

The Management and Wellbeing Practices Survey 2018

Technical Report

About Labour Market Analysis

Labour Market Analysis is a multi-disciplinary team of economists, social researchers and statisticians based in the Labour Market Directorate of the Department for Business and Trade.

The team provides the evidence base for the Government's policy of [making the labour market more flexible, efficient and fair](#). Results are disseminated through publications on [Research and Analysis](#) and [Statistics](#).

About this publication

This publication describes the methodology of the Management and Wellbeing Practices 2018. The survey was commissioned by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. The survey was carried out by Kantar, an independent social research company.

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Business and Trade.

Contact

If you have any feedback or questions about this publication, please contact Michael Jacob (Michael.Jacob@beis.gov.uk).

Legal disclaimer

Whereas every effort has been made to ensure that the information in this document is accurate, the Department for Business and Trade does not accept liability for any errors, omissions or misleading statements, and no warranty is given or responsibility accepted as to the standing of any individual, firm, company or other organisation mentioned.

Copyright

© Crown Copyright 2023

You may re-use this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence visit:

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence or email:
psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information in the material that you wish to use, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holder(s) concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

enquiries@trade.gov.uk.

Contents

1. Overview of report coverage	5
2. Introduction	6
2.1 Background to the survey	6
2.2. Objectives	7
2.3 Overview of methods	7
3. Sample design and selection	9
3.1 Overview of sample design	9
3.2 IDBR Sample and site selection	9
3.3 Telephone number matching (process and results)	12
4. Questionnaire development	16
4.1 Overview of questionnaire development	16
4.1.1 Cognitive testing	16
4.2 Piloting	17
4.3 Questionnaire programming	18
5. Fieldwork	19
5.1 Overview of approach	19
5.2 Screening procedures	19
5.3 Interviewer briefings	20
5.4 Fieldwork outcomes	20
5.4.1 Sample outcomes	20
5.4.2 Interview lengths	24
5.5 Quality control measures	24
6. Coding, weighting, and data production	25
6.1 Coding	25
6.2 Data cleaning, editing and checking	25
6.3 Weighting	25
6.4 Design Effects and Confidence intervals	28
6.5 Data tabulations and SPSS dataset	29
6.5.1 Data outputs	29
6.5.2 SPSS dataset	30

1. Overview of report coverage

This technical report describes the design and administration of the 2018 Management and Wellbeing Practices Survey. It includes details of the survey methodology including: sample design, fieldwork procedures, response rates and weighting information.

The 2018 Management and Wellbeing Practices Survey is a new survey which combines information previously collected by the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) and/or the Work-Life Balance Survey.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background to the survey

The MWP survey was commissioned by BEIS and undertaken by Kantar and the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR).

The overarching aim of the MWP survey was to provide updated evidence on key issues relating to in-work support for parents, flexible working and collective rights. All three areas have seen significant policy developments in recent years.

A key principle of the Industrial Strategy is that everyone should be able to access and enjoy 'good work'. This includes a focus on widening participation in the labour market. The provision of a right to shared parental leave and pay from 2015 acknowledged that the imbalance of these rights in favour of mothers could be discouraging some women from sustaining their careers and some fathers from spending more time with their young children, thereby indirectly contributing to inequality in the workplace. By giving parents more flexibility in how they share the care of their child in the first year, the provisions aim to enable both parents to retain a strong link with the labour market.

In relation to flexible working, increasing recognition of the importance of enabling employees to balance their personal and working lives, led to the right to request flexible working being substantially extended. Previously available only to employees with caring responsibilities, the right was extended to cover all employees with 26 weeks' continuous service as part of the Children and Families Act 2014. The government's expectation was that this extension – supported by an ACAS Code of Practice – would help deliver a net benefit to employers through higher productivity, lower labour turnover and reduced absenteeism, as well as aiding labour market participation and inclusion more generally.

There have also been notable changes in the area of collective rights, with the introduction of the Trade Union Act 2016, particularly in respect of balloting arrangements and, in the public sector, use of check-off and the provision of facility time. The Taylor Review of Modern Working Practices in 2017 also highlighted the important of employee voice in the workplace, recommending the extension of the Information and Consultation of Employees (ICE) Regulations.

The MWP survey was undertaken in late 2018 and early 2019 to provide evidence on how employers were responding to policy developments in these areas. Comparisons are drawn throughout the report with the findings from earlier surveys on these topics, specifically the 2013 Work-Life Balance Employer Survey (WLB) (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2014) and the 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS) (Van Wanrooy *et al.*, 2013). Clearly, employer practices have changed in many significant ways in the time since the survey was undertaken, with the COVID-19 pandemic causing widespread changes in working arrangements for many organisations and their employees. The findings from the survey therefore also provide an important opportunity to assess employer practices and attitudes prior to the onset of the pandemic.

This report describes the technical details of the survey.

