

**Technical Report Employer Survey
Project B3**

**“Interactions Between Capabilities in Work
and Private Life“**

**Stephanie Pausch
Julia Harand
Reinhard Schunck
Peter Jacobebbinghaus**

Stephanie Pausch, Julia Harand, Reinhard Schunck and Peter Jacobebbinghaus

Technical Report Employer Survey Project B3: Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life

SFB 882 Technical Report, No. 04
DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities
Project “ Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations ” (B3)
Bielefeld, *January 2014*
Corrected Version April 2015

SFB 882 Technical Report Series
General Editors: Stefan Liebig, Christian Meyer and Johanna Vompras
ISSN 2196-985X

This publication has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

SFB 882 Technical Reports are refereed scholarly papers. Submissions are reviewed by peers in a two-stage SFB 882 internal and external refereeing process before a final decision on publication is made.

The Technical Report Series is a forum for presenting technical works (e.g. data documentation, field reports etc.) in progress. Readers should communicate comments on the manuscript directly to the author(s).

The papers can be downloaded from the SFB 882 website <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

SFB 882 “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities”
University of Bielefeld
Faculty of Sociology
PO Box 100131
D-33501 Bielefeld
Germany
Phone: +49-(0)521-106-4942 or +49-(0)521-106-4613
Email: office.sfb882@uni-bielefeld.de
Web: <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

Table of Contents

1. Survey Design.....	2
1.1 Project Description	2
1.2 Study Population and Sampling	2
1.3 Survey Instrument.....	6
2. Implementation of the Survey	7
2.1 Field Phase and Field Control	7
2.2 Response Rate and Evaluation of the Sample	8
2.3 Survey Mode	8
2.4 Selectivity Analysis	9
2.4.1 Descriptive Analyses.....	9
2.4.2 Multivariate Analyses	12
2.5 Item-Non-Response Rates.....	14
3. Representativeness of the Sample.....	15
References	18
Appendix: Employer Survey Questionnaire.....	I

Components of the Employer Survey B3 (2012 Results)

Project title	Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations
Founded by	German Research Foundation (DFG)
Project period	2011–2015
Content	Economic situation, employment structure, equal opportunities, healthcare
Group conducting interviews	German Institute for Employment Research (IAB)
Study population	Work organizations (facilities, operating units, work organizations) with at least 500 employees who are subject to social security (see Section 1.2)
Research area	Germany
Field research period	April to August 2012
Sampling method	Disproportionately stratified random sampling
Sample size	115
Response rate	23.9 percent

1. Survey Design

1.1 Project Description

As part of the Collaborative Research Center's program "From Heterogeneities to Inequalities" (SFB 882), Project B3, entitled "Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations," was designed to analyze the role of the work environment in the genesis of social inequalities by taking into account mutual influences on employees' opportunities for personal fulfillment at work and in their private lives. In addition to an employee survey that evaluated opportunities for fulfillment in the employees' working and private lives, employers were surveyed about measures used to assess employees' capabilities in these two life domains. The study design, which links the employer and employee surveys, provides a rich dataset, with extensive information that serves to answer specific research questions. The role of the work organizations as negotiating partners and the opportunity structures within these organizations were also analyzed. The surveys were carried out in cooperation with the German Institute for Employment Research (IAB) in Nuremberg. The establishment surveys were conducted by employees of IAB.

The project comprises a longitudinal study consisting of three waves of employer and employee surveys: the first wave was collected during the months of April to August of 2012, and the second and third wave will be collected in 2014 and 2016, respectively. A standardized questionnaire is used to determine the operating and personnel structures and to measure equal opportunities and diversity, especially heterogeneous characteristics (e.g., age, gender, and migration history), as well as activities for promoting health. The survey contents relate to the time of the survey and the survey year.

This technical report describes the methods used in and the results of the first of three waves of the employer survey, for which data were collected from April to August 2012.

1.2 Study Population and Sampling

In order to address the central questions of the project, it was necessary to ensure a sufficient variety of work organizations across various industry sectors. To achieve this, disproportionately stratified random sampling was selected; this type of sampling allows for a smaller sample size than simple random sampling (Schnell, Hill, and Esser, 1999: 261; Diekmann 2004: 337).¹

¹ In order to make statements about the population (see Section 3), the data must be weighted with the reciprocal probability of selection.

The selection of the establishments was based on administrative operational data provided by IAB in coordination with the Research Data Center (FDZ) of the Federal Employment Agency at IAB. As a sampling basis, IAB's employment history data (*Beschäftigten-Historik*, BeH) were used (BeH, Version 08.07.00-120203). The BeH contains all the employers' social security notifications. Because they are obligated to report it, all establishments in Germany that have at least one employee who is subject to social security are included in this population. At the time of the sampling, the data available were current to December 31st, 2010. Based on registration numbers, employee data were aggregated at the establishment level, and the number of employees for the employer sample was calculated. The population for the sampling was thereby restricted to those establishments reported to have at least 500 regular employees by this date.² This restriction was imposed to ensure that sufficient internal gross samples would be available for the subsequent employee survey. Since this project is intended to be a longitudinal study, the internal sample must comprise a sufficiently large number of employees to be included in the longitudinal employee surveys. On the basis of experiences gleaned from comparable studies (see, e.g., Bender et al., 2008; Knerr et al., 2009), an average number of 67 employees per establishment was defined as the requisite target size to provide enough cases for the subsequent waves.³ In addition, restricting the sampling to facilities with more than 500 employees ensures that only some of their employees need to be contacted to fulfill the requisite number of employee interviews. This is useful for minimizing the potential influence of survey effects (or reactivity), such as when employees within a facility exchange views about the survey.⁴

To ensure that each employer interview applied to the operating unit covered by the registration number, interviewers made a note at the beginning of the interview confirming that the individual survey referred to that particular unit and not to the company as a whole. However, if statements pertaining to the particular operating unit were not possible, respondents were asked to indicate this fact and to provide information pertaining to the entire company.

