

dti

**EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
RESEARCH SERIES NO. 37**

Job separations: A survey
of workers who have
recently left an employer

Volume one - Main analysis
report

TANIA CORBIN
OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS



**EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
RESEARCH SERIES NO. 37**

Job separations: A survey of
workers who have recently
left an employer

Volume one – Main analysis
report

TANIA CORBIN
OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS

Published in December 2004 by the Department of Trade and Industry.

URN 04/1920
ISBN 0 85605 409 7

© Crown Copyright 2004

This DTI publication can be ordered at: www.dti.gov.uk/publications
Search using URN 04/1920. Alternatively call the DTI Publications Orderline on
0870 1502 500 (+44 870 1502 500) and provide the URN, or email them at:
publications@dti.gsi.gov.uk

This publication can be accessed online at www.dti.gov.uk/er/inform.htm

Trade union membership information can be downloaded from
www.dti.gov.uk/er/emar/trade.htm

Postal enquiries should be addressed to:

Employment Market Analysis and Research
Department of Trade and Industry
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
United Kingdom

Email enquiries should be addressed to: emar@dti.gov.uk

Foreword

The Department of Trade and Industry's aim is to realise prosperity for all. We want a dynamic labour market that provides full employment, flexibility and choice. We want to create workplaces of high productivity and skill, where people can flourish and maintain a healthy work-life balance.

The Department has an ongoing research programme on employment relations and labour market issues, managed by the Employment Market Analysis and Research branch (EMAR). Details of our research programme appear regularly in the ONS journal *Labour Market Trends*, and can also be found on our website: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/emar>

DTI social researchers, economists, statisticians and policy advisors devise research projects to be conducted in-house or on our behalf by external researchers, chosen through competitive tender. Projects typically look at individual and collective employment rights, identify good practice, evaluate the impact of particular policies or regulations, or examine labour market trends and issues. We also regularly conduct large-scale UK social surveys, such as the Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS).

We publicly disseminate results of this research through the DTI Employment Relations Research series and Occasional Paper series. All reports are available to download at <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/inform.htm>

Anyone interested in receiving regular email updates on EMAR's research programme, new publications and forthcoming seminars should send their name, organisation and postal address to us at: emar@dti.gov.uk

The views expressed in these publications do not necessarily reflect those of the Department or the Government. We publish them as a contribution towards open debate about how best we can achieve our objectives.



Grant Fitzner
Director, Employment Market Analysis and Research

Acknowledgements

The Department of Trade and Industry would like to thank Tania Corbin of the Office for National Statistics for preparing this report in 2002. Any delay in publication is solely the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Industry.

Contents

Executive summary	5
Background and purpose.....	5
Characteristics of the sample.....	5
Socio-demographic correlates of job separations.....	6
Experiences of workers who had left a job by main reason they left.....	7
1 Background and aims of the report	9
Background to the report.....	9
Access to survey data.....	9
Content of the main analysis report.....	10
Sampling and interviewing procedures.....	10
2 Characteristics of the sample	11
Age and sex.....	11
Ethnicity.....	11
Family unit type.....	11
Age of youngest dependent.....	12
Limiting health problems.....	12
Educational qualifications.....	13
Age when completed full-time education.....	13
Occupational group.....	13
Industry division.....	14
Full-time/Part-time.....	14
Reason left last job (LFS reason).....	14
JSS reason for leaving job by LFS reason for leaving last job.....	15
3 Socio-demographic correlates of job separations	16
Introduction.....	16
Main reason respondent left their job (WhyLeft).....	17
Length of temporary contract.....	19
Reason given for dismissal.....	20
Whether employer has allowed respondent to stay in job.....	20
Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on.....	22
Reason respondent had to leave.....	24
Main reason respondent decided to leave.....	26
4 JSS variables by main reason respondent left job (WhyLeft)	28
Circumstances under which the respondent left their job.....	29
Respondents' experiences of help, advice and grievance procedures.....	30
Payments received by respondents who were dismissed, made redundant or left their job because of a dispute or disagreement.....	34
The experience of respondents who voluntarily resigned from their jobs.....	36
Payments received by respondents who voluntarily resigned from their jobs.....	40
The respondent's experience after leaving their job.....	42

5 Sampling errors 49

Technical report..... 51

Executive summary

The Job Separations Survey explores the different categories of job separations and investigates the circumstances of those separations. It found that younger employees were more likely to leave a job. Redundancies amongst women were most common for those in 'administrative or secretarial occupations'. Male redundancies were most common amongst 'managers and senior officials', and men were much more likely to report having been dismissed for alleged misconduct. Most respondents reported they could have remained in their job had they so wished. A third of respondents had found another job when they left.

Of respondents who had to leave their job over half reported that the job no longer existed. Around one in six employees who had been dismissed, made redundant or involved in a dispute were offered independent advice by their employer, the majority accepted this offer. Around half of respondents said their employer had an internal grievance procedure, but only around one in ten of these respondents used the procedure to challenge leaving their job.

Background and purpose

- This reports the results of the Job Separations Survey (JSS) carried out by Social Survey Division of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) between June 2001 and April 2002. The survey was based on wave 5 Labour Force Survey (LFS) respondents interviewed between December 2000 and November 2001.
- The aim of the survey was to gain a statistically representative picture of the experience of dismissal and redundancy and of the use of grievance procedures.
- Data are presented on characteristics of the sample, the relationship between the main JSS variables and demographic and socio-economic characteristics and between all the JSS variables and the reason the respondent left their job.

Characteristics of the sample

- The sample was split almost exactly between men and women (51 per cent were men, 49 per cent were women) and there was no difference between the sexes in the age distribution.
- Around one in sixteen (six per cent) of all respondents were from ethnic groups other than 'White'.
- Men and women were equally likely to be living as a lone parent with non-dependent children (five per cent) but women were more likely than men to be living as a lone parent with dependent children (nine per cent compared with three per cent). Men were slightly more likely to be living alone (12 per cent compared with ten per cent).

- Men were more likely to hold a degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification (19 per cent compared with 14 per cent) but women were more likely to hold both GCSEs or ALevels as their highest qualification (34 per cent and 35 per cent respectively for women, 31 per cent and 27 per cent respectively for men)
- Men were much more likely to have been managers or senior officials in their last job (16 per cent compared with six per cent of women) while women were much more likely to have been working in administrative or secretarial occupations (24 per cent compared with six per cent). Men and women were equally likely to have been working in elementary occupations in their last job (16 per cent).
- The majority of male respondents (86 per cent) had been full-time in their last job. Female respondents were almost equally split between full- and part-time (51 per cent had been full-time and 49 per cent had been part-time).

Socio-demographic correlates of job separations

- Almost two-thirds of the sample (65 per cent) reported that they had resigned from their job. Sixteen per cent had been made redundant, seven per cent had been in a temporary job that came to an end, seven per cent left for 'other' reasons and just three per cent of the sample had been dismissed.
- Almost half (49 per cent) of respondents who had been dismissed were aged 24 and under. Redundancy was most common among respondents aged 25 to 34 (24 per cent).
- The manufacturing industry accounted for around a quarter of the redundancies, dismissals and 'other' reasons for leaving (29 per cent, 24 per cent and 23 per cent respectively).
- Women who had been made redundant were much more likely to have been working in an administrative or secretarial occupation than any other (38 per cent compared with between one per cent and 13 per cent in the other occupations).
- Almost a fifth (19 per cent) of men who were made redundant had been working as managers or senior officials.
- Of the respondents who had been dismissed, 65 per cent were men and 35 per cent were women. Men were much more likely to report having been dismissed because of alleged misconduct.
- Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of respondents reported that their employer would have allowed them to have stayed in their job if they had wanted. Twenty-three per cent had to leave their jobs.
- The likelihood of being able to stay on decreased with age with 36 per cent of those who were able to stay on being aged 24 and under compared with only five per cent being aged 55 or over.

- Almost three quarters (72 per cent) of respondents could have stayed on by continuing in their job as before, 17 per cent could have negotiated a change in their working conditions with their employer and seven per cent could have unwillingly accepted a change in their working conditions.
- Almost half (46 per cent) of women and three per cent of men who could have stayed on by unwillingly accepting a change in their working conditions had been working in administrative or secretarial occupations.
- Almost three-quarters (71 per cent) of respondents who reported that they had to leave their job because their job was no longer there were male.
- A third of the sample had already found another job when they left their job and a further 25 per cent left because they wanted another job.
- Men were more likely than women to have decided to leave their job because of a dispute or disagreement with an employer or colleague (61 per cent compared with 39 per cent).
- Eighty per cent of respondents who left their job to undertake or concentrate on education were aged 24 or under.
- Almost a third (30 per cent) of those who left to undertake or concentrate on education had been employed in sales and customer service occupations and around a quarter (24 per cent) had been in elementary occupations.

Experiences of workers who had left a job by main reason they left

- Of the respondents who had to leave, 56 per cent said this was because the job was no longer there and 20 per cent reported that the company they had been working for had closed down or ceased trading.
- Sixteen per cent of the respondents who had been dismissed, made redundant or involved in some kind of dispute were offered independent advice from outside by their employer. Of those who were offered this advice, 65 per cent accepted.
- Only 16 per cent of the respondents had been a member of a trade union. Forty per cent of the trade union members in the survey sought help or advice from their union.
- Forty-four per cent of the respondents reported that their employer had had an internal grievance procedure, and of these respondents only eight per cent used the procedure in place to challenge having to leave their job.
- Three per cent of respondents made an application to an employment tribunal. Respondents who had been dismissed were the most likely to have made an application (16 per cent).
- The majority of respondents who decided to leave their jobs either wanted, or had already found, another job. Of these, 51 per cent wanted better career prospects, 47 per cent wanted better pay and 38 per cent wanted better working conditions.

- Only 17 per cent of the sample claimed either Jobseeker's Allowance or Income Support since leaving their job. Respondents who had been made redundant were the most likely to have claimed Jobseeker's Allowance (33 per cent) and dismissed respondents were more likely to have claimed Income Support (nine per cent).
- Twenty-three per cent of the respondents considered starting their own business when they left their job. Of these, 22 per cent actually went on to start their own business. Forty-three per cent of these respondents who had received any money from their employer or a grievance procedure used this money to help set up their business.

1

Background and aims of the report

Background to the report

The Department of Trade and Industry commissioned Social Survey Division in ONS to carry out a survey of people who had recently left an employer, in order to answer some unresolved questions about employees' experiences of changing jobs.

The number of applications to employment tribunals has been increasing in recent years and continues to rise. It now exceeds 100,000 per year, with unfair dismissal cases exceeding 40,000. The increase in the number of employment tribunal applications as well as in the use of the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas) services is of great importance for the administration of these services, while other aspects of job separations are of importance to other aspects of public administration (e.g. redundancy payments).

There is only limited information, however, on the nature of dismissals and other job separations. One aim of the JSS was to investigate how readily employees go to arbitration and tribunals and whether potential cases are dealt with by internal grievance procedures or other means.

Another aim of the survey was to clarify some of the questions that have been raised as a result of previous research into this subject: For example, estimates of the number of dismissals per year are estimated to lie between 200,000 (LFS) and 400,000 (Workplace Employment Relations Survey, WERS). Apart from the level of uncertainty in these estimates there is doubt about the way in which LFS informants describe their own job separations. (WERS gives the employers' view). Some employees will describe their dismissals as 'redundancy' or 'retirement' or leaving for 'other reasons', whilst similarly, some who are described as having been dismissed may in practice have been made redundant or come to the end of a fixed employment term. The JSS was commissioned in order to explore the different categories of job separations and to further investigate the circumstances of those separations.

Access to survey data

Anonymised data from the survey will be lodged with the Data Archive, University of Essex.

Content of the main analysis report

The next chapter begins by describing the characteristics of the sample. Distributions of some of the main demographic variables of the sample are presented by age and sex.

The third chapter of the report discusses the socio-demographic correlates of job separations. The main JSS variables, those that establish how the respondent came to leave their job, are presented in analyses by some of the most relevant demographic and socio-economic variables. These variables include the age, sex and ethnic group of the respondent as well as some details about their last job including occupation type, industry group, number of employees in the workplace and whether they had been in full- or part-time employment.

The fourth chapter of the report presents analyses of all of the JSS variables by the main reason the respondent left their job (WhyLeft).

The final chapter of the main analysis report presents the methodology used to calculate the standard errors used in the report as well as the standard errors themselves in table format. These standard errors are based on the variables discussed in Chapter 2 of the report.

The tables referred to in the main analysis report are available separately from the DTI Publications Orderline: Job separations: A survey of workers who have recently left an employer. Volume two – Tables.

Sampling and interviewing procedures

For detailed information on the sampling and interviewing procedures used for the JSS, see the Technical report at the end of the main analysis.

2

Characteristics of the sample

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the socio-demographic characteristics of the sample. Some of the characteristics of respondents which could have a bearing on their employment status are displayed below. The distribution of these variables are presented by age and sex.

Age and sex

The gender distribution of the sample was split almost equally with 51 per cent being male and 49 per cent being female. The age distribution was slightly skewed with the highest number of respondents falling in the youngest age band and gradually decreasing throughout the rest of the age bands (32 per cent of the sample were 24 and under compared with only eight per cent being 55 or over). This was true for both men and women. (Table 2.1)

Ethnicity

Only about six per cent of all respondents were from ethnic groups other than 'white'. The representation of non-white ethnic groups peaked among those aged 25 to 44 and was least likely in those aged 55 and over. There was little difference in the distribution by sex. (Table 2.2)

Family unit type

Each respondent's family unit was classified into one of six family unit types. 'Couple, no children' included married or cohabiting couples without children. Couples with children were classified separately depending on whether or not the child was dependent. 'Lone parent' describes a man or woman living with at least one child, and these have been classified separately depending on whether the child is dependent or not. 'One person' does not necessarily mean that the respondent lives alone; this category includes adults living in shared households with unrelated people, adults living within their child's family home or adults living with a sibling etc. As the JSS is an individual level survey that is based on a sub-sample of the LFS household survey, the JSS respondent could either be the householder, or a spouse, child or a non-related adult of the householder.

Over half the sample were living in a family unit which was a couple with children (39 per cent with dependent children and 16 per cent with non-dependent children). Almost a quarter (22 per cent) were living as a couple with no children.

Men were more likely than women to be living in a one-person family unit or as a couple with no or non-dependent children. Women were more likely than men to be living in a household formed of a couple with dependent children and were three times more likely than men to be living in a household formed of a lone parent with dependent children (9 per cent compared with three per cent of men). Men and women were equally likely to be living in a lone parent family unit with non-dependent children.

Lone parent family units with non-dependent children were much more commonly found among those respondents in the 24 and under age group, and those in the 55 and over age group were much more likely to be living as a couple with no children (65 per cent compared with between nine per cent and 31 per cent). (Table 2.3)

Age of youngest dependent

Of the respondents that lived in households with dependent children living at home, over half (51 per cent) reported that the youngest child was under five years of age. This compares with between 11 per cent and 20 per cent having a dependent child which fell in any of the other age groups.

Just over half (55 per cent) of those living in a household with dependent children were female and a third were 24 and under. Almost three-quarters (71 per cent) of the respondents in the 25 to 34 age group lived in a household where the youngest dependent was aged under five years. Around half of the 24 and under and the 35 to 44 years age groups also had a youngest dependent of this age (45 per cent and 53 per cent respectively).

Youngest dependents of 16 years or over were most common in households of respondents who were aged 24 and under. The high level here is probably explained by the fact that many of the JSS respondents will have been the children of the LFS householders and are likely to have siblings living at home with them. There was no real difference in the distribution between the sexes. (Table 2.4)

Limiting health problems

Eighteen per cent of the sample reported having a health problem lasting more than 12 months with very little difference in the distribution between the sexes (19 per cent of men compared with 17 per cent of women). The likelihood of having a health problem gradually increased with age with respondents in the oldest age group being twice as likely as those in the youngest age group to report having a long-standing health problem (36 per cent compared with 18 per cent).

Just over a quarter of those with a long standing health problem reported that it limited the amount of paid work that they could do, with slightly more men than women reporting this (28 per cent compared with 24 per cent of women). Forty per cent of those with a health problem reported that it limited the kind of paid work they could do with respondents between 25 and 34 particularly likely to report this. (Table 2.5)

Educational qualifications

The highest qualification of 17 per cent of the sample was a degree or equivalent qualification. A third of the sample held A-levels as their highest qualification and a further third held GCSEs.

While men were more likely than women to have reached degree level or equivalent (19 per cent compared with 14 per cent of women), women were more likely than men to hold either A-levels or GCSEs as their highest qualification.

Respondents in the 25 to 34 age band were the most likely to hold a degree or equivalent qualification with a quarter of this group holding a degree compared with between 8 per cent and 21 per cent of each of the other age groups. Over half the respondents in the youngest age group held A-levels or equivalent as their highest qualification. (Table 2.6)

Age when completed full-time education

Just over a third (35 per cent) of the sample had received a secondary education, completing full-time education at the age of 16. Twenty-one per cent had finished their education at 17 or 18, seven per cent at 19 or 20 and 14 per cent at 21 or over. Nine per cent of the sample were still in full-time education at the time of their LFS interview.

The vast majority (96 per cent) of those in full-time education were aged 24 and under. Over half (58 per cent) of those who completed their full-time education at 15 or under were in the 55+ age group and a quarter of those who completed their education at the age of 21 or older were in the 25 to 34 age group.

Men were slightly more likely than women to have completed their education at the age of 21 or above with 16 per cent of men leaving education at this age compared with 11 per cent of women. Thirteen per cent of women were still in full-time education compared with only five per cent of men. (Table 2.7)

Occupational group

Sixteen per cent of the sample had been in 'elementary occupations' when they left their job, closely followed by 15 per cent in 'sales and customer service' occupations and 14 per cent in 'administrative and secretarial' occupations. Eleven per cent of the sample had been managers or senior officials and 15 per cent had been in professional or associate professional occupations.

Men were much more likely to have been managers or senior officials than women (16 per cent of men compared with six per cent of women). Men were also more likely to have been in professional or associate professional occupations than women.

Women were four times more likely to have been employed in administrative and secretarial' occupations (24 per cent of women compared with 6 per cent of men), three times more likely to have worked in 'personal service' occupations

(13 per cent compared with three per cent) and twice as likely to have been employed in 'sales and customer service' occupations (20 per cent compared with ten per cent).

'Sales and customer service' occupations were much more common among the younger respondents with almost a third (30 per cent) of this group being in the 24 and under age group, compared with between eight per cent and ten per cent in the other age groups. 'Elementary occupations' and 'personal service' occupations were similarly skewed towards the younger respondents with 23 per cent and ten per cent of respondents falling in the youngest age group respectively. Those in the 45 to 54 age group were the most likely to have been managers and seniors officials and 25 to 34 year olds were more likely to have been in professional or associate professional occupations. (Table 2.8)

Industry division

A fifth of all respondents had left jobs in the 'wholesale, retail and motor trade', followed by 17 per cent who had been employed in the manufacturing industry and 12 per cent in the 'real estate, renting and business activity' industry. Other industry classifications only accounted for between one and nine per cent of the total sample.

Almost a quarter (24 per cent) of women had been employed in the 'wholesale, retail and motor industry' with the next most common industry for women being health and social work (16 per cent). For men, the most common industry had been the manufacturing industry (24 per cent) followed by the wholesale, retail and motor industry (18 per cent) and the 'real estate, renting and business activity' industry (15 per cent).

Employment in the 'wholesale, retail and motor trade' was much more common amongst the younger respondents with almost a third (30 per cent) of the youngest age group being employed in this sector. Respondents in the older age groups were more likely to have been employed in the manufacturing industry than any other industry with almost a quarter of both the 45 to 54 age group and the 55 and over age group having been employed in this sector. (Table 2.9)

Full-time/part-time

Sixty-nine per cent of the sample had been in full-time employment when they left their job. Men were much more likely than women to have been employed in full-time positions; 86 per cent of men compared with only 51 per cent of women.

Respondents in the 25 to 34 age group and the 45 to 54 age group were the most likely to have been employed full-time while part-time work was the most common in those respondents in the oldest age group. (Table 2.10)

Reason left last job (LFS reason)

Resignation was by far the most common reason given by respondents for leaving their last job; 45 per cent of all respondents gave this as their reason. Around a third of respondents gave 'other reason' as their reason for leaving

and 17 per cent said that they were made redundant or took voluntary redundancy. Only four per cent of respondents gave either dismissal or early retirement as their reason for leaving their job.

Men were more likely than women to give redundancy/voluntary redundancy as their reason for leaving their job (21 per cent of men compared with 13 per cent of women). Men were also more likely than women to take early retirement or leave work because of a dismissal. Women were slightly more likely than men to have resigned from their job (48 per cent) or to have left for 'other reasons' (36 per cent).

More than half (52 per cent) of those in the 24 and under age group had resigned from their last job and resignations were more common among this age group than any other. Redundancy/voluntary redundancy and early retirement were most common among those in the 55 plus age group (36 per cent and 17 per cent respectively) and dismissals were equally common among the 24 and under and the 45 to 54 age groups (4 per cent). (Table 2.11)

JSS reason for leaving job by LFS reason for leaving last job

The reasons for leaving in the JSS question Whyleft were compared with those given at the LFS question Redylft.

Only those respondents who said in the LFS that they left because of dismissal, resignation, redundancy, early retirement or 'other' reasons were selected to take part in the JSS. However, the JSS question expanded the options made available to respondents to try to gauge the 'real' reason the respondent left their job (in particular, to gain the information first hand for those cases that had been proxy in the LFS) and also to examine how these responses had differed between the two surveys. It must be noted, however, that the wording of the two questions is slightly different and could therefore be interpreted slightly differently by the respondent.

Of the respondents who reported in the LFS that they had been made redundant (or taken voluntary redundancy), 77 per cent also said they had been made redundant when asked again in the JSS. However, eight per cent of these respondents said that they had resigned and a further eight per cent that they had been in a temporary job that ended.

Eighty-five per cent of the respondents who said they had resigned in the LFS also said they left for this reason when asked in the JSS. A further eight per cent said they left for 'other' reasons and five per cent because a temporary job or contract had come to an end.

Of the respondents who reported that they left for 'other' reasons in the LFS, three-quarters said in the JSS that they had resigned. Ten per cent maintained that they left their job for 'other' reasons, nine per cent because a temporary job or contract had ended, five per cent because they were made redundant and just one per cent said that they had been dismissed. (Table 2.12)

3

Socio-demographic correlates of job separations

Introduction

This chapter concentrates on analysis of the main JSS variables by demographic characteristics of the sample. The variables focused on in this chapter are those that form the initial part of the survey, aimed at establishing the true nature of the respondent's separation from their job.

These particular variables were chosen as the subject of the analysis as they set the context of respondents' experiences of leaving their job and can provide very useful information about any relationships that exist in terms of other demographic characteristics of the respondents.

The variables which make up the analysis presented in this chapter include the main reason by which the respondent came to leave their job (i.e. were they dismissed, did they resign, was it a temporary contract etc.) and whether their employer would have allowed them to have stayed on if they had wanted.

Other variables included are those which expand on these; these include length of temporary contract, reason given for their dismissal, reason they decided to leave, conditions under which they could have stayed on and reasons why they had to leave.

Very small bases have been avoided wherever possible because of the relatively high sampling errors attached to small numbers. However, the variables in this chapter were selected because of their importance to the Job separations survey and as a result, they are sometimes included in analyses even where bases are too small for percentage distributions to be displayed.

In many cases small bases have been avoided by not running the distributions by sex, but there are a number of cases where even without this third dimension the bases are rather small. In general, percentage distributions are shown if the base is 30 or more. Where the base is lower actual numbers are shown in square brackets.

Chi-square statistics are also presented with the tables, but again these should be regarded cautiously because of the very small base sizes in some cases.

Main reason respondent left their job (WhyLeft)

All respondents in the survey were asked to give the main reason they left their job. Almost two-thirds of the sample (65 per cent) reported that they resigned from their job. A further 16 per cent had been made redundant, seven per cent had been in a temporary job that came to an end and another seven per cent said they left for 'other reasons'. Only three per cent of the sample reported that they had been dismissed.

Main reason respondent left job by age

Respondents in the youngest age groups were much more likely to report that they had been dismissed with 49 per cent of this group being 24 or under and a further 23 per cent being aged between 25 and 34. Leaving a job because of resignation, 'other reasons' and the end of a temporary contract were also most common among the youngest age group.

Almost a quarter of those who reported being made redundant were aged 25 to 34. Men were more likely than women to have been dismissed, while women were more likely to have resigned. (Table 3.1.1)

Main reason respondent left job by ethnic group

Ninety-four per cent of the sample was white, with only six per cent being from other ethnic minority groups. White respondents were more likely than non-white respondents to have left their job for all of the reasons. None of the non-white respondents reported that they had been dismissed. (Table 3.1.2)

Main reason respondent left job by industry group of last job

A sizeable number of the job separations included in the survey had taken place in the manufacturing industry. This industry accounted for around a quarter of the redundancies (29 per cent), dismissals (24 per cent) and other reasons for leaving (23 per cent). Sixteen per cent of temporary jobs that ended and 13 per cent of resignations also took place in this industry group.

The wholesale, retail and motor trade accounted for a similar number of job separations, accounting for almost a quarter of resignations (24 per cent) and other reasons (21 per cent) and 18 per cent of dismissals.

Sixteen per cent of both the dismissal and redundancies took place in the real estate, renting and business activity industry.

There was little difference in the distributions between men and women. (Table 3.1.3)

Main reason respondent left job by occupation

A fifth of respondents who reported they had been dismissed had been working as process, plant or machine operatives, closely followed by 18 per cent who had been working in sales and customer service occupations.

Those in professional occupations and managers and senior officials were the least likely to be dismissed, accounting for zero and 3 per cent of this group respectively.

Over a fifth of those who reported that they had been made redundant had been working in administrative and secretarial occupations and almost the same amount of those who resigned (18 per cent) had been in sales and customer service occupations.

Women who were made redundant were much more likely to have been in administrative or secretarial occupations than any other (38 per cent compared with between one per cent and 13 per cent in the other groups) while men who were made redundant seemed to be spread across all the occupation types. Almost a fifth (19 per cent) of men who were made redundant had been managers or senior officials. (Table 3.1.4)

Main reason respondent left job by number of employees in last workplace

The majority of the sample had been working in workplaces where there were either 50 or more employees (40 per cent) or where there were ten or less (25 per cent).

Half of those that had been on a temporary contract had been working in a workplace with 50 or more employees while almost a quarter (23 per cent) had been working in the smallest size workplace (ten or fewer employees). This pattern was very similar in each of the groups for which a percentage distribution is available, with 43 per cent of redundancies, 39 per cent of resignations and 30 per cent of 'other reasons' for leaving occurring in workplaces of 50 or more employees, and around a quarter of redundancies, resignations and other reasons for leaving occurring in the workplaces with ten or less employees.

There was no real difference in the distributions between the sexes. (Table 3.1.5)

Main reason respondent left job by whether last job had been full- or part-time

Seventy per cent of the sample had been working full-time when they left their job and 30 per cent had been part-time. There was little variation from this across the different reasons for leaving although there were slightly less part-time among those who had been made redundant (20 per cent compared with between 29 per cent and 32 per cent).

While 87 per cent of men had been full-time in their last job, the divide between full and part-time for women was almost equal (51 per cent full-time and 49 per cent part-time). However, while this split across the different reasons for leaving remained quite even for women, the distribution for men varied somewhat.

Ninety-two per cent of men who had been made redundant and 91 per cent of men who left for other reasons had been in full-time employment. This compares with between 80 per cent and 86 per cent of those who had resigned or had been on a temporary contract. (Table 3.1.6)

Length of temporary contract

Seven per cent of the sample reported that the reason they left their job was that they had been employed in a temporary contract that had come to an end. As the base number of respondents who fell into this category was only 85, the analyses that can be based on them is limited. Summary statistics of this group are outlined below.