2.2. Objectives

The main objectives of the survey were to:

- Provide an updated and statistically reliable data set on employment relations and management practices, including:
 - Employee representation
 - Flexible working
 - Shared Parental Leave
- Establish whether and how employment relations and management practices have changed over time and drivers of this
- Provide data which will contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of legislative changes

2.3 Overview of methods

The approach to this survey broadly replicates the methodology adopted for previous Work-Life Balance (WLB) surveys.

The population for the survey was all workplaces in Great Britain with at least five employees, across all Standard Industrial Classification (SIC 2007) major groups, apart from SIC Sectors T and U (Activities of households as employers and extraterritorial organisations and bodies).

The sample for the MWP survey was drawn from the Inter-Departmental Business Register (IDBR), which is held and maintained by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The IDBR is widely acknowledged to be the most comprehensive register of businesses available and is the same sampling frame used for the 2013 WLB survey and the 2011 WERS¹. The sample was selected at the workplace level rather than enterprise level, meaning that multiple sites of the same organisation could be included. Only workplaces with five or more employees were included in the survey population.

Workplaces were selected at random within specified size and industry groups. Larger workplaces and certain industry sectors were over-sampled to ensure sufficient numbers of workplaces to allow subgroup analysis by workplace size and industry. Oversampling larger workplaces also increases the precision of employment-weighted estimates. This oversampling was corrected for in the analysis through the use of weights.

The survey interviews were conducted with the most senior manager at the workplace with responsibility for human resource issues. Interviews were conducted via telephone; this was also the case for the WLB survey series, but different to the mode used in WERS, where interviews with managers were carried out face-to-face. It is important to bear this in mind when making comparisons between findings from the MWP survey and findings from WERS. The change in mode meant that some questions had to change format, switching from sometimes long lists of response options presented on a showcard to shorter, often yes/ no questions. This could potentially lead to an increase in affirmative responses.

¹ It should be noted that WERS did not include workplaces in SIC (2007) sections A or B.

The questionnaire consisted of eight substantive sections:

- Screener and introduction
- Maternity and paternity rights
- Shared Parental Leave
- Other parental leave
- Childcare and bereavement leave
- Flexible working
- Collective rights
- Sources of information / use of external sources of HR knowledge

Where possible, efforts were made to ensure consistency with key questions in the WLB and WERS series, to allow for comparisons over time. However, some changes were necessary in order to reflect policy developments, as well as due to the need to ensure interviews were not overly long and in the case of some questions previously asked in WERS, because of the change in survey mode.

Fieldwork for the survey took place between September 2018 and February 2019. A total of 11,141 cases were issued for fieldwork; of which 6,763 were deemed eligible. Workplaces were contacted by telephone and asked to complete the interview. Overall, 2,489 interviews were achieved, representing a response rate of 37 per cent. The average interview length was 29 minutes.

Weights were applied in the analysis both to correct for the variation in sampling probabilities but also for non-response. The weighted data are representative of the population of workplaces in Britain with five or more employees. An employment-based weight was also used in some instances, so that in addition to providing estimates of the percentage of workplaces with particular arrangements or characteristics, it is also possible to explore the percentage of employees working in these workplaces. Workplace-weighted estimates indicate the situation of an average workplace, but it is important to bear in mind that most workplaces are small in size. Large workplaces, which are few in number, employ a disproportionate share of all employees, and so employment-weighted estimates give a better indication of the situation experienced by the average employee.

3. Sample design and selection

3.1 Overview of sample design

The target population for the MWP survey comprised all GB workplaces with at least 5 staff, excluding the small number in SIC sections T and U (respectively 'activities of households as employers', and 'extraterritorial organisations and bodies').

The sample for the survey was drawn from the Inter-Departmental Business Register (IDBR) which is maintained by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). This was the same sampling frame used for the previous WLB employer surveys and for the 2011 WERS.

The IDBR is a list of over 2.1 million UK businesses in all sectors of the UK economy. The information used to create and maintain the IDBR database is obtained from five main administrative sources, listed below:

- HMRC VAT – Traders registered for VAT purposes with HMRC
- HMRC PAYE – Employers operating a PAYE scheme, registered with HMRC
- Companies House – Incorporated businesses registered at Companies House
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) farms; and
- Department of Finance and Personnel, Northern Ireland (DFPNI)

The IDBR is widely acknowledged to be the most comprehensive register of businesses available and the most suitable survey sample frame so long as unregistered micro-businesses are excluded from the target population (as here).

One drawback of using the IDBR as a sample source is that it includes very few telephone numbers so a telephone matching exercise is required before it can be used for a telephone survey (the process for this is described below).

The survey concept of 'workplace' needed to be operationalised within the IDBR. It is largely equivalent to the local unit (LU) recorded in the IDBR although not in every case: there are LUs with multiple workplaces and there are also single workplaces that include multiple LUs. However, for sampling purposes, the LU has been treated as equivalent to 'workplace'.

