IDBR). Interviewers then sought out the workplace and attempted to secure a survey interview. Attempts were made to follow workplaces that had moved location, and those that had transferred ownership, although these were not always successful. The panel comprises 989 workplaces that had 5+ employees in 2004 and which also had 5+ employees in 2011. The response rate was 52 per cent among those workplaces pursued for re-interview in 2011.

## **6 Producing Harmonized Samples for Analysis**

The forgoing discussion focuses on the 2011 WERS and REPONSE surveys as administered in the field by their respective research teams. However, it will have been apparent that the surveys – though very similar in many respects – are not identical in their design. Some work is then required in order produce harmonized samples and data items for comparative analysis.

### **6.1 Constructing harmonized samples**

The selection criteria for the 2011 WERS and REPONSE workplace samples differ along three dimensions:

- Workplace size (number of employees at the workplace)
- Industry sector
- Legal status/ownership.

The selection criteria for the 2011 Surveys of Employees differ along two further dimensions:

- Whether the employee's workplace participated in the MQ
- The employee's tenure at the workplace

It is then necessary to harmonize the samples along each of these three dimensions, so that they represent equivalently-defined populations in Britain and France. The samples can then be used for comparative analysis.

The workplace samples are harmonized by restricting each workplace sample to include only:

- Workplaces with 11 or more employees:
  - In WERS: ZALLEMP5>=11
  - In REPONSE: SIREN\_NEWEFF>=11
- Workplaces coded to NACE rev.2 Sections D (Manufacturing) to Section S (Other Service Activities), with the exception Section O (Public Administration):
  - In WERS: NSICOD07 not equal to 15

- In REPOSE: The first two digits of NAF\_R not equal to 08 or 09.
- Workplaces in the trading sector of the economy:
  - In WERS: ASTATUS1 <=8
  - In REPOSE: all cases

The employee samples are harmonized by restricting each employee sample to include only:

- Employees located in workplaces that were surveyed in the Survey of Managers
  - In WERS: all cases
  - In REPOSE: selecting only those employees with a workplace record
- Employees with at least one year of tenure at the workplace
  - In WERS: Question A1 equal to 2, 3, 4 or 5.
  - In REPOSE: all cases.

In practice, this will still imply a small discontinuity between the WERS and REPOSE samples because the REPOSE employee sample all has at least 15 months' tenure; however, it is not possible to identify tenure at such a disaggregated level in WERS.

The final samples that are available for comparative analysis are as follows:

|                      | <b>2011<br/>WERS</b> | <b>2011<br/>REPOSE</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Management interview | 1,602                | 3,947                  |
| Survey of employees  | 11,581               | 11,244                 |

When harmonized in these ways, the workplace samples are representative of 55% of workplace employment in France and 54% in Britain (around 13m employees in each case). The employee samples are representative of 50% of all employees in France and 45% in Britain.<sup>2</sup>

## 6.2 *Constructing harmonized data items*

The comparability of the survey questionnaires from WERS and REPOSE is indicated in Appendix B. English-language versions of the REPOSE questionnaires, and French-language versions of the WERS questionnaires, are being made available as part of our broader project, along with Stata syntax that constructs comparable data items from the source data. These files are all being made available via our project website.<sup>3</sup>

## 7 Further information on the 2011 WERS

The 2011 WERS website ([www.wers2011.info](http://www.wers2011.info)) provides access to the full **survey documentation**, including copies of the survey questionnaires. It also provides a detailed description of the survey methodology, and provides access to a range of other **user-support services**, including a bibliography of research based on WERS and a set of answers to 'frequently asked questions' from data users.

The **survey data** itself may be downloaded for research purposes from the website of the [UK Data Service](http://www.ukds.ac.uk) (UKDS). The UKDS also provides access to the survey data from the earlier surveys in the WERS series. The data available from the UKDS have been anonymised to protect the identity of individual respondents and participating establishments. A ['secure access' version](#) of the data, which

<sup>2</sup> See Table A5 in Amossé T, Forth J and Salibekyan Z (2016) "Technical appendix", in T Amossé, A Bryson, J Forth and H Petit (eds.) *Comparative Workplace Employment Relations: An Analysis of Britain and France*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.niesr.ac.uk/projects/employment-relations-britain-and-france>

contains the IDBR reference numbers needed to link WERS to other official surveys and databases, is also available to researchers who have been approved by UKDS and the ONS.

The **primary analysis** of the 2011 WERS was reported in two stages. A free 40-page booklet of First Findings was published by the survey sponsors in January 2013, whilst the full report (the sourcebook) was published by Palgrave in November 2013.

Van Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Forth, J., Stokes, L. and Wood, S. (2013) [\*The 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Study: First Findings\*](#), London: Department for Business Innovation and Skills.

Van Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Forth, J., Stokes, L. and Wood, S. (2013) [\*Employment Relations in the Shadow of Recession: Findings from the 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Study\*](#), Palgrave MacMillan.

## 8 Further information on the 2011 REPONSE

The website of the French government provides some access to the **survey documentation**, including copies of the survey questionnaires.

<http://dares.travail-emploi.gouv.fr/dares-etudes-et-statistiques/enquetes-de-a-a-z/article/rerelations-professionnelles-et-negociations-d-entreprise-reponse-edition-2010>

Access to the **survey data** can be demanded to the “Comité du secret” (Conseil national de l’information statistique) after having contacted the person in charge of the dataset in the French Ministry of Labour. More information can be read (in French) at the following site.