Socio-demographic characteristics by length of temporary contract

There were slightly more men than women who had been on a temporary contract that came to an end (54 per cent were males and 46 per cent were women). There was little variation between the sexes across the different contract lengths although men were slightly more likely than women to have had a contract with an unfixed period.

Temporary contracts seemed to be more common among the younger respondents with the distribution of those giving this reason for leaving their job decreasing with age. Only six per cent of those who had been on a temporary contract were aged 55 or over compared with 39 per cent being 24 or under). Respondents in the youngest age group were the most likely to have been on a short contract of three months or less.

White respondents were more likely than non-white respondents to be have been employed for any of the contract lengths although there was no real variation from the overall distributions between these groups. (Table 3.2.1)

Socio-economic characteristics by length of temporary contract

Seventeen per cent of the respondents that had been on temporary contracts had been working in administrative and secretarial occupations and 15 per cent had been in elementary occupations. Managers and senior officials and those in professional or associate professional occupations were the most likely to have had contracts of one to two years and the least likely to have had a contract of an unfixed period.

A fifth of those who had been on a temporary contract had been in the real estate, renting and business activity industry. A further 18 per cent had been in the wholesale, retail and motor trade and 16 per cent in the manufacturing industry.

Half the respondents who had left their job because a temporary contract had come to an end had been working in workplaces of 50 or more employees and almost a quarter (23 per cent) had been in workplaces of ten or less. The majority of those in contracts of three to six months or of no fixed period had been employed in a workplace with 50 or more employees.

Although 70 per cent of all respondents who had been on temporary contracts had been working full-time, those in short contracts of three or less months were equally likely to be full- or part-time. (Table 3.2.2)

Reason given for dismissal

Just three per cent of the sample reported that they had been dismissed from their job. As the base number of respondents who fell into this category was only 32, the analyses that can be based on them are limited. Summary statistics are outlined below. Almost half of the sub-sample of people who had been dismissed gave 'other reasons' as their reason for dismissal.

Socio-demographic characteristics by reason given for dismissal

Of the respondents who reported having been dismissed, 65 per cent were male and 35 per cent were female. Men were much more likely to report having been dismissed because of alleged misconduct but there was little difference between the sexes across the other reasons for dismissal.

Younger respondents were much more likely to have been dismissed than the older group with almost half (49 per cent) of the respondents who had been dismissed being aged 24 and under and a further 23 per cent being between 25 and 34. Respondents in the youngest age group were more likely to have been dismissed because of alleged misconduct or 'other' reasons.

None of the non-white respondents had been dismissed. (Table 3.3.1)

Socio-economic characteristics by reason given for dismissal

Almost a quarter of those who had been dismissed had been working in the manufacturing industry, 18 per cent had been in the wholesale, retail and motor trade and 16 per cent had been in the real estate, renting and business activity industry.

Of the respondents who had been dismissed for misconduct, half of these had been employed in the manufacturing industry. There were no other real relationships between reason for dismissal and industry type.

A fifth of those that had been dismissed had been employed as process, plant or machinery operatives closely followed by 18 per cent in sales and customer service occupations and 17 per cent each in associate professional and elementary occupations. It was not possible to discern any relationships between reason given for dismissal and occupation.

Thirty-four per cent of all those who had been dismissed had been working in a company of 50 or more employees and this group accounted for half of the cases dismissed for alleged misconduct. A further 22 per cent had been employed in a workplace with between 11 and 19 employees.

Of those who had been dismissed, 70 per cent had been employed full-time. There was no difference between full and part-time employees with regards to their reason for being dismissed. (Table 3.3.2)

Whether employer has allowed respondent to stay in job

Respondents who answered that they left their job (at WhyLeft) for any other reason than being dismissed were asked if their employer would have allowed them to stay. In addition, respondents who gave their reason for dismissal as

being that their job came to an end were asked this question. The aim of this question was to try to clarify whether the decision to leave the job had been the respondent's or the employer's.

Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of the respondents reported that their employer would have allowed them to have stayed on if they had wished. For almost a quarter (23 per cent), staying on in their job had not been an option that was available to them.

Whether respondent could have stayed on by age

Over a third of those that could have stayed on in their jobs were in the 24 and under age group and the likelihood of being able to stay on decreased with age so that only 5 per cent of those that could have stayed on were 55 or over.

Respondents in the younger age groups were the most likely to have had to leave with 23 per cent of the 24 and under age group and 26 per cent of the 25 to 34 years group falling into this category.

Of the women who could have stayed on 40 per cent were in the youngest age group and almost a third (30 per cent) of those women that had to leave were aged between 25 and 34. By contrast, men in the 25 to 34 years age group were the most likely to be able to stay on (29 per cent) and those in the 24 and under age group the most likely to have had to leave (25 per cent). (Table 3.4.1)

Whether respondent could have stayed on by ethnic group

Ninety-four per cent of all of the respondents who answered this question were white with just 6 per cent of other ethnic origins. There was no difference between the ethnic groups with regard to whether or not the respondent would have been allowed to stay in their job. (Table 3.4.2)

Whether respondent could have stayed on by industry group in last job

Of the respondents that had to leave their job, almost a quarter (23 per cent) had been employed in the manufacturing industry. Seventeen per cent of those who had to leave had been employed in the wholesale, retail and motor trade and a further 16 per cent had been employed in the real estate, renting and business activity industry. Almost a quarter of those who could have stayed on had been employed in the wholesale, retail and motor trade industry.

There was very little difference in the distributions with regard to sex. (Table 3.4.3)

Whether respondent could have stayed on by occupation in last job

Seventeen per cent of respondents who had to leave their job had been employed in elementary occupations, 16 per cent in administrative and secretarial occupations and 13 per cent had been managers or senior officials. However, the distribution of these percentages is not dissimilar to those who could have stayed on.

Women who had to leave were much more likely than men to have been employed in administrative and secretarial occupations (28 per cent compared

with 9 per cent). Men who had to leave were more likely than women to have been managers or senior officials or employed in professional occupations (16 per cent compared with 6 per cent and 13 per cent compared with five per cent respectively). (Table 3.4.4)

Whether respondent had to leave by number of employees in last workplace

The distribution of those who had to leave and those who could have stayed on across the different workplace sizes were almost identical. In addition, they did not really vary from the overall distribution of the population who answered this question.

There was no real difference in the distributions for men or women, or between the sexes. (Table 3.4.5)

Whether respondent had to leave by whether full- or part-time in last job

Seventy per cent of the respondents who were asked this question had been full-time in their last job. A greater proportion of those who had to leave had been full-time than those who could have stayed on (77 per cent compared with 68 per cent). This could be explained by the fact that a good proportion of the sample were students in full-time education that left their part-time jobs voluntarily to concentrate on their education. This suggestion is backed up by analysis of the age at which the respondent left full-time education by whether they had been full- or part-time in their last job. While only two per cent of those in full-time employment had still been in full-time education, 25 per cent of the part-time respondents were still in education. (Table 3.4.6.1)

There were no real differences in the distribution between the sexes. (Table 3.4.6)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on

Those respondents who answered that their employer would have allowed them to have stayed on in their jobs were asked to give the conditions under which they could have stayed on; that is, what they would have had to have done or accepted in order to stay on.

Almost three-quarters of those that could have stayed in their jobs (72 per cent) reported that they could have just continued in their job as before. Seventeen per cent could have negotiated a change in their working conditions with their employer and seven per cent could have unwillingly accepted a change in their working conditions. Three per cent of the sample could have done something else and one per cent could have taken a temporary contract.

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by age

Over a third (38 per cent) of all those respondents who could have negotiated a change in their working conditions fell into the 24 or under category. This group was also the most likely to have been able to have stayed in their job by continuing in the job as before (36 per cent) or doing something else (50 per cent).

The likelihood of these conditions for staying on applying to the respondent decreased as the age of the respondent increased. An exception to this rule are respondents who could have stayed on by unwillingly accepting a change in their working conditions who were much more likely to fall into the older age groups; 39 per cent of this group were aged 45 to 54 and a third were 35 to 44.

Women in the youngest age group (24 and under) were more likely than men of the same age to have been able to negotiate a change in their working conditions (43 per cent compared with 30 per cent) and to have continued in the job as before (41 per cent compared with 32 per cent). Men in the 45 to 54 age group were more likely than women of the same age to have had to unwillingly accept a change in their working conditions to have stayed on (47 per cent compared with 30 per cent). (Table 3.5.1)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by ethnic group

White respondents were more likely than non-white respondents to have been able to have stayed in their job by any of the conditions suggested in the questionnaire, but the distribution did not differ from that of the general population. There was no difference in the distribution between the sexes. (Table 3.5.2)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by industry group in last job

Respondents who could have stayed on by continuing in their job as before were more likely to be in the wholesale, retail or motor trade than any other industry group (24 per cent compared with between 0 per cent and 15 per cent). Around a quarter of those who could have unwillingly accepted a change in their working conditions were in either the wholesale, retail and motor trade (23 per cent) or the manufacturing industry (22 per cent). This pattern was almost identical for those respondents who could have stayed on in some other way. Those respondents who could have negotiated a change in their working conditions were most likely to have been employed in real estate, renting or business activity (17 per cent) or in health and social work (15 per cent).

Just over a quarter of women (27 per cent) who could have continued in their job as before had been employed in the wholesale, retail and motor trade. Men in this category were equally likely to have been in the wholesale, retail and motor trade or the manufacturing industry (21 per cent each).

Of those respondents who could have negotiated a change in their working conditions, women were much more likely than men to have been employed in health and social work (22 per cent compared with 5 per cent) while men were twice as likely as women to have been employed in the manufacturing industry (16 per cent compared with eight per cent). (Table 3.5.3)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by occupation in last job

A quarter of those respondents who could have stayed on by unwillingly accepting a change in their working conditions had been working in administrative and secretarial occupations. Seventeen per cent of this group had been managers of senior officials. Over a quarter (26 per cent) of those

who could have stayed on by some other means had been working in elementary occupations.

Almost half (46 per cent) of women, but only three per cent of men, who could have stayed on by unwillingly accepting a change in their working conditions had been working in administrative or secretarial occupations.

Women who could have stayed on by continuing in their job as before were twice as likely as men in this group to have been working in sales or customer service occupations (24 per cent compared with 12 per cent). (Table 3.5.4)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by number of employees in last workplace

The majority of respondents who would have been allowed to have stayed on in their job had been employed in a workplace with 50 or more employees (39 per cent), and almost a quarter had been employed in a workplace with 10 or fewer employees. This pattern remains for all of the conditions under which the respondent could have stayed on.

Over half (54 per cent) of the men who could have stayed in their job by negotiating a change in their working conditions had been employed in a workplace with 50 or more employees. This compares with about a third (32 per cent) of women. There was little other difference in the distributions between the sexes. (Table 3.5.5)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on by whether full- or part-time in last job

Of the respondents who could have stayed in their job, 68 per cent had been in full-time work and 32 per cent had been part-time. Respondents who could have stayed on by accepting a change in their working conditions were particularly likely to have been full-time (78 per cent) as were those who could have stayed on by other means (77 per cent). This was true for both men and women with 94 per cent of men who could have unwillingly accepted a change in their conditions being full-time, and 62 per cent of women in the same group being full-time. (Table 3.5.6)

Reason respondent had to leave

Twenty-three per cent of the sample reported that they would not have been allowed to have stayed on in their job. Respondents who did report this situation were asked to give the reason why they had to leave. The base number of the sub-sample in each of the answer categories is very small in some cases and as such, the analyses that can be based on this are limited. Summary statistics of this variable are outlined below.

Socio-demographic characteristics by reason respondent had to leave

Sixty-five per cent of the respondents who had to leave were male and 35 per cent were female. Men accounted for almost three-quarters (71 per cent) of respondents who reported that their job was no longer there. Men were also slightly more likely than woman to report that they had to leave their job because the company closed down/ceased trading (53 per cent of men

compared with 47 per cent of women) and that they had to leave for personal reasons (57 per cent of men compared with 43 per cent of women). More men than women also reported that they had to leave because of a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues.

Just over a quarter (26 per cent) of respondents that had to leave were aged between 25 and 34 and slightly less than a quarter (23 per cent) were 24 or under. Over a quarter of those who reported they had to leave because their company closed down were in the 55 or over age group and a quarter of those whose job was no longer there were aged between 25 and 34.

Of the respondents who gave personal reasons as their reason for having to leave, 13 per cent were non-white compared with between 0 per cent and 6 per cent of non-white representation in each of the other reasons. (Table 3.6.1)

Socio-economic characteristics by reason had to leave

Seventeen per cent of all those respondents who had to leave had been employed in elementary occupations and 16 per cent had been employed in administrative or secretarial occupations.

Around a quarter (22 per cent) of those who had to leave because their company closed down had been employed in administrative or secretarial occupations and the same proportion had been in skilled trades or craft related occupations. Eighteen per cent of respondents who reported that their job was no longer there had been employed in elementary occupations and a further 16 per cent had been managers or senior officials. A fifth of those who left for personal reasons had been process, plant or machinery operatives and 18 per cent had worked in associate professional occupations.

Almost a quarter (23 per cent) of those who had to leave had been employed in the manufacturing industry and it was this industry that accounted for the majority of respondents who left because the company closed down (28 per cent) and because their job was no longer there (23 per cent). Almost a quarter (24 per cent) of those who reported having to leave for personal reasons had been employed in the wholesale, retail and motor trade.

Almost half (45 per cent) of respondents who left for personal reasons had been employed in workplaces of 50 or more employees and a similar proportion (44 per cent) of respondents whose jobs were no longer there had also been employed in a workplace of this size. The majority of those whose company had closed down/ceased trading had been working in a company of ten or fewer employees.

Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of all those respondents who had to leave had been in full-time employment. A third of those whose company had closed down had been in part-time employment compared with a fifth of those whose job was no longer there and 22 per cent of those who had to leave for personal reasons.

Main reason respondent decided to leave

A third of the sample had already found another job when they left their LFS reference job, and a further 25 per cent left because they wanted another job. Seven per cent of the sample left to undertake or concentrate on education and four per cent had had a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues.

Again, the base numbers of some of the sub-samples of this group are very small and the analyses that can be done on the variable are limited. Summary statistics are outlined below.

Socio-demographic characteristics by main reason respondent decided to leave their job

The sub-sample of respondents who resigned from their jobs was split almost equally between men and women with 51 per cent being female and 49 per cent being male. Men were more likely than women to have resigned because of a dispute with their employer (61 per cent compared with 39 per cent) and women were slightly more likely to have left to undertake or concentrate on education (57 per cent compared with 43 per cent of men).

Younger respondents were more likely to have resigned from their jobs with 37 per cent of those aged 24 and under having decided to leave their job compared with only five per cent of those aged 55 and over. The likelihood of having resigned decreased as the age of respondent increased.

Eighty per cent of those who decided to leave in order to undertake or concentrate on education were aged 24 or under, 17 per cent were 25 to 34 and three per cent were 35 to 44 years of age. Respondents in the youngest age group were also more likely to have left for other reasons.

Nine per cent of respondents who left to undertake or concentrate on education were non-white, as were nine per cent of those who left for other reasons. White respondents were more likely to have left to become self-employed, for reasons relating to their own health or to take a rest/ increase their leisure time. (Table 3.7.1)

Socio-economic characteristics by main reason respondent decided to leave their job

Of the respondents who decided to leave their jobs, 17 per cent had been employed in sales and customer service occupations and 16 per cent had been in elementary occupations. Almost a third (30 per cent) of respondents who left to undertake or concentrate on education had been employed in sales and customer service occupations and around a quarter (24 per cent) had been in elementary occupations. A similar pattern was found in all the other reasons for leaving.

Almost a quarter (22 per cent) of those who decided to leave their job had been working in the wholesale, retail and motor trade, 15 per cent had been employed in manufacturing and 12 per cent had been in real estate, renting and business activity related industries.

A third of those who left to undertake or concentrate on education had been in the wholesale, retail and motor trade and almost a third (32 per cent) of those who had had a dispute or disagreement with an employer or colleague had been in the construction industry. A quarter of those who wanted another job had been employed in the wholesale, retail or motor trade.

The most common workplace size of all respondents who decided to leave their job was 50 or more employees (40 per cent) with the next most common size being ten or fewer employees (25 per cent of the sample). This pattern was consistent throughout all the reasons for deciding to leave.

Just over two-thirds (66 per cent) of all respondents who decided to leave their job had been full-time, as had almost 80 per cent of those who had found another job. Of those who left to undertake or concentrate on education, slightly more were part-time, with 58 per cent being part-time and 42 per cent being full-time. (Table 3.7.2)

4

JSS variables by main reason respondent left job (WhyLeft)

Chapter 4 concentrates on the details of the respondent's experience of leaving their job. This includes, among other things, how they came to leave their job, what help or advice the respondent was offered or received about leaving their job and whether they went through a tribunal or other grievance procedure.

The first section presents the initial questions of the JSS that establish the exact circumstances by which the respondent came to leave their job.

The next section concentrates on those respondents who had experienced compulsory severance from their jobs; that is, those who had been dismissed, were made redundant or had had a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues. This section includes details of any grievance procedures the respondent went through, as well the outcome of these.

The third part of the chapter concentrates on the payments the compulsory severance group of respondents received or felt they should have received.

The fourth section of this chapter concentrates on those respondents who voluntarily resigned from their jobs. It covers the reason why they decided to leave their job, whether they had to give notice, how much notice they had to give and, if they left to get or take up another job, why they wanted another job.

The fifth section covers details of any payments the respondents that voluntarily resigned received, or felt they were entitled to.

The final section of the chapter covers all respondents and includes details of whether the respondent had a job to go to when they left their reference job, how long they looked for work and by what methods and details of their new job, if appropriate. It also covers questions that asked about the respondents' pension schemes, whether they had started, or considered starting, their own business, whether they had done any voluntary work and whether they had been in receipt of any benefits, such as Job Seekers Allowance.

All of the variables covered in this chapter are presented in analyses by the main reason the respondent left their job (WhyLeft).

In many cases the base number of respondents in the sub-samples are very small and it is not always possible to discuss the relationship in terms of

percentages. Where base numbers are less than 30, summary relationships are given of the variables and actual numbers are shown in the tables in square brackets.

Circumstances under which the respondent left their job

All of the respondents in the JSS were asked questions about how they came to leave their job. The aim of these initial questions was to establish the exact reason they left their job, and the factors surrounding this, as well as whether it had been their decision to leave or their employer had 'asked' them to.

Reason respondent was dismissed

Of the respondents who were dismissed from their jobs, almost half (48 per cent) gave 'other reasons' as the reason given for their dismissal, and almost a quarter (24 per cent) were dismissed because of alleged misconduct. Nine per cent of respondents reported that the reason for their dismissal was alleged inefficiency and a further nine per cent reported that their employer had not given them a reason. (Table 4.1.1)

Whether respondent could have stayed on

Respondents who gave 'job came to an end' as their reason for being dismissed, or had left for any other reason were asked whether their employer would have allowed them to have stayed or whether they had to leave.

More than three-quarters (77 per cent) of the respondents could have stayed in their jobs, while just less than a quarter (23 per cent) reported that they had to leave.

Ninety-four per cent of those who had resigned could have stayed in their jobs, while six per cent said that they would not have been allowed to have stayed on. Of those who were made redundant more than three-quarters (77 per cent) had no choice about leaving their job while 23 per cent could have stayed on if they had wanted to. Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of those who left for 'other' reasons could have stayed in their jobs. (Table 4.1.2)

Reason respondent had to leave

Of those respondents who said that their employer would not have allowed them to stay, over half (56 per cent) said this was because the job was no longer there and a fifth said that the company they had been working for closed down/ceased trading. Eleven per cent left because of personal reasons.

Of the respondents who resigned from their jobs, 37 per cent did so for personal reasons, 21 per cent had had a dispute or disagreement with an employer or colleague and 14 per cent had been in a job or contract that had ended.

Of those who were made redundant, 67 per cent said the reason they had to leave was because the job had ended and 31 per cent reported that the company they had been working for closed down or ceased trading.

Eighty-one per cent of respondents who left because a temporary job had come to an end gave 'job no longer there' as the reason they had to leave and 11 per cent gave personal reasons. A further four per cent reported that the company they were working for closed down, three per cent reported an imposed change in working conditions and two per cent had to leave because they had had too much sickness absence. (Table 4.1.3)

Conditions under which respondent could have stayed on

Eighty-two per cent of all the respondents who could have stayed in their job had resigned. Seven per cent left for 'other reasons', five per cent had been made redundant (or taken voluntary redundancy), four per cent had been in a temporary job which had come to an end and two per cent had taken early retirement.

Of the respondents who had resigned, almost three-quarters (74 per cent) could have stayed on by continuing in the job as before, 17 per cent could have negotiated a change in their working conditions and five per cent could have unwillingly accepted a change in their working conditions.

Only 42 per cent of those who were made redundant could have stayed on by continuing in their job as before. Forty-four per cent of this group would have had to have unwillingly accepted a change in their working conditions if they had stayed and ten per cent could have negotiated a change in their working conditions with their employer. Four per cent would have done something else.

A quarter of those who left their job because a temporary contract had come to an end could have stayed on by negotiating a change in their working conditions and almost two-thirds (60 per cent) of this group could have continued in their job as before. (Table 4.1.4)

Respondents' experiences of help, advice and grievance procedures

Respondents who had been dismissed, made redundant or had left because of a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues were routed through a section of questions asking about any help or advice they were offered/received, as well as any grievance procedures they went through. This section of the chapter presents the responses to these questions.

An alternative route was introduced into the questionnaire at the question WhyLeave with the aim of picking up respondents who had left because of a dispute but who had not answered to this effect in the preliminary questions.

As the route was placed there as a means to pick up people who should have been routed through the dispute/grievance procedures section originally, the responses to these two sets of questions have been combined.

Whether employer offered respondent independent advice

On leaving their jobs, 16 per cent of the respondents who were dismissed, made redundant or involved in a dispute were offered independent advice from outside of the organisation they were working for. Eighty-four per cent of respondents were not offered this sort of help.

Almost a third (30 per cent) of respondents who were made redundant were offered independent advice and nine per cent of those who left for other reasons were offered this sort of help. None of the respondents who were dismissed were offered independent advice. (Table 4.2.1)

Whether respondent took up offer of receiving advice

Of the respondents who were offered independent advice from outside of the organisation, 65 per cent took up the offer. Respondents who resigned were the most likely to have received this independent advice, with two-thirds of this group reporting that they took the employer up on the offer. (Table 4.2.2)

Trade union membership

Just 16 per cent of the respondents asked reported that they had been a member of a trade union. A fifth of both those who had been made redundant and those who left for 'other' reasons had belonged to a trade union, as had 17 per cent of those who had resigned. Only four per cent of those who had been in a temporary job or contract that came to an end had been a member of a trade union. (Table 4.2.3)

Whether respondent sought help or advice from trade union

Trade union members did not necessarily use the union as a source of help, with only 42 per cent of such respondents reporting that they sought help or advice from their trade union.

Respondents who were made redundant were the most likely to use their union as a source of help, with 66 per cent of this group having followed this path. (Table 4.2.4)

Whether respondent sought advice from anyone else

All the respondents who were asked if their employer had offered them independent advice were asked if they asked anyone else for advice regarding having to leave their job. 'Someone else' could mean a person or organisation. Around a quarter (24 per cent) had gone elsewhere for advice.

Almost a third (31 per cent) of those who had resigned had asked someone else for advice and around a quarter of those who left for other reasons, those who were dismissed and those who were made redundant also asked for someone else's help or advice (27 per cent, 24 per cent and 23 per cent respectively). Only nine per cent of those who had left because a temporary contract came to an end had sought advice from outside the company. (Table 4.2.5)

Sources of help and advice

Over half the respondents (53 per cent) who asked someone else for advice had sought this advice from someone other than those people/organisations given in the question. Respondents were equally likely to have approached a Citizen's Advice Bureau and a solicitor to get help or advice about leaving their job, but very few respondents asked Acas for advice.

Of the other people/organisations mentioned, particularly common were an employer or colleague (including ex-colleagues) and family and friends. (Table 4.2.6)

Whether employer had an internal grievance procedure

Forty-four per cent of the respondents reported that their employer had had an internal grievance procedure and 29 per cent said that there had been no such procedure in operation. More than a quarter (27 per cent) of the sample were unsure whether or not such a procedure existed.

Respondents who had been made redundant were more likely than those leaving for any other reason to report that there had been an internal grievance procedure in existence in their company. These respondents were also more likely to report that a procedure existed than to report that it either did not or that they did not know (53 per cent said they were sure a procedure existed compared with 26 per cent who said that it did not and 21 per cent who were unsure).

Respondents who had resigned and who had been in a temporary job or contract that came to an end were also more likely to be sure that such a procedure existed in their company than to say that there was no procedure or that they didn't know.

Almost half (48 per cent) of those respondents who had been dismissed reported that there was no internal grievance procedure in their company, as did 41 per cent of those who left for 'other reasons'. Almost a third (32 per cent) of those who had been in a temporary job that came to an end did not know whether their employer had had an internal grievance procedure. (Table 4.2.7)

Use of internal grievance procedures

Respondents who had been sure that an internal grievance procedure had existed in their company were asked whether or not they had used the procedure to challenge having to leave their job.

Only eight per cent of respondents who were sure that an internal grievance procedure had existed in their old workplace had used it to challenge having to leave their job.

Fifteen per cent of those who had resigned and just two per cent of those who had been made redundant used the internal grievance procedure in place at their workplace.

Respondents who used an internal grievance procedure were asked if they had a meeting with their employer to try to resolve the matter. Because the base number of respondents using such procedures is so small, it is not possible to talk about further details of these cases in terms of proportions, and actual numbers have been used in the tables pertaining to these variables.

Of the sample who used an internal grievance procedure, more respondents had a meeting with their employer than not. Almost all of those who had a

meeting with their employer were allowed to take a representative to the meeting with them and it was common for this representative to have been a trade union representative. (Table 4.2.8)

Whether anyone suggested taking the case to an employment tribunal

All the respondents routed through this set of questions were asked whether anyone had suggested taking their case to an employment tribunal. Ninety-three per cent of the sample reported that no one had suggested this to them. Of the seven per cent to whom someone did suggest they take their case to a tribunal, one per cent said it was the trade union that suggested it, one per cent said it was an advisor and five per cent reported that it had been someone else.

Respondents who had been dismissed and those who left for other reasons were most likely to have had someone suggest that they go to a tribunal (18 per cent and 14 per cent respectively compared with between four per cent and seven per cent in the other groups). (Table 4.2.9)

Whether respondent applied to an employment tribunal

Respondents were asked if they had made an application to an employment tribunal, regardless of whether or not anyone had suggested it to them.

Only three per cent of the respondents had made an application to a tribunal. Respondents who had been dismissed were the most likely to have made such an application (16 per cent) followed by two per cent of those who had been made redundant and one per cent of those who resigned. (Table 4.2.10)

What happened to the tribunal application

Again, the base number of respondents who had made an application to a tribunal was very small and it is not possible to present more detailed analyses surrounding these applications in terms of proportions.

Among those respondents who had been dismissed, three of the tribunal cases were still pending and one had been dropped. The respondent who had resigned had settled their case with their employer and those who were made redundant were equally likely to have settled the case or for it to still have been pending at the time of interview.

Of the cases that had been settled, Acas had been involved in agreeing three out of four of the cases.

Respondents who went through an internal grievance procedure and/or a tribunal case were asked what the final outcome of all these procedures had been. In most cases the respondent had received extra monetary compensation as a result of their procedures and they were equally likely to have received other compensation or to have agreed a private settlement with their employer.

The amount of extra monetary compensation received as a result of grievance procedures varied from respondent to respondent and ranged between £345 and £ 20,000. (Table 4.2.11)

Payments received by respondents who were dismissed, made redundant or left their job because of a dispute or disagreement

All of the respondents who left their job because they were dismissed, made redundant or had had a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues were asked about any payments they received from their employer. If they did not receive any payments, they were asked whether there were any payments that they felt they were entitled to but did not receive.