For the sampling, establishments were stratified according to industry sectors (based on the German "*Wirtschaftszweig*" WZ08 classification).⁵ The industry sectors A (Agriculture, forest-

² Employees subject to social security who are reported to the Federal Employment Agency include (in addition to the regular employees) trainees, employees in partial retirement, interns, working students, and pensioners without contributions. Since these groups should not be represented in the employee survey, only those establishments in which more than 500 employees were reported in group 101 ("social security with no special features") were included in the population for the sampling. Employees in marginal employment were likewise excluded.

³ Recent employer surveys (e.g., WeLL [Berufliche Weiterbildung als Bestandteil Lebenslangen Lernens [Bender et al., 2008; Knerr et al. 2009]) suggested that telephone numbers would be available for approximately 10 to 20 percent of the employees whose addresses are provided by the survey institute, IAB. In light of past experience after some research of the survey institute telephone numbers for about 37 percent of the sample will be available. Taking into consideration the expected rate of attrition, a sample size of at least 500 employees would be needed.

⁴ It should be noted that only large establishments were selected for the sample, so small and medium-sized establishments are not represented. (See the European Union definition of company size classes at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:124:0036:0041:en:PDF> [accessed 2013/11/11].)

⁵ The classification of industry sectors is based on WZ08 (*Wirtschaftszweige* 2008), which is also used by the Federal Statistical Office and which represents the most common classification of industries in Germany. (https://www.destatis.de/DE/Methoden/Klassifikationen/GueterWirtschaftsklassifikationen/klassifikationwz2008_erl.pdf?__blob=publicationFile [accessed 2013/11/11]).

ry, and fishing), B (Mining and quarrying industries), and S (Other service activities) were not included, since the organizational contexts of these sectors were difficult to compare with those of other industry sectors. In addition, industry sector T (Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use) and industry sector U (Activities of extra-territorial organizations and bodies) are not in the sample, since employees in sector T are not embedded in any organizational context and employees in sector U are employed in organizations that do not fall within the same national context as the other establishments included in the sample. Furthermore, temporary work agencies, i.e. work organizations that provide employees on subcontracted labor for other organizations, (WZ08: 78200 and 78300) were excluded from the sample, because it is difficult to determine which organizational context these employees are actually embedded in. On the one hand, their temporary work agency defines the extent of their employment, wages, and the like, on the other hand, workers on temporary loan may be socially embedded within the establishment where they are placed.

The population sample of 3,934 establishments was stratified according to industry sectors and geographical location (East Germany and West Germany) (see Table 1). In accordance with the research question formulated in the project proposal, differences in the organizational structure of establishments of the “old” and “new” economies, industry sector J (Information and communication activities) was split into two subsectors: J-I (WZ08: 58110-60200), which includes publishing activities, motion picture projection activities, sound recording and music publishing activities, radio and television programming, and broadcasting activities; and J-II (WZ08: 61100–63990), which includes telecommunication, computer programming consulting, and related activities and information service activities.

Table 1. Distribution of sample establishments by industry and country sector

Industry sector*	Country sector (Germany)	
	West	East
C Manufacturing		
D Electricity, gas, steam, and air-conditioning supply		
E Water supply; sewerage, waste management, and remediation activities		
F Construction		
G Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles		
H Transportation and storage		
I Accommodation and food service activities		
J Information and communication activities I	11%	22%
K Financial and insurance activities		
L Real estate activities		
M Professional, scientific, and technical activities		
N Administrative and support service activities		
O Public administration and defence; compulsory social security		
P Education		
Q Human health and social work activities		
R Arts, entertainment, and recreational activities		
J Information and communication activities II (WZ 2008: 61100-63990)	44%	88%

* The various industry sectors are defined according to the classification WZ08.

Out of the 34 strata, a disproportionate sample was randomly drawn. Considering that the ratio of the number of establishments in the West and in the East is 5.4:1, the draw-down probability for strata in East Germany was doubled when compared with strata in West Germany. In addition, the drawdown probability for one group of establishments in industry sector J-I (WZ08: 61100-63990) was quadrupled to ensure that a sufficient number of establishments would be surveyed, as stated in the project proposal. In total, 539 companies were drawn for the gross sample, of which 115 agreed to be interviewed (see Table 2). Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying particular establishments, the number of industry sectors presented in this report has been reduced from 17 to 12 as a basis for the strata. Thus, sectors D (Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply), E (Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities) and F (Construction) were combined as a single sector, as were sections J-I and J-II and sectors I (Accommodation and food service activities), L (Real estate activities), and R (Arts, entertainment and recreation activities).