3.2 IDBR Sample and site selection

The local units on the IDBR were stratified based on both their industry section and the number of employees at the local unit level. Some industry sections were linked together to reflect analytical practice on earlier WLB studies. The IDBR population totals of workplaces with five or more employees are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: IDBR counts by SIC 2007 sections and workplace employment

Industry section(s)	Number of employees							TOTAL
	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-99	100-249	250-599	500+	
A&B	7,452	2,661	1,296	376	173	67	44	12,069
C	19,695	14,266	10,745	4,582	2,887	879	425	53,479
D&E	2,555	1,830	1,475	600	395	96	81	7,032
F	27,380	12,750	5,990	2,005	965	200	70	49,360
G	91,330	52,545	28,715	7,045	3,705	1,320	320	184,980
I	43,360	32,420	21,950	3,940	1,595	205	80	103,550
H&J	23,005	14,190	10,550	4,415	2,555	842	527	56,084
K	9,405	5,515	2,940	985	675	350	335	20,205
L, M&N	74,705	39,685	20,490	7,860	4,775	1,621	965	150,101
O	2,790	3,020	3,145	1,615	1,400	685	490	13,145
P	7,735	7,925	13,770	8,525	4,530	595	290	43,370
Q	28,400	27,245	21,120	7,380	2,945	610	545	88,245
R & S	31,065	13,395	7,240	2,340	1,195	250	110	55,595
TOTAL	368,877	227,447	149,426	51,668	27,795	7,720	4,282	837,215

The overall interview target was 2,500 interviews. Given that analysis would be required by industry section and by number of employees, different sampling fractions were applied to each stratum in an effort to obtain reliable samples by these criteria without causing excessive harm to the precision of cross-stratum survey estimates.

After some simulation work, the target interview number per stratum was set to be a weighted combination of (i) a design that optimises for analysis by number of employees, and (ii) a design that optimises for analysis by industry section. For design (i), an initial sample size target of 350 was set for each of the seven employment bands and the remaining interviews (2,500 minus $350 \times 7 = 50$) was then distributed to maximise proportionality. For design (ii), a similar process was carried out with an initial sample size target of 100 for each of 13 industry section groups. This produced two preliminary sample size targets for each stratum. The final interview target for each stratum was equal to $75\% \times \text{design (i) target} + 25\% \times \text{design (ii) target}$, reflecting the fact that employment band was considered the 'primary' stratification variable.

Using this approach resulted in the interview targets displayed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Interviewing targets by SIC 2007 sections and workplace employment

Industry section(s)	Number of employees							TOTAL
	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-99	100-249	250-599	500+	
A&B	21	9	5	3	2	2	3	45
C	29	27	27	26	29	31	26	195
D&E	11	9	8	5	5	4	5	47
F	41	24	15	12	10	7	4	113
G	130	97	69	40	37	46	20	439
I	62	60	54	23	16	7	5	227
H&J	34	27	26	26	26	29	33	201
K	19	13	9	6	7	12	21	87
L, M&N	107	73	50	45	48	56	60	439
O	7	9	12	11	16	25	31	111
P	12	15	34	49	46	21	18	195
Q	41	51	52	42	30	21	34	271
R & S	46	25	18	14	12	9	7	131
TOTAL	560	439	379	302	284	270	267	2,501

To maximise the probability that the interviewing targets would be achieved, each stratum interview target was multiplied by an employment band-specific sample ratio, reflecting conversion rates from previous business surveys that utilised the IDBR sample frame and adopted a similar method. To guard against under-delivery, the sample ratios were increased by more than 50% each to allow for a reserve pool (all of which was used). The resulting sample profile is shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: IDBR sample totals sent for telephone number matching by SIC 2007 sections and workplace employment

Industry section(s)	Number of employees							TOTAL
	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-99	100-249	250-599	500+	
A&B	189	65	28	17	12	12	15	338
C	261	196	150	140	159	183	128	1,217
D&E	99	65	45	27	28	24	25	313
F	369	175	84	65	55	41	20	809
G	1,170	705	385	215	203	271	98	3,047
I	558	436	301	124	88	41	25	1,573
H&J	306	196	145	141	143	172	162	1,265
K	171	95	50	33	39	71	103	562
L, M&N	965	530	279	242	263	330	294	2,903
O	63	65	66	59	88	148	151	640
P	108	109	190	264	251	124	88	1,134
Q	369	370	290	226	164	124	166	1,709
R & S	414	182	101	75	65	53	34	924
TOTAL	5,042	3,189	2,114	1,628	1,558	1,594	1,309	16,434

3.3 Telephone number matching (process and results)

Kantar carried out a telephone number matching exercise to append telephone numbers to the business details provided from the IDBR. This comprised three stages:

- An automatic telephone look-up run by a computer system;
- A more comprehensive process of manually searching databases;
- A final stage of manual telephone number matching – looking up each case individually on the internet

The final stage of manual matching was used to ensure the match rate for all SIC/employment band combinations was as high as possible.