Whether or not respondent received any payments

Fifty-nine per cent of the respondents who had left because of a dismissal, redundancy or a dispute reported that they did not receive any payments when they left their job. Forty-one per cent of respondents did receive some kind of payment from their employer.

Sixty-four per cent of respondents who had been made redundant and 62 per cent of those who had taken early retirement received some sort of payment when they left their job. This compares with just 22 per cent of those who had resigned, 12 per cent of those who had been in a temporary job that came to an end and just ten per cent of those who had been dismissed. Just over a quarter (28 per cent) of those who left for 'other reasons' received a payment when they left their job. (Table 4.3.1)

Whether respondent felt they should have received any payment(s)

Of the respondents who did not receive any payments from their employer when they left their job, 20 per cent felt that there were payments that they were entitled to.

Around a quarter of respondents who had been made redundant (27 per cent) felt that there were payments which they should have received that they did not. Seventeen per cent of those who resigned also felt that they had been entitled to a payment that they didn't receive. (Table 4.3.2)

Payments respondents felt they were entitled to but did not receive

Respondents who felt that they were entitled to payments that they did not receive were asked what payments they felt they were owed. Almost two-fifths of respondents (38 per cent) felt they were entitled to be paid for leave they had outstanding and two-fifths felt they should have received payment for something else. A quarter felt they should have received compensation for the loss of their job and 22 per cent that they should have received payment in lieu of notice. A further 16 per cent felt they were owed back pay and ten per cent pension payments.

'Other' payments mentioned as ones which respondents felt they should have received included bonus payments, expenses, shares and compensation for other things (e.g. loss of the use of a company car).

Respondents who had been made redundant were more likely than those leaving for other reasons to feel that they were entitled to monies which they did not receive. No one who had taken early retirement had retired at the

normal age or who had left because a temporary contract had come to an end felt they were entitled to payments that they did not receive. (Table 4.3.2.1)

Payments respondent did (or will) receive

Respondents who did receive a payment, or payments, from their employer when they left their job were asked for further details about what these payments were. Almost two-thirds (63 per cent) of those respondents who received a payment when they left their job received money as compensation for losing their job and over half (56 per cent) received money for leave they had outstanding. Thirty per cent received money in lieu of notice, 15 per cent received payments for something else and seven per cent received pension payments.

The vast majority (76 per cent) of those who did, or will, receive payments from their employer had been made redundant. Of this group, 58 per cent had received compensation for the loss of their job, 40 per cent had received payment for leave outstanding, a quarter had received payment in lieu of notice and ten per cent had received back pay, or payment for hours worked. Just four per cent of those who had been made redundant received any sort of pension payment.

The base numbers of respondents in the other type of job separations who received a payment, or payments, from their employer are too small to look at in terms of proportions.

A small number of respondents, the majority of whom had left their job because they had been made redundant, reported that they received payments for things other than those that were listed. The most common 'other' payments that were received were bonus payments, goodwill or loyalty payments and compensation for other things (such as loss of the use of a company car). (Table 4.3.3)

Amount received for payments

The base number of respondents in receipt of many of the payments covered in the questionnaire is very small and it therefore is not possible to talk about all of them in terms of percentages. Where the base is greater than 30, percentages have been used but otherwise actual numbers are presented.

The number of respondents in receipt of back pay was very small and it was only those who had been made redundant and those who had resigned that reported receiving this kind of payment. The most common amount to have received for back pay was between £200 and £500.

The most common amount of money received for payment in lieu of notice was between £1,000 and £5000; almost two-thirds (65 per cent) of respondents in receipt of this payment reported that it was within this margin. Sixteen per cent of respondents reported that their payment for lieu of notice was between £5,000 and £10,000 and ten per cent reported that their payment had been in the region of £200 to £500. None of the respondents received less than £100 for this type of payment and only four per cent of the respondents received over £10,000.

The majority of respondents who received compensation for the loss of their job received less than £5,000 (48 per cent). The next most common amount received was between £5,000 and £10,000 (20 per cent of respondents), followed by 16 per cent of respondents who received between £10,000 and £25,000. Respondents were unlikely to have received over £25,000 as compensation for their job with only ten per cent receiving £25,000 to £50,000 and four per cent receiving over £100,000.

Respondents who had received compensation for the loss of their job were asked to provide information about what this payment had been equivalent to in terms of their usual salary. Over two-thirds (68 per cent) of the respondents who received compensation for the loss of their job (or redundancy pay) reported that this pay was equal to six months or less salary and 18 per cent received an amount equal to between one and two years' salary. (Table 4.3.4a)

Respondents who stated that they received payments relating to their pension were asked whether this had been a lump sum, the start of their regular pension payments or a refund of the contributions they had made (or any combination of these).

Very few respondents received payments relating to their pensions when they left their job. The majority of pension payments that were made were the start of the respondent's regular pension payments. Only one respondent received a refund of the pension payments they had made.

Regular pension payments varied between £120 and £1,200 per month. Most of the regular payments lay between £250 and £499 a month. The amount received for lump sum pension payments varied anywhere between £5,000 and £100,000. The respondent who received a refund of their contributions received £200. (Table 4.3.4b)

Almost a third (34 per cent) of respondents who received a payment for leave not taken received between £200 and £500. The next most common amount to receive for this kind of payment was less than £100 (18 per cent) and respondents were equally likely to have received between £500 and £1,000 and between £1,000 and £5,000 (17 per cent each).

Respondents who had been made redundant were more likely to have received between £200 and £500 than any other amount (36 per cent of this group had received this amount compared with between 0 per cent and 24 per cent receiving any of the other amounts).

Of the respondents who reported receiving 'other' payments from their employer when they left their job, the most common amount to have received was between £1,000 and £5,000. It was very unlikely for respondents to have received £5,000 or over. (Table 4.3.4c)

The experience of respondents who voluntarily resigned from their jobs

Respondents who reported that they could have stayed in their jobs by either continuing as before, negotiating a change in their working conditions or by some other means were routed into a section of questions about voluntary

resignations. Respondents who said they had to leave because of personal reasons, were also routed on to this section.

Questions in this section covered whether the respondent had to give notice, why the respondent wanted to leave their job and whether they viewed this as giving up work permanently or taking a break.

Whether the respondent had to give notice of their intention to leave

Of these respondents, over three-quarters (78 per cent) had to give their employer notice of their intention to leave.

Respondents who had been working in a temporary job that came to an end were the least likely to have had to give notice; only 36 per cent of this group reported that they did had to give a period of notice, compared with between 67 per cent and 83 per cent in the other groups.

Respondents who had resigned were the most likely to have had to give notice (83 per cent). (Table 4.4.1)

Length of notice served

Respondents who did have to give notice were asked both how much notice they had to give and how much notice they actually served.

Of the respondents who did have to give their employer notice of their intention to leave, 63 per cent had to give between two to four weeks' notice. Thirty-seven per cent of the respondents had to give just one week's notice.

Half the respondents actually served between two and four weeks notice, and a third of the respondents served only a week's notice. Seven per cent of respondents served between five and 12 weeks' notice and four per cent served over 12 weeks' notice. Seven per cent of the respondents who said that they had to give their employer notice of their intention to leave did not serve any time on notice.

Half those respondents who left their jobs for 'other' reasons only served one week of notice and around a third served two to four weeks. (Table 4.4.1)

Main reason respondent decided to leave job

Of the respondents who had to leave their job because of personal reasons or could have stayed on by either continuing in the job as before, negotiating a change in their working conditions or doing something else, a third had found another job and a quarter left because they wanted another job. Almost a quarter decided to leave for 'other reasons'.

Seven per cent of the respondents left to undertake or concentrate on education and four per cent left because of a dispute or disagreement with their employer or colleagues. Few respondents left for the other reasons provided, with only two per cent leaving to look after their own children, two per cent because they wanted to become self-employed and one per cent to take a rest or increase their leisure time.

Over a third (36 per cent) of respondents who had resigned left their job because they had already found another one and over a quarter (27 per cent) left because they wanted a new job. A further six per cent left to undertake or concentrate on education and five per cent of those who resigned did so because of a dispute or disagreement with an employer or colleague.

Of those respondents who left a temporary job that had come to an end, over a quarter (27 per cent) had found another job and a over a fifth (22 per cent) left to undertake or concentrate on education. Thirty-eight per cent of this group reported that they decided to leave their job for 'other' reasons. (Table 4.4.2)

Other reasons given for deciding to leave job

The 'other' reasons given by respondents for deciding to leave their job were very varied. It was possible in some cases to code the 'other' reasons back into the original coding frame; for example, ten per cent of the other reasons given were to undertake or concentrate on education, nine per cent were to get another job and five per cent wanted to take a rest or increase their leisure time.

Fifteen per cent of respondents giving 'other' reasons as their reason for deciding to leave their job reported that they left either because they moved house or because the distance or travelling to their job was too much. Nine per cent of respondents reported that their contract ended, or there was a shortage of work, eight per cent wanted a change in their hours or workload and seven per cent left because they wanted better pay. Five per cent of left because their employer had enforced changes in their job or work.

Respondents who resigned from their jobs and gave 'other' reasons for leaving were most likely to report that they left because they had either moved or the distance or travelling to their job was too much, with 17 per cent of respondents giving reasons which fell into this category. Fourteen per cent of respondents wanted better working conditions or terms of employment, 12 per cent left to undertake or concentrate on education and ten per cent left because they wanted another job. (Table 4.4.2.1)

Whether respondent viewed leaving as permanently leaving work or taking a break

Respondents who decided to leave their job because of their own health, to look after their own children, to look after another person, to undertake or concentrate on education or to take a rest/increase their leisure time were asked whether they viewed leaving their job as taking a break from work or giving up work permanently.

Ninety per cent of the respondents asked, viewed leaving their jobs as a temporary break from work and just ten per cent felt they were giving up work permanently.

Seven per cent of respondents who resigned and just three per cent of those who left because a temporary job came to an end viewed their leaving as giving up work permanently. (Table 4.4.3)

Reasons given for getting or wanting to get another job

Respondents who said that they decided to leave their jobs because they either wanted, or had found, another job were asked to give reasons why they had wanted another job. The respondents were able to give as many reasons as they wanted and as such the totals add to more than 100 per cent.

Over half (51 per cent) the respondents said they wanted better career prospects and almost a half (47 per cent) said they wanted better pay. Thirty-eight per cent of respondents said they wanted better working conditions and around a third (32 per cent) said they wanted another job for 'other reasons'. Thirty per cent of respondents wanted a change of hours and 16 per cent wanted more family-friendly working conditions. (Table 4.4.4)

Other reasons for getting or wanting to get another job

The 'other' reasons given by respondents for getting, or wanting to get, another job were quite varied. It was possible, in some cases, to code the 'other' reasons back into the original coding frame. For example, over a third of the respondents (36 per cent) said that they wanted more family-friendly working conditions, 18 per cent said they wanted a change in their hours and six per cent said they wanted better working conditions.

Seventeen per cent of those who gave other reasons for wanting to get another job said that the reason was the distance or travelling involved in the job they had left. Five per cent of respondents reported that they had been made redundant or there was a shortage of work and four per cent wanted to get another job because of a dispute or conflict with their employer or colleagues. (Table 4.4.4.1)

Family-friendly working conditions desired

Respondents who reported that they wanted another job because they wanted more family-friendly working arrangements were asked what conditions they were looking for.

The majority of the respondents (62 per cent) said they wanted some other condition than was provided on the list of pre-codes. Seventeen per cent said they wanted to work closer to home, 14 per cent wanted flexi-time arrangements, six per cent wanted time off to care for their children or other dependents and one per cent wanted childcare facilities at or near their workplace. (Table 4.4.5)

Whether respondent worked on own account or started their own business

Respondents who reported that the reason they wanted to get another job was to work on their own account or start their own business were asked whether or not they had in fact started their own business after leaving their job.

Although the base number of respondents who left for this reason was very small (16 respondents), all but one of these did go on to start up their own business. (Table 4.4.6)

Payments received by respondents who voluntarily resigned from their jobs

All of the respondents who voluntarily left their jobs were asked about any payments they received from their employer. If they did not receive any payments, they were asked whether there were any payments that they felt they were entitled to but did not receive.

Whether or not respondent received any payments when they left their job

Respondents for whom the decision to leave their job had been their own were asked whether they had received any payments from their employer. Just over a quarter (26 per cent) reported that they had received at least one payment when they left their job.

A third of the respondents who left their job for 'other' reasons and around a quarter (23 per cent) of those who resigned received at least one payment when they left their job compared with only ten per cent of those who had been in a temporary job that came to an end. (Table 4.5.1)

Whether respondent felt they should have received any payment(s)

Of those respondents who did not receive any payments when they left their job, 11 per cent felt they were entitled to at least one payment that they did not receive. Twelve per cent of respondents who resigned, six per cent of those who left because a temporary contract came to an end and five per cent of those who left for 'other' reasons felt that they were entitled to a payment that they did not receive. (Table 4.5.2)

Payments respondent felt they were entitled to but did not receive

Respondents who felt that they were entitled to a payment or payments that they did not receive were asked to provide information about the payments they felt they were owed. Almost two-fifths (38 per cent) of respondents who felt they were owed money by their employer felt that they were entitled to payment for leave they had outstanding. Over a quarter (27 per cent) of these respondents felt they should have received a payment for back pay, four per cent felt they were due a payment in lieu of serving notice and three per cent felt they were entitled to some form of pension payment. Thirty-nine per cent of the respondents felt they were entitled to some other payment.

Of the other payments mentioned by respondents, commission and bonus payments were particularly common. Other payments that emerged included payments for a refund of tax, other compensation, such as the loss of the use of a company car and payment for expenses. (Table 4.5.2.1)

Payments the respondent did or will receive

Of the respondents who did (or will) receive a payment when they left their employer, almost two-thirds (63 per cent) received money for leave they had outstanding. Over a third of the respondents (35 per cent) received money for hours they had worked (back pay) and 11 per cent received pension payments. A further nine per cent received compensation for the loss of their job, or redundancy pay, and another nine per cent received payment in lieu of notice.

Ten per cent of the respondents reported that they had received payment for something other than those payments listed in the question.

This pattern was virtually identical amongst those respondents who had been made redundant as it is these respondents who make up the majority of respondents in receipt of 'other' payments. (Table 4.5.3)

Amount received for payments

The base number of respondents in receipt of many of the payments covered in the questionnaire is very small and it therefore is not possible to talk about all of them in terms of percentages. Where the base is greater than 30, percentages have been used but otherwise actual numbers are presented.

Of the respondents who received back pay when they left their job, almost a third (31 per cent) received between £200 and £500 and almost a quarter (23 per cent) received less than £100. Nineteen per cent of the respondents received between £100 and £200 and 15 per cent received between £500 and £1,000. Only two per cent of the respondents received over £10,000.

Very few respondents received payment in lieu of notice but of those who did, the most popular sum to have received was between £1,000 and £5,000. Respondents who had resigned were the most likely to have received this kind of payment.

Very few of the respondents who had voluntarily left their jobs received compensation for the loss of their job which is as expected. For those who did receive such compensation, the majority received less than £5,000.

Respondents who had received compensation for the loss of their job were asked to give further information on what this payment had been equivalent to in terms of their usual salary. The majority of respondents received payments equivalent to six months or less salary. (Table 4.5.4a)

Respondents who had received payments relating to their pension were asked if this had been the start of their regular pension payments a lump sum payment or a refund of their pension contributions (or a combination of these).

Respondents who received payments relating to their pensions, of which there were very few, were equally likely to have received a lump sum payment as they were the start of their regular pension payments. Respondents were much less likely to have received a refund of pension contributions already paid.

Lump sum pension payments varied anywhere between £130 and £54,000 with payments almost equally likely to be between £0 and £5,000 and between £25,000 and £50,000. All of the pension payment refunds were less than £5,000 and varied between £40 and £800. The majority of regular pension payments were £1,000 or more per month. (Table 4.5.4b)

Forty-one per cent of respondents who received money for leave not taken received between £200 and £500. Over a quarter (26 per cent) of these respondents received £100 or less, 13 per cent received between £500 and £1,000 and nine per cent received between £101 and £200. Only two per cent of

the respondents received more than £5,000. The distribution of payments of those who had resigned was virtually identical to the overall pattern.

The majority of the 'other' payments received were for less than £100 with very few falling in the other categories. (Table 4.5.4c)

The respondent's experience after leaving their job

This section of the chapter covers the respondents' experiences of looking for another job as well as their experiences after leaving their job, including whether or not they received any benefits, whether they started their own business and what happened to their pension entitlement.

Whether respondent looked for work after leaving their job (voluntary separations)

Respondents who voluntarily left their job (i.e. those who had been routed through the WhyLeave question with the exception of those who decided to leave because they wanted another job) were asked whether they had looked for work since leaving their job. Over three-quarters (76 per cent) reported that they had.

Respondents who were made redundant were the most likely to have looked for work since leaving their job with 82 per cent of these respondents reporting that they had looked for work. Seventy-eight per cent of those who were dismissed looked for work after leaving their job, as did 73 per cent of those who resigned. (Table 4.6.1)

Whether respondent had done any paid work since leaving their job

Respondents who answered that they had not looked for work since leaving their job were asked whether or not they had done any paid work since leaving. Forty per cent of those who had not looked for work had done some paid work since leaving their job.

Respondents who had resigned from their jobs were more likely to have done some paid work than those who were made redundant with 47 per cent of those who had resigned answering positively to this question compared with only 36 per cent of those who were made redundant. (Table 4.6.2)

Whether respondent was looking for or had found another job before they left their employer

Respondents who answered that they left their job because they wanted another job (at WhyLeave) were asked whether they had been looking for work before they left their reference job. Almost four-fifths (79 per cent) of the respondents answered that they had been looking for work before they left.

Respondents who wanted another job were also asked whether or not they already had a job to go to when they left their reference job (regardless of whether they had answered positively that they had been looking while still in their old job). Eighty-five per cent of the respondents had already found another job before they left their employer. (Table 4.6.3)

Whether respondent looked for work after leaving their job (wanted another job)

Respondents who answered that they decided to leave their job because they wanted another one (at WhyLeave) but who had neither looked for or found another job whilst they were still employed, were asked whether they had looked for work since leaving their job. Almost all of these respondents (98 per cent) had looked for work since leaving their reference job. (Table 4.6.4)

Methods used to look for employment

Respondents who had looked for work since leaving their job (not including those who had already found a job before they left) were asked which methods they had used, or were using, in their search. Respondents were able to give as many answers as they liked to this question and as such the percentages may not add up to 100.

Almost three-quarters (73 per cent) of the respondents who had looked for work since leaving their job had looked in newspapers and magazines, 60 per cent had applied directly to employers and a further 56 per cent had asked friends, relatives or others about jobs. Almost half the respondents (46 per cent) had used the Employment Service and over a third (35 per cent) had used private employment agencies. Thirty-one per cent of respondents had looked for jobs on the internet.

Respondents who had been made redundant were the most likely to have used the Employment Service (now part of Jobcentre Plus) with 58 per cent of this group using this method compared with 41 per cent of those who had been on a temporary contract which came to an end and 38 per cent of those who had resigned.

Respondents who had resigned were less likely than those who had been made redundant to have used any of the methods listed with the exception of applying directly to employers (61 per cent compared with 58 per cent). Respondents who had left a temporary job or contract were still more likely than those who had resigned to have used this method with 64 per cent of this group having applied directly to employers.

Respondents who had resigned were much less likely than the other two groups to have used private employment agencies with only 27 per cent of this group using this method compared with 46 per cent each of those who had been made redundant and those who had been on temporary contracts that had ended. (Table 4.6.5)

Length of time spent looking for new job

Respondents who had looked for work since leaving their jobs were asked how long they had been looking for a new job. A quarter of the respondents reported that they had looked, or been looking, for a job for between one and three months. A further 20 per cent had looked for less than a week and 16 per cent had looked for three or more months. Eight per cent of the respondents were still looking for a job at the time of the JSS interview.

With the exception of those respondents that had left their jobs for 'other' reasons, respondents in all the types of job separations were more likely to

have spent between one and three months looking for work than any other period of time. For those who had left for 'other' reasons, respondents were equally likely to have been looking for one to two weeks and for one to three months.

Respondents who had been made redundant were more likely than those in the other groups to still be looking for work at the time of interview (14 per cent compared with between three per cent and eight per cent). (Table 4.6.6)

Whether respondent had done any paid work since leaving (those who wanted another job)

Respondents who left their employer because they wanted another job, but did not find a new job before they left, were asked if they had done any paid work since leaving their job. Eighty-five per cent of the respondents had done some kind of paid work since leaving their job.

Respondents who resigned or left for some 'other' reason were particularly likely to have done some kind of paid work after leaving their jobs: 88 per cent of those who resigned and 89 per cent of those who left for 'other' reasons had gone on to do some form of paid work.

Respondents who had been in a temporary job or contract that had come to an end were the least likely to have done any paid work since leaving (79 per cent) and only 80 per cent of respondents who had been made redundant had gone on to do any paid work by the time of the interview. (Table 4.6.7)

Type of paid work respondent did after leaving their job

Respondents who reported that they had done some kind of paid work since leaving their job were asked whether this had been a permanent job, a fixed term appointment, consultancy or freelance work or temporary work.

Three-quarters of the respondents had gone in to a permanent job when they left their previous job. A further 16 per cent of the sample went on to temporary work, six per cent went to work in a fixed term appointment and three per cent went on to do consultancy or freelance work.

Respondents who had left their job because a temporary contract had come to an end were the least likely to have gone on to a permanent job (45 per cent compared with between 70 per cent and 79 per cent in the other types of job separation). A third of this group went on to work in another temporary position and 18 per cent were employed in fixed term appointments.

Respondents who had been made redundant were the next least likely to have gone on to work in a permanent position (70 per cent) and a fifth of this group went on to do temporary work.

Respondents who had resigned from their positions were the most likely to have got a permanent job after leaving their job (79 per cent) and the least likely of all the other types of job separation to have gone on to work in a fixed term appointment (five per cent) or to do consultancy or freelance work (two per cent). Fourteen per cent of this group went on to do temporary work. (Table 4.6.8)

Comparison of pay of new job with previous job

Over half of the respondents (56 per cent) were paid more in their new job than they had been paid in the job they left. However, almost a quarter (23 per cent) reported that they were paid less than previously, and a fifth were paid about the same.

Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of those respondents who had resigned were being paid more in their new jobs. This compares with around half of those who had been in a temporary job that came to an end or had left for 'other' reasons (52 per cent and 45 per cent respectively).

Only a quarter of those respondents who had been made redundant were paid more in their new jobs and 43 per cent of this group were being paid less. Almost a third (32 per cent) were being paid about the same. (Table 4.6.9)

Whether new job full- or part-time

Seventy-two per cent of the respondents went on to work in full-time jobs. Respondents who had been in a temporary job that had come to an end were the least likely to go on to do full-time work (68 per cent compared with between 71 per cent and 79 per cent of the other types of job separation). Respondents who had been made redundant were the most likely to go in to full-time work (79 per cent). (Table 4.6.10)

Whether part-time respondents likely to take full-time work in the future

Respondents who had answered that the job they took after leaving their LFS reference job was part-time were asked if they were likely to take a full-time job at any time in the future.

Over two-thirds (69 per cent) of the part-time respondents reported that they would be likely to take a full-time job at some point in the future. The base numbers of part-time respondents in most of the types of job separation are too small to talk about in terms of percentages, although 71 per cent of respondents who had resigned from their jobs said that they were likely to take a full-time job at some point. Only 53 per cent of respondents who had been made redundant felt they were likely to take a full-time job at any point in the future. (Table 4.6.10.1)

Whether respondent had done any voluntary work since leaving job

Respondents who had not done any paid work since leaving their job were asked if they had undertaken any voluntary work since leaving. Only nine per cent of the sample reported that they had done some form of voluntary work.

The base numbers are too small in most of the types of job separation to talk about in terms of percentages, but ten per cent of those who had resigned and eight per cent of those who had been made redundant had undertaken some form of voluntary work since leaving their job. (Table 4.6.11)

Whether respondent claimed any benefits when they left their job

Both respondents who had gone on to find a new job and those who were still not working were asked if they had claimed Jobseeker's Allowance or Income Support since leaving their job.

The majority of the sample (83 per cent) reported that they had claimed neither Jobseeker's Allowance or Income Support since leaving their job. Thirteen per cent had claimed Jobseeker's Allowance (or Unemployment Benefit) and just four per cent had claimed Income Support (or Supplementary Benefit).

Respondents who had been made redundant were the most likely to have claimed Jobseeker's Allowance (33 per cent compared with between seven per cent and 30 per cent in the other groups) and respondents who had been dismissed were the most likely to have claimed Income Support (nine per cent compared with between four per cent and seven per cent).

Respondents who had resigned were the most likely to have claimed neither of the benefits listed (89 per cent) with only seven per cent of this group having claimed Jobseeker's Allowance and four per cent having claimed Income Support. (Table 4.6.12)

Whether respondent had been in an employer pension scheme

Respondents who had found another job and those that were still looking were asked whether they had been a member of a pension scheme operated by their previous employer. Less than a quarter of the respondents (24 per cent) reported that they had been a member of such a scheme.

Respondents that had been made redundant were the most likely to have been a member of such a scheme (40 per cent) and those who had resigned were the next most likely (23 per cent). Respondents who had been in a temporary job that came to an end were by far the least likely to have been paying in to an employer pension scheme with only four per cent reporting that they had been in such a scheme. (Table 4.6.13)

What happened to respondent's pension entitlement

Respondents who had been members of a pension scheme run by their employer (occupational pension scheme) were asked what had happened to their pension when they left their job. The majority of the respondents who had been in an occupational pension scheme (63 per cent) reported that their pension had been frozen until retirement age. Almost a quarter of the respondents had their pension rights transferred to their new employer and ten per cent of the sample had their pension payments refunded. Eight per cent of the sample were being paid their pension in full.

Respondents who had been made redundant and respondents who had resigned were almost equally likely to have had their pension frozen until retirement age or to have received a refund of the payments they had made (66 per cent and 63 per cent respectively). However, respondents who had been made redundant were much more likely to be being paid their pension payments in full (14 per cent compared with four per cent), while those who

had resigned were more likely to have had their rights transferred to their new employer (28 per cent compared with 16 per cent). (Table 4.6.13.1)

Whether respondent had considered working on their own account

All respondents, with the exception of those that had already said that the reason they left their job was to start their own business, were asked whether they had thought about working on their own account (including starting their own business or working as self-employed) since leaving their job. Almost a quarter (23 per cent) said they did consider this when they left their job.

Respondents who had been dismissed were the most likely to have considered working on their own account with 46 per cent of this group saying they had considered this compared with between 18 per cent and 35 per cent of the other groups. Those who had been made redundant were the next most likely to have thought about working on their own account and respondents who had resigned from their jobs were the least likely to have considered this action. (Table 4.6.14)

Whether respondent did work on their own account

Respondents who reported that they had considered working on their own account since they left their job were then asked whether or not they did end up working on their own account. Almost a quarter (22 per cent) reported that they did go on to work on their own account or start their own business. Twenty-three per cent of those who had been made redundant and 21 per cent of those who had resigned went to work independently or start their own business. (Table 4.6.14.1)

Occupational group of business respondent started

Respondents who reported that they had started, or considered starting their own business, were asked to give information about the type of business this had been. The responses to this question were re-coded into the coding frame of the major occupational group variables of the LFS (socmajl and socmajm).

The occupational groups of the business started by respondents were very varied. A fifth of the sample went on to work as managers or administrators which is as expected as the respondents were usually going on to work on their own account. A further 18 per cent went on to start up craft and related businesses and 14 per cent started businesses classified as associate professional occupations (such as graphic designers, sports officials and driving instructors).