[http://www.cnis.fr/cms/Accueil/activites/ trois\\_comites/Comite\\_du\\_secret\\_statistique](http://www.cnis.fr/cms/Accueil/activites/ trois_comites/Comite_du_secret_statistique)

Some of the initial **primary analysis** of the 2011 REPONSE has been reported in two articles published by DARES:

Pignoni M.-T., Raynaud E. (2013), « [Les relations professionnelles au début des années 2010 : entre changements institutionnels, crise et évolutions sectorielles](#), *Dares Analyses*, n°026.

Naouas A., Romans F. (2014), « [La négociation salariale d’entreprise de 2004 à 2010. Entre renforcement de l’obligation de négocier et baisse de l’implantation des délégués syndicaux](#) », *Dares Analyses*, n°067.

There is no detailed sourcebook to accompany the 2011 REPONSE survey. Instead, a variety of additional reports have been commissioned on specific topics by DARES. Those which have been published to date are listed on the DARES web page noted above (along with links to the published reports).

## **Appendix A: The WERS Sponsors**

The six sponsoring organizations with responsibility for the 2011 WERS were as follows:

- The Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) - the UK government department with responsibility for government policy on employment relations
- The Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas) - the UK government agency with responsibility for promoting good employment relations practice within organizations
- The UK Commission for Employment and Skills(UKCES) - the UK government agency with responsibility for promoting skills investments
- The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) - the UK government agency with responsibility for health and safety
- The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) – the major funder of academic research in the social sciences in the UK
- the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) – and independent research institute.

## Appendix B: Topics covered in the WERS and REPOSE Questionnaires

**Table B1: Topics covered in the WERS and REPOSE Management Questionnaires**

|  | <i>WERS</i>  | <i>REPOSE</i>  | <i>Topics with comparable data</i>  |
|--|--|--|---|
| Workforce size and composition                 | Number of employees, occupational mix, <i>contracted hours</i> , gender, age, employment change and quits  | Number of employees, occupational mix, gender, age, employment change* and quits*  | Number of employees, occupational mix, gender, age, employment change and quits   |
| Workplace characteristics                      | Main activity, age, location, part of larger organisation, <i>legal status</i> , whether listed, whether franchise, type of ownership, owner management          | Main activity, age, location, part of larger organisation, whether listed, whether franchise, type of ownership, owner management                      | Main activity, age, location, part of larger organisation, whether listed, whether franchise, type of ownership, owner management |
| Product market characteristics                 | Type and scale of competition, workplace performance   | Type and scale of competition, workplace performance   | Type and scale of competition, workplace performance  |
| Workplace strategy                             | Product strategy, <i>strategic plan including HR issues</i>  | Product strategy   | Product strategy  |
| HR function                                    | Characteristics and duties of HR manager, autonomy of HR from wider organisation, membership of employers' association, <i>sources of information and advice</i> | Characteristics of HR manager, <i>nature of personnel function</i> , autonomy of HR from wider organisation, membership of employers' association      | Characteristics of HR manager, autonomy of HR from wider organisation, membership of employers' association                       |
| Work organisation and ICT                      | Team working, problem solving, job rotation, <i>working time arrangements</i> , targets, monitoring, benchmarking, <i>use of computers</i>                       | Team working, problem solving, job rotation, targets, monitoring, benchmarking, <i>use of ICT</i>  | Team working, problem solving, targets  |
| Employee representation and dispute resolution | Union membership, union presence and representation, non-union presence, <i>dispute resolution procedures</i>  | Union membership, union presence and representation, non-union presence  | Union membership, union presence and representation, non-union presence   |
| Pay determination                              | Bargaining rights, scope of bargaining, method and level of pay determination, most recent pay settlement, performance-related pay, profit-related pay           | Bargaining rights, scope of bargaining, method and level of pay determination, most recent pay settlement, performance-related pay, profit-related pay | Bargaining rights, most recent pay settlement, performance-related pay, profit-related pay.                                       |
| Actions in response to recession               | Degree affected, actions taken, recent redundancies  | Actions taken  | Actions taken   |
| Skills development                             | Performance appraisal, <i>type and amount of training provided</i>   | Performance appraisal, <i>training budget</i>  | Performance appraisal   |

Note: topics listed *in italics* are present in only one of the two surveys

\* Data on employment change and quits are matched into the REPOSE management dataset from administrative data – see Section 4.5.

**Table B2: Topics covered in the WERS and REPONSE Employee Questionnaires**

|                                       | <i>WERS</i>  | <i>REPONSE</i>   | <i>Topics with comparable data</i>  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Employee characteristics              | Gender, age, qualifications, <i>marital status, children, caring responsibilities</i>  | Gender*, age, qualifications   | Gender, age, qualifications   |
| Job characteristics                   | Occupation, hours of work, tenure, contract, wages, job security, job control, training, job satisfaction, <i>flexible working arrangements</i>  | Occupation*, hours of work, tenure, contract, wages*, job security, job control, training, job satisfaction, <i>appraisal</i>                | Occupation, hours of work, tenure, contract, wages, job security, job control, job satisfaction             |
| Employee involvement, unions, climate | Union membership and representation, union effectiveness, managers' efforts at information and consultation, managers' behavioural integrity, <i>climate of employment relations, satisfaction with influence on decisions</i> | Union membership and representation, union effectiveness, managers' efforts at information and consultation, managers' behavioural integrity | Union membership and representation, union effectiveness, managers' efforts at information and consultation |
| Recession-induced changes to job      | <i>Reorganisation of work and changes to terms and conditions</i>  | <i>Redundancies and temporary layoffs in past 3 years</i>  | Not directly comparable   |

Note: topics listed *in italics* are present in only one of the two surveys

\* Data on gender, occupation and wage levels are matched into the REPONSE employee dataset from administrative data – see Section 4.5.