A total of 16,434 records were issued to the telephone matching process, as shown in Table 2.3 (i.e. all records drawn from the IDBR by the Office for National Statistics).

In total 11,613 records were successfully matched constituting a 71% match rate, although match rates varied by business size and SIC group, as shown in Tables 3.4 and 3.5.

Table 3.4: Successfully matched records at telephone number lookup, by workplace number of employees

Number of employees	Sent for number matching	Successfully matched	Match rate
5-9	5,042	3,103	62%
10-24	3,189	2,194	69%
25-49	2,114	1,594	75%
50-99	1,628	1,260	77%
100-249	1,558	1,242	80%
250-499	1,594	1,239	78%
500+	1,309	981	75%
TOTAL	16,434	11,613	71%

Table 3.5: Successfully matched records at telephone number lookup, by SIC 2007 industry section

Number of employees	Sent for number matching	Successfully matched	Match rate
A	303	181	60%
B	35	23	66%
C	1,217	904	74%
D	96	53	55%
E	217	160	74%
F	809	504	62%
G	3047	2,357	77%
H	696	475	68%
I	1573	995	63%
J	569	358	63%
K	562	417	74%
L	343	209	61%
M	1,223	816	67%
N	1,337	829	62%
O	640	491	77%
P	1,134	924	81%
Q	1,709	1256	73%
R	487	366	75%
S	437	295	68%
TOTAL	16,434	11,613	71%

A number of cases returned duplicate telephone numbers. Once these were removed, 11,141 records could be used for the survey (as shown in Table 3.6).

Table 3.6: Profile of available sample (including reserve)

Industry section	Number of employees							TOTAL
	5-9	10-24	25-49	50-99	100-249	250-599	500+	
A	100	38	16	10	7	5	4	180
B	6	5	3	3	2	1	3	23
C	164	142	116	111	122	138	101	894
D	9	6	3	5	8	9	12	52
E	48	35	29	18	12	10	5	157
F	198	111	57	47	46	28	11	498
G	799	532	300	170	175	247	73	2,296
H	71	59	60	60	60	59	53	422
I	296	282	209	84	68	28	12	979
J	82	56	37	34	39	45	41	334
K	91	45	27	21	30	50	66	330
L	102	43	17	9	15	15	5	206
M	253	172	94	66	65	77	75	802
N	200	105	73	74	104	124	112	792
O	39	47	45	40	62	99	93	425
P	64	76	161	237	204	97	70	909
Q	231	246	212	172	128	100	137	1,226
R	95	55	52	41	37	24	20	324
S	142	71	29	15	15	11	9	292
TOTAL	2,990	2,126	1,540	1,217	1,199	1,167	902	11,141

4. Questionnaire development

4.1 Overview of questionnaire development

The MWP questionnaire was drafted by Kantar in collaboration with BEIS and NIESR. Where possible, new questions drew heavily on existing questions from either the WLB or WERS surveys. The final questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.

The main sections of the final questionnaire are outlined in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Summary of the main sections of the MWP questionnaire

Section	Coverage of questions
Screening and Introduction	Confirming the workplace, location and number of employees. Confirming the respondents job title and introducing the survey.
Maternity and Paternity rights	Incidence of maternity/paternity leave, awareness of maternity/paternity leave legislation, as well as detail of maternity/paternity leave and benefits offered by the workplace.
Shared Parental Leave (individual rights)	Incidence of shared parental leave, awareness and satisfaction of shared parental leave legislation, as well as detail of shared parental leave and benefits offered by the workplace.
Other parental leave	Incidence of other parental leave and awareness of other parental leave legislation.
Childcare and bereavement leave	Information about childcare and bereavement leave policies at the workplace.
Flexible Working (Individual Rights)	Availability of flexible working arrangements at the workplace, incidence of requests for (and examples of) flexible working.
Collective Rights (employment rights and enforcement)	Nature of communication between managers and employees, existence of employee committees, union membership/representation at the workplace.
Sources of Information	Sources of information used to find out about flexible working or maternity / paternity / parental leave legislation

4.1.1 Cognitive testing

New and amended questions were developed using cognitive testing before the full survey was piloted ahead of main stage fieldwork.

In total, 14 cognitive interviews were conducted with workplaces in July 2018 by Kantar researchers. The interview was conducted by telephone and lasted around 30 minutes with a £30 incentive provided at the end of the interview to thank respondents for their participation.

All interviews were audio-recorded subject to consent and with the help of a probe guide, which outlined the key terms and concepts to probe in more detail on.

A reduced version of the questionnaire was administered by the researchers who then retrospectively probed the respondent to discuss their response processes to the questions and to identify if they found any parts of the survey difficult to respond to.

4.2 Piloting

Following the changes made as a result of the cognitive testing stage, the MWP questionnaire was piloted for four weeks from the 30th of August 2018 until the 19th of September 2018.