Table 2. Gross population sample for Employer Survey B3 for 2012

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	West			East		
	Popu- lation	Gross sample	Com- pleted inter- views	Popu- lation	Gross sample	Com- pleted inter- views
C – Manufacturing	1211	133	32	122	27	6
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply						
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	114	13	3	27	6	2
F – Construction						
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	196	22	5	28	6	0
H – Transportation and storage	162	18	3	37	8	1
J – Information and communication activities	127	46	8	14	8	3
K – Financial and insurance activities	229	25	4	20	4	1
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	141	16	4	24	5	0
N – Administrative and support service Activities	122	13	1	44	10	1
O – Public Administration and defence, compulsory social security	313	34	12	112	25	4
P – Education	89	10	2	36	8	1
Q – Human health and social work activities	581	64	17	145	32	4
I – Accommodation and food service activities						
L – Real estate activities	31	4	1	9	2	0
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation Activities						
Number of cases	3316	398	92	618	141	23

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

1.3 Survey Instrument

The survey of the establishments (Employer Survey) was designed to be a personal interview conducted by employees of IAB on the basis of a standardized questionnaire (see Appendix). Instruments were selected according to existing employer surveys (e.g., the IAB Establishment Panel). If a face-to-face interview was not possible, the questionnaire was delivered to the employer by post or electronic transmission.

The Employer Survey consisted of four parts. Part 1, "General information about the establishment", requests basic information concerning the establishment's structure and its personnel procedures. Part 2, "Equality of opportunity/Diversity", concerns specific action taken by the establishment in these areas, and Part 3, "Health promotion", deals with health promotion, including illness rates and employee surveys about health protection in the workplace. Part 4 completes the interview by asking the respondents if they would be willing to take part in the follow-up panel survey to be conducted 2 years hence.

Part 1 of the questionnaire includes questions about the establishment's founding year, the pressure exerted by competitors, and innovative activities. It also focuses on the number of hierarchy levels, the personnel structure, and the distribution of employees with different qualifications and at different task levels, as well as the proportions of women and of individuals without German citizenship. Part 2 addresses issues of equal opportunities and of diversity, specifically, concrete actions on the part of the company to promote female junior staff by means of targeted career planning, mentoring programs or networking groups for women. Moreover, questions are asked about family-friendly measures such as childcare provided at the company (e.g., an on-site kindergarten, nursery or day-care center and homework supervision), financial support or other forms of assistance for childcare, offers for employees who are out on parental leave, flexible working hours or the possibility of telecommuting or taking work home. In addition, it asks about the integration of employees with different cultural and/or ethnic backgrounds. Part 3 focuses on measures that analyze the rate of illness and protect employee health through employee discussions and courses that promote health-related behavior.

2. Implementation of the Survey

2.1 Field Phase and Field Control

The field phase of the Employer Survey lasted from April to August 2012. Interviews were conducted by 10 IAB employees (so called ProIAB) who work at selected local employment offices of the German Federal Employment Agency. For the field work, the ProIAB staff obtained the addresses of the establishments selected for sampling, and these were distributed according to the different survey areas. The contacts for the survey, in most cases the personnel managers, were identified, and announcement letters were sent to the companies to inform them about the survey.

2.2 Response Rate and Evaluation of the Sample

Out of the total population of 3,934 companies, a study sample of 539 was selected through disproportionately stratified random sampling. Information about these selected companies were submitted to the ProIAB staff in two installments. The first installment consisted of 270 companies randomly drawn from 50 percent of the population in each of the 34 strata. Contact information about these establishments were submitted to the ProIAB staff on April 5, 2012. The second group consisted of 269 companies, and the contact information were submitted on June 14, 2012. Of these 539 companies, 115 agreed to be interviewed, resulting in a response rate of 23.9 percent⁶; 15 of these 115 refused to consent to having their employees surveyed.

Table 3. Response rate of the sample and adjustments made

Sample status	Number of respondents	%
Gross sample	539	100.00
Reduction in sample through attrition (total)	58	10.76
Not contacted	48	8.91
Company no longer exists	5	0.93
Company cannot be found at address provided	2	0.37
Company name correct, company number incorrect	2	0.37
Company name incorrect, company number correct	1	0.19
Adjusted net sample	481	89.24
Refusal to participate	310	64.45
Contact not reached	53	11.02
Other reasons for nonparticipation	3	0.62
Employers who agreed to be interviewed	115	23.91
Consented to have employees surveyed	100	86.96
Did not consent to have employees surveyed	15	13.04

2.3 Survey Mode

Since not all the companies were able to engage in face-to-face interviews, the ProIAB staff opted to send questionnaires by e-mail or post to achieve a higher response rate (see Table 4). Of 115 questionnaires, 68 were sent by e-mail, and one company wished to receive the questionnaire by post; in 41 cases the interviews were conducted in person, and the average duration of an interview was 48 minutes.

⁶ The initial response rate was 23.6 percent, according to standard definitions provided by AAPOR (2011: 44).