Ten per cent of the sample set up business in professional occupations (including teaching, engineering and accountancy) and four per cent started clerical or secretarial businesses. (Table 4.6.15)

Whether respondent used money to help start up business

Respondents who had started their own business and had received any money from either their employer, or as a result of a grievance procedure or tribunal, were asked whether they had used any of this money to help start up their business.

Forty-three per cent of the respondents reported that they had used this money towards starting up their business, while 57 per cent said that they did not. The base numbers of respondents within each type of job separation that were asked this question are too small to talk about in terms of percentages. (Table 4.6.16)

Amount of money used to start up business

Respondents who reported that they had used some of the money they had received to help start up their business were asked how much of this money was used for this purpose. As the base numbers here are so small, it is not possible to talk about this in terms of proportions. However, respondents were most likely to use between £0 and £5,000 of the money they received towards their new business. (Table 4.6.16.1)

5

Sampling errors

Sampling errors are survey errors that arise as a result of the fact that the sample chosen is only one of a number of samples that could have been chosen. An issue of interest to users of survey data is the precision of the estimates that are produced from the chosen sample. The smaller the sample from which an estimate is derived, the less precise is the estimate.

The standard error of the mean provides a measure of the range of different estimates; this is the standard deviation of the estimates (means or proportions) which would have arisen from the different samples that might have been selected. The smaller the standard error, the more precise the estimate.

Standard errors calculated from a survey with a simple random sample will, typically, differ from those calculated from a more complex sample design such as stratified or cluster sampling. A useful benchmark to assess the relative magnitude of a standard error is to calculate the variance derived from a particular (complex) sample design with the variance that would have arisen from a simple random sample of the same size. This ratio (of the variances) is the design effect, or Deft. (LFS User Guide, Volume 1: Design and Methodology, 1997).

The standard way to produce standard errors for complex survey designs is as follows:

Standard error (complex survey design) =
Standard error (simple survey design) * deft.

OR

$\sqrt{(p(1-p)/n)} * \text{deft}$

For the JSS, standard errors that take into account this design effect were created using STATA, an integrated statistical package for use in Windows, Macintosh and Unix.

Standard errors for the main JSS variables and the main demographic variables used in the analyses are presented in the tables. These include standard errors of the frequencies of the variables as well as crosstabulations of all the JSS and demographic variables reported on in Chapter 2 of this report.

JSS variables include the reason the respondent left their job (WhyLeft), the reason the respondent was dismissed (WhyDismi), length of temporary contract (LongTemp), whether the respondent could have stayed on if they had

wanted (Wished), conditions under which they could have stayed on (StayOn), reason why they had to leave (HavLeave) and the main reason why they decided to leave their job (WhyLeave).

Demographic variables include age group (agegrp), sex, ethnic group (wethnic1), number of employees in last workplace (MPNE01), whether full- or part-time in last job (FTPTWK), occupation in last job (occupate) and industry group of last job (industry).

In most cases, standard errors are not presented for variables where the base number of respondents is less than 50. However, there are two exceptions to this rule:

First, standard errors are presented where the main survey variable itself has a base of less than 50 (for example, in the case of the variable WhyDismi). In such cases the standard errors for the variable subgroups are presented, but the variable is not broken down further by any other demographic or socio-economic characteristics.

Second, in some cases where a variable has been broken down into several sub-groups there will be one or two groups with a base less than 50 and several others where the base number is much greater. The standard errors for these small bases are presented along with the other subgroups of the variable it has been broken down by.

Technical report

Contents

1 Introduction	56
Introduction and background.....	56
Coverage of the report	56
2 Design issues	58
Using the LFS as a sampling frame.....	58
Reference period.....	58
Sample type.....	59
3 Questionnaire development	61
Introduction.....	61
Expert review.....	61
Cognitive testing.....	61
4 The questionnaire	64
Introduction.....	64
Questionnaire topics.....	64
Changes to the questionnaire.....	64
5 The sample	67
Sample selection criteria.....	67
Sample size.....	67
Breakdown of sample by type of job change recorded in the LFS.....	68
6 Fieldwork procedures and response	69
Introduction.....	69
The advance letter.....	69
Interviewer briefing.....	69
Organisation of staff.....	70
Reissue of telephone interviews to face-to-face.....	71
Survey response	71
7 Managing changes in the LFS	72
Changes to LFS variables after April 2001	72
Occupational coding.....	72
Number of employees in the workplace.....	73
Ethnicity.....	74
8 Weighting and adjustment procedures	75
Introduction.....	75
Weighting.....	75
Standard errors	77

9 The impact of the sampling strategy on data analysis	79
Appendix 1.....	81
LFS variables carried across – wave 1.....	81
LFS variables carried across – waves 2 to 4	82
Appendix 2.....	83
The questionnaire.....	83
Appendix 3.....	99
Changes made to questionnaire for main-stage survey	99
Appendix 4.....	105
Sampling filter used for JSS	105
Appendix 5.....	106
The advance letter	106
The advance letter: Welsh version.....	107
Appendix 6.....	108
Interviewer briefing notes: Cognitive testing	108
Scope of the task.....	108
After the CAPI interview.....	108
Reminder about taping	108
Incentives.....	108
Claims	108
Contacts	109
Your sample of addresses	109
No phone cases.....	109
Introducing the work.....	109
The qualitative interview.....	110
After the interview	110
Questions to probe and report on	111
Reminder: some basic probes	113
Notes about Blaise Questionnaire for briefing.....	113
Appendix 7.....	115
Interviewer briefing notes: Main stage survey	115
Section One.....	115
Section Two.....	115
Section Three	117
Section Four	119
Section Five.....	119
Questionnaire instructions.....	121
Appendix 8(a)	128
Responding versus non-responding tables.....	128

Appendix 8(b)	131
Derivation of JSS weight.....	131
Appendix 8(c)	132
A comparison of weighted and non-weighted distributions	132
Appendix 8(d)	135
Tables showing adjustment for wave 5 attrition.....	135
Appendix 8(e)	136
Derivation of final weight (Grossfac).....	136
Appendix 9	137
JSS reason for leaving job by LFS reason.....	137

Notes to tables

Tables showing percentages

The row or column percentages may add to 99 per cent or 101 per cent because of rounding. In addition, for many variables respondents were able to provide more than one answer and in these cases percentage totals may be much greater than 100 per cent.

The following conventions have been applied to the tables:

- no cases
- 0 values less than 0.5 per cent

Small bases

Very small bases have been avoided wherever possible because of the relatively high sampling errors that attach to small numbers. In general, percentage distributions are shown if the base is 30 or more. Where the base is lower, actual numbers are shown in square brackets.

Chi-square statistics

For all of the tables discussed in the report chi-square statistics have been produced. However, it should be noted that in many of these cases the base number of respondents, and the number falling into each subdivision of a variable, may be very small and the chi-square statistic must therefore be regarded with great caution.

1

Introduction

Introduction and background

The Job Separations Survey was a small ad hoc survey carried out by the Office for National Statistics' Social Survey Division on behalf of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) during the period of June 2001 to June 2002.

The main objectives of the Job Separations Survey (JSS) were to provide a statistically representative picture of employees' experience of dismissal and redundancy, and of the use of grievance procedures. The number of applications to employment tribunals saw a steady rise until the end of 2001. In the first half of 2002 a fall in the number of applications was witnessed but the number of applications still exceeds 100,000. However, information on the nature of dismissals and other involuntary job changes is limited and there is a need to discover how readily employees resort to conciliation procedures and tribunals and whether potential tribunal cases are dealt with by internal grievance procedures or other means. There was also a desire to explore the reasons behind discrepancies between employer and employee data.

The objectives of the survey were set by the DTI and the questionnaire was developed by DTI in collaboration with the Question Testing Unit in Social Survey Division¹, who carried out a qualitative pilot for the survey.

Main-stage fieldwork ran between July 2001 and April 2002² and achieved a total of 1,263 interviews with people who had recently left an employer.

Coverage of the report

The report starts off in Chapter 2 by discussing the design issues of the Job Separations Survey, including the advantages of using the Labour Force Survey as a sampling frame.

The third chapter of the report outlines the developmental work that was involved in the JSS. This involved an expert review of the survey instrument and cognitive testing of the questionnaire. The chapter also includes summary of the results of this work.

¹ Now called Qualitative Methods as Applied to Surveys (QMAS) which is part of the Methodology and Statistical Development Group in ONS.

² The field dates for the main-stage survey were:
Wave 1 – 2nd July to 1st September 2001
Wave 2 – 25th October to 19th December 2001
Wave 3 – 9th January 2002 to 20th March 2002
Wave 4 – 18th February 2002 to 20th April 2002

The next chapter gives an outline of the questionnaire used in the survey and the adaptations that had been made to the questionnaire as a result of the developmental work.

Chapter 5 goes on to describe in more detail how the sample for the JSS was selected, how the sample size varied from quarter to quarter and what the achieved sample was.

Chapter 6 reports on the fieldwork procedures employed for the survey and the survey response. This includes details of the advance letter, the interviewer briefings, the organisation of interviewing staff and how the cases for interview were issued as well as the final response for the survey.

The seventh chapter of the report discusses changes that were made to the sampling frame from which JSS respondents were selected (the LFS) and the impact this had on the data carried across from this survey to the JSS. It also details the steps that were taken to handle these changes.

Chapter 8 discusses the weighting strategy that was used for the survey and how these weights were derived.

The final chapter, Chapter 9, discusses some issues relating to the sampling of the JSS having a possible effect on the analyses.

2

Design issues

Using the LFS as a sampling frame

The Labour Force Survey was chosen as the sampling frame from which to select respondents for the Job Separations Survey because not only is it a large-scale source of data about the labour market, but it also includes questions which could be used for screening potential JSS respondents, such as what reason they had given for leaving their last job.

An additional advantage of using the LFS as the sample source is that there is demographic and classificatory information readily available about the sample. Not only did this eliminate the need for demographic questions to be asked in the JSS, thus reducing programming and interview costs, but other data held about respondents was used to enrich the analysis. For example, JSS data has been analysed across a number of classificatory variables including occupation, age, gender and ethnic group. These variables were also used to gain further insight into non-responding individuals and used as the basis of the weighting used in the survey. Further detail about the derivation of these weights can be seen in Chapter 8.

Besides reducing the cost of the survey, using the LFS as the sampling frame minimises the burden placed on the respondent as it limits the number of questions they have to answer.

The LFS underwent some considerable changes in April 2001 and as a result, some of the variables carried across with the December to February data for the first JSS quarter had changed or ceased to exist by the time of the second quarter. These were Soc90 occupational variables, number of employees in the workplace variables and the ethnic group variable.

Appendix One provides full details of the variables carried forward from the respondents' LFS interviews and the differences between the data gained at these different periods can be seen. Further discussion about the variables affected and how these were dealt with in the analysis follows in Chapter 7.

Reference period

Respondents for the Job Separations Survey were identified from those wave 5 LFS respondents who reported having left a job in the previous three months. Each wave of the LFS covers a three-month period and the sample for each quarter of the JSS was drawn from the most recent wave 5 data available.

Below is a table illustrating the source of each of the JSS quarters:

Source of the Job Separations Survey quarters

JSS quarter	LFS wave 5 sampled from
1	December 2000 to February 2001
2	March 2001 to May 2001
3	June 2001 to August 2001
4	September 2001 to November 2001

Source: Job Separations Survey.

The elapsed time between interviews was small enough for details of job changes to be fresh in respondents' minds, but not so small as to over-burden respondents. This gap also had the benefit of having allowed some of the grievance procedures the respondents were involved in to have progressed. This had the result that respondents were able to say more about tribunal and other processes as well as their outcomes where these had been concluded.

Sample type

The Labour Force Survey is a household survey which seeks to obtain first-hand information about each adult household member (16 or over), either face to face or over the telephone. However, when this is not possible, information about an individual can be given by another member of the household, meaning that a great deal of LFS data, including data about job separations, could have been provided by proxy.

For the Job Separations Survey it was important that the information be gained first-hand and achieving the sample therefore relied on speaking to the household member who had actually experienced a job change. In some cases this was found not to be possible, either because the selected person refused, because they were living away from the address and were unable to be contacted or because they had language difficulties. Because of the nature of the questionnaire, asking in some detail about help and advice received as well as monetary compensation, it was not possible to conduct these interviews by proxy.

In simple terms, the basis for selection was the response given to a question on the LFS that asks respondents why they left their last job.³ The Job Separations Survey attempted to follow up all those respondents who said they left because they were 'Dismissed', 'Made redundant', 'Resigned', 'Took early retirement' or gave an 'Other reason' but did not follow those who 'Gave up work for health reasons', 'Gave up work for family or personal reasons', 'Retired at the normal age' or whose 'Temporary job finished'.

Because of the emphasis of the survey on respondents' experience of conciliation and tribunal procedures (although this is by no means the only

³ REDYLFT

Could you tell me the reason you left your last job?

interest of the survey) it was decided that inclusion of LFS respondents who had left jobs for these latter reasons could result in too many cases which were not of interest.

A more detailed discussion of the sampling procedure follows in Chapter 5.

3

Questionnaire development

Introduction

The main-stage fieldwork described in this report was preceded by a stage of developmental work. This developmental work was conducted in two stages: an expert review⁴ of the questionnaire, followed by a small-scale qualitative pilot survey, focusing on cognitive testing of the questions.

Expert review

The expert review was conducted on DTI's first draft of the questionnaire and looked at the structure and routing of questions, question wording and how likely interviewers and respondents were to understand the coding frames. As a result of this review, the questionnaire was amended in consultation with DTI and resulted in a working document that could be programmed for use in the pilot.

Cognitive testing

Following the expert review, the redrafted questionnaire was subjected to cognitive testing. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with a small sample of respondents who had recently left a job, using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). Following completion of the CAPI questionnaire, respondents were asked cognitive questions about the wording used in the questionnaire, their understanding of what the questions were asking and the circumstances in which they left their last job.

The cognitive testing for the Job Separations Survey took place between 16th and 30th April 2001.

Interviewer briefing

The cognitive interviews for the Job Separations Survey were conducted by four general field force (GFF) interviewers trained in cognitive methods.

Prior to the fieldwork, an interviewer briefing was held to introduce interviewers to the survey and to demonstrate the CAPI program. As well as a copy of the questionnaire, interviewers were given briefing notes which outlined how to recruit respondents, how to administer incentive payments and

⁴ Expert review is a systematic critique of a survey instrument carried out by experts in questionnaire design. It pays attention to the use of language, issues of social acceptability, reference periods and ease of retrieval of information from memory.

details of which of the survey questions needed particular attention in the cognitive testing. A copy of the briefing notes for the cognitive testing can be seen in Appendix Six.

Participating respondents were given £10 as a thank you for taking part in the survey.

The sample

The respondents for the cognitive work were selected from a sample drawn from wave 5 LFS data using the same filter as in the main-stage survey. That is, they had left a paid job in the last three months (previous to the wave 5 interview) and the reason given for leaving being one of the following:

- Dismissed
- Made redundant / took voluntary redundancy
- Resigned
- Took early retirement
- Other reason (but not including 'Temporary job finished', 'Gave up work for health reasons', 'Retired at, or after, the statutory retirement age' or 'Gave up work for family or personal reasons'.

The sample drawn from the LFS was split by geographical area and four interviewers trained in cognitive testing were allocated addresses within reasonable travelling distance. The areas covered by the pilot sample were chosen by the location of these specially trained interviewers and included North London and the South East, Glasgow and Lanarkshire, Devon and Cornwall and Bristol. The interviewers were given up to 20 addresses each from which to gain their target number of eight interviews and were briefed on how to prioritise the cases they had been given. The pilot resulted in an achieved sample of 30 interviews.

Because certain reasons for a job change occurred less frequently than others, in particular dismissal and early retirement, interviewers were asked to contact these cases first and to make up the rest of their quota with respondents giving the other reasons for their job change. In order to test how the questionnaire worked for people in different circumstances and with different experiences, it was important that all reasons for leaving a job were covered where possible.

The breakdown of the achieved pilot sample, by the reason for leaving their job given in the LFS was as follows:

Achieved JSS pilot sample; reason for leaving job

Reason for leaving job	Number in JSS pilot
Dismissed	1
Redundant	5
Resigned	15
Early retirement	0
Other	9

Source: Job Separations Survey

It is uncommon for employees to leave their job because of early retirement and although there were eight such cases drawn in the entire sample, there was only one in the geographical areas used for the pilot. Unfortunately, this respondent declined to take part.

Summary of pilot findings

The pilot showed that in many cases, people's reasons for leaving a job are not as straightforward as might be assumed. Often the respondents' separations began in one form, but were transformed into another, either through discussions with their employer or through more formal grievance procedures. The pilot survey helped provide a context for some of these issues and informed the way in which the questionnaire was amended.

In addition, the pilot, and the cognitive testing it incorporated, was able to identify problems with routing, unclear question wording and areas where interviewer instructions were either needed, or required clarification.

A detailed discussion of changes to the questionnaire resulting from the pilot follows in the next chapter.

4

The questionnaire

Introduction

The main objective of the Job Separations Survey was to gain a representative picture of employees' experiences of dismissal and redundancy and of their use of grievance procedures. The questionnaire aimed to achieve this by gaining detailed data about respondents' experiences of leaving a job and of any conciliation or tribunal procedures they had been through.

Questionnaire topics

The questionnaire included eight main topic areas, each of which covered a slightly different aspect of the experience of leaving a job:

- Background information about the job respondents had left (including the date they had left and how long they had been with that employer);
- Their reasons for leaving their job;
- Whether they had left voluntarily or been required to leave by their employer;
- Whether they had been warned about having to leave;
- Whether they had been involved in industrial action (for example a dispute or strike);
- What help or advice they had been offered or had received;
- Whether they had looked for, or done, any paid work since leaving their job; and
- Whether they had started, or considered starting, a business since leaving their job.

Changes to the questionnaire

The majority of alterations made to the original questionnaire following the pilot clarified question wording and made pre-coded answer categories more comprehensive. In addition a number of structural changes were made to the questionnaire such as adding questions, for example to gain more detailed information about tribunal and conciliation procedures, and substantial amendments to routing.

Structural changes

One aim of the Job Separations Survey was to distinguish between employees who had left their job by choice and those who were required to leave by their employer. The pilot showed that the original wording of the question designed to make this distinction, 'Could you have stayed on if you had wished?', led respondents' whose jobs were still available, but who felt that they had no choice but to leave, to answer negatively. As a result, the wording was changed to 'Would your employer have allowed you to have stayed on if you had wanted?' The new version, which places the emphasis of the question on the employer's role in the job separation, helped to distinguish between people who did have a choice about leaving their job, and those who did not.

The pilot also showed that respondents were sometimes reluctant to give the full reason for their job change early in the interview and although this would often emerge later, they would, by then, have been routed past important questions about tribunal and other grievance procedures.

It was decided to pick up such cases later in the questionnaire and to make this possible, a pre-code was added at the question asking respondents why they decided to leave their job (WhyLeav).⁵ This pre-code allowed respondents to give 'Had a dispute or disagreement with employer or colleague' as their reason for leaving. Respondents choosing this option were then routed through a block of questions about the dispute and their use of grievance procedures, mirroring those found earlier in the questionnaire. In the main-stage survey, a number of respondents said here that the reason they had left their job had been a dispute or disagreement with an employer or colleague. The majority of these had given their reason for leaving their job as 'Resignation' at the earlier question asking for this information (WhyLeft).

A third structural change made to the questionnaire also concerns WhyLeav. The original question provided interviewers with four broad categories in which to code respondents' answers. Subsequent questions were then used to gain more detailed information. The original categories were:

Wanted to get another job,

Wanted to start a business,

Wanted/needed to take a break from work,

Wanted/needed to give up work altogether.

However, the pilot found that respondents gave answers here that were difficult for interviewers to code into the categories provided. More detailed codes

⁵ 'What was the main reason you decided to leave your job?'

were moved from the later questions 'Why did you decide to give up work?' and 'Why did you want to take a break from work?' and added to the coding frame at this question⁶ to replace these broad categories.

Respondents choosing reasons originating from the coding frames of these original questions were then asked if they viewed their leaving as taking a break from work or giving up work permanently so as not to lose any of the previous detail.

A number of questions were added to gain more detailed information about the outcome of respondents' tribunal applications and hearing procedures. The original questionnaire asked respondents if they had taken their case to an employment tribunal. If they answered 'Yes' they were asked if their case had been settled by Acas conciliation or had gone to a full tribunal hearing, and if they answered 'No' they were asked if Acas had conciliated in their case. These original questions did not seem to obtain enough detail about respondents' experiences of the conciliation process and as a result, a number of additional questions were added for the main stage. The addition of these questions (see Appendix 2, Questions 28-32) also had the benefit of making data from the JSS comparable with those of other employment surveys, such as the Survey of Industrial Tribunal Applications.

Other changes

Other changes included adding questions to the questionnaire, re-wording questions, adding pre-codes to existing questions and providing detailed instructions to interviewers about how to clarify the questions with respondents. Examples of the addition and rewording of questions include changes that were made to allow for payments that were due but hadn't yet been received (Appendix 2, Question 36) and to ask respondents if there were any payments which they felt they should have received but didn't (Appendix 2, Question 37).

A copy of the questionnaire used for the main-stage survey can be seen in Appendix 2.

A list of all the changes made to the questionnaire for the main stage can be seen in Appendix 3.

⁶ The new coding frame is:

- Wanted to get another job
- Had found another job
- Wanted to become self-employed, work on your own account or start a business
- To look after children
- To look after another dependent or person who needs care
- Own health reasons
- To undertake, or concentrate on, education or training
- To take a rest, increase leisure time or take part in a leisure activity
- Had dispute or disagreement with employer or colleagues
- Other reason – please specify.

5

The sample

Sample selection criteria

Respondents for the JSS were selected if they had left a job in the three months before the wave 5 LFS interview because of dismissal, redundancy, resignation, early retirement or 'other' reasons (not including 'temporary job finished', 'gave up work for health reasons', 'retired at, or after, the statutory retirement age' or 'gave up work for family or personal reasons').

The specification for the code used to filter the respondents from the wave 5 LFS data can be seen in Appendix 4.

Respondents excluded from the sample include the self-employed, respondents whose job is to temp and respondents whose data had been given by proxy in the LFS and who were unable or unwilling to take part in person.

The JSS questionnaire begins with a filter question to ensure that the selected respondent is eligible to be interviewed. If, when the interviewer got to speak to the selected person, it was found that the LFS data had been inaccurate, for example the respondent had not left a job in the reference period, or was self-employed, the respondent's interview was terminated and the case coded as ineligible.

This filter question (LeftJob) can be seen in the questionnaire in Appendix Two.

Sample size

Before the main-stage fieldwork for the JSS began, previous analysis of data about job changes from the LFS was examined to predict the size of sample that might be expected for the survey. This analysis suggested that a total of around 450 individuals would be sampled each quarter using the filter mentioned above and the number of interviews to be achieved over the course of the year, assuming a 75 per cent co-operation rate, was expected to be about 1,200.

The number of individuals sampled for each quarter was quite varied, and steadily increased for each wave.

The main reason for this increase was the fact that the LFS is often used as a sample source and the sampled address file needed to be checked against the Used Address File (UAF) to make sure that none of the selected individuals had already been sampled for a previous ad hoc survey. If it was found that they had, they were removed from the sample file and not used for the survey.

While in the first quarter of the JSS, two other ad hoc surveys had already drawn samples from the wave 5 LFS sample file (thus reducing the total

number of addresses that could be used), for the second to fourth quarters no addresses had previously been sampled.

The total number of respondents sampled for the survey was 1,648 and the total number of interviews achieved over the year was 1,263. The table below gives a breakdown of the number of achieved interviews by the number of respondents sampled for each survey quarter.

Achieved interviews in the Jobs Separation Survey			
JSS quarter	Total number sampled	Number achieved	* Percentage of total sample achieved
1	351	273	77.8
2	407	302	74.2
3	422	323	76.5
4	468	365	78.0
Total	1648	1263	76.6

* It should be noted that these should not be regarded as final response rates as ineligible cases have not been taken into account. A discussion of the final response rates and a breakdown of the survey outcomes follows in Chapter 6.
Source: National Statistics (www.statistics.gov.uk)

Breakdown of sample by type of job change recorded in the LFS

Prior to the main-stage survey, predictions were made for the distribution of each type of job change based on previous LFS data as well as examination of the summer 2000 LFS data. The table below shows the total number of cases that were originally predicted for each type of job separation, as well as the actual numbers drawn in the survey sample across the four waves. The table also presents the achieved number of cases in each type of job separation and the proportion of the prediction that this number represents.

The predictions that were supplied by DTI took the form of a range, with lower and upper limits.⁷ The lower limit of the prediction has been used as the basis of this table as it was this lower limit on which the target number of interviews (1,200) was based (given a target response rate of 75 per cent).

Reason for leaving last job				
Reason for leaving	LFS prediction (Lower limit)	Drawn sample	Achieved sample	Percentage of prediction
Dismissed	40	38	29	72%
Redundant	320	271	215	67%
Resigned	680	716	570	84%
Early retirement	10	31	24	240%
Other	480	555	425	88%

Source: Job Separations Survey.

⁷ For example, the number of 'Dismissed' respondents predicted to be drawn from the LFS was between 10 and 20 for each quarter (a total of 40 to 80 cases).

6

Fieldwork procedures and response

Introduction

The Job Separations Survey was a telephone interview survey of respondents sampled from the Labour Force Survey. Where respondents did not have a telephone or had been interviewed face to face for their LFS interviews, the case was allocated to LFS field interviewers to complete alongside their usual quotas. In addition, cases which remained non-contacts at the end of the telephone unit interviewing period were reallocated to the field interviewers wherever possible.

The advance letter

Advance letters were produced by Social Survey Division (SSD) and sent directly to the respondents who were to be contacted by the telephone unit, approximately one week before contact was attempted. For those respondents who were to be called on in person, the letters were sent to the LFS Management Units to be kept until cases had been assigned to interviewers. When the cases had been allocated, the letters were sent to the interviewers and the interviewers then sent letters directly to the respondent one week before they would visit the address. This meant that if the interviewer knew they would not be visiting the area for a couple of weeks, they could prevent the letter being sent too far in advance of their visit.

Because the respondents for this survey had already taken part in five LFS interviews, the letter was not so much to introduce the Office for National Statistics to them, but to remind respondents of their participation in the LFS, introduce the Job Separations Survey and indicate who in the household we were interested in talking to. The letter also asked the respondent for their help with the JSS and stressed the importance of participation in surveys of this kind, as well as emphasising the short time the JSS would take to complete.

Welsh addresses were sent a double-sided Welsh and English version of the letter offering recipients the opportunity to speak to someone in Welsh. A copy of the advance letter (Welsh and English) can be seen in Appendix 5.

Interviewer briefing

A request was made for volunteers in the Telephone Unit (TU) to work on the Job Separations Survey and eight interviewers were recruited. Field force interviewers carrying out the face-to-face quotient of the sample and Telephone Unit interviewers were briefed separately.

Telephone Unit Interviewers

A face-to-face briefing was held at which the eight Telephone Unit interviewers, as well as four supervisors, attended. The interviewers were briefed on the main aims of the survey, who it was for and details of the sample. The Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) program was demonstrated to them using an overhead projector, while they were talked through the questionnaire instructions.

This briefing gave the interviewers an opportunity to see the CAPI version of the questionnaire before they started work on the survey, as well as to ask any questions.

Face-to-face interviewers

The LFS interviewers did not attend a face-to-face briefing because of the wide spread in their geographical location and the fact that it was not known at the start of each wave which interviewers would be allocated JSS interviews (as non-contacts from the Telephone Unit (TU) were reissued to the field).

Instead, all of the LFS interviewers were sent briefing packs which included the briefing notes used in the TU briefing and a set of interviewer instructions. The interviewers were instructed to only read the information if they were later allocated a JSS case.