The purpose of this pilot was to provide information on the likely interview length, to check on the general flow of the questionnaire and to identify areas for improvement in terms of question wording or interviewer instructions, as well as to test the Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) set-up for any routing issues.

A random sample of firms was selected from the Dunn and Bradstreet business database², with sufficient numbers selected in sector and size bands to ensure a broad spread of business types. Interviews were carried out by interviewers at Kantar's telephone unit, based in Hangar Lane, London. All interviewers working on the pilot attended a project briefing before beginning work, conducted by a member of the research team. The briefing covered some background details about the survey and ran through the questionnaire in full.

In total, 25 interviews were achieved. Table 4.2 shows the profile of the final achieved sample by firm size (number of employees). Due to the relatively short fieldwork period available, the final sample skews largely toward smaller firms. This is due to the increased difficulty of identifying and getting hold of the correct respondent in larger firms, which generally requires more time.

Table 4.2: Final achieved pilot sample

Size	TOTAL
5-49	19
50-249	4
250+	2
TOTAL	25

A separate report detailing the pilot methodology and findings can be found in Appendix B.

² <https://www.dnb.co.uk/>

4.3 Questionnaire programming

Once the questionnaire was agreed, Kantar programmed an electronic script using its CATI scripting software. The script was tested by Kantar and BEIS signed-off prior to the start of main stage fieldwork.

Early in fieldwork, two errors in the interview script were uncovered which resulted in missing data for a small number of respondents. Where respondents had given permission to recontact an attempt was made to recontact them to obtain the missing data. Overall, 26 out of the 27 respondents were successfully recontacted.

The errors in the interview script were:

- The filters at the questions CONOFTEN and CONPROCESS were specified incorrectly meaning that they were not asked of respondents who had answered 'Don't know' at CONRANGE (10 respondents in total).

Given that a relatively small number of respondents were impacted, and because they answered 'Don't know' to CONRANGE, it was decided not to attempt recontact, but to instead impute their responses at CONOFTEN and CONPROCESS as 'Don't know'.

- The question FWPOLICY should have been asked of all respondents who had selected any of the answers at FWAVAIL. However due to an incorrectly specified question filer, FWPOLICY was only asked of respondents who had selected corresponding answers at both FWAVAIL and FWANY. In total, 45 respondents were not asked FWPOLICY, 27 of whom had given permission to be recontacted.

5. Fieldwork

5.1 Overview of approach

Interviewing took place between the 27th of September 2018 and the 15th of February 2019 inclusive.

Interviews were carried out by our specialist business-to-business trained interviewers from Kantar's field department. Interviews were conducted using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI).

Telephone fieldwork encouraged participation whilst also allowing the respondent to participate at a time that suited them. Encouragement and flexibility from fieldworkers were essential requirements of this survey, which targets busy professionals. Respondents were able to schedule appointment times for the interviewer to call, ensuring that the interviewer's time was used most efficiently and respondents were more committed to taking part. On some occasions these appointments were broken due to the busy nature of the organisations surveyed. However, a simple electronic process allowed the interviewers to re-schedule an appointment and then move on to the next interview.

5.2 Screening procedures

We chose to streamline the screener and main interview stages of fieldwork into a single stage to allow employers more flexibility on the timing of their response. In doing this we also replaced the standard practice of mailing out an advance letter to employers with e-mail communication, supported by further information available on a dedicated survey website.

The purpose of a screener was to ensure that contact details were obtained for the correct person at each workplace before proceeding with an interview. This required interviewers to establish not only that the respondents worked for the correct business (and more specifically, at the sampled workplace) but also that they occupied a relevant role/ position at the workplace (so that they had sufficient knowledge of the subject matter to accurately answer the questions).

The initial stage of the call effectively covered what would normally be included in a screener.

Interviewers first checked eligibility for the study (that it was a business at that address and that there were at least five employees on the payroll), they then identified the most appropriate person to interview about the workplaces ("the most senior person at the site with responsibility for human resource and personnel issues, or for general management issues"), before proceeding with the interview.

One of the key considerations was to ensure that interviews were conducted with someone at the sampled *workplace* rather than merely the sampled business. To that end, the first step in the screening interview asked interviewers to confirm whether the person they were speaking to was working for the sampled company at the sampled workplace. If they were, the interviewer could proceed with an interview.

If the person they were speaking to worked for the sampled company, but not at the sampled workplace the interviewer sought to obtain contact details for the sampled workplace and arrange another call³.

At the point of contact, interviewers had the option within the script to send the respondent an email outlining some basic information about the survey, and arrange a callback after the respondent had been given an opportunity to read the email. This approach was implemented to account for the fact that advance notification had not been sent to workplaces. Interviewers were instructed to offer the email to all respondents, but respondents could proceed with an interview without the email being sent, if preferred.

The respondent email can be found in Appendix E.