Table 4. Interview methods

Mode	Total number interviewed	%	Accumulated %
Letter (post)	1	0.87	0.87
Telephone	5	4.35	5.22
E-mail	60	52.17	57.39
E-mail and telephone	8	6.96	64.35
Face-to-face	41	35.65	100.00
Total	115	100.00	

2.4 Selectivity Analysis

Within the selectivity analysis, factors that influence the willingness of a company to take part in the Employer Survey were analyzed to reveal potential systematic biases and to estimate the generalizability of the results. This type of analysis compares survey participants with nonparticipants and should provide information about subgroup-specific and systematic biases of the final sample (Knerr et al. 2009: 15f.). Logistic regression analysis was used to assess the extent to which the industry sector, size of the company, and location in West or East Germany influenced the willingness of the establishments to participate in the survey. First, some descriptive analyses were carried out to address the relationship between the gross population sample and the completed interviews.

2.4.1 Descriptive Analyses

Table 5 shows the probability of participation for the companies within the different industry sectors for Germany as a whole. The probability that an establishment in industry sector O (Public administration and defence; compulsory social security) would participate in the Employer Survey was 27.1 percent, which is the highest rate of participation. The combined industry sectors D (Electricity, gas, steam, and air-conditioning supply), E (Water supply; sewerage, waste management, and remediation activities), and F (Construction) had the second highest rate of participation, at 26.3 percent. The probability that an establishment in industry sector C (Manufacturing), the largest sector, would participate in the Employer Survey was 23.8 percent.

Table 5. Probability of participation in the Employer Survey by industry sectors (West and East-Germany combined)

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	Gross population	Completed interviews	
	Total	Total	in %
C – Manufacturing	160	38	23.8
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	19	5	26.3
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities			
F – Construction			
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	28	5	17.9
H – Transportation and storage	26	4	15.4
J – Information and communication activities	54	11	20.4
K – Financial and insurance activities	29	5	17.2
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	21	4	19.0
N – Administrative and support service	23	2	8.7
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	59	16	27.1
P – Education	18	3	16.7
Q – Human health and social work activities	96	21	21.9
I – Accommodation and food service activities	6	1	16.7
L – Real estate activities			
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation Activities			
Number of cases	539	115	

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

Tables 6 and 7 give an overview of the distribution of the gross population in comparison to the completed interviews for West and East Germany. For West Germany, deviations were small and added up to a maximum of 4.5 percentage points (Table 6). Industry sector J (Information and communication activities), with the largest negative deviation of -2.9 percentage points of the completed interviews, was underrepresented when compared with the gross population. Industry sector O (Public administration and defence; compulsory social security) had the largest positive deviation of 4.5 percentage points. Industry sector K (Financial and insurance activities), with a deviation of -1.9 percentage points, and sector N (Administrative and support service), with a deviation of -2.2 percentage points, were underrepresented, while sector Q (Human health and social work activities), with a deviation of 2.4 percentage points, was overrepresented.

Table 6. Distribution comparison of gross sample and completed interviews for West Germany

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	Population		Completed interviews		Difference (II) - (I)
	Total	in % (I)	Total	in % (II)	
C – Manufacturing	133	33.4	32	34.8	1.4
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply					
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	13	3.3	3	3.3	0.0
F – Construction					
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	22	5.5	5	5.4	-0.1
H – Transportation and storage	18	4.5	3	3.3	-1.3
J – Information and communication activities	46	11.6	8	8.7	-2.9
K – Financial and insurance activities	25	6.3	4	4.3	-1.9
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	16	4.0	4	4.3	0.3
N – Administrative and support service	13	3.3	1	1.1	-2.2
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	34	8.5	12	13.0	4.5
P – Education	10	2.5	2	2.2	-0.3
Q – Human health and social work activities	64	16.1	17	18.5	2.4
I – Accommodation and food service activities					
L – Real estate activities	4	1.0	1	1.1	0.1
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation activities					
Number of cases	398	100.0	92	100.0	

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

For East Germany, the deviations were also small (Table 7). Industry sector J (Information and communication services) showed the largest positive deviation with 7.4 percentage points, and sector C (Manufacturing) showed a deviation of 6.9 percentage points. The largest negative deviation, -5.3 percentage points, was found in industry sector Q (Human health and social work activities). The combined industry sectors D (Electricity, gas, steam, and air-conditioning supply), E (Water supply; sewerage, waste management, and remediation activities), and F (Construction) were overrepresented, with a deviation of 4.4 percentage points, while the combined industry sectors I (Accommodation and food service activities), L (Real estate activities), and R (Arts, entertainment, and recreation activities) were slightly underrepresented, with a deviation of -1.4 percentage points. Other underrepresented sectors included industry sector G (Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcy-

cles), with a deviation of -4.3 percentage points; sector M (Professional, scientific, and technical activities), with a deviation of -3.5 percentage points; and sector N (Administrative and support services), with a deviation of -2.7 percentage points.

Table 7. Distribution comparison of gross sample and completed interviews for East Germany

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	Population		Completed interviews		Difference (II) - (I)
	total	in % (I)	total	in % (II)	
C – Manufacturing	27	19.1	6	26.1	6.9
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply					
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	6	4.3	2	8.7	4.4
F – Construction					
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	6	4.3	0	0.0	-4.3
H – Transportation and storage	8	5.7	1	4.3	-1.3
J – Information and communication activities	8	5.7	3	13.0	7.4
K – Financial and insurance activities	4	2.8	1	4.3	1.5
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	5	3.5	0	0.0	-3.5
N – Administrative and support service	10	7.1	1	4.3	-2.7
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	25	17.7	4	17.4	-0.3
P – Education	8	5.7	1	4.3	-1.3
Q – Human health and social work activities	32	22.7	4	17.4	-5.3
I – Accommodation and food service activities					
L – Real estate activities	2	1.4	0	0.0	-1.4
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation activities					
Number of cases	141	100.0	23	100.0	

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

2.4.2 Multivariate Analyses

A logistic regression analysis was carried out to analyze the extent to which the industry sector, size of the company, and location in West or East Germany influenced the willingness of companies to participate in the survey. As a first step, all 539 companies of the gross population were included in the model. Next, the model was recalculated for the 481 companies in the net population. These were differentiated into those who participated in the Employer

Survey and those who did not. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 8, with “participation in the Employer Survey” as the dependent variable.