Interviewers who were allocated cases were then sent information sheets for their interview(s) which included the contact name and address of the respondent and some demographic information about them carried from the LFS. They were also sent advance letters to send to respondents approximately one week before they planned to make contact.

A copy of the briefing notes and the interviewer instructions for the main-stage survey can be seen in Appendix 7.

Organisation of staff

Telephone Unit (TU) staff are split between four shifts of interviewing per week: Monday and Tuesday or Wednesday and Thursday, a.m. and p.m. There are two a.m. and p.m. shifts on Monday/Tuesday and Wednesday/Thursday. A total of eight interviewers were selected to cover all four of these shifts and were placed two per shift for each shift in the week.

The face-to-face interviews were carried out by Labour Force Survey interviewers. An advantage of using these interviewers rather than the general field force is that they will be more familiar with the subject matter of the questionnaire and may have interviewed the selected person previously on the LFS, or at least someone at the address. They may therefore already have built up a rapport with the respondent and may know useful information such as times when they are likely to find the respondent at home.

Reissue of telephone interviews to face-to-face

As already mentioned, respondents with whom the TU interviewers could not make contact (other than those cases where the respondent had moved with no forwarding address) were reissued to face-to-face interviewers.

At the end of each quarter, TU supervisors went through all of the non-contacts, as well as those which had been coded as no replies or had been left messages, and recorded the serial numbers of those cases that were suitable to reissue to the field.

The information sheets for these cases were then passed to the LFS Management Units to enable them to allocate the cases to suitable interviewers. Once the allocations had been made, the questionnaires were scattered to the chosen interviewers and they would proceed with the cases as normal. In each quarter there were usually around 20 to 40 cases that were reallocated to the field.

Survey response

The table below provides a breakdown of the final survey response. The total number of addresses sampled across the four waves was 1,648 and of these, 1,263 interviews were achieved which is slightly more than the target number of interviews (1,200).

The overall response rate for the survey was 77 per cent and the response within eligible cases was 80 per cent, exceeding the target response rate of 75 per cent.

Job Separations Survey: survey response

Survey wave	Target sample	Achieved sample	Total eligible	Ineligible	Refusal	Other e.g. non-contact	Response	Response eligible cases
1	351	274	333	18	15	45	78%	82%
2	407	302	387	20	19	66	74%	78%
3	422	323	411	11	33	55	77%	79%
4	468	364	444	24	35	44	78%	82%
Total	1648	1263	1575	73	102	210	77%	80%

Source: Job Separations Survey.

Ineligible cases were those cases for which either the information given in the LFS had been incorrect (and they had not actually left an employer in the specified period) or who were self-employed and therefore not eligible for the JSS.

One reason for this incorrect information was that the LFS collects data by proxy and the person supplying the information sometimes supplied incorrect data about the date the selected person left their job and whether they were employed on a payroll or were self-employed.

Four per cent of the target sample turned out to be ineligible.

7

Managing changes in the LFS

Changes to LFS variables after April 2001

Because the LFS changed considerably in April 2001, some of the variables used in the first wave of the JSS were superseded. In particular, the occupational classification system (updated from Soc90 to Soc2000), the ethnicity question and questions about the number of employees in the workplace all changed between the December to February and the March to May LFS waves. The updated versions of these variables were carried across for the second to fourth JSS quarters. How these variables changed and what steps were taken to take account of this in the JSS analysis are described below.

Owing to the relatively small number of cases using the December to February version of the variables (JSS quarter 1), we considered the best way to rectify the difference for all these variables was to recode the first quarter responses, bringing them in line with the response codes of the updated versions.

Occupational coding

The SOC2000 occupational classification system was introduced in April 2001 to replace the previous SOC90 classification. The main reason for the changes in the variable was to bring the classification up to date to reflect changes in society. The new code has a much tighter definition of some of the developing industries, including computer and related occupations, environment and conservation and customer service roles.

Recoding of occupational variables between March and April 2001 has been a major task for many large-scale surveys. However, because of the small number of cases for which this outdated data had been recorded, the task of matching the assigned codes against the updated coding system was not too arduous for the JSS.

The Methodology and Statistical Development Group in ONS created a user guide based on research which consisted of coding data to SOC90 and SOC2000 and looking at the correspondence between the two classifications. Analyses were conducted on data from three sources to show the relationships between SOC90 and SOC2000 at the unit group level.⁸ These sources included the 1991 Census and the LFS.

⁸ *User Guide to Soc2000: The relationship between Soc2000 and Soc90 Classifications*, Methodology and Statistical Development Group, Office for National Statistics.

The user guide included the results of this coding exercise in table format to illustrate how the variables mapped across from SOC90 to SOC2000 and thus where the relationships between the two variables lay. From these tables, it was possible to look at SOC90 data and see how it would have been coded using SOC2000. In many cases, the SOC90 data transferred directly into only one SOC2000 code. Where more than one code was displayed, the frequency of use was displayed for each code.

For the JSS recoding, these tables were used to code the SOC90 data into the updated version. Where recoding into a particular classification was not obvious, other data held in the JSS dataset (including industrial classifications, name of employer and any other data held about the respondent's position) were used to fine-tune the coding and to make sure that the chosen code was the most representative of the actual situation. Using this method allowed all the wave 1 cases where the SOC90 information was present, to be recoded into the new SOC2000 coding system.

Number of employees in the workplace

The variable recording the number of people in the workplace changed from NMPNO (main job) and NMPNOL (last job) for December to February to MPNE01 (for employees) and MPNS01 (for self-employed) for March to May. The response categories were the same for both variables:

Number of employees

1-10

11-19

20-24

Don't know but under 25

25-49

Don't know but over 24

50 or over

However, the difference between the two sets of variables is that the new version (MPNE01 and MPNS01) is divided into two different variables depending on whether the respondent is self-employed, while the former version does not make such a distinction.

For the JSS this is not such an issue as the sample excludes the self-employed. There were a couple of cases where the self-employed version of the question held data but these were cases where the respondents classified themselves as self-employed but were on the company payroll.

For the JSS analysis, all of the number of employee variables were re-coded into the MPNE01 variable. This did not result in any loss of data as any 'true'

self-employed respondent would have been filtered out during the sampling stage, or, if an error had been recorded in the LFS data, through the initial filter question on the JSS (LeftJob).

Ethnicity

The answer categories of the ethnicity question changed quite dramatically between the two LFS waves. The old and new response codes to the questions are as follows:

Code	Ethnic (pre April 2001)	Eth01
1	White	White
2	Black – Caribbean	Mixed
3	Black – African	Asian/Asian British
4	Black – Other	Black/Black Caribbean
5	Indian	Chinese
6	Other	Other
7	Bangladeshi	
8	Chinese	
9	None of these	

Because the vast majority of the sample was white (94 per cent) the problem of recoding the responses was limited to a small number of cases. For most of the ethnic groups, recoding into the new Eth01 code was fairly straightforward, as the Eth01 categories were more encompassing than the previous Ethnic codes rather than the other way round. However, the one area where data is lacking is in the 'Mixed' classification, as such a value did not exist in the first Ethnic question. The recoding method used was as follows:

Ethnic code 1 was recoded into Eth01 code 1,

Ethnic codes 2, 3 & 4 were recoded into Eth01 code 4,

Ethnic codes 5, 6 & 7 were recoded into Eth01 code 3,

Ethnic code 8 was recoded into Eth01 code 5, and

Ethnic code 9 was recoded into Eth01 code 6.

A new variable was created for the JSS and was named Ethnic01.

8

Weighting and adjustment procedures

Introduction

Together with DTI, SSD considered what biases may be present in the JSS dataset that could affect the quality of the data. Investigation into possible biases was undertaken to ensure that the bias in the data was not at an unacceptable level. A description of these investigations, as well as their findings, are shown below.

Weighting

JSS weights

SSD, in conjunction with the Methodology and Statistical Development Group (MG), attempted to identify possible causes of non-response bias in order to develop a weighting procedure to take account of this. A weight was also produced to enable DTI to use the data to produce population estimates.

To identify any non-response bias to the JSS, analyses were carried out on many of the demographic variables carried across from the LFS. These variables included sex, age, ethnic group, geographic region, family unit type and age of youngest dependent.

The entire sample of responding and non-responding individuals was used to establish whether there was any differentiation in the characteristics of those respondents who took part in the JSS and those who did not. As we had brought information about all the individuals across from the LFS, the amount of analysis we were able to do on the selected LFS respondents who didn't take part in the JSS was significant.

The outcome codes of all the cases were recoded into 'responding' and 'non-responding', with 'responding' being those cases for which a full interview took place with the selected person and 'non-responding' being all other cases (including ineligible, non-contacts, refusals, etc.). Crosstabulations of the demographic variables listed above were then run by this recoded outcome code to establish if there were any differences in the characteristics of those individuals who took part in the JSS and those who, for whatever reason, did not.

This analysis showed slight differential non-response between geographic regions, age groups, ethnic groups and family unit types. The next step was to

assess whether any of these four variables were correlated with the main variables of interest in the JSS (i.e. those that establish the situation behind the respondent leaving their job).

Results showed that the most likely source of non-response bias would be from differing response rates between age groups. There was a very slight indication of non-response bias in the other sample subgroups but because the sample was so small it was felt that it would not be possible to form meaningful non-response groups based on more than one variable. In particular, ethnic group was ruled out because there were too few non-white respondents, the difference in response between the geographic regions was felt to be small enough not to be significant (particularly if Merseyside was combined with the North West category) and as family unit type is strongly correlated with age there seemed little point in using both these variables.

Tables that show the relationship of these four variables by responding and non-responding cases are included in Appendix 8(A).

JSS weights were therefore created, based on each of five age groups. The weight was calculated by dividing the set sample size by the responding sample size for each age group. These five separate JSS weights were added to the dataset and the weight is called wtjss. These weights can be viewed in Appendix 8(B).

Once the weights had been applied to the dataset, weighted distributions of the main demographic and survey variables were run and compared with identical non-weighted distributions. If the weights had an impact on the analyses, the final weight would be created using the JSS weight multiplied by the LFS weight. However, it was found that the JSS weights made very little difference, if any, to the distributions and a decision was therefore made not to include the JSS weights when producing the final weighting system.

Tables showing the difference between the weighted and non-weighted distributions of two of the variables by age are included in Appendix 8(C).

Attrition bias

Some analyses were carried out on wave 5 LFS responders as compared with responders of all waves in order to investigate whether wave 5 attrition introduced any bias into the JSS dataset. It was found that distributions based on wave 5 alone reported a lower proportion of those aged 16 to 34 (for both men and women), a lower proportion in Merseyside, lower levels of unemployment and activity and a higher level of employment. The results therefore suggested that LFS attrition would introduce a small degree of bias into the JSS sample. The results of this analysis appear in Appendix 8 (D).

However, the modest level of this bias meant that a decision was taken by both DTI and ONS that the slight improvement in the estimates that correcting for this bias would create did not warrant the extensive work that would be involved in doing so. Therefore the JSS data has not been adjusted for LFS wave 5 attrition.

Final weighting and grossing

Following the decisions not to employ weights for JSS non-response and attrition bias, the weighting system to be used for the JSS was based mainly on the weighting system used in the LFS waves from which the JSS was sampled.

DTI requested that the data be grossed up to the population and the final weight used in the JSS, Grossfac, was computed by multiplying the LFS weight, INTWT02, by a grossing factor. The grossing factor was created as follows:

For each of the quarters from which the JSS samples were drawn⁹ the total population of the LFS sample was obtained.

For each of the quarters, the entire wave 5 sample was weighted and the sample size of each of these was recorded. A scaling factor was computed by dividing the entire population size by the size of the weighted wave 5 sample. This scaling factor was then divided by four as there were four quarters to the JSS which were based on four separate LFS waves, each with different sample size.

The final weight, Grossfac, was created by multiplying the scaling factor for each case in the JSS by the INTWT02 value assigned to each case. A table showing the process of creating the Grossfac weight is included in Appendix 8 (E).

An additional weight based on the overall response rate of the JSS (80 per cent) was added to the dataset to allow any comparisons to the population to be made in the future. This weight was calculated by dividing one by one-hundredth of the overall response rate:

$1/0.8$.

The weight is called nrweight.

Standard errors

Sampling errors are survey errors that arise as a result of the fact that the sample chosen is only one of a number of samples that could have been chosen. An issue of interest to users of survey data is the precision of the estimates that are produced from the chosen sample. The smaller the sample from which an estimate is derived, the less precise the estimate is.

The standard error of the mean provides a measure of the range of different estimates; this is the standard deviation of the estimates (means or proportions) which would have arisen from the different samples that might have been selected. The smaller the standard error, the more precise the estimate.

Standard errors calculated from a survey with a simple random sample will, typically, differ from those calculated from a more complex sample design such

⁹ (Dec 2001 to Feb 2002, Mar to May 2002, June to Aug 2002 and Sep to Nov 2002)

as stratified or cluster sampling. A useful benchmark to assess the relative magnitude of a standard error is to calculate the variance derived from a particular (complex) sample design with the variance that would have arisen from a simple random sample of the same size. This ratio (of the variances) is the design effect, or Deft. (*LFS User Guide, Volume 1: Design and Methodology, 1997*).

The standard way to produce standard errors for complex survey designs is as follows:

$$\text{Standard error (complex survey design)} = \text{Standard error (simple survey design)} * \text{deft.}$$

or

$$\sqrt{(p(1-p)/n)} * \text{deft}$$

For the JSS, standard errors that take into account this design effect were created using STATA, an integrated statistical package for use in Windows, Macintosh and Unix.

Standard errors for the proportions of some of the main survey variables, can be seen in the main analysis part of this report.

9

The impact of the sampling strategy on data analysis

Although respondents for the Job Separations Survey were only sampled if they left their job because of resignation, dismissal, early retirement, redundancy or some 'other' reason, they were asked again at the start of the JSS for their main reason for leaving their job. The options given here included all the reasons a person may leave a job, not just those that had been sampled from the LFS¹⁰.

In this JSS question, a good deal of respondents (seven per cent of the sample) reported that they had left their job because a temporary job or contract had come to an end. A discussion took place between DTI and ONS about whether this group of respondents should be excluded from the dataset, as it was felt that their inclusion might produce an artificially low percentage for this group because those who cited this as the reason for leaving their job in the Labour Force Survey would not be included. However, it was decided that they should remain in the data for a number of reasons.

First, the questions asked in the LFS and in the JSS are not the same and as such are asking for very slightly different information. As such, respondents who said that they left because of a temporary job coming to an end in the JSS could not accurately be used as a measure of this group in the LFS.

Second, one of the main aims of the Job Separations Survey was to find out how employees themselves classify their job separations and how this compares with what really happened. The 'WhyLeft' question was included in the JSS to investigate how the reasons given in the JSS and those given in the LFS differed. In fact, in many cases, the reasons given at the two questions were quite different, as is illustrated in Table 9.1 in Appendix Nine. Respondents who said in the JSS that they left because of a temporary job coming to an end were spread across all the LFS reasons for leaving.

¹⁰ WhyLeft – 'May I just check, how did you come to leave your job at [Employer]?'

- Dismissed
- Made redundant
- Resign/give notice
- Took early retirement
- Retired at the normal age
- Temporary job/contract that came to an end
- Or did you leave for some other reason?

Third, it is useful to know that although these respondents gave temporary job or contract as the reason for leaving their job, when they were probed further on subsequent questions it was found that for many of them there were more diverse factors surrounding their experience.

Analysis was run on the 85 cases who said that they had left because a temporary job or contract had come to an end, and many of them said in subsequent questions that they had to leave because of too much sickness absence, their company closing down or an imposed change in working conditions. These respondents were routed on to sections with further questions relevant to each of these.

One reason for the inconsistency in responses between the two surveys could be reluctance on the part of the respondent to talk about the real reason for leaving their job in one survey or another. Another reason could be because the information given in the LFS may have been given by proxy while in the JSS only first-hand information was accepted.

It was decided that where respondents had said that they had left because a temporary job or contract ended, but further probing showed that something else was going on, these respondents were of definite interest to the survey and should be included in the analysis.

Appendix 1

LFS variables carried across – wave 1

INECACA	Economic activity
NSTATL	Employment status (last job)
NSTAT	Employment status
SOCMAJL	Major occupation group (last job)
SOCMINL	Minor occupation group (last job)
SOCLAST	Occupation (last job)
SOCMAJM	Major occupation group (main job)
SOCMINM	Minor occupation group (main job)
SOCMAIN	Occupation (main job)
INDS92L	Industry SECTION (previous job)
INDD92L	Industry DIVISION (previous job)
INDG92L	Industry GROUP (previous job)
INDM92L	Industry CLASS (previous job)
INDS92M	Industry SECTION (main job)
INDD92M	Industry DIVISION (main job)
INDG92M	Industry GROUP (main job)
SOCLASL	Social class in last job
SOCLASM	Social class
NMPNOL	Number of employees at workplace (last job)
NMPNO	Number of employees at workplace
OTHWPNO	No. of employees in total in the UK
OTHWP	Employer has other workplaces in UK
FTPTWK	Full-time or part-time in main job
TTUSHR	Total usual hours in main job
JOBTYP	Permanent or temporary job
JOBTMP	Types of temporary job
EMPMON	Length of time in continuous employment (incl. self-employed)
EDAGE	Age when completed continuous FT education
SEX	Sex
ETHNIC	Ethnic origin
AGE	Age
MARSTT	Marital status
LIVTOG	Whether living together as couple
FUTYPE	Type of family unit
AYFL19	Age youngest child in family under 19
RELHFU	Relationship to head of family unit
LNGLIM	Have health problem lasting more than 1 year
LIMITK	Whether health problem affects kind of work
LIMITA	Whether health problem affects amount work
GOVTOF	Government office regions – quanvert variable
QUALS(01–11)	Type (qualification) already held 1–11
REDUND	Whether made redundant in last 3 months
REDPAID	Whether left paid job in last 3 months
REDYLFT	Reason for leaving last job
WNLEFT2	When left last job – new ranges

LFS variables carried across – waves 2 to 4

INECACA	Economic activity
NSTATL	Employment status (last job)
NSTAT	Employment status
SC2KMMJ	Major occupation group in main job
SC2KMMN	Minor occupation group in main job
SOC2KM	Occupation in main job
SC2KLMJ	Major occupation group in last job
SC2KLMN	Minor occupation group in last job
SOC2KL	Occupation in last job
INDS92L	Industry SECTION (previous job)
INDD92L	Industry DIVISION (previous job)
INDG92L	Industry GROUP (previous job)
INDM92L	Industry CLASS (previous job)
INDS92M	Industry SECTION (main job)
INDD92M	Industry DIVISION (main job)
INDG92M	Industry GROUP (main job)
MPNS01	Number of employees (self-employed)
MPNE01	Number of employees
OTHWPNO	No. of employees in total in the UK
OTHWP	Employer has other workplaces in UK
FTPTWK	Full-time or part-time in main job
TTUSHR	Total usual hours in main job
JOBTYP	Permanent or temporary job
JOBTMP	Types of temporary job
EMPMON	Length of time in continuous employment (incl. self-employed)
EDAGE	Age when completed continuous FT education
SEX	Sex
ETH01	Ethnic origin
AGE	Age
MARSTT	Marital status
LIVTOG	Whether living together as couple
FUTYPE	Type of family unit
AYFL19	Age youngest child in family under 19
RELHFU	Relationship to head of family unit
LNGLIM	Have health problem lasting more than 1 year
LIMITK	Whether health problem affects kind of work
LIMITA	Whether health problem affects amount work
GOVTOF	Government office regions – quanvert variable
QUALS(01–11)	Type (qualification) already held 1–11
REDUND	Whether made redundant in last 3 months
REDPAID	Whether left paid job in last 3 months
REDYLFT	Reason for leaving last job
WNLEFT2	When left last job – new ranges

Appendix 2

The questionnaire

Variable Name Preliminary questions A-D to all respondents.

QBGROUND

Name ENTER THE RESPONDENT'S NAME

LeftJob In the Labour Force Survey interview it was recorded that you had left a job in the previous 3 months. Is this correct?

THIS MEANS A CHANGE OF EMPLOYER RATHER THAN A MOVE WITHIN THE SAME ORGANISATION. CASES WHERE THE EMPLOYER HAS CHANGED BUT THE JOB IS THE SAME (I.E. A TAKEOVER) SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED.

DO NOT INCLUDE SELF-EMPLOYED PEOPLE WHO HAVE GIVEN UP A SELF-EMPLOYED JOB OR CONTRACT, OR WHO ARE DIRECTORS OF A BUSINESS WHICH THEY OWN.

Yes A
No Exit

DateLeft A May I just check, on what date did you leave that job? B
ENTER DATE DD/MM/YY

EDAGE THIS IS THE LFS VARIABLE WHICH SHOWS THE AGE THE RESPONDENT LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION. CODE 96 MEANS THEY WERE STILL IN FULL-TIME EDUCATION AT WAVE 5 INTERVIEW.

Employer B And could you tell me the name of the employer you left on this date? C

HowLong C How long were you with [Employer]?
Less than two years C2
Two years or more C1

Years C1 ENTER TIME IN YEARS If < 5 then D
If > 5 then 1

Months C2 ENTER TIME IN MONTHS D

NumChang D Including the time you left [Employer], how many times have you changed or left an employer in the last 5 years? 1

**QBLEAVE
REDYLFT** THIS VARIABLE SHOWS THE REASON THE RESPONDENT GAVE FOR LEAVING THEIR JOB IN THE WAVE 5 LFS INTERVIEW

WhyLeft 1 (May I just check) how did you come to leave your job at [Employer]. Were you...?

RUNNING PROMPT

Dismiss	Dismissed	2
Redunt	Made redundant	3
Resign	Did you resign / give notice (including leaving an employment agency)	3
Earltire	Take early retirement	3
Normtire	Retire at the normal age (For retirement in that job)	3
Contract	Or was it a temporary or contract job Which came to an end	1a
Other	Or did you leave for some other reason	3

LongTemp 1a How long was the contract for?
RUNNING PROMPT

Lestthree	Less than 3 months	3
Threesix	3 months but less than 6 months	3
SixTwelv	6 months but less than 12 months	3
OneTwo	12 months but less than 2 years	3
MoreTwo	2 years or more	3
Temp	No fixed period, just a temporary job	3

WhyDismi 2 What was the reason given for your dismissal?
READ OUT WHOLE LIST

EndJob	Job came to an end	3
Retire	Compulsory retirement age	6
Miscond	Alleged misconduct	6
Ineffict	Alleged inefficiency	6
Health	Health reasons	6
OthDiss	Other reasons given (include dispute with employer here if not covered by other codes)	6
Noreason	No reason given	6

Wished 3 Would your employer have allowed you to have stayed on if you had wanted?

Leave	No, I had to leave (employer would not have let me stay on)	4
Stayed	Yes, I could have stayed on if I had wanted	5

HavLeave 4 Why did you have to leave?
INTERVIEWER CODE MAIN
REASON

Miscond2	Alleged misconduct	6
Ineffic2	Alleged inefficiency	6
Sickness	Too much sickness absence	6
Dispute	Dispute or disagreement with employer or colleagues	6
WorkChang	Employer imposed change in working conditions	9
Closed	Company closed down/ceased trading	11
Jobended	Job no longer there (e.g. job ended or transferred to another employer or company)	11
Compret	Compulsory retirement age	33
IllHealth	Ill health	6
Personal	Personal reasons made it difficult or impossible	52

StayOn 5 If you had stayed on, would you have...?

RUNNING PROMPT

Continue	Continued in the job as before (with no change in working conditions)	52
Accept	Unwillingly accepted changes in working conditions imposed By your employer	9
Negotiate	Negotiated a change in your working conditions with your employer, e.g. going part time	52
TakeTemp	Taken a temporary or fixed term contract, or	9
OthWay	Would you have done something else – Please specify	5a
OthMeans	5a In what other way would you have stayed on?	52
Warning	6 Did your employer warn you in advance that you could be dismissed or made redundant (laid off)?	
	Yes	7
	No	9
QBDISMISS		
TypeWarn	7 Was this (were these) warning(s) given formally or informally?	
Formal	Formally - received something in writing (including email) or had formal meeting with employer or other person of authority	8
Informal	Informally – spoken to by employer or other person of authority	9
Both	Both	8
FormWarn	8 How was (were) the warning(s) given?	
Verbal	Verbally	9
Written	In writing	9
Both	Both	9
Indust	9 May I just check, did you leave your job at [Employer] in the course of an industrial dispute or strike?	
	Yes	10
	No	15
Dispute	10 What was the industrial dispute or strike about? INTERVIEWER CODE MAIN REASON	
Pay	Pay or other working conditions	15
DiscGen	Discrimination on grounds of sex	15
DiscEthn	Discrimination on grounds of ethnic group, origin or race	15
DiscSexO	Discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation	15
DiscTrad	Discrimination on grounds of trade union membership	15
PayDduc	Deductions from pay	15
SeleRed	Selection for redundancy	15
Redundan	11 May I just check, what reason was given for the redundancy or end of your job?	

CODE ALL THAT APPLY
SET [10] OF

Shortage	Shortage of work or job completed	13
Costred	Need to reduce costs	13
Structur	Improve management or workforce structure	13
Prospect	To improve prospects for others	13
Transfer	Transfer of work to another employer	12
Merger	Merger between companies / organisations	12
Relocate	Employer relocated	13
Closed	Company closed down or ceased trading	13
Illness	Your own ill health	13
OthRend	Other reason	13
TransReg	12 When work is transferred to another employer, worker's rights are often preserved by Transfer of Employment (TUPE) regulations. Was this the case in your redundancy?	
	Yes	13
	No	13
	Don't Know	13
RedAffct	13 Did this redundancy affect just you, or were other workers considered for redundancy or made redundant at the same time?	
JustMe	Just me	15
Workers	Other workers involved	14
Consult	14 Did your employer consult with the workers or a trade union about the need to lay off workers? NOTE: A CONSULTATION IS A TWO-WAY PROCESS WHERE WORKERS ARE ASKED TO GIVE THEIR OPINIONS – TELLING WORKERS THAT THERE WILL BE LAY-OFFS IS NOT A CONSULTATION	
YesTrade	Yes, consulted with trade union	15
YesWorks	Yes, consulted with workers	15
NoConsult	No	15
Dknw	Don't know	15
QBCOMPS		
EV		
OffAdvi	15 Before you left your job, did your employer offer to arrange independent advice from someone outside the company or organisation? INCLUDE HELP OFFERED THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATOR BROUGHT IN TO RUN COMPANY IN CASES OF BANKRUPTCY ETC.	
	Yes	16
	No	17
TakeAdvi	16 Did you take up the offer of receiving advice?	
	Yes	17
	No	17
TradMemb	17 Were you a member of a trade union?	

	Yes	18
	No	19
TradSeek	18 Did you seek help or advice from your trade union about having to leave your job?	
	Yes	19
	No	19
OthAdvi	19 Did you ask anyone else for advice?	
	Yes	20
	No	22
WhoAdvi	20 Who did you ask for advice?	
Citizen	Citizens Advice Bureau	22
Acas	Acas	22
Welfare	Welfare Rights Centre	22
Consultant	Employment consultant	22
Solicitor	Solicitor	22
SomeElse	Someone else – please specify	21
ElseAdvi	21 Who else did you ask for advice?	22
IntGriev	22 Did your employer have an internal grievance procedure?	
Yes	Yes – Respondent is sure there is a procedure	23
YesThink	No – Respondent is sure there is not a procedure	27
Unsure	Respondent is unsure whether a procedure exists	27
Dknw	Don't know	27
UseGriev	23 Did you use the grievance procedure to challenge having to leave?	
	Yes	24
	No	27
Hearing	24 Did you have a meeting with your employer to try to resolve the matter?	
	Yes	25
	No	27
HearRep	25 Were you allowed to take a representative or supporter to the meeting?	
	Yes	26
	No	27
WhoRep	26 Who accompanied you?	
TURep	Trade union representative	27
LegaRep	Legal representative	27
Colleag	Colleague	27
LineMan	Line manager	27
OthRep	Other	27
Noone	No-one	27
InduTrib	27 Did the union, an advisor or anyone else suggest taking the case to an employment tribunal?	