5.3 Interviewer briefings

All interviewers attended a face-to-face briefing, delivered by a member of the Kantar research team, before beginning work on the survey. The briefing covered:

- Background to the survey and the policy areas being addressed
- An explanation of the objective of the survey
- Definition of some key terms used in the questionnaire (e.g. flexi-time, collective bargaining)
- A walk-through of the screening process and how to identify the correct respondent
- A run through of the questionnaire

Interviewers were also provided with a copy of the briefing slides, some interviewer instructions, and a 'Key terms and definitions' document. The briefing materials provided to interviewers can be found in Appendices C and D.

5.4 Fieldwork outcomes

5.4.1 Sample outcomes

A breakdown of the fieldwork outcomes and response rate calculations are provided in Table 5.1 below. In total, 2,489 interviews were completed with a response rate of 37%.

This response rate is calculated by excluding workplaces that were found to be ineligible (e.g. dead numbers, workplaces with fewer than 5 employees). In total there were 4,378 ineligible workplaces, leaving an eligible sample of 6,763 workplaces. The response rate represents the number of completed interviews (2,489) as a proportion of all eligible sample.

³ Later in the fieldwork period, interviewers were given permission by the research team to conduct interviews with employees based somewhere other than the sampled workplace, but only after confirming that the respondent was in a position to answer in reference to the specific sampled workplace.

Classification of eligible and ineligible sample takes into account the fact that this survey did not include a separate screening stage prior to the main interview stage, as is often the case with business surveys.

Where a separate screening stage is conducted, the response rate is often presented based only on those records successfully screened at initial stages of fieldwork. As the MWP combined the screening and main interview stages, it could reasonably be argued that outcomes that might have been excluded following a screening stage (e.g. Caller ID block, No such job title, Unavailable during fieldwork) should be removed from the calculation. This is the approach taken in Table 5.1⁴.

An alternative, 'standardised' response rate of 27% has also been calculated, by including the outcomes referred to above in the eligible sample.

⁴ The following outcome codes have been classified as 'ineligible' on the basis that they would have been screened out in a separate screener exercise: Caller ID Block/ Call Barring Message; No such job title; Deferral; Unavailable during fieldwork; Refusal; Deleted interview.

Table 5.1: Sample breakdown and response rates by workplace size

	Outcome	Total	Number of employees						
			5-9	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-249	250-499	500+
Eligible Live	No answer, Answer Machine, Number Busy	1,116	268	181	134	135	124	163	111
	Soft Appointment (arranged with respondent)	133	24	26	17	11	26	20	9
	Definite Appointment (arranged with respondent)	17	5	5	2	1	0	2	2
	Stopped (mid interview - will finish later)	74	10	17	13	6	12	9	7
	Fresh Undialled sample	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	General Callback, (not arranged with respondent)	2,648	582	470	356	329	340	326	245
	Prioritised Sample	44	6	9	12	8	0	3	6
Ineligible sample	Dead Number	249	76	42	28	22	24	26	31
	Escalated Refusal	10	3	1	2	2	0	1	1
	Less than 5 employees	447	345	47	15	15	13	7	5
	Business Closed Down	272	85	73	32	29	21	22	10
	Residential Number	70	24	10	8	9	8	6	5
	Unknown At Number or Business unknown at number, Incapable of interview	269	81	46	33	26	30	31	22
	Wrong Company Name	235	70	41	38	23	30	17	16
	Modem / Fax	272	68	50	39	29	25	31	30
	Duplicate, System error	83	16	13	13	13	8	10	10
	Caller ID Block / Call Barring Message	48	10	7	7	2	3	11	8
	No Such Job title and No-one Responsible	275	58	44	35	40	23	39	36
	Deferral	86	24	20	13	8	10	7	4

The Management and Wellbeing Practices Survey 2018: Technical Report

	Refusal / Hard Refusal / Respondent Refusal	1,666	563	441	182	159	153	155	13
	Unavailable During Fieldwork	386	97	64	59	39	40	44	43
	Deleted interview	10	2	1	1	2	1	3	0
Eligible used sample	Quit (mid interview - refused to finish)	133	33	27	32	9	16	11	5
	Opt Out	109	28	9	10	9	16	19	18
	Complete	2,489	551	526	412	297	278	249	176
Total	Total outcomes	11,141	2,990	2,126	1,540	1,217	1,199	1,167	902
	Total Ineligible	4,378	1,522	900	505	418	389	410	234
	Total Eligible Used	242	61	36	42	18	32	30	23
	Total Eligible Live	4,032	895	708	534	490	502	523	380
	Completes	2,489	512	482	459	291	276	204	265
Response rate	Field Response Rate	37%	35%	39%	44%	36%	34%	27%	40%
	Standardised Response Rate	27%	25%	29%	31%	28%	27%	25%	23%

5.4.2 Interview lengths

The average duration of the interviews was 29 minutes.