Table 8. Results of the logistic regression analysis of the probability of participation in the Employer Survey

	Gross population		Net population	
	β -	p-Value	β -	p-Value
Industry sector (WZ 2008)* <i>Reference: C – Manufacturing</i>				
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply				
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	0.207	(0.710)	0.333	(0.561)
F – Construction				
H – Transportation and storage	-0.476	(0.409)	-0.424	(0.468)
J – Information and communication activities	-0.201	(0.603)	-0.151	(0.699)
K – Financial and insurance activities	-0.410	(0.437)	-0.239	(0.657)
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	-0.246	(0.675)	-0.281	(0.635)
N – Administrative and support service	-1.073	(0.162)	-1.085	(0.159)
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	0.290	(0.412)	0.286	(0.424)
P – Education	-0.346	(0.605)	-0.331	(0.624)
Q – Human health and social work activities	-0.037	(0.906)	0.168	(0.599)
I – Accommodation and food service activities				
L – Real estate activities	-0.368	(0.741)	0.022	(0.985)
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation activities				
Company size/1000	0.013	(0.810)	0.009	(0.858)
East/West <i>Reference: East</i>				
West	0.450	(0.091)	0.289	(0.285)
Constant	-1.567	(0.000)	-1.350	(0.000)
Probability > LR	0.755		0.855	
Pseudo R ² (McKelvey and Zavoina):	0.036		0.032	
NUMBER OF CASES	539		481	

Yes = 1, Participated in the survey; No = 0, no participation. LR = likelihood ratio.

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

The model of the logistic regression showed no statistically significant deviations for participants and nonparticipants in both the gross and the net populations of the Employer Survey. None of the factors analyzed - industry sector, company size, nor location in East or West Germany - had any influence on the probability of an establishment’s participation in the survey. In addition, the McKelvey and Zavoina pseudo-R² and the likelihood ratio chi-square test all indicate a bad fit for this model. This leads to the conclusion that the variables used in the models cannot explain the probability of participation in the survey. Consequently, considering the variables included in the model, there were no systematic biases in the final sample.

2.5 Item-Non-Response Rates

Tables 9, 10, and 11 present the response rates for questions selected from three parts of questions in the Employer Survey. In general, the response rates were high. For questions concerning labor productivity, job security, and profit compared with the main competitor, the proportion of missing answers was the highest, with rates between 18 and 30 percent. It should be noted that the establishments which did not respond to these questions were mainly from industry sectors C (Manufacturing) and O (Public administration and defence; compulsory social security). For questions relating to the personnel structure, the non-response rates were between 11 and 16 percent; presumably the respondents found it difficult to answer these questions owing to the ad-hoc nature of the survey. Nevertheless, remaining answer rates were very high, indicating that the survey was well accepted and the data were of good quality.

Table 9. Response rates for general information questions about the company (all companies)

Question	Response rate (%)
Founding year of the establishment	93.91
Pressure from competition	98.26
Risk to company high-pressure competition	97.39
Labor productivity compared with main competitor	74.78
Job security compared with main competitor	81.74
Profit compared with main competitor	69.57
Number of hierarchy levels	98.26
Existence of industry-wide wage agreement	100.00
Existence of a works or staff council	100.00
Annual result last fiscal year	88.70
Innovation activity of the company	92.17
<i>Personnel structure</i>	
Employees for menial jobs, requiring no specific vocational education	87.83
Employees for qualified jobs, requiring completion of vocational training or comparable on-the-job training or applicable professional experience	87.83
Employees for qualified jobs, requiring a university or university of applied sciences degree	86.96
Executives	85.22
Working proprietors, directors, managers	83.48
Trainees/apprentices	86.96
Candidates for civil service	84.35
<i>Age groups</i>	
Under age 30	88.70
Age 30 to 49	88.70
Age 50 or older	88.70

Table 10. Response rates for questions about equal opportunities or diversity

Question	Response rate (%)
Existence of agreements or voluntary operational initiatives to promote equal opportunities for men and women	100.00
<i>Equal opportunities for men and women</i>	
Promotion of female junior staff through targeted career planning, mentoring programs for women, networking groups for women	95.65
Targeted promotion of female junior staff by preferential recruitment of women, female quotas	96.52
Mixed-gender teams used specifically to support equal opportunities	96.52
<i>Family-friendly measures</i>	
Childcare provided at the company	99.13
Offers for employees who are out on parental leave	99.13
Flexible working hours (Flexitime)	100.00
Telecommuting/homework	100.00
Special leave/unpaid leave (e.g., interruption of work when caring for relatives or children)	99.13
<i>Integration of employees</i>	
Language courses	98.26
Promotion of employees with different cultural/ethnic backgrounds through targeted career planning, mentoring programs, networking groups	94.78
Courses on cultural competence/getting to know the German culture	99.13
Mixed teams used specifically to support equal opportunities	96.52

