

WERS 2004: Primary Analysis

Errata Version 1.3: June 2007

This note details the errors that have currently been identified in the primary analysis of WERS 2004, including the First Findings publication, the sourcebook and the SMEs report.

Additions since version 1.0 (Aug 2006):

- Sourcebook, note 3: ‘profit-related payments’

Additions since version 1.1 (Dec 2006):

- First Findings, note 6: ‘frequency of working more than 48 hours a week’
- Sourcebook, note 4: ‘profit-sharing schemes’

Additions since version 1.2 (Apr 2007):

- Sourcebook, note 5: ‘off-the-job training’

Readers should also note that the weight for the Cross-Section Survey of Employees, 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, was not included. A separate note outlines this issue in more detail, describing the impact on survey estimates of revising the weight to include the gender adjustment, and lists all affected estimates in both First Findings and the SMEs report; for further details please see FAQ 5.14: <http://www.wers2004.info/FAQ.php#revised>

First Findings: “Inside the Workplace: First Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey”

1. Page 13 ‘Representative voice’: The proportion of workplaces with recognised unions in which members had access to a lay representative was 71 per cent in 1998 and 68 per cent in 2004: a difference that is not statistically significant. The sentence reporting this result implies that the figure was 68 per cent in both years and should read as follows, “The proportion of workplaces with recognised unions in which members had access to a lay representative, either on-site or elsewhere in the organisation, was no different in 2004 (68 per cent) than in 1998 (71 per cent).”

2. Page 17 ‘Direct communication’: The figures reporting on issues commonly discussed at workforce meetings and team briefings mistakenly omitted the small number of verbatim answers coded after fieldwork (**XDMWHIC1-3** and **XDBWHIC1-3**). The figures for work organisation should read 50 and 58 per cent for team briefings and workforce meetings respectively, instead of 49 and 57 per cent. Additionally, for team briefings, the figure for production issues should be 58 per cent rather than 57 per cent.

3. Table 6 (p.20): The figure for percentage of public sector workplaces where any pay was set by management should read 24 per cent instead of 21 per cent for 1998.

4. Page 23 ‘Addressing Workplace Conflict’: It is reported that “The incidence of claims is by no means even, with five per cent of all workplaces having at least ten claims brought against them (four per cent in 1998).” This sentence should read, “...with 5.9 per cent of all workplaces having at least ten claims *per thousand employees* brought against them (4.6 per cent in 1998)”.

5. Table 11 (p.33): The published figures for job satisfaction appear to be based on unweighted data. However, the vast majority of the printed estimates for this table are still correct. The table below provides the results based on weighted data – those affected are highlighted, with the original published figure given in parentheses.

Table 11 Job satisfaction (results using weighted data)

	% of employees				
	<i>Very satisfied</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very dissatisfied</i>
Sense of achievement	18	52	20 (19)	7 (8)	3
Scope for using initiative	20	52	18	8	3
Influence over job	12	45	28	11	3
Training	11	40	26	16	7
Pay	4	31	24	28	13
Job security	14 (13)	51 (50)	22	10 (11)	5
Work itself	17	55	19	7	3
Involvement in decision-making	8	30	39	16 (17)	6

6. Page 28 'Hours of work': The figure for the proportion of employees working more than 48 hours a week once a month over the past year should read eight per cent, instead of nine per cent.

Sourcebook: “Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey”

1. Table 7.4 (p.184): The figure for percentage of public sector workplaces where any pay was set by management should read 24 per cent instead of 21 per cent for 1998.
2. Table 7.5 (p.186): The heading “% workplaces” that appears at the top of this table should read “% employees”.
3. Page 193 ‘Profit-related payments’: It is reported that, “As noted in earlier surveys, PRP was less common where unions were recognized for pay bargaining: one-third (35 per cent) of unionized workplaces had PRP, compared with two-fifths (43 per cent) of non-unionized workplaces.” This sentence should read, “...PRP was more common where unions were recognized for pay bargaining: one-third (35 per cent) of non-unionized workplaces had PRP, compared with two-fifths (43 per cent) of unionized workplaces.”
4. Page 349, Endnote 13: The endnote suggests that deferred profit-sharing schemes were outlawed between 1998 and 2004. This is not the case. However, tax and National Insurance relief for Approved Profit Sharing (APS) schemes was withdrawn during this period.
5. Page 85 ‘Off-the-job training’: The figure for the proportion of employees either agreeing or strongly agreeing that managers at their workplace encouraged people to develop their skills should read 57 per cent instead of 72 per cent for 2004.

SMEs report: “Small and Medium-sized Enterprises: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey”

1. Table 5.3 (p.52): The summary row for 'Any downward communication' should read as shown below. The original published figures are given in parentheses.

Table 5.3 Arrangements for direct communication

	<i>All private sector</i>	<i>Size of firm</i>			
		<i>All SMEs</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium-sized</i>	<i>Large</i>
Any downward communication	79	69	64	88	95
	(72)	(57)	(51)	(81)	(93)

2. Page 62 ‘Pay rates and pay satisfaction’: The figures of 21 per cent and 15 per cent in the final two lines on this page should be transposed.