5.5 Quality control measures

The use of CATI for this type of survey had a number of advantages. The telephone research was controlled and supervised to allow careful sample management and maximum control of the interviewing at all stages, allowing both overall response and response amongst certain types of workplaces to be monitored on a daily basis. This therefore ensured that a wide range of workplaces participated in the survey, providing representative results.

In addition, managers in the telephone unit implemented quality control by listening in to interviews as they were being conducted, as well listening back to recorded interviews.

The interview was conducted electronically with all questions and routing programmed automatically, meaning that interviewers were free to concentrate on the respondent's answers and data was recorded accurately.

6. Coding, weighting, and data production

6.1 Coding

The questionnaire included several questions where an 'Other (specify)' option was available to respondents.

Post-interview coding was undertaken by the Kantar coding department. All 'Other (specify)' responses were inspected by members of the Kantar coding department and where possible were back coded to the existing code frame. Members of the research team also examined the verbatim responses and this resulted in some additional codes being suggested and added to the code frames of some questions. Any new codes were reviewed and approved by the Kantar research team before changes to code frames were made.

For all questions, the aim was to reduce the proportion of answers left in the non-specific 'Other' category to below 10%.

Some questions had no pre-developed code frame and these required the interviewer to record verbatim what was said by the respondent. Once 250 interviews had been completed, the Kantar research and coding teams drew up code frames to reflect the common themes recorded.

6.2 Data cleaning, editing and checking

The CATI set-up removed much of the requirement for post-fieldwork data editing as range, logic and consistency checks were built into the programme, thus interviewers could resolve the majority of inconsistencies by pointing them out to the respondent during the interview.

Nevertheless, quality assurance checks were carried out on the data during the data preparation stage. Post-fieldwork data checks are often necessarily subjective in nature in determining what data should be amended or removed. Recognising this, the Kantar research team adopted a 'conservative' approach to the data checking/editing process by only editing data where it was deemed an 'obvious' error/contradiction had been made.

As part of standard quality procedures, Kantar conducted an extensive range of checks on the data outputs before provided to BEIS. This included topline checks (to ensure the correct respondents were being asked each question), checks between the raw and processed data, coding checks and extensive checking on the content of analysis breaks in the data tables.

6.3 Weighting

The survey data was weighted in three steps.

Step 1 was to produce a **design weight** which is conventionally equivalent to one divided by the case's sampling probability. However, because the sample was sourced from ONS, the

true sampling probability – which would account for cases within the stratum that were excluded from the active sample frame - was not known.

Instead a quasi-design weight was produced equal to: N_h/n_h where N_h is the ONS population total for stratum h and n_h is the sample total drawn from stratum h . Strata were defined by the cross-tabulation of SIC section (19 categories) and employment total, banded into seven categories (5-9, 10-19, 20-49, 50-99, 100-249, 250-499, 500+).

The employment total was also collected directly from the respondent during the interview and the answer sometimes differed substantially from the employment total listed on the sample frame. These cases are known as '**stratum jumpers**' and they can be problematic cases if they retain their sample stratum design weight while being treated as part of a different stratum for analysis purposes. To avoid inflating the variance of the survey estimates, these cases were given **pseudo-design weights** in which they were treated as having been sampled from their *analysis* stratum rather than their *sample* stratum. To keep things simple, no adjustments were made to the values of N_h (or to n_h) to reflect the sample stratum-to-analysis stratum transition matrix obtained from the survey.

Step 2 was to produce a sample frame based **non-response weight** which was equal to one divided by the case's estimated probability of response, given its characteristics X_i as listed on the sample frame. In this case, $p(\text{response}|X_i)$ was estimated using a logistic regression model and five predictor variables: (i) 7-banded employment total, (ii) SIC section, with some less numerous sections combined into a single category, (iii) legal status, (iv) whether part of a multi-site enterprise or not, and (v) the natural log of the enterprise's turnover.

A base weight was formed equal to the product of the (pseudo) design weight and the non-response weight. This weight was used as the initial weight in a **raking procedure** designed to calibrate the sample's marginal profile to the population marginal profile supplied by ONS at the time of sampling (see Table X.1). The margins selected were (i) 7-banded employment total, (ii) SIC section (with some sections combined as in step 2), and (iii) region.

The resulting **calibration-weighted** sample distribution was then compared to the three two-way tabulations of the population data (employment total*SIC section, employment total*region, and SIC section*region) to check for problems of fit. In each case, the disparities were no greater than should be expected due to sampling variance so further weighting was not warranted. The modest variance of the weights within each analysis category meant that no 'trimming' of extreme weights was required.

The **weighting efficiency** (the effective sample size expressed as a proportion of the actual sample size) was **58%** ($n_{\text{eff}} = 1,445$) and ranged from 78% to 90% per employment total band, from 37% to 76% per SIC section, and from 52% to 64% per region. The only sub-50% weighting efficiency was for SIC section O but the sample size was only 82 so, even with 100% weighting efficiency, results would have had a wide margin of error for this category.