Table 11. Response rates for questions about health promotion measures

Question	Response rate (%)
Sickness rate analysis	100.00
Employee survey on health protection at the work	100.00
Discussion group on health problems in the establishment ("health circles")	100.00
Courses for health-promoting behavior	100.00

3. Representativeness of the Sample

Tables 12 and 13 present the distribution of the population as compared with the completed interviews, differentiated for East and West Germany. The population consisted of 3,934 companies, of which 3,316 were in the West and 618 were in the East. In West Germany (Table 12), the differences between population and completed interviews can be classified as low. With a deviation of 4.9 percentage points of the completed interviews, industry sector J (Information and communication activities) was overrepresented. As explained above, this was due to an increased drawdown probability. Furthermore, industry sector K (Financial and insurance activities), with a deviation of -2.6 percentage points, and sector N (Administrative and support services), with a deviation of -2.6 percentage points, were slightly underrepre-

sented, and sector O (Public administration and defence; compulsory social security), with a deviation of 3.6 percentage points, was slightly overrepresented.

Table 12: Distribution comparison of population and completed interviews for West Germany

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	Population		Completed interviews		Difference (II) - (I)
	total	in % (I)	total	in % (II)	
C – Manufacturing	1211	36.5	32	34.8	-1.7
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply					
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	114	3.4	3	3.3	-0.2
F – Construction					
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	196	5.9	5	5.4	-0.5
H – Transportation and storage	162	4.9	3	3.3	-1.6
J – Information and communication activities	127	3.8	8	8.7	4.9
K – Financial and insurance activities	229	6.9	4	4.3	-2.6
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	141	4.3	4	4.3	0.1
N – Administrative and support service	122	3.7	1	1.1	-2.6
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	313	9.4	12	13.0	3.6
P – Education	89	2.7	2	2.2	-0.5
Q – Human health and social work activities	581	17.5	17	18.5	1.0
I – Accommodation and food service activities					
L – Real estate activities	31	0.9	1	1.1	0.2
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation activities					
Number of cases	3316	100.0	92	100.0	

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

For East Germany (Table 13), the distribution of completed interviews also reflects the distribution of the population. However, industry sector J (Information and communication activities), with a deviation of 10.8 percentage points, sector C (Manufacturing), with a deviation of 6.3 percentage points, and sector Q (Human health and social work activities), with a deviation of -6.1 percentage points, exhibited greater differences between population and completed interviews. Again, the largest positive deviation of 10.8 percentage points for industry sector J was due to the increased drawdown probability for one part of the population.

Table 13: Distribution comparison of population and completed interviews for East Germany

Industry sector (WZ 2008)*	Population		Completed interviews		Difference (II) - (I)
	total	in % (I)	total	in % (II)	
C – Manufacturing	122	19.7	6	26.1	6.3
D – Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply					
E – Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	27	4.4	2	8.7	4.3
F – Construction					
G – Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	28	4.5	0	0.0	-4.5
H – Transportation and storage	37	6.0	1	4.3	-1.6
J – Information and communication activities	14	2.3	3	13.0	10.8
K – Financial and insurance activities	20	3.2	1	4.3	1.1
M – Professional, scientific and technical activities	24	3.9	0	0.0	-3.9
N – Administrative and support service	44	7.1	1	4.3	-2.8
O – Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	112	18.1	4	17.4	-0.7
P – Education	36	5.8	1	4.3	-1.5
Q – Human health and social work activities	145	23.5	4	17.4	-6.1
I – Accommodation and food service activities					
L – Real estate activities	9	1.5	0	0.0	-1.5
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation activities					
Number of cases	618	100.0	23	100.0	

*Owing to the small number of cases in the population of the sample and the accompanying risk of identifying the companies, the industry sectors were reduced in this table from 17 to 12 sectors as a basis for the stratification.

To make statements about the whole population (described in Section 1.1) the data must be weighted. This results from the disproportionately stratified random sample and, to a lesser extent, the different probability of participation in the survey. A simple way to calculate weights is to divide the number of cases in the population by the number of completed interviews, differentiated by industry sector and region (see Table 2).⁷

⁷ Note that organizations from industry sectors J-I and J-II, have different design weights. An alternative would be weighting according to the inverse drawdown probability (see Table 1); however, with this weighting, the marginal distributions would not be adapted to the population.

References

AAPOR (2011): *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 7th Edition. Deerfield: The American Association for Public Opinion Research. Available online at:

http://www.aapor.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Standard_Definitions2&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=3156 [accessed 2013/11/11].

Bender, S., M. Fertig, K. Görlitz, M. Huber, S. Hummelsheim, P. Knerr, A. Schmucker, and H. Schröder (2008): *WeLL — Berufliche Weiterbildung als Bestandteil Lebenslangen Lernens: Projektbericht*. Nuremberg: Bundesagentur für Arbeit. Available online at:

http://doku.iab.de/fdz/reporte/2008/MR_05-08.pdf [accessed 2013/11/11].