UniTrib	Yes, union	28
AdviTrib	Yes, advisor	28
ElseTrib	Yes, someone else	28
NoTrib	No – suggested	28
GoTrib	28 And did you make an application to an employment tribunal?	
	Yes	29
	No	If 23 = Yes 31 If 23 = No 33
AppEnd	29 Applications to employment tribunals can end in four ways. What happened in your case? Was it...? RUNNING PROMPT. PLEASE READ OUT SLOWLY.	
Withdraw	Withdrawn, whereby you dropped the claim without any financial or other compensation	31
Settled	Settled, whereby you agreed with your employer not to pursue the claim in exchange for financial or other compensation	30
Hearing	Decided at a full tribunal hearing (found in either yours or your employer's favour)	31
Dismiss	Or dismissed or disposed by the tribunal because your case was ineligible	31
Settlement	30 THIS QUESTION AIMS TO FIND OUT WHO WAS INVOLVED IN FORMALLY AGREEING THE SETTLEMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT RUNNING PROMPT. Was....?	
Acas	Acas involved in drawing up the final settlement	31
Independ	Or were you required to sign a legally binding agreement, forgoing your right to Continue your case or take it to tribunal, after taking independent legal advice (for example from a solicitor)	31
Dont	Or do you not know	31
Outcome	31 What was the final outcome (when all procedures were completed)? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
Reinstat	Reinstated – offered old job back (whether or not taken)	33
Engage	Re-engaged – offered a different job by your employer	33
Money	Received extra monetary compensation, (more than you were previously entitled to)	32
OthComp	Received other non-monetary compensation such as a reference or apology	33
Settle	Agreed a private settlement with your employer	33
NoDiff	Or did it make no difference in the end	33
Waiting	Or are you still waiting to hear outcome	33
HowExtra	32 How much extra monetary compensation did you receive? ENTER AMOUNT IN POUNDS	33
QBALLCOM		
P		
HelpBefo	33 Before you left your job at [Employer], did your employer offer to help you in any of the following ways...? INDIVIDUAL PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
TimeOff	Give you additional time off to look for a new job	34

OutPlace	Offer you the services of a recruitment agency	34
Counsel	Offer you counselling	34
Training	Provide training	34
NoHelp	Or was no help given	34
Notice	34 Did your employer give you a period of notice?	
	Yes	35
	No	36
NoPeriod	35 What was your period of notice? ANSWER IN WEEKS. IF LESS THAN ONE WEEK ANSWER AS ZERO (0)	36
Payment	36 Apart from your normal wages or salary, did you receive any payments from your employer when you left your job? (Do not include any compensation awarded by a tribunal, but do include any statutory redundancy payments or pension payments which are from, or arranged through your employer)	
Yes	Yes	40
No	No	37
Waiting	Waiting to receive outstanding payment(s)	40
NotPaid	37 Were there any payments which you felt you were entitled to but which you did not, or will not, receive?	
	Yes	38
	No	98
WhatNot	38 What other payments did you feel you were entitled to? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
BackPay	Back pay – pay owed to the respondent in addition to normal wages or salary	98
InLieu	Payment instead of working out your period of notice	98
RedunPay	Compensation for loss of job or redundancy payment	98
Pension	Pension payment	98
LeavePay	Holiday pay for leave you had not taken	98
OtherPay	Payment for anything else – please specify	39
WhatOther	39 Please describe the other payment(s) mentioned	98
WhatPay	40 What payments did you or will you receive. Payment for...? INDIVIDUAL PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.	
BackPay	Back pay – pay owed to the respondent in addition to normal wages or salary	42
InLieu	Payment instead of working out your period of notice	43
RedunPay	Compensation for loss of job or redundancy payment (Include statutory redundancy pay but not that awarded by a tribunal)	44
Pension	Pension payment	45
LeavePay	Holiday pay for leave you had not taken	49
OtherPay	Payment for anything else – please specify	41
PayOther	41 Please tell me about any other payments you received	98
MuchBack	42 How much did you (will you) receive for back pay?	98

MuchLieu	43 How much did you (will you) receive for payment instead of working out your notice?	98
MuchRedun	44 How much did you (will you) receive for compensation for loss of your job?	51
Pension1	45 Is (was) this pension payment... PLEASE CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
Lump	A lump sum payment	46
Refund	A refund of pension contributions you had made	47
RegPens	Or the start of your regular pension payments	48
MuchLump	46 How much is or was this lump sum payment?	98
MuchRefund	47 How much did you (will you) receive as refund for your pension contributions?	98
MuchReg	48 How much are you (or will you be) receiving for your regular pension payments? (PLEASE ENTER AMOUNT IN POUNDS AND HOW OFTEN PAYMENTS ARE, OR WILL BE, RECEIVED [E.G. WEEKLY OR MONTHLY] IN THE SAME BOX)	98
MuchLeav	49 How much did you (will you) receive for leave you had not taken?	98
MuchOther	50 How much did you (will you) receive for this	98
ReduWage	51 You mentioned a redundancy payment. Thinking of your usual wages or salary, what period of time would that payment be equal to? PLEASE RECORD WHETHER GIVEN IN TERMS OF WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS	98
QBVOLREG		
GiveNoti	52 When you decided to leave your job, did you have to give a period of notice?	
	Yes	53
	No	55
LongNoti	53 How long was that? PLEASE RECORD IN WEEKS. IF LESS THAN ONE WEEK ENTER ZERO (0)	54
SpentNoti	54 And how long a period did you actually spend on notice? ONLY INCLUDE TIME ACTUALLY SPENT ON NOTICE OR ON LEAVE IN LIEU OF NOTICE. DO NOT INCLUDE ANY PERIODS FOR WHICH THE RESPONDENT RECEIVED PAY INSTEAD OF WORKING NOTICE. PLEASE RECORD ANSWER IN WEEKS. IF LESS THAN ONE WEEK ENTER ZERO (0)	55
Payment2	55 Did you receive any payments from your employer when you left your job? (Include any statutory redundancy payments or pension payments which are from, or arranged through, your employer) WAITING SHOULD ONLY BE USED FOR CASES WHERE RESPONDENT HAS RECEIVED CONFIRMATION THAT THEY WILL RECEIVE MONEY.	

Yes	Yes	59
No	No	56
Waiting	Waiting to receive outstanding payment(s)	59
NotPaid2	56 Were there any payments which you felt you were entitled to but which you did not, or will not, receive?	
	Yes	57
	No	71
WhatNot2	57 What payments did you feel you were entitled to? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
BackPay	Back pay (pay owed to the respondent in addition to normal wages or salary)	71
InLieu	Payment instead of working out your period of notice	71
RedunPay	Compensation for loss of job / redundancy payment	71
Pension	Pension payment	71
LeavePay	Holiday pay for leave you have not taken	71
OtherPay	Payment for anything else – please specify	71
WhatOth2	58 Please describe the other payment(s) mentioned	71
WhatPay2	59 What payments did you (will you) receive? Payment for.... INDIVIDUAL PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.	
BackPay	Back pay – pay owed to the respondent in addition to normal wages or salary	61
InLieu	Payment instead of working out your period of notice	62
RedunPay	Compensation for loss of job or redundancy payment	63
Pension	Pension payment	64
LeavePay	Holiday pay for leave you had not taken	68
OtherPay	Payment for anything else – please specify	60
PayOth2	60 Please tell me about any other payments you received?	69
MuchBack2	61 How much did you / will you receive for back pay?	71
MuchLieu2	62 How much did you / will you receive for payment instead of working out your notice?	71
MuchRedu2	63 How much did you / will you receive for compensation for loss of your job?	70
Pension2	64 Is (was) this pension payment...? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
Lump	A lump sum payment	65
Refund	A refund of pension contributions you had made	66
RegPens	Or the start of your regular pension payments	67
MuchLump2	65 How much is (was) this lump sum payment?	71
MuchRefun2	66 How much did you (will you) receive as refund for your pension contributions?	71
MuchReg2	67 How much are you (will you be) receiving for your regular pension payments? PLEASE ENTER AMOUNT IN POUNDS AND HOW OFTEN PAYMENTS ARE, OR WILL BE, RECEIVED (E.G. WEEKLY OR MONTHLY) IN THE SAME BOX	71

MuchLeav2	68 How much did you (will you) receive for leave you had not taken?	71
MuchOth2	69 How much did you (will you) receive for this these payments?	71
ReduWage2	70 You mentioned a redundancy payment. Thinking of your usual wages or salary, what period of time would that payment be equal to? PLEASE RECORD WHETHER GIVEN IN TERMS OF WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS	71
WhyLeave	71 What was the main reason you decided to leave your job? CODE MAIN REASON	
WantJob	Wanted to get another job	94
FoundJob	Had found another job	94
WantBus	Wanted to become self-employed, work on your own account or start a business	97
Children	To look after children	93
LookAft	To look after another dependent or person who needs care	93
Health	Own health reasons	93
Educate	To undertake, or concentrate on, education or training	93
RestLeis	To take a rest, increase leisure time or take part in a leisure activity	93
Dispute	Had dispute or disagreement with employer or colleagues	72
Other	Other reason – please specify	92
Windust	72 May I just check, did you leave your job in the course of an industrial dispute or strike?	
	Yes	73
	No	74
Wdispute	73 What was the industrial dispute or strike about? CODE MAIN REASON	
Pay	Pay or other working conditions.	74
DiscGen	Discrimination on grounds of sex	74
DiscEthn	Discrimination on grounds of ethnic group, origin or race	74
DiscSexO	Discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation	74
DiscTrad	Discrimination on grounds of trade union membership	74
PayDduc	Deductions from pay	74
SeleRed	Selection for redundancy	74
WoffAdvi	74 Before you left your job at [Employer], did your employer offer to arrange independent advice from someone outside the company or organisation? INCLUDE HELP OFFERED THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATOR BROUGHT IN TO RUN COMPANY IN CASES OF BANKRUPTCY ETC.	
	Yes	75
	No	76
WtakeAdvi	75 Did you take up the offer of receiving advice?	
	Yes	76
	No	76
WTradMemb	76 Were you a member of a trade union?	

	Yes	77
	No	78
WTradSeek	77 Did you seek help or advice from your trade union about having to leave your job?	
	Yes	78
	No	78
WOthAdvi	78 Did you ask anyone else for advice?	
	Yes	79
	No	81
WWhoAdvi	79 Who did you ask for advice?	
Citizen	Citizens Advice Bureau	81
Acas	Acas	81
Welfare	Welfare Rights Centre	81
Consultant	Employment consultant	81
Solicitor	Solicitor	81
SomeElse	Someone else – please specify	80
WElseAdvi	80 Who else did you ask for advice?	81
WIntGriev	81 Did your employer have an internal grievance procedure?	
Yes	Yes – respondent is sure there is a procedure	82
No	No – respondent is sure there is not a procedure	86
Unsure	Respondent is unsure whether a procedure exists	86
Dknw	Don't know	86
WUseGriev	82 Did you use the grievance procedure to challenge having to leave?	
	Yes	83
	No	86
WHearing	83 Did you have a meeting with your employer to try to resolve the matter?	
	Yes	84
	No	86
WHearRep	84 Were you allowed to take a representative or supporter to the meeting?	
	Yes	85
	No	86
WWhoRep	85 Who accompanied you?	
TURep	Trade union representative	86
LegaRep	Legal representative	86
Colleag	Colleague	86
LineMan	Line manager	86
OthRep	Other	86
Noone	No one	86
WInduTrib	86 Did the union, an advisor or anyone else suggest taking the case to an employment tribunal? CODE FIRST THAT APPLIES	

UniTrib	Yes, union	87
AdviTrib	Yes, advisor	87
ElseTrib	Yes, someone else	87
NoTrib	No	87
WGoTrib	87 And did you make an application to an employment tribunal	
	Yes	88
	No	If 82=Yes 90 If 82=No 98
WAppEnd	88 Applications to employment tribunals can end in four ways. What happened in your case? Was it...? RUNNING PROMPT. PLEASE READ SLOWLY.	
Withdraw	Withdrawn, whereby you dropped the claim without any financial or other compensation	90
Settled	Settled, whereby you agreed with your employer not to pursue the claim in exchange for financial or other compensation	89
Hearing	Decided at a full tribunal hearing (found in either yours or your employer's favour)	90
Dismiss	Or dismissed or disposed by the tribunal because your case was ineligible	90
WSettlement	89 THIS QUESTION AIMS TO FIND OUT WHO WAS INVOLVED IN FORMALLY AGREEING THE SETTLEMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT. RUNNING PROMPT. Was...?	
Acas	Acas involved in drawing up the final settlement	90
Independ	Or were you required to sign a legally binding agreement, forgoing your right to continue your case or take it to tribunal, after taking independent legal advice (for example from a solicitor)	90
Dont	Or do you not know	90
WOutcome	90 What was the final outcome (when all procedures were completed)? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
Reinstat	Reinstated – offered your old job back (whether or not taken)	98
Engage	Re-engaged – offered a different job by your employer	98
Money	Received extra monetary compensation, (more than you were previously entitled to)	91
OthComp	Received other non-monetary compensation such as a reference or apology	98
Settle	Agreed a private settlement with your employer	
NoDiff	It made no difference in the end	98
Waiting	Still waiting to hear outcome	98
WHowExtra	91 How much extra monetary compensation did you receive? ENTER AMOUNT IN POUNDS	98
OtherWhy	92 What was the reason you decided to leave your job?	98
GiveBreak	93 Did you see this as taking a break from work or giving up work	

	permanently?	
Break	Taking a break from work	98
GiveUp	Giving up work permanently	98
WhyAnoth	94 Why did you get or want to get another job? Was it because you wanted...? INDIVIDUAL PROMPT	
BettPay	Better pay	100
BettCond	Better conditions at work	100
FamFrien	More family-friendly working arrangements	96
Career	Better career prospects	100
Hours	To change hours (e.g. from full- to part-time)	100
Other	Some other reason – please specify?	95
OthWhyAn	95 What was the reason you wanted another job?	100
FamCond	96 What conditions were you looking for?	
Creche	Childcare facilities/crèche at or near workplace	100
FlexTime	Flexitime	100
TimeOff	Time off work to care for children or others	100
Closer	Working closer to home	100
Other	Other	100
StartBus	97 And did you work on your own account or start a business after you left your job?	
	Yes	116
	No	98
LookWork	98 Can I just check, have you looked for work since you left your job?	
	Yes	103
	No	99
PaidWork	99 Can I just check, have you done any paid work since you left your job at [Employer]?	
	Yes	106
	No	110
Looking	100 Thinking of the job you left at [Employer], were you looking for work before you left that job?	
	Yes	101
	No	101
QBWANTJOB		
JobLined	101 Did you have a job to go to, when you left your job? ONLY ANSWER YES IF RESPONDENT HAD RECEIVED A FIRM OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT WHICH THEY HAD ACCEPTED	
	Yes	106
	No	102
LookWor2	102 (May I just check) have you looked for work since you left that job?	

	Yes	103
	No	105
LookMeth	103 What methods have you used to look for work? Did you...? INDIVIDUAL PROMPT	
EmpServ	Use the Employment Service	104
Private	Use a private employment agency	104
NewsMags	Look in newspapers or magazines	104
Direct	Apply directly to employers	104
Friends	Ask friends, relatives or others about jobs	104
Internet	Use the internet to look for work	104
Other	Do anything else to find work	104
LongLook	104 How long were you (have you been) looking for work?	
Less1wk	Less than one week	105
Oneless2	One week but less than two weeks	105
Twoless4	Two weeks but less than four weeks	105
Onemles3	Four weeks but less than three months	105
More3mon	More than three months	105
Stilllook	Still looking	105
PaidWor2	105 May I just check, since you left your job at [Employer] have you done any paid work?	
	Yes	106
	No	110
TypeJob	106 Is or was this a permanent job, a fixed-term appointment, a consultancy or freelance position or another type of temporary job? IF RESPONDENT HAS HELD MORE THAN ONE JOB, GIVE PRIORITY TO PERMANENT JOB EVEN IF NOW ENDED. IF NO PERMANENT JOB HELD GIVE PRIORITY TO THE LONGEST POSITION.	
Perm	Permanent job	107
Fixed	Fixed term appointment	107
Consult	Consultancy or freelance	107
Temp	Temporary work	107
PayComp	107 Are or were you being paid more, less or about the same as the job you had at [Employer] (for the same amount of work)? IF MORE THAN ONE JOB SHOULD ANSWER FOR PERMANENT OR LONGEST JOB	
PaidMore	Paid more	108
PaidLess	Paid less	108
PaidSame	Paid about the same.	108
FullPart	108 Is or was this job full time or part-time?	
Full	Full-time	111
Part	Part-time	109

FuLikely	109 Are you likely to take a full time job at any time in the future?	
	Yes	111
	No	111
VolWork	110 Since you left your job, have you undertaken any voluntary work?	
	Yes	111
	No	111
QBALLSEPS		
JobSeek	111 May I just check, have you claimed Jobseeker's Allowance or Income Support since you left your job at [Employer]?	
JobSeeks	Jobseeker's Allowance / Unemployment Benefit	112
IncSupp	Income Support / Supplementary Benefit	112
Neither	Neither	112
Pensions	112 Were you a member of a pension scheme operated by or provided for you by [Employer]? INCLUDE PENSION SCHEMES OPERATED BY, OR ARRANGED THROUGH, YOUR EMPLOYER BUT DO NOT INCLUDE PRIVATE PENSION ARRANGEMENTS.	
	Yes	113
	No	114
PensLeft	113 And what happened to your pension entitlement when you left? CODE ALL THAT APPLY	
PenNow	Pension now being paid (in full or part)	114
PenFroze	Pension frozen until retirement age	114
PenTrans	Pension rights transferred to a future employer	114
PenRefun	Pension payments refunded	114
PensLost	Lost all pension entitlement	114
BusStart	114 When you left your job, did you think about working on your own account, for example working as self-employed or starting a business?	
	Yes	115
	No	119
DidStart	115 And did you work on your own account or start a business after you left your job?	
	Yes	116
	No	116
BusType	116 What type of work or business did you start or consider? TYPE OF BUSINESS NEEDS TO BE SUFFICIENTLY PROBED SO THAT OCCUPATIONAL CODING CAN BE APPLIED	
		If Payment or Payment2 = Yes or Money in Outcome or Woutcome then 117 else 119

UseMoney	117 You have told me about the money you received either as compensation from a tribunal or other grievance procedure, or from [Employer] when you left that job. Did you use any of that money to start your business?	
	Yes	118
	No	119
HowMoney	118 How much of the money received did you use to set up your business? RECORD IN POUNDS	119
Thanks	119 Thank you for taking part in this survey.	

Appendix 3

Changes made to questionnaire for main-stage survey

Changes made to the JSS questionnaire for the main-stage survey

Variable name	Changes identified	Changes made
LeftJob	Need to exclude business owners or those who are directors of their own business. Need instruction here to exclude these, as with SE on contract.	Interviewer Instruction added: 'This means a change of employer rather than a move within the same organisation. Cases where the employer has changed but the job is the same (i.e. a takeover) should not be included. Do not include self-employed people who have given up a self-employed job or contract, or who are directors of a business which they own.'
None	Many students with PT work picked up. Either include additional variable from LFS or add question here to find out if respondent in full-time education.	Additional variable (EDAGE) brought across from LFS and inserted into questionnaire so visible for interviewer – (EDAGE = 96 means still in full-time education.)
New Question	New question needed to find out name of company/employer for reference job. Need consistent reference to one job throughout questionnaire, even if this turns out not to be job referred to in LFS.	New question added (Employer) – 'And could you tell me the name of the employer you left on this date?'
HowLong and Years/ Months	Name substitution of current job so clear which job referring to. Do not ask for months for jobs over two years.	Text substitution used: How long were you with [Employer]? Answer categories changed: Less than two years Two years or more If less than two years ask 'Months'. If two years or more ask 'Years'. Months = 'Enter time in months' Years = 'Enter time in years'
NumChang	Adapt so clear that this is 'Up to and including LFS reference job'. Do not ask this question of respondents who'd had job for 5 years or more.	Wording changed to: 'Including the time you left [Employer], how many times have you changed jobs or left an employer in the last 5 years?' CHECK added so that this question is only asked of those who were in their job for less than 5 years. Question removed from questionnaire.
ExpChang	Drop question.	
WhyLeft	Interviewer instruction to code leaving an agency as 'resign'. Change 'resign' pre-code to resigned/gave in notice.	Wording changed to: '(May I just check) how did you come to leave your job at [Employer]?' Pre-code changed to: Did you resign/give notice (including leaving an employment agency)?
WhyDismi	Interviewer instruction that rows/disputes should go into 'Other'.	Pre-code changed to: Other reasons given (include dispute with employer here if not covered by other codes).
Wished	Change so that is clear whether or not respondent was able to stay on. Changes answer categories to: No, had to leave Yes, could have stayed on if I had wanted	Wording changed: 'Would your employer have allowed you to stay on if you had wanted?' Answer categories changed: No, I had to leave (employer would not have let me stay on) Yes, I could have stayed on if I had wanted

StayOn	<p>Reword in terms of what the respondent would have done if had stayed in job. Make pre-codes e.g. 'Continued in the job as before...' Add pre-code 'negotiate a change in working conditions with employer (e.g. go part-time by agreement)'. Those offered temporary contract should now be routed to Indust, NOT GiveNoti</p>	<p>Reworded: 'If you had stayed on would you have...?' Pre-codes reworded: Continued in the job as before (with no change in working conditions) Unwillingly accepted changes in working conditions imposed by your employer Negotiated a change in your working conditions with your employer, e.g. going part time Taken a temporary or fixed term contract, or Would you have done something else? Routing of those offered temporary contract changed</p>
HavLeave	<p>Add pre-code for company closed down/ceased trading Reword pre-code to 'employer imposed change in working conditions' Add pre-code for ill-health Add interviewer instruction to answer this question for the MAIN reason.</p>	<p>Pre-code added: Company closed down/ceased trading Pre-code reworded: Employer imposed change in working conditions Pre-code added: Ill health Instruction added: 'Interviewer code main reason'</p>
Warning	<p>Change wording so that not only formal warnings are included.</p>	<p>Wording changed: 'Did your employer warn you in advance that you could be dismissed or made redundant (laid off)?'</p>
WarnVerb WarnWrit	<p>Change questions to gain details about types of warning rather than number of warnings.</p>	<p>WarnVerb and WarnWrit deleted. New question added (TypeWarn): 'Was this (were these) warning(s) given formally or informally? Formally – received something in writing (incl. email) or had formal meeting with employer or other person of authority Informally – Spoken to by employer or other person of authority Both New question added (FormWarn): 'How was (were) the warning(s) given?' Verbally In writing Both</p>
Indust Dispute Redundan	<p>Clarify which job talking about Clarification for interviewers Make this question a multi-code Add pre-code Employer relocated Add pre-code Company closed down/ceased trading Add pre-code Illness</p>	<p>Text substitution of [Employer] used in question Interviewer instruction added to code main reason Question made into multi-code Pre-codes added: Employer relocated Company closed down or ceased trading Your own ill health</p>
Consult	<p>Interviewer instruction so that consult does not include 'giving information' – Two-way process. Add 'Don't know' pre-code</p>	<p>Instruction added: 'Note: A consultation is a two-way process where workers are asked to give their opinions – telling workers that there will be lay-offs is not a consultation' Pre-code added: Don't know</p>
OffAdvi	<p>Interviewer instruction that this should include help offered by an administrator.</p>	<p>Instruction added: 'Include help offered through an administrator brought in to run company in cases of bankruptcy etc.'</p>
WhoAdvi	<p>Add more options to list – John McQueeney to advise.</p>	<p>Pre-codes added: Acas Welfare rights centre Employment consultant</p>

IntGriev	Change pre-codes to find out how much respondent knows about grievance procedures in their workplace.	Pre-codes changed to: Yes-respondent is sure there is a procedure No-respondent is sure there is not a procedure Respondent is unsure whether a procedure exists Don't know
Hearing	Soften question so it gains information about both formal and informal meetings	Reworded: 'Did you have a meeting with your employer to try to resolve the matter?'
HearRep	Change wording in line with wording of Hearing	Reworded: 'Were you allowed to take a representative or supporter to the meeting?'
Settled AcasArb New Question	Replace with more detailed policy questions Replace with more detailed policy questions New question inserted – AppEnd	Question replaced with AppEnd / Settlement (below) Question replaced with AppEnd / Settlement (below) 'Applications to employment tribunals can end in four ways. What happened in your case? Was it...? (1) Withdrawn, whereby you dropped the claim without any financial or other compensation (2) Settled, whereby you agreed with your employer not to pursue the claim in exchange for financial or other compensation (3) Decided at a full tribunal hearing (found in either yours or your employer's favour) (4) Or dismissed or disposed by the tribunal because your case was ineligible?'
New Question	New question inserted - Settlement	'THIS QUESTION AIMS TO FIND OUT WHO WAS INVOLVED IN FORMALLY AGREEING THE SETTLEMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT. Was... ? (1) Acas involved in drawing up the final settlement (2) Or were you required to sign a legally binding agreement, forgoing your right to continue with your case or take it to tribunal, after taking independent legal advice (for example from a solicitor) (3) or do you not know?'
Outcome	Change pre-codes to account for new policy questions	Pre-codes changed: Re-instated – offered old job back (whether or not taken) Re-engaged – offered a different job by employer Received extra monetary compensation (more than you were previously entitled to) Received other non-monetary compensation such as a reference or apology Agreed a private settlement with your employer Or did it make no difference in the end? Or are you still waiting to hear outcome?