Table 6.1: Marginal population distributions supplied by ONS, plus weighting efficiencies

	Category	Respondent sample size	Population total	Weighting efficiency	n _{eff}
Employment total (questionnaire)	5-9 employees	510	368,877	90%	459
	10-19 employees	482	227,447	89%	430
	20-49 employees	459	149,426	89%	409
	50-99 employees	291	51,668	88%	258
	100-249 employees	276	27,795	86%	238
	250-499 employees	204	7,720	82%	170
	500+ employees	265	4,282	78%	207
	TOTAL	2,489	837,215	58%	1,445
SIC section(s)	A&B	35	12,069	75%	26
	C	176	53,479	50%	87
	D&E	30	7,032	61%	18
	F	94	49,360	76%	71
	G	480	184,980	65%	318
	I	246	103,550	69%	170
	H&J	132	56,084	58%	77
	K	48	20,205	62%	30
	L, M&N	359	150,101	63%	224
	O	82	13,145	37%	30
	P	288	43,370	51%	147
	Q	351	88,245	55%	194
	R&S	168	55,595	69%	115
Region	East Midlands	157	58,582	64%	102
	East of England	252	79,928	60%	184
	London	352	132,220	55%	232

	North East	82	29,403	52%	41
	North West	258	91,062	59%	142
	Scotland	228	71,676	61%	126
	South East	411	120,441	59%	228
	South West	243	76,718	60%	128
	Wales	110	37,481	60%	57
	West Midlands	201	73,243	59%	122
	Yorkshire and The Humber	195	66,461	55%	100

6.4 Design Effects and Confidence intervals

Design effects and confidence intervals for some of the key metrics are shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2: Design effects

		Estimate	DEFF	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Percentage of employees at workplace that are members of a Trade Union (SCUNI)	None	86.5%	1.12	81.2%	85.0%
	1-10%	2.3%	0.85	2.1%	3.6%
	11-20%	2.7%	1.42	2.5%	4.6%
	21-30%	1.8%	1.02	1.8%	3.2%
	31-40%	1.3%	1.59	1.0%	2.5%
	41-50%	1.5%	0.90	1.3%	2.5%
	51-60%	0.7%	1.12	0.5%	1.4%
	61-70%	0.5%	0.81	0.3%	1.0%
	71-80%	1.1%	0.95	0.9%	2.0%
	81-90%	0.5%	0.61	0.4%	1.0%
	91-99%	0.2%	0.65	0.2%	0.6%
100%	0.9%	1.18	0.7%	1.9%	
	Yes	23.1%	1.75	20.7%	25.6%

Whether workplace pays more than Statutory Maternity Pay	No	75.7%	1.77	73.2%	78.2%
	It depends on the employee	1.2%	2.14	0.6%	2.1%
Whether workplace pays more than Statutory Paternity Pay	Yes	22.7%	1.76	20.2%	25.1%
	No	76.1%	1.78	73.6%	78.6%
	It depends on the employee	1.2%	2.08	0.7%	2.2%
Whether any employees have taken adoption leave in the past 2 years	Yes	2.2%	0.87	1.7%	2.8%
	No	97.8%	0.87	97.2%	98.3%
Whether aware of Shared Parental Leave	Yes	73.1%	0.95	71.0%	75.6%
	No	26.9%	0.95	24.4%	29.0%
Whether aware of Parental Leave	Yes	63.8%	1.20	61.5%	66.5%
	No	36.2%	1.20	33.5%	38.5%
Whether any employees have taken parental leave in the past 2 years	Yes	12.7%	1.22	11.9%	15.2%
	No	81.5%	1.22	84.8%	88.1%
Whether workplace has meetings between senior manager and whole workforce	Yes	85.5%	1.19	84.5%	88.1%
	No	13.4%	1.19	11.9%	15.5%

6.5 Data tabulations and SPSS dataset

6.5.1 Data outputs

The following outputs were provided to BEIS:

- A full, coded data file (in SPSS format)
- Excel data tables

Several tasks were undertaken to process and prepare the SPSS dataset. These included:

- Applying a standard naming convention to all variables
- Ensuring that all variable labels and code frame labels were clear and were consistent with the questionnaire
- Creating a number of derived variables and adding them to the file. These were primarily the combining of variables for questions at which respondents could choose to give their answer as a number or as a percentage (e.g. number / percentage of female employees)

- Adding sample variables relating to each workplace (e.g. sector, region).

Data tables were run to a specification agreed with BEIS.

6.5.2 SPSS dataset

This section gives a brief overview of the structure and contents of the SPSS dataset. Variables in this dataset appear in the order in which they were asked. The dataset itself is available at: <https://www.data-archive.ac.uk/>

Case number

Case number is the variable serial

Questionnaire answers

The answers to every question asked during the interview are included in the dataset. Variable names correspond to the question codes from the questionnaire (Appendix A).

Weights

The dataset contains one weight variable – RimweightMWP2019.

If you need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email enquiries@trade.gov.uk. Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.