Diekmann, A. (2004): *Empirische Sozialforschung: Grundlagen, Methoden, Anwendungen*. Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Fischer, G., F. Janik, D. Müller, and A. Schmucker (2008): *Das IAB-Betriebspanel — von der Stichprobe über die Erhebung bis zur Hochrechnung*. Nuremberg: The Research Data Centre (FDZ) of the Federal Employment Service at the Institute for Employment Research. Available online at:

http://doku.iab.de/fdz/reporte/2008/MR_01-08.pdf [accessed 2013/11/11].

Knerr, P., H. Schröder, F. Aust, and R. Gilberg (2009): *Berufliche Weiterbildung als Bestandteil Lebenslangen Lernens (WeLL): WeLL-Erhebung 2007: Methodenbericht*. Nuremberg: Bundesagentur für Arbeit. Available online at:

http://doku.iab.de/fdz/reporte/2009/MR_06-09.pdf [accessed 2013/11/11].

Schnell, R., P. B. Hill, and E. Esser (1999): *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Munich: Oldenbourg.

Appendix: Employer Survey Questionnaire



Sequential Number:

Project B3 “Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life”

Employer Survey

Questionnaire

Your answers will be treated confidentially in compliance with the current data protection legislation and will be anonymized for analysis to ensure that individual establishments cannot be identified.

Contact:

Bielefeld University
Universitätsstraße 25
33615 Bielefeld
- Germany -

Prof. Dr. Martin Diewald
Dr. Reinhard Schunck
Dr. Anja Abendroth
Silvia Melzer
Stephanie Pausch
Mareike Reimann

(0521) 106-4309
(0521) 106-4643

Institute for Employment Research (IAB)
of the German Federal Employment
Agency (BA)
Regensburger Straße 104
90478 Nuremberg
- Germany -

Dr. Peter Jacobebbinghaus

(0911) 179-1765

April 2012

Part 1: General Information about the Establishment

This interview addresses your specific establishment or operating unit and not the entire company. If it is not possible to provide information based on this specific establishment, please indicate this and try to provide information about your company as a whole.

1. In what year was this establishment/operating unit founded?

INT: The question refers to the year the establishment was originally established, not to the year of a possible takeover of the establishment/operating unit.

2. How is your company managed? Solely by the proprietors or their family members or solely by employed managers?

- Solely by the proprietors and/or their family members
- Solely by employed managers
- Both

3. How would you describe your establishment? As...

- an independent company or an independent organization without other places of business
- the head office of an enterprise or an organization with other places of business/offices/branches
- a place of business/office/branch of a larger enterprise or organization
- a regional or technical middle-level administrative unit in a multilevel company or multilevel government agency/organization

4. (a) How would you rate the level of competition that your establishment faces?

According to the following scale, please evaluate your establishment in relation to its competition. Grade your response by choosing a number between 0 and 10, where 0 means pressure from competition is “nonexistent” and 10 means pressure from competition is “very high.”

INT: If possible, the answer should be applied to the specific establishment/operating unit, otherwise to the whole company. In the public service, such as local facilities, the competition may be a locational competitor; for example, universities may compete for students or for public funds.

The pressure from competition is...

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Nonexistent | | | | | | | | | | | Very high |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |

(b) If the pressure from competition is high (Grade 6 or higher), how likely is it that this will endanger your company’s future?

- 1) Very likely
- 2) Likely
- 3) Somewhat likely
- 4) Unlikely
- 5) Very unlikely

5. As compared with its main competitors, would you consider your establishment to be better, the same or worse in terms of the following aspects?

- a) Labor productivity.....Better The same Worse
- b) Job securityBetter The same Worse
- c) ProfitBetter The same Worse

6. Please indicate whether the following instruments exist in your establishment:

- a) Job descriptions for most of the existing jobs Yes No
- b) A stipulated procedure for staff recruitment..... Yes No
- c) Written agreements on objectives with employees..... Yes No
- d) Planning of personnel development and advanced training set out in writing... Yes No
- e) Written personnel reviews..... Yes No



If you answered yes to part e (written personnel reviews), what are those reviews used for?

- Decisions on wage increases
- Decisions on advanced training activities.....
- Decisions on promotions
- Other: _____

7. How many hierarchy levels do you differentiate within your establishment? (Please include the top and bottom levels.)

INT: If the number of hierarchical levels in various operating areas differs, please indicate the maximum number.

Number of levels:

8. What is the status of your establishment with regard to binding agreements?

- a) It is bound by an industry-wide wage agreement
- b) It is bound by a company agreement concluded between the establishment and the trade union.....
- c) It is not bound by a collective agreement.....

9. Based on the wage agreement currently in force, does your company pay employees salaries and wages above the collectively agreed-upon scale?

INT: This question applies to employees only.

- Yes
- No

10. Does your establishment have...

(a) A works council or staff council elected in accordance with the Works Council Constitution Act?

- Yes
- No.....

(b) Another form of staff representation that is specific to your company, such as a staff spokesperson, round-table conferences or something similar?

- Yes
 No

- 11. How would you rate your company's annual result for the preceding fiscal year?**
 Please answer according to the following scale, where -5 means the annual result was "very bad" and +5 means the annual result was "very good." Grade your statement by choosing a number between -5 and +5.

INT: Annual result is defined as profits minus expenditures.

The annual result was...