HelpBefo	<p>Change question wording to allow for help offered as well as received.</p> <p>Make it clear that 'time-off' was additional time to their normal leave etc.</p> <p>Change wording of pre-codes, e.g. instead of 'Time off' have 'Gave you additional time off to....'</p> <p>Change 'Outplacement agency' to 'Recruitment agency'</p>	<p>Reworded: Before you left your job at [Employer], did your employer offer to help you in any of the following ways?</p> <p>Pre-codes changed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give you additional time off to look for a new job Offer you the services of a recruitment agency Offer you counselling Provide training Or was no help given?
Payment and Payment2	<p>Add pre-code to account for payments not yet received</p> <p>Need interviewer instruction to ensure that the respondent has received confirmation that they WILL receive this and are just waiting for it to go through – Do NOT want what they think they should get. Route this as 'Yes'. Interviewer instructions should also be clear that we are interested in redundancy payments that are statutory (therefore not from employer) and pension payments that are from or arranged through an employer pension scheme.</p>	<p>Pre-code added: 'Waiting to receive outstanding payment(s)'. Instruction added: 'Do not include any compensation awarded by a tribunal, but do include any statutory redundancy payments which are from, or arranged through your employer.' 'Waiting' should only be used for cases where the respondent has received confirmation that they will receive money.'</p>
WhatPay and WhatPay2	<p>Reword to allow for payments still outstanding;</p> <p>Add pensions payment to Payment (as in Payment2).</p> <p>Add additional question for those who answered pensions to ask if this was a lump sum or start of pension payments.</p> <p>Add question to find out how much was received for these pension payments</p> <p>Change pre-code 'Payment for leave outstanding' to 'Holiday pay for leave you have not taken'</p> <p>Change 'Pay in lieu of notice' to 'Payment instead of working out your period of notice'</p>	<p>Questions reworded: 'What payments did you or will you receive? Payment for....?'</p> <p>Pre-code added: Pension payment</p> <p>New questions added for further information on pension payments (see below)</p> <p>Pre-codes reworded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Back pay – pay owed to the respondent in addition to their normal wages or salary Payment instead of working out your period of notice Holiday pay for leave you had not taken
New Question	<p>New question inserted – Pension1 (2)</p>	<p>'Is (was) this pension payment?'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lump sum payment A refund of pension contributions you had made Or the start of your regular pension payments
New Question	<p>New question inserted – MuchLump</p>	<p>'How much is or was this lump sum payment?'</p>
New Question	<p>New question inserted – MuchRefund</p>	<p>'How much did you (or will you) receive as refund for your pension contributions?'</p>
New Question	<p>New question inserted – MuchReg</p>	<p>'How much are you (or will you be) receiving for your regular pension payments?'</p>
New Question	<p>Insert new question for respondents who say 'No' to Payment and Payment 2 to find out if there were any payments they felt they should have received.</p>	<p>New question added (NotPaid and NotPaid2): 'Were there any payments which you felt you were entitled to but which you did not, or will not, receive?'</p>
New Question	<p>New question inserted to follow above – WhatNot and WhatNot2</p>	<p>'What payments did you feel you were entitled to?' (Pre-codes as at Payment)</p>

SpenNoti	Interviewer instruction to clarify what is wanted here.	Instruction added: 'Only include time actually spent on notice or on leave in lieu of notice. Do not include any periods for which the respondent received pay instead of working notice. Please record answer in weeks. If less than one week enter zero (0).'
WhyLeave	Add pre-code 'Had found another job' – Route to WhyAnoth. Add 'Become selfemployed/work of my own account' to 'Wanted to start a business'. Add pre-codes from previous WhyBrek and WhyGive questions to coding list. Add pre-code 'Had dispute/disagreement with employer or colleagues' – to route to new block.	Pre-codes amended: Wanted to get another job Had found another job Wanted to become selfemployed, work on your own account or start a business To look after children To look after another dependent or person who needs care Own health reasons To undertake, or concentrate on, education or training To take a rest, increase leisure time or take part in a leisure activity Had dispute or disagreement with employer or colleagues Other reason – please specify
New Question	New question inserted – GiveBreak – routing from pre-codes previously from WhyGive and WhyBrek.	'Did you see this as taking a break from work or giving up work permanently?' Taking a break from work Giving up work permanently
New Block	Insert new block to ask tribunal and dispute questions of people giving 'Dispute with employer or colleagues' as the main reason they decided to leave their job.	New block inserted copying questions Indust to HowExtra. New questions named WIndust to WHowExtra etc.
WhyAnoth	Add pre-code – Wanted better career prospects. Add pre-code – Wanted to change hours (e.g. change from full- to part-time)	Pre-codes added: Better career prospects Wanted to change hours (e.g. from full- to part-time)
WhyBrek	Remove question	Removed
FamCond PaidWork	Add pre-code – 'Working closer to home' Clarify which job referring to	Pre-code added as specified. Question reworded: 'Can I just check, have you done any paid work since you left your job at [Employer]?' Question reworded: 'Thinking of the job you left at [Employer], were you looking for work before you left that job?' Instruction added: 'Only answer 'yes' if respondent had received a firm offer of employment which they had accepted'
Looking	Clarify which job referring to	
JobLined	Interviewer instruction – this must be a firm offer of employment which has been accepted	
LookMeth	Add pre-code – 'Private employment agency' Make this question a prompt question	Pre-code added Question made into individual prompt question
PayComp	Reword so clear which job is being compared with which	Question reworded: 'Are or were you being paid more, less or about the same as the job you had at [Employer] (for the same amount of work)?'
FullPart	Make question clearer	Question reworded: 'Is or was this job full-time or part-time?'
BusStart	Reword to include going self-employed and working on own account.	Question reworded: 'When you left your job, did you think about working on your own account, for example working as self-employed or starting a business?'

BusType	Interviewer Instruction that this needs to be fully probed out so occupational coding can be applied.	Instruction added: 'Type of business needs to be sufficiently probed so that occupational coding can be applied'
UseMoney	Route to this if Yes at Payment or Payment2 or Money in Outcome or WOutcome	Routing changed as specified.

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics

Appendix 4

Sampling filter used for JSS

The respondents are selected for the Job Separations Survey where:

This wave = 5;

And ((REDPAID =1) and (REDYLFT = 1 or 2 or 4 or 6 or 9))

OR ((EVERWK =1 and (calculation LEFTM and LEFTYR v ref week is less than or= 3 months) and (REDYLFT = 1 or 2 or 4 or 6 or 9)))

Notes to the sampling filter

Variable	Variable label
REDPAID = 1	those people who are currently working but left in the last three months
REDYLFT	the reason given in the LFS for leaving their last job. The codes for REDYLFT are: 1 = Dismissed 2 = Made redundant/took voluntary redundancy 4 = Resigned 6 = Took early retirement 9 = Other reason
EVERWK = 1	those people who have ever had a paid job or place on a scheme
LEFTYR	the year in which the respondent left their last job
LEFTM	the month in which the respondents left their last job

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics

Appendix 5

The advance letter

SDS/«SELNO»/«ADDNO»

«SPREM1»

«SPREM2»

«SPREM3»

«SPREM4»

«SDISTDETS»

«SPTOWNDETS»

«SPCODE»

Date as postmark

Dear Respondent,

Recently you, or a member of your household, kindly took part in some research for the Office for National Statistics (ONS). We are now contacting some of the people who helped us then to ask them to take part in some research we have been asked to do for the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). This research will involve a single interview which should take about 15 minutes to complete.

An interviewer from the Office for National Statistics will be telephoning or calling at your home in the next week or so to explain more about this research and to ask either yourself or another household member to take part. We would like to talk to people who have recently left a job. It is very important that we hear about job changes from the employee's point of view and are interested in all views and experiences.

As before, interviewers will treat everything they hear in the strictest confidence and no information which could identify those who take part, will be passed on to DTI or anyone outside the Office for National Statistics.

I do hope you will be able to help us with this important research. If you have any queries you would like dealt with before your interviewer calls please contact me on (0800 0923448).

Yours sincerely

Colin Lloyd

Survey Manager

The advance letter; Welsh version

Dyddiad fel y marc post

Annwyl Atebydd

Rydych chi, neu rywun yn eich cartref, yn ddiweddar wedi cymryd rhan yn garedig mewn gwaith ymchwil ar gyfer y Swyddfa Ystadegau Gwladol. Rydyn ni nawr yn cysylltu â rhai o'r bobl a fu o gymorth i ni bryd hynny i ofyn iddyn nhw gymryd rhan mewn gwaith ymchwil rydyn ni wedi cael cais i'w wneud ar ran yr Adran Masnach a Diwydiant (DTI). Bydd y gwaith ymchwil yn golygu un cyfweiliad a ddylai gymryd tua chwarter awr i'w gwblhau.

Bydd un o gyfwelwyr y Swyddfa Ystadegau Gwladol yn eich ffonio neu'n galw yn eich cartref yn ystod yr wythnos nesaf fwy neu lai i egluro mwy am y gwaith ymchwil hwn ac i ofyn i chi neu i rywun arall yn eich cartref gymryd rhan. Hoffem siarad â phobl sydd wedi gadael swydd yn ddiweddar. Mae'n bwysig iawn i ni gael clywed am newid swyddi o safbwynt y gweithiwr, a hoffem glywed am bob barn a phrofiad.

Fel o'r blaen, bydd cyfwelwyr yn trin popeth a glywant yn hollol gyfrinachol ac ni fydd unrhyw wybodaeth a allai fod yn ffordd i adnabod y rheiny sydd wedi cymryd rhan yn cael ei throsglwyddo i DTI nac i unrhyw un y tu allan i'r Swyddfa Ystadegau Gwladol.

Gobeithio y gallwch ein helpu yn y gwaith ymchwil pwysig hwn. Os bydd gennych unrhyw ymholiadau i ni ddelio â nhw cyn i'r cyfwelydd alw, byddwch cystal â chysylltu â mi ar (0800 0923448). Os ydych am siarad yng Nghymraeg gyda Ystadegau Gwladol, galwch ar rhif ffôn 01633 813381.

Yn gywir

Colin Lloyd

Rheolwr Arolygon

Appendix 6

Interviewer briefing notes: Cognitive testing

Scope of the task

You will be trialing a CAPI interview about a recent change of job and following the CAPI interview with both cognitive question testing and some more exploratory questions. The client (DTI) is interested in the reasons for job changes and what processes were involved. The reasons recorded for a change of job on the LFS include relatively few 'dismissals' compared to data from surveys of employers. (This is not surprising, people would often prefer to say they have resigned from a post than been fired and employers often invite or allow people to resign). Early retirement may also include cases where the individual had little choice but to depart. DTI are particularly interested in cases where the process may have involved recourse to internal grievance procedures or where reference to an Industrial Tribunal was contemplated or occurred.

There are over 60 questions in the CAPI interview but the routing limits the number that will be applicable in any one case.

After the CAPI interview

The intention is that you will complete the CAPI interview first and then go back over the interview with your respondent. The discussion will need to be taped.

Reminder about taping

We have found that to say 'I normally tape (discussion about the questions) because it is impossible to have a conversation and scribble notes at the same time' is enough to reassure respondents. You can add that the tapes are for us to compile notes and that respondents will not be identified.

Incentives

As this interview involves both CAPI interview and cognitive testing we are offering a £10 incentive payment. You will need to pay this as cash and get a signed receipt (these forms will be issued to you). As with all survey incentives, these are regarded as 'windfall' for tax and benefit purposes. If your respondent queries why we are 'paying' you can say that this is often done when we are testing questions as a thank you for taking part.

You can claim for these with your normal returns for pay and expenses.

Claims

We expect the interviews (CAPI and follow-up) to last on average for about an hour. You will need to spend about the same time on each interview to write a report.

Survey number is PA504

Contacts

Research:
Jack Eldridge
Tania Corbin
Kate Fox

Field:
Chris Ash

Your sample of addresses

The addresses and other information are taken from wave 5 of the LFS and will give you the name of the LFS respondent and a telephone number where this is available. (See later for cases with no telephone number).

The LFS respondent may not be the person you need to interview but you will probably need to contact them first. As the LFS sample may be scattered, phoning first to set up an interview should be the normal approach.

We have given you addresses reasonably near to where you live. Start with those most convenient to you, but note that we do want a spread of the types of reasons why a job was left.

There is a variable called REDYLFT which tells you the LFS reason why someone left their job:

1=Dismissal
2=Redundancy
4=Resigned
6=Early Retirement
9=Other

You may not have a dismissal case amongst your addresses, but always try for the interview if you have. Ideally, get at least one of each of the types of job change listed above and then go for more resigned (4) and others (9).

The target number of interviews for each of you to achieve is seven. If it will be possible for you to do more, please ring us first to discuss.

No phone cases

If you are visiting the area anyway try to call on the address. If you are happy to write a note asking them to contact you then do this. If any respondents want a HQ letter contact us to arrange (This should be fairly unlikely as these households will have had five LFS contacts already).

Introducing the work

Introduce yourself and remind the respondent that they helped us with the LFS. You will need to explain that this time we want to speak to the household

member who had actually left a job in the three months before the LFS interview and they may need reminding about the question which asked this.

The reason for talking with these people is that we want to test some new questions about the reasons why people change jobs. These questions will be used on a large-scale survey in the future. To make sure they work, we are approaching people who were said to have recently changed jobs in the LFS interview, to see if they would help us.

It would mean a short interview followed by a discussion with the interviewer about the questions. As this is helping us develop new questions there is a 'thank you' payment of £10. The interview and discussion would last about an hour, or more if they have lots to tell us. It will, of course, be 'face to face'.

The qualitative interview

We will provide you with a paper copy of the questionnaire but envisage that you will show respondents the CAPI screen. Some questions that we particularly want discussed will be marked on screen with *** (three stars or asterisks). During the interview you will identify other questions where your respondent raises issues or where YOU feel the respondent gave clues that there was a problem with the question. We suggest you open a remark box in the interview and type a brief note to yourself. When you re-enter the interview to do the cognitive follow-up this will show as a 'paper clip' by the answer box and will prompt you to probe out what happened. You can recall remarks by using the 'navigate' option on the tool bar and opening remarks. REMEMBER, your respondent may be looking at the screen with you so keep your remark neutral.

The CAPI interview is structured to accept the initial 'reason' for the job separation but then checks to see if the individual could have 'stayed on' and tries to investigate what happened. However, your role is also to get a picture of what 'really happened'. You will have the LFS coding of why the job separation occurred, and the answer to the CAPI question 'Could you have stayed on?' as well as other questions to clarify the issue. Hopefully this will reveal more about what 'really happened', but you may be able to get a description of what occurred in the respondent's own words. We can then judge whether the CAPI procedure does clarify whether some early retirements and resignations were situations more akin to dismissals.

The LFS questions do not seek to explore the reasons for job separations in any depth. The CAPI interview part of this testing is a pilot run of what will be a main-stage telephone interview aimed at finding out what happened at the job change. So ANY feedback that would improve the CAPI questions and make it possible for respondents to be frank about what happened would be valued.

After the interview

You will need to review your tape and any notes you have made against the areas we have asked you to check. We would like a written summary of your findings structured under the report headings (see later) BUT if in your interview you:

- Found a particularly good way of probing the topic;
- Revealed a theme we had not thought of;
- Or have ideas for an alternative wording for a question;

RING and tell us!

We will pass your ideas on to the other interviewers to try out. The cognitive interviews are an iterative process – they can develop and improve with the benefit of your experience – but we will need to keep you all informed.

Questions to probe and report on

We need a concise summary of what happened at the questions you discussed with the respondent. Look for:

- Ways to ensure the questions are understood;
- Problems with definitions and solutions;
- Were the answers a true account of what happened?

Note that the LFS interview will have occurred some months ago, and the job that was left should have occurred within the three months previous to the wave 5 LFS interview. Comment if there seems to be a definition or time problem.

Leftjob

Note the on-screen instructions about how a job change is defined. You may find that this is the first difficulty faced by your respondent. If they have misdefined this then trial the interview anyway but get a good description of the circumstances.

Whyleft to Stayon

This series of CAPI questions attempts to find out what happened at the change of job.

You have several options here but it is important to explore HOW they came to their answer at Whyleft and how this relates to later answers.

You could ask them to 'tell me what happened in your own words.' Note that you may get a different answer in conversation than to the CAPI interview. If so, explore the reason for this with the respondent.

For those that say they were DISMISSED, WhydisMi asks for reasons – check how and why they reached their answer.

Wished

This question is important as it attempts to find out if the answers at the earlier questions such as 'resign' or 'job came to an end' are polite ways of meaning 'obliged to leave'.

Havleave

Ask the respondent to describe the circumstances in their own words. Do the pre-codes fit what happened? How did they choose their answer?

StayOn

Keep in mind how the respondent reached this question. Have you got a good picture of how and why the job change occurred? Is the story different to the information obtained by the CAPI questions? Ideas for change?

Redundan

Explore what happened and how they chose their answer. Do the pre-codes fit the story?

Consult

Check what they think this question means. Consult implies a two-way process not just being given information. What happened? How did they decide what to answer?

OffAdvi

Check their understanding of this question. 'Put this in your own words.'

IntGriev

Ask them to describe what the internal grievance procedure is in that company and the circumstances regarding their case.

Indu Trib

Note that the new terminology is employment tribunal. Does the respondent recognise this as the old industrial tribunal?

HelpBefo

Get a description of what happened. What do the pre-codes mean to the respondent?

What Pay (MuchBack2 to Muchleav2)

This series of questions could be confusing. Try to probe out what the respondent understood each pre-code to mean and what the answers covered. Note that payments granted by a tribunal might be included here. If there was reference to a tribunal, check for this.

WhyGive

Why Brek

Get a description in their own words, and how they chose their answer. Do the chosen pre-codes fit? If not, suggest alternatives.

JobSeek

Note that benefit names have changed – did this cause any problems? You may need to prompt ‘unemployment benefit’ or ‘supplementary benefit’ as the older terms. Did they miss answering because of terminology?

PensLeft

Pension arrangements are frequently misunderstood. Ask for the situation ‘in their own words’. Use the pre-code examples to check what is happening. Where appropriate ask what the pre-codes meant to the respondent.

BusType

Note we need to code this (as per Occupation and Industry coding) so record sufficient detail.

Reminder: some basic probes

- What did the question mean? Probes: ‘In your own words....’ or ‘What did you understand by...?’
- ‘You mentioned XX at this question(pause)’ Make use of pauses and leaving questions half finished.

Or, pick up on response and ask the journalist probes:

- ‘What happened?’
- ‘Why did it happen?’
- ‘How did this come about?’

Notes about Blaise Questionnaire for briefing

LeftJob

This question is here to check the data given in the LFS interview. Because of the way the sample was drawn, everyone being interviewed should answer ‘Yes’ to this question. If they do say ‘No’ they are routed straight back out of the questionnaire.

If you get a respondent who does answer ‘No’ to this, please ask some questions to check that this is correct and, if so, establish why the information was wrongly recorded in the LFS interview. Because the LFS asks for proxy

information, it is possible that the LFS respondent was wrong. However, it is also possible that the LFS respondent and your respondent have a difference of opinion.

DateLeft

This question has a soft check as the date the respondent left their job should be within the last year. The sample for this pilot work is from an earlier wave so if some of the dates given in your interview are longer ago than this, they will just need to be suppressed.

HowLong

Because of the checks used at this question, 'years' and 'months' are recorded separately. At HowLong you need to press 'Yes' to continue and then enter the years and months separately, in the questions that follow.

Outcome

Here, the respondents are asked what the outcome of their tribunal/hearing/conciliation was. One of the options is HowExtra – received extra monetary compensation (more than you were previously entitled to). You will need to probe here what they were previously entitled to and how much they received, to ensure the amount recorded at HowExtra is given correctly.

Payment and Payment2

Any money received by the respondent, apart from that awarded by a tribunal or their normal wages, should be recorded here. If the respondent received redundancy pay or compensation for loss of job, this should be included whether it came from the employer or was a statutory redundancy payment.

Appendix 7

Interviewer briefing notes: Main-stage survey

Section One

- Who is it for?
- What is the survey about?
- Aims of the survey

Who is it for?

The Survey of Job Separations is being conducted on behalf of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI).

What is the survey about?

The survey is a follow-up of wave 5 LFS respondents who were recorded as having left a job in the three months prior to the LFS and who had answered that they left for one of the following reasons (variable RDYLFT):

- Dismissed
- Made redundant
- Resigned
- Took early retirement
- Other.

Aims of the survey

DTI are interested in this group of people as at present there is only limited information on the nature of dismissals and other job separations. This survey aims to discover how readily employees go to conciliation and tribunals and whether potential cases are dealt with by internal grievance procedures or other means. It is also a chance to talk to employees about the real reason for their job change as the number of dismissals reported by the employee and that reported by the employer varies significantly.

The main aims of the survey then, are to provide a representative picture of employees' experiences of dismissal and redundancy, and of the use of grievance procedures.

Section Two

The advance letter

There are two versions of the advance letter. An English version and a Welsh and English version for Welsh addresses. The Welsh version offers respondents the facility to speak to someone in Welsh.

Because the person we want to talk to in these interviews may have been a proxy respondent in the LFS wave 5 interview, we do not have all their names. As such the letter does not refer specifically to the respondent we want to talk to, and could be opened by any member of the household.

The letter gives minimal information about the survey, including that it is for the Department of Trade and Industry and that we want to talk to people who have recently left a job as we are interested in job changes from the employee's point of view. The letter also states that the research involves a one-off interview which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete (this is based on estimates of timings gained from the pilot). Below is a copy of the letter.

SDS/«SELNO»/«ADDNO»
«SPREM1»
«SPREM2»
«SPREM3»
«SPREM4»
«SDISTDETS»
«SPTOWNDETS»
«SPCODE»

Date as postmark

Dear Respondent,

Recently you, or a member of your household, kindly took part in some research for the Office for National Statistics. We are now contacting some of the people who helped us then to ask them to take part in some research we have been asked to do for the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). This research will involve a single interview which should take about 15 minutes to complete.

An interviewer from the Office for National Statistics will be telephoning or calling at your home in the next week or so to explain more about this research and to ask either yourself or another household member to take part. We would like to talk to people who have recently left a job. It is very important that we hear about job changes from the employee's point of view and are interested in all views and experiences.

As before, interviewers will treat everything they hear in the strictest confidence and no information which could identify those who take part, will be passed on to DTI or anyone outside the Office for National Statistics.

I do hope you will be able to help us with this important research. If you have any queries you would like dealt with before your interviewer calls please contact me on (0800 0923448).

Yours sincerely

Colin Lloyd

Survey Manager

Section Three

- Establishing the correct respondent
- Introducing the work
- Interview details
- Confidentiality

Establishing the correct respondent

You need to speak to the person who, in the wave 5 LFS interview, was identified as having recently left a job (i.e. in the last three months). This person will be referred to throughout these notes as the JSS contact. In some households there may be more than one JSS contact and you will need to interview each one separately. You may be able to carry out both interviews on the same call, but if not, you will need to make subsequent calls to achieve both interviews. Where there are two respondents in a household, the info sheets for the cases will be tied together so it is important that, if you are unable to interview both respondents in the same call, the second respondent gets interviewed at a later date.

In most cases you will have the name of the JSS contact who you need to speak to and will be able to ask for them directly. However, if you do not have the respondent's name you will need to establish who in the household you need to talk to.

When you phone up or call at the address, find out whether the person who answers the phone has seen the advance letter.

If they have seen the advance letter:

- Remind them of the LFS wave 5 interview, find out if they had taken part in it and try to establish who in the household had left a job sometime between September and December 2000 (i.e. in the three months prior to the Dec-Feb wave);
- If they had not taken part in the LFS interview, ask them if they had left a job between Sep-Dec;
- If so, go on to introduce the work;
- If not, try to find out who in the household did, and ask to talk to this person. If they are not there you should get a name for them so you can ask directly the next time you call.

If they have not seen the advance letter:

- Introduce yourself and why you are calling and try to establish if they had left a job in the period September to November;
- If they did, make sure that there is no-one else in the household who has also left a job in this period.

- If there is someone else who left a job, you should explain to the person that you will only need to interview one of them and ask them the reason they left their job. You should use the LFS information from your info sheets to help you find out whether this is the person you need to talk to. The LFS information includes the reason the respondent left their job, when they left their job and the age they left full time education. (This latter variable is included as it also tells us whether the respondent was still in full-time education at the time of the wave 5 interview (Code 96) and may make it easier to identify who in the household was being referred to.)
- If they did not have a job change in this period you should again try to establish who did and ask to talk to this person. If they are not there you should get a name for them so you can ask for them directly the next time you call. If the person does not know who you need to speak to, you should try to find out when other people may be at home and phone back or re-visit the address on another occasion.

Introducing the work

When you get to speak to the JSS contact, you will need to introduce the survey. You should tell them that it is being conducted on behalf of DTI who are interested in hearing about job changes from the employee's point of view. You should also say that you are talking to people who have left a job within the last year and would be very interested to talk to them about their experience, whatever this was.

If they require more information about what the survey is about, you can say that the main aim of the survey is to gain accurate information about the number of people leaving jobs, and their reasons for doing so, as well as to find out what help or advice was available to the employee and whether they used this.

Interview details

You should assure the respondent that the survey will be a one-off interview and NOT the start of a round of interviews as in the LFS. The pilot found that people showed reluctance at taking part until they were assured it was only one interview so it is very important to get this across to the respondent.

You should also tell the respondent that the interview will be fairly short, approximately 15 minutes, unless they have a lot to tell.

Confidentiality

You should assure the respondent of confidentiality using the usual pledge. As the LFS is an ONS survey they should be familiar with ONS but may need some reassurance about the fact that this survey is for DTI. The most important thing to mention is that no names or addresses or any other information which could identify them will be passed to DTI. DTI will only receive statistical information gained from the interviews.

Section Four

The sample

As mentioned above, the sample was drawn from wave 5 LFS interview respondents who had left a job in the previous three months for one of the following reasons:

REDYLFT:

1=Dismissal

2=Redundancy

4=Resigned

6=Early Retirement

9=Other

Answers to this question, in the form of one of the above codes, will be included on your info sheets and will be included in the questionnaire as a SHOW field prior to the question 'WhyLeft'. You will also have a variable that tells you the age they left full-time education (EDAGE) which also tells you whether or not they are still in FT education. This too will be visible in the questionnaire directly before the question 'Employer'. You may find this information useful throughout the interview, and particularly at the recruiting stage when you are trying to establish if you have the correct respondent.

Section Five

- The questionnaire
- Interviewer instructions

The questionnaire

The questionnaire includes eight question blocks and covers all aspects of leaving a job. There are just over a hundred questions in the questionnaire overall, but most respondents will only answer a fraction of these, depending on the routing for their situation. Timings from the pilot showed most interviews to take less than 10 minutes, although there were one or two exceptions to the rule. Therefore, as mentioned above, a good estimate of interview length to give the respondents is 15 minutes.

To give a bit of background, following is an outline of each of the blocks and what they cover:

Block BGround – The aim of this block is to get some background detail about the respondent including their name, the date they left their job, the name of the employer they left, the length of time they had been with that employer and how many times they had changed jobs in the five years up to this job change.

Block BLeave – This block aims to establish the reason the respondent left their job and whether they had a choice about it. Questions ask the respondent their reason for leaving and if their employer would have allowed them to have stayed on. If they would have been allowed to stay on, there is a question to find out the circumstances in which they could have stayed on and if they

would not have been allowed to stay on, they are asked to state the reason they had to leave. If they were dismissed they are asked the reason for their dismissal and whether they'd received any warning previous to it.

Block BDismiss – This block is asked of those respondents who did not have a choice about leaving their job (i.e. they had been dismissed or made redundant or had said they had to leave for reasons related to their performance or behaviour at work, for example sickness absence, misconduct or a dispute with their employer). Questions are geared towards the disciplinary process and ask whether the respondent had left in the course of a dispute or strike, if it was a redundancy whether this had affected just them, or if other workers were involved, and whether there had been a consultation between the employer and the workers.

Block BCompSev – This block is also asked of all those respondents who did not have a choice about leaving their job (compulsory severance cases). Questions here ask the respondents about any help or advice they received and whether they took their case to a tribunal or other form of grievance procedure. It also asks for details of the outcome of such procedures.

Block BAllComp – This block is asked of those respondents who did not have a choice about leaving their job and this time includes those who left at normal retirement age. The questions ask about help provided by the employer before leaving their job and about any payments that the respondent received.

Block BVolReg – This block is aimed at respondents who left their job voluntarily. Questions cover whether the respondent received any payments, the main reason they decided to leave their job and whether they had looked for work or done any paid work since leaving their job. Respondents who say that the main reason they left their job was because they'd had a dispute or disagreement with their employer will be routed through the set of questions in Block BCompSev about advice and tribunal procedures.

Block BWantJob – Respondents who answered that the reason they left their job was because they wanted another job are routed through this block. Questions cover whether the respondent has looked for work, for how long they were or have been looking and details about any work they have done since leaving the reference job, including a current job.

Block BAllSeps – These questions are asked of all respondents, unless the information has already been gained earlier. Questions ask whether respondents have claimed any benefits since leaving their job, whether they were a member of a pension scheme and whether they had started or considered starting a business.

Interviewer instructions for the survey follow.

If you have any queries about anything here, or about the interviewer instructions, my contact details are:

Tania Corbin
Telephone No.

Questionnaire instructions

Block Bground

LeftJob – In the Labour Force Survey interview it was recorded that you had left a job in the previous three months. Is this correct?

This question is here to confirm the data given in the wave 5 LFS interview. Because of the way the sample was drawn, everyone being interviewed should answer 'Yes' to this question. If you enter 'No' at this question, respondents are routed straight back out of the questionnaire. However, as the LFS interview could have been a while ago, and the information could have been given by proxy, there is a possibility either that respondents cannot remember when they left their job, or that the proxy information was incorrect.

Before entering 'No' at this question, you should make sure that the respondent has definitely not left a job in the reference period. We are interested in talking to anybody who has left a job recently, as long as it was not before the beginning of September 2000 (we are working from Dec – Mar wave 5 LFS data).

Groups we are not interested in for these interviews are:

- Self-employed people who have an ongoing business but who had left a particular job or contract. For example, someone who has their own building firm who had finished a three-month building job but will go on to do another;
- Self-employed people who work as directors for companies which they own.

NB. We ARE interested in people who are directors of companies which they do not own.

DateLeft – May I just check, on what date did you leave that job?

Some respondents may have trouble remembering the date on which they left their job. Because there is a check based on this question, a date is needed here so if the respondent has problems of recall, assume the date as being the 14th of the month.

Employer – And could you tell me the name of the employer you left on this date?

Here you need to establish the name of the employer the respondent left at LeftJob. This employer should be the one which was referred to in the LFS interview.

It may become apparent during the interview that the respondent is talking not about the LFS reference job but another. If so, continue with the interview. As long as the same job is referred to throughout the interview this is acceptable.

Text substitution to insert the name of the employer given here, has been used throughout the questionnaire where possible.

HowLong – How long were you with employer?

Because of the routing based on this question, the pre-codes ask you to enter whether the length of time the respondent was with their employer was 'less than 2 years' or '2 years or more'.

If the respondent gives a figure of less than two years you will be asked to record how long this period was in months. If they give a figure of two years or over, you will be asked to record it in years.

NumChang – Including the time you left employer, how many times have you changed or left an employer in the last 5 years?

This question is asked of respondents who have been with their employer for less than five years. The same rules regarding a change of job apply here as at LeftJob.

Respondents may become confused with the number of changes they have had if they have been involved in a takeover or have had a change of employer in the same job, and it is therefore important to make sure that they are only including jobs which they have actually left (for whatever reason).

Block BLeave

Wished – Would your employer have allowed you to have stayed on if you had wanted?

This question finds out whether or not the respondent had a choice about leaving their job. You should ensure that when the respondent gives their answer, they are thinking in the correct terms for the question; that is, whether or not their employer would have LET them stay on. We are not interested here in any other reasons why they could or could not have stayed in their job.

HavLeave – Why did you have to leave?

This question is important as it determines the route the respondent will take through the questionnaire. While in some cases you will find it easy to code the response into the given pre-codes, some responses may be ambiguous and will require you to clarify the answer with the respondent.

If this occurs, you should read the most appropriate pre-codes back to the respondent to check which one most accurately describes their situation. For example, if the respondent says 'I was made redundant' you should check back with them which of the codes best describes their experience. For example, you could say 'Can I just check, you say you were made redundant, was this because the company closed down or ceased trading? Or did your job come to an end? Or another reason?'

Two of the pre-codes are quite similar: 'Too much sickness absence' and 'Ill health'.

'Sickness absence' should be used for cases where the respondent has had to miss work because of their health and this has been mentioned to them by their employer.

'Ill health' should be used for those cases where the respondent themselves felt they could no longer carry on doing their job: they may not necessarily have had time off work because of it or had a poor sick record.

StayOn – How would you have stayed on?

This question is aimed at finding out in what circumstances it would have been possible for the respondent to stay in their job, i.e. what they would have had to have done to stay on. The concepts in the pre-codes are quite long so they should be read out slowly.

Warning – Did your employer warn you in advance that you could be dismissed or made redundant (laid off)?

If any type of warning at all was given, enter 'yes'. Respondents are asked to describe the types of warning they received in more detail in the two questions that follow.

Block Bdismiss

Dispute – What was the industrial dispute or strike about?

Deductions from pay – This should be used when money has been deducted from the respondent's pay without their agreement or consent.

Include here things like:

- A change of working hours which meant that the respondent had received too much money;
- A change in shift work allowance.

Consult – Did your employer consult with the workers or a trade union about the need to lay off workers?

A consultation is a two-way process where the employer has asked the workers for their opinions on the plan to lay off workers. A case where the employer has sent a note or memo round to tell workers of the situation, or tell them what is happening, is NOT a consultation. If the respondent says 'Yes' you should check what form this consultation took.

Block BcompSev

WhoAdvi – Who did you ask for advice?

Acas – This is an acronym for the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service which is an independent service that aims to prevent and resolve employment-related disputes.

Outcome – What was the final outcome (when all procedures complete)?

Here, respondents are asked what the outcome of their tribunal, hearing or conciliation procedure was. One of the options is 'Received extra monetary compensation (more than you were previously entitled to)'. This means that the respondent was given a payment which was enhanced as a result of going to the tribunal, hearing or conciliatory procedure. Respondents who received this extra monetary compensation are routed to the question HowExtra, which asks them to give the amount they received.

HowExtra – How much extra monetary compensation did you receive?

This question wants to know how much more money the respondent received than they were originally entitled to.

To ensure the amount recorded here is given correctly you will need to probe to find out what they were entitled to previously and check how much they received in total. The amount given here should be the difference between the two.

Block BAIIComp

Payment – Apart from your normal wages or salary, did you receive any payments from your employer when you left your job?

Any money received by the respondent, apart from that awarded by a tribunal or their normal wages, should be recorded here. If the respondent received redundancy pay or compensation for loss of job, this should be included, whether it came from the employer or was a statutory redundancy payment.

Please see note below regarding pension payments below.

BackPay

Back pay is there to record any pay the respondent has received, or is going to receive, in addition to their normal wages or salary.

This includes extra money owed them due to a recent pay rise or money owed them for expenses incurred through work.

However, it does NOT include payments for things such as holiday pay or payment instead of working out your notice. These payments are covered by the other pre-codes.

Pension1

Pensions arranged through an employer can include the employer's pension scheme or a group personal pension plan. We are interested in either of these types of pension.

We are not interested in pension arrangements that the employee has made for themselves which are unrelated to their employment.

You will need to probe to make sure that the respondent is not talking about a private pension arrangement.

ReduWage – You mentioned a redundancy payment. Thinking of your usual wages or salary, what period of time would that payment be equal to?

This question asks the respondent to define their redundancy payment in terms of their normal wages or salary. You may need to help them to work out their payment in equivalent terms. If they do have difficulty interpreting the question, it might help to give an example; e.g. 'You said you got £2,000 as a redundancy payment, what would that be equal to in terms of your salary? For example, would it be about two weeks' wages, six months' wages?

MuchReg – How much are you (will you be) receiving for your regular pension payments?

This question asks for an amount, in pounds, as well as how often the money will be received. It is a string variable which requires you to enter both things into the same field. For example, you may want to write '£300 per month' or '£3,000 a year'.

MuchOther – How much did you (will you) receive for these payments?

This variable is a string rather than a numerical variable to allow for cases where more than one payment is mentioned. If the respondent does give two other payments they'd received, for example a fee refund and a bonus, you could type '£300 refund of fees, £800 bonus'.

Block BVolReg

SpenNoti – And how long a period did you actually spend on notice?

This question is here to establish how much time was spent on notice. This would include any leave that was taken towards the notice, but NOT any money that was paid to the respondent instead of them working out their notice.

For example, a respondent could give four weeks' notice. They might have two weeks' leave entitlement and decide that instead of working four weeks' notice they will work two and have two weeks leave. This is still spending four weeks on notice. However, if the respondent gave four weeks notice but their employer told them that they should only work one week and they would be paid for the next three weeks, this is only spending one week on notice.

Payment2 – Apart from your normal wages or salary, did you receive any payments from your employer when you left your job?

Any money received by the respondent, apart from that awarded by a tribunal or their normal wages, should be recorded here. If the respondent received redundancy pay or compensation for loss of job, this should be included, whether it came from the employer or was a statutory redundancy payment.

Please see notes above regarding BackPay and Pension payments below.

ReduWage2 – You mentioned a redundancy payment. Thinking of your usual wages or salary, what period of time would that payment be equal to?

This question asks the respondent to define their redundancy payment in terms of their normal wages or salary. You may need to help them to work out their payment in equivalent terms. If they do have difficulty interpreting the question, it might help to give an example; e.g. 'You said you got £2,000 as a redundancy payment, what would that be equal to in terms of your salary? For example, would it be about two weeks' wages, six months. wages?

MuchReg2 – How much are you (will you be) receiving for your regular pension payments?'

This question asks for an amount, in pounds, as well as how often the money will be received. It is a string variable which requires you to enter both things into the same field. For example, you may want to write '£300 per month' or '£3,000 a year'.

MuchOth2 – How much did you (will you) receive for these payments?

This variable is a string rather than a numerical variable to allow for cases where more than one payment is mentioned. If the respondent does give two other payments they'd received, for example a fee refund and a bonus, you could type '£300 refund of fees, £800 bonus'

WhyLeave – What was the main reason you decided to leave your job?

This question includes two pre-codes which are 'Children' and 'LookAft'. It aims to distinguish between the respondent's own children and other people they look after.

'Children' is only to be used for looking after the respondent's own children (including step-children or other children they have legal guardianship of).

Any other person the respondent looks after, including other children, should be coded as 'To look after another dependent or person who needs care'.

WWhoAdvi – Who did you ask for advice?

Acas – This is an acronym for the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service which is an independent service which aims to prevent and resolve employment-related disputes.

WOutcome – What was the final outcome (when all procedures complete)?

Here, respondents are asked what the outcome of their tribunal, hearing or conciliation procedure was. One of the options is 'Received extra monetary compensation (more than you were previously entitled to)'. This means that the respondent was given a payment which was enhanced as a result of going

to the tribunal, hearing or conciliatory procedure. Respondents who received this extra monetary compensation are routed to the question HowExtra, which asks them to give the amount they received.

Block BAISeps

PensLeft

Pensions arranged through an employer can include the employer's pension scheme or a group personal pension plan. We are interested in either of these types of pension.

We are not interested in pension arrangements that the employee has made for themselves which are unrelated to their employment. You will need to probe to make sure that the respondent is not talking about a private pension arrangement.

Appendix 8(a)

Responding versus non-responding tables

Age group of respondent by whether or not took part in JSS

Age (grouped)	Responding	Non-responding	Total
	399	131	530
24 and under	75.3%	24.7%	100.0%
	31.6%	37.6%	32.9%
	310	89	399
25 to 34	77.7%	22.3%	100.0%
	24.5%	25.6%	24.8%
	261	55	316
35 to 44	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
	20.7%	15.8%	19.6%
	197	46	243
45 to 54	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
	15.6%	13.2%	15.1%
	96	27	123
55 and over	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
	7.6%	7.8%	7.6%
	1263	348	1611
Total	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	10.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Ethnic origin of respondent by whether or not took part in JSS

Ethnic origin	Responding	Non-responding	Total
	1191	315	1506
White	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
	94.3%	90.2%	93.4%
	72	34	1612
Non-white	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
	5.7%	9.8%	100.0%
	1263	349	1612
Total	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Family unit type of respondent by whether or not took part in JSS

Family unit type	Responding	Non-responding	Total
One person	139	71	210
	66.2%	33.8%	100.0%
	11.0%	20.3%	13.0%
Married couple, no children	176	48	224
	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
	13.9%	13.8%	13.9%
Married couple, non-dependent children only	194	36	230
	84.3%	15.7%	100.0%
	15.4%	10.3%	14.3%
Married couple, dependent children	428	101	529
	80.9%	19.1%	100.0%
	33.9%	28.9%	32.8%
Cohabiting couple, no children	101	36	137
	73.7%	26.3%	100.0%
	8.0%	10.3%	8.5%
Cohabiting couple, children (dependent or non)	85	27	112
	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
	6.7%	7.7%	10.5%
Lone parent (dependent or non child)	140	30	170
	82.9%	17.1%	100.0%
	11.1%	8.6%	10.5%
Total	1263	349	1612
	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Region of respondent by whether or not took part in the JSS			
Geographical region	Responding	Non-responding	Total
North East	67	14	81
	82.7%	17.3%	100.0%
	5.3%	4.0%	5.0%
North West	109	16	125
	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
	8.6%	4.6%	7.8%
Merseyside	15	7	22
	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
	1.2%	2.0%	1.4%
Yorkshire and Humberside	120	28	148
	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
	9.5%	8.0%	9.2%
East Midlands	103	24	127
	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
	8.2%	6.9%	7.9%
West Midlands	106	36	142
	74.6%	25.4%	100.0%
	8.4%	10.3%	8.8%
Eastern	135	33	168
	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
	10.7%	9.5%	10.4%
London	122	58	180
	67.8%	32.2%	100.0%
	9.7%	16.7%	11.2%
South East	192	61	253
	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
	15.2%	17.5%	9.1%
South West	120	27	147
	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
	9.5%	7.8%	9.1%
Wales	56	9	65
	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%
	4.4%	2.6%	4.0%
Scotland	118	35	153
	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
	9.3%	10.1%	9.5%
Total	1263	348	1611
	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Appendix 8(b)

Derivation of JSS weight

Derivation of JSS weight			
Age group	Total responding	Total sample	JSS weight
24 and under	399	530	1.328
25 to 34	310	399	1.287
35 to 44	261	316	1.378
45 to 54	197	243	1.234
55 and over	96	123	1.281

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Appendix 8(c)

A comparison of weighted and non-weighted distributions

Below are two sets of tables for two of the main-survey variables. The variables are WhyLeft (the main reason the respondent left their job) and Wished (whether they would have been allowed to have stayed on if they had wanted). The variables are presented in crosstabulations with the age group of the respondent (AgeGrp). In each case the first table shows the non-weighted data and the second table shows the weighted data to enable a comparison to be made.

Non-weighted distribution of reason for leaving by age group

Reason for leaving	24 and under	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 and over	Total
Dismissed	15	7	2	6	2	32
	46.9%	21.9%	6.3%	18.8%	6.3%	100.0%
Made redundant	26	47	47	48	38	206
	3.8%	2.3%	0.8%	3.1%	2.1%	2.5%
Resigned	296	213	176	110	27	822
	36.0%	25.9%	21.4%	13.4%	3.3%	100.0%
Early retirement	74.0%	68.5%	67.7%	56.1%	28.1%	65.1%
			1	6	13	20
Retired (normal age)			5.0%	30.0%	65.0%	100.0%
			0.4%	3.1%	13.5%	0.2%
Temporary contract ended					2	2
					100.0%	100.0%
Other reason	32	20	18	9	6	85
	37.6%	23.5%	21.2%	10.6%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	31	24	16	17	8	96
	32.3%	25.0%	16.7%	17.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	400	311	260	196	96	1263
	31.7%	24.5%	20.6%	15.5%	7.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Weighted distribution of reason for leaving by age group

Reason for leaving	24 and under	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 and over	Total
Dismissed	20	9	2	7	3	41
	48.8%	22.0%	4.9%	17.1%	7.3%	100.0%
	3.8%	2.3%	0.6%	2.9%	2.4%	2.5%
Made redundant	35	60	57	59	49	260
	13.5%	23.1%	21.9%	22.7%	18.8%	100.0%
	6.6%	15.0%	18.2%	24.5%	39.2%	16.1%
Resigned	393	274	213	136	35	1051
	37.4%	26.1%	20.3%	12.9%	3.3%	100.0%
	73.9%	68.5%	67.8%	56.4%	28.0%	65.2%
Early retirement			1	7	17	25
			4.0%	28.0%	68.0%	100.0%
			0.3%	2.9%	13.6%	1.6%
Retired (normal age)					3	3
					100.0%	100.0%
					2.4%	0.2%
Temporary contract ended	43	26	22	11	8	110
	39.1%	23.6%	20.0%	10.0%	7.3%	100.0%
	8.1%	6.5%	7.0%	4.6%	6.4%	6.8%
Other reason	41	31	19	21	10	122
	33.6%	25.4%	15.6%	17.2%	8.2%	100.0%
	7.7%	7.8%	6.1%	8.7%	8.0%	7.6%
Total	532	400	314	241	125	1612
	33.0%	24.8%	19.5%	15.0%	7.8%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Non-weighted distribution of whether respondent could have stayed in job by age group

Whether respondent could have stayed on	24 and under	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 and over	Total
No, had to leave	61	68	57	59	38	283
	21.6%	24.0%	20.1%	20.8%	13.4%	100.0%
	15.8%	22.4%	22.1%	31.1%	40.4%	23.0%
Yes, could have stayed on	325	236	201	131	56	949
	34.2%	24.9%	21.2%	13.8%	5.9%	100.0%
	84.2%	77.6%	77.9%	68.9%	59.6%	77.0%
Total	386	304	258	190	94	1232
	31.3%	24.7%	20.9%	15.4%	7.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Weighted distribution of whether respondent could have stayed in job by age group

Whether respondent could have stayed on	24 and under	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 and over	Total
No, had to leave	81	88	69	73	49	360
	22.5%	24.4%	19.2%	20.3%	13.6%	100.0%
	15.8%	22.4%	22.1%	31.1%	40.5%	22.9%
Yes, could have stayed on	432	304	243	162	72	1213
	35.6%	25.1%	20.0%	13.4%	5.9%	100.0%
	84.2%	77.6%	77.9%	68.9%	59.5%	77.1%
Total	513	392	312	235	121	1573
	32.6%	24.9%	19.8%	14.9%	7.7%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Appendix 8(d)

Tables showing adjustment for wave 5 attrition

Distribution of sex, age, region and employment status. All waves and wave 5 only. LFS September–November 2001 (weighted by INTWT)

		All waves	Wave 5 only	Relative difference
Sex	1 Male	49.4%	49.6%	0.4%
	2 Female	50.6%	50.4%	-0.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	
All	1.00 Under 16	20.4%	20.2%	-1.0%
	2.00 16 to 24	11.0%	10.6%	-3.7%
	3.00 25 to 34	14.3%	13.8%	-3.2%
	4.00 35 to 44	15.5%	15.7%	1.4%
	5.00 45 to 54	13.2%	13.7%	4.0%
	6.00 55 and over	25.6%	25.9%	1.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	
Males	1.00 Under 16	21.1%	21.1%	-0.1%
	2.00 16 to 24	11.4%	10.9%	-4.4%
	3.00 25 to 34	14.7%	14.3%	-3.2%
	4.00 35 to 44	15.9%	16.0%	0.3%
	5.00 45 to 54	13.3%	13.9%	4.3%
	6.00 55 and over	23.5%	23.9%	1.5%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	
Females	1.00 Under 16	19.7%	19.3%	-1.9%
	2.00 16 to 24	10.7%	10.4%	-3.0%
	3.00 25 to 34	13.8%	13.4%	-3.3%
	4.00 35 to 44	15.1%	15.5%	2.4%
	5.00 45 to 54	13.1%	13.6%	3.7%
	6.00 55 and over	27.7%	27.9%	1.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	
GOR	1 North East	4.3%	4.3%	-0.5%
	2 North West	9.2%	9.0%	-1.8%
	3 Merseyside	2.3%	2.1%	-10.2%
	4 Yorkshire & Humberside	8.5%	8.3%	-1.4%
	5 East Midlands	7.1%	7.0%	-1.2%
	6 West Midlands	9.0%	8.6%	-4.2%
	7 Eastern	9.2%	9.6%	4.6%
	8 London	12.3%	12.0%	-2.4%
	9 South East	13.6%	13.9%	1.9%
	10 South West	8.3%	8.7%	4.6%
	11 Wales	4.9%	4.8%	-2.3%
	12 Scotland	8.5%	8.5%	-0.4%
	13 Northern Ireland	2.8%	3.2%	13.4%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	
ILODEFA	1 In employment	48.0%	49.0%	2.2%
	2 ILO unemployed	2.6%	2.5%	-1.9%
	3 Inactive	29.0%	28.3%	-2.7%
	4 Under 16	20.4%	20.2%	-1.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Appendix 8(e)

Derivation of final weight (Grossfac)

Derivation of final weight (Grossfac)				
	D00F	MM01	JA01	SN01
Totals	57330289	57383306	57436324	57482432
Weighted sample size in wave 5	11074283	10876292	10642594	10470408
Scaling factor to scale up wave 5 to all waves	5.1768849	5.275999	5.396835	5.4899897
Scaling factor after dividing by 4	1.2942212	1.3189998	1.3492088	1.3724974
<i>Actual grossing population estimate</i>	<i>57408088</i>			

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

Appendix 9

JSS reason for leaving job by LFS reason

JSS reason for leaving job by LFS reason for leaving job by sex						
	Dismissed	Redundant / voluntary redundancy	Resigned	Early retirement	Other reason ¹¹	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male						
Dismissed		[11]	2	1	-	2
Made redundant	[2]	77	3	[3]	8	20
Resigned		[2]	9	84	[2]	69
Early retirement	-	2	0	[9]	0	2
Retired (normal age)	-	-	-	[2]	-	0
Temporary job/contract ended	[4]	8	5	[1]	8	7
Other reason	[2]	2	7	[1]	13	8
<i>Base</i>		21	133	271	18	204
Women						
Dismissed		[7]	2	0	-	0
Made redundant	-	77	1	[1]	3	12
Resigned		-	7	85	[1]	80
Early retirement	-	1	1	[4]	-	1
Retired (normal age)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary job/contract ended	-	8	4	-	10	7
Other reason	[1]	4	9	-	7	8
<i>Base</i>		8	82	299	6	221
All						
Dismissed		[18]	2	1	-	1
Made redundant	[2]	77	2	[4]	5	16
Resigned		[2]	8	85	[3]	75
Early retirement	-	1	0	[13]	0	2
Retired (normal age)	-	-	-	[2]	-	0
Temporary job/contract ended	[4]	8	5	[1]	9	7
Other reason	[3]	3	8	[1]	10	8
<i>Base</i>		29	215	570	24	425

Source: Social Survey Division, Office for National Statistics.

¹¹ Not including 'Gave up work for health reasons', 'Gave up work for family or personal reasons', 'Retired at the normal age' or 'Temporary job finished'.

Where base numbers are less than 30, actual numbers have been used as it is meaningless to talk about such small numbers in terms of proportions.

Zeros (0s) represent proportions of less than one per cent and a dash has been inserted where there were no cases at all.

The DTI Employment Relations Research Series

Reports published to date in the DTI Employment Relations Research Series are listed below. Adobe PDF copies can be downloaded from the DTI website: www.dti.gov.uk/er/inform.htm

This and other DTI publications can be ordered at: www.dti.gov.uk/publications

Click the 'Browse' button, then select 'Employment Relations Research Series'. Alternatively call the DTI Publications Orderline on 0870 1502 500 (+44 870 1502 500) and provide the URN. Or email them at: publications@dti.gsi.gov.uk with your details.

Libraries, research centres, organisations and academics wishing to be added to our mailing list for printed copies of this series should email their details to DTI at: emar@dti.gov.uk

- No. 1 *Involving employees in Total Quality Management: employee attitudes and organisational context in unionised environments.* Margaret Collinson, Chris Rees, Paul Edwards with Linda Inness. URN 98/507. June 1998
- No. 2 *Industrial Tribunals, workplace disciplinary procedures and employment practice.* Jill Earnshaw, John Goodman, Robin Harrison and Mick Marchington. URN 98/564. February 1998
- No. 3 *The dynamics of union membership in Britain – a study using the Family and Working Lives survey.* Richard Disney, Amanda Gosling, Julian McCrae and Stephen Machin. URN 98/807. January 1999
- No. 4 *The individualisation of employment contracts in Britain.* William Brown, Simon Deakin, Maria Hudson, Cliff Pratten and Paul Ryan. URN 98/943. February 1999
- No. 5 *Redundancy consultation: a study of current practice and the effects of the Regulations.* Jill Smith, Paul Edwards and Mark Hall. URN 99/512. July 1999
- No. 6 *The employment status of individuals in non-standard employment.* Brendan Burchell, Simon Deakin and Sheila Honey. URN 99/770. July 1999
- No. 7 *Partnership at work.* John Knell. URN 99/1078. September 1999
- No. 8 *Trends in earnings inequality and earnings mobility 1977-1997: the impact of mobility on long-term inequality.* Abigail McKnight. URN 00/534. February 2000
- No. 9 *Costs and benefits of European Works Councils Directive.* Tina Weber, Peter Foster and Kursat Levent Egriboz. URN 00/630. February 2000
- No. 10 *Explaining the growth in the number of applications to Industrial Tribunals, 1972-1997.* Simon Burgess, Carol Propper and Deborah Wilson. URN 00/624. April 2001

- No. 11 *Implementation of the Working Time Regulations*. Fiona Neathey and James Arrowsmith. URN 01/682. April 2001
- No. 12 *Collective bargaining and workplace performance: an investigation using the Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998*. Alex Bryson and David Wilkinson. URN 01/1224. November 2001
- No. 13 *Findings from the 1998 Survey of Employment Tribunal Applications (Surveys of Applicants and Employers)*. URN 03/999. February 2004
- No. 14 *Small firms' awareness and knowledge of individual employment rights*. Robert Blackburn and Mark Hart. URN 02/573. August 2002
- No. 15 *Awareness, knowledge and exercise of individual employment rights*. Nigel Meager, Claire Tyers, Sarah Perryman, Jo Rick and Rebecca Willison. URN 02/667. February 2002
- No. 16 *Working long hours: a review of the evidence. Volume 1 – Main report. Volume 2 – Case studies (and appendices)*-J Kodz et al. URN: 03/1228. November 2003
- No. 17 *Evaluation of the Partnership at Work Fund*. Mike Terry and Jill Smith. URN 03/512. May 2003
- No. 18 *Retirement ages in the UK: a review of the literature*. Pamela Meadows. URN 03/820. July 2003
- No. 19 *Implementation of the Working Time Regulations: follow-up study*. Fiona Neathey. URN03/970. July 2003
- No. 20 *The impact of employment legislation on small firms: a case study analysis*. Paul Edwards, Monder Ram and John Black. URN 03/1095. September 2003
- No. 21 *Employee voice and training at work: analysis of case studies and WERS98*. Helen Rainbird, Jim Sutherland, Paul Edwards, Lesley Holly and Ann Munro. URN 03/1063. September 2003
- No. 22 *The Second Work-Life Balance Study: Results from the Employer Survey*. Stephen Woodland, Nadine Simmonds, Marie Thornby, Rory Fitzgerald and Alice McGee. URN 03/1252. October 2003
- No. 23 *The business context to long hours working*. T. Hogarth, W.W. Daniel, A.P.Dickerson, D. Campbell, M.Wintherbotham, D. Vivian. URN 03/833. November 2003
- No. 24 *Age matters: a review of the existing survey evidence*. Dr. Peter Urwin. URN 03/1623. February 2004
- No. 25 *How employers manage absence*. Stephen Bevan, Sally Dench, Heather Harper and Sue Hayday. URN 04/553. March 2004
- No. 26 *The content of new voluntary trade union recognition agreements 1998-2002: Volume one – An analysis of new agreements and case studies*. Dr Sian Moore, Dr Sonia McKay and Helen Bewley. URN 04/1084. August 2004
- No. 27 *The Second Work-Life Balance Study: Results from the Employees' Survey*. Jane Stevens, Juliet Brown and Caroline Lee. URN 04/740. March 2004
- No. 28 *2003 Compendium of Regulatory Impact Assessments*. Employment Market Analysis and Research. URN 04/743. April 2004
- No. 29 *Trade union recognition: statutory unfair labour practice regimes in the USA and Canada*. John Godard. URN 04/855. March 2004
- No. 30 *Equal opportunities policies and practices at the workplace: secondary analysis of WERS98*. Tracy Anderson, Neil Millward and John Forth. URN 04/836. June 2004
- No. 32 *The evaluation of the Work-Life Balance Challenge Fund*. Adrian Nelson, Kathryn Nemec, Pernille Solvik and Chris Ramsden. URN 04/1043. August 2004

- No. 33 *Findings from the Survey of Employment tribunal Applications 2003*. Bruce Hayward, Mark Peters, Nicola Rousseau and Ken Seeds. URN 04/1071. August 2004
- No. 34 *Employment relations monitoring and evaluation plan 2004*. Employment Market Analysis and Research. URN 04/1256. September 2004
- No. 35 *Findings from the 1998 survey of representatives in Employment Tribunal cases*. P.L.Latreille, J.A. Latreille and K.G. Knight. URN 04/1530. August 2004