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very bad | | | | | | | | | | | Very good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 | |

- 12. To what extent has your company newly developed, improved, or further developed a product or service in the past business year (2011)?**

- 1) To a very small extent
 2) To a small extent
 3) To a moderate extent
 4) To a large extent
 5) To a very large extent

- 13. How do you assess the overall technical state of the facilities and of the factory and business equipment used in your establishment?**

- 1) Completely new standard
 2) Relatively new standard
 3) Partly new standard
 4) Obsolete
 5) Completely obsolete

- 14. What percentage of persons within each of the employment groups listed below was employed at this establishment as of March 31, 2012?**

INT: Questions 14 through 19 can also be answered later (on an additional form) if the information requested is not available.

1) Employees subject to social security	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/> %
2) Trainees/apprentices	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/> %
3) Marginal part-time workers	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/> %
4) Civil servants, including civil service candidates	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/> %
TOTAL	
	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/> 100 %

15. **The following three questions refer to the personnel structure of your establishment. Please indicate how the percentage of employees counted on March 31, 2012 was distributed among the employment groups listed.**

What was the percentage of each group within the total number employed in the company?

What percentage within each subgroup were women?

What percentage within each subgroup did not have German citizenship?

INT: To calculate the percentage of women and of people without German citizenship, the respondent should consider the respective proportions of each work group within the total population. *Example:* 10% of the group perform a simple activity, of which half are women, so the share done by women would be 50%.

	% of Total	% Women	Without German Citizenship
1) Employees for menial jobs that requiring no specific vocational education	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
2) Employees for qualified jobs that			
a) ... require a completed vocational training or comparable on-the-job training or applicable professional experience	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
b)... require a university degree or university of applied sciences degree	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
3) Executives	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
4) Working proprietors, directors, managers	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
5) Trainees/apprentices	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
6) Civil service candidates	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %	<input type="text"/> %
TOTAL	<input type="text" value="100"/> %	<input type="text" value="100"/> %	<input type="text" value="100"/> %

16. **What percentage in your establishment were part-time workers on this date?**

%

What percentage of this subgroup were women on this date? %

INT: Part-time work is defined as employment which involves less than 80% of the regular working time.

17. **Regarding the executive staff at your establishment, were any executives working part-time?**

Yes.....

No ➔ Proceed to **Question 18**

(b) If yes, what percentage of the executives were working part-time? %

(c) What percentage of these part-time executives were women? %

18. What is the percentage of workers with a...

What percentage of these were women?

	In total	Women
1) Permanent contract	[] %	[] %
2) Initial fixed-term contract	[] %	[] %
3) Fixed-term contract	[] %	[] %
4) Temporary employment contract	[] %	[] %
TOTAL	100 %	100 %

19. In percentages, what is the age distribution of the employees in this establishment/ operating unit?

If precise values are not available, please estimate.

1. Under age 30	[] %
2) Age 30 to 49	[] %
3) Age 50 or older	[] %
TOTAL	100 %

20. Which of the following measures are taken at your establishment/company with respect to the employment of older employees (i.e. employees who are 50 years of age or older)?

- a) Partial retirement.....
- b) Adjustment of demands concerning performance/work on individual basis
- c) Mixed-age teams.....
- d) Within-firm advanced training activities.....
- e) Special advanced training programs.....
- f) Health-promoting measures.....
- g) Other measures

INT: Please check 'h' if there are NO measures for older employees.

- h) No measures for older employees

21. What percentage of employees participated in internal or external advanced training activities during the second half of 2011?

Employees in training courses: [] %

22. I will now read out three ways of recruiting personnel. For each of these methods, please indicate whether or not it is used at your establishment?

- a) Do you use personal contacts or recommendations of other employees? Yes
 No
- b) Do you fall back on employees who were formerly employed in your establishment? Yes
 No
- c) Do you use other methods for recruiting personnel, such as advertisements, electronic media solicitation, an employment agency, recruitment agencies and unsolicited applications? Yes
 No

Part 2: Equal Opportunities/Diversity

23. Regarding equal opportunities for men and women,

(a) Does your establishment/operating unit have agreements in place or does it use voluntary operational initiatives for this purpose to promote equal opportunities for men and women?

- Yes ➔ Proceed to **Question 23 b)**
 No

INT: Multiple answers are possible.

(b) If yes, check the agreements that apply:

- Legal agreements
- Collective labor agreements
- Voluntary operational initiatives
- Other

24. I will now read out several measures that support equal opportunities for men and women.

Please indicate which ones have been taken by your establishment/operating unit. Please indicate how often the measures that have been taken by your establishment/operating unit were used within the last year.

Measure	Taken	Frequency of use
1) Promotion of female junior staff through targeted career planning, mentoring programs for women, networking groups for women	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
2) Targeted promotion of female junior staff by preferential recruitment of women (female quotas)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
3) Use of mixed-gender teams specifically to support equal opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
4) Other measures, namely:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>

25. **I will now read out several family-friendly measures.**
Please indicate which ones have been taken by your establishment/operating unit?
Please indicate how often the measures that have been taken by your establishment/operating unit were used within the last year.

INT: If so, how often was this measure used within the last year?

1 = measure is taken seldomly

2 = measure is taken sometimes

3 = measure is taken frequently

4 = measure is taken very often

Measure	Taken	Frequency of use
1) Operational child care (e.g., company kindergarten, company nursery, day-care center, homework supervision on-site), financial support or other forms of assistance for child care	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
2) Opportunities for employees who are out on parental leave (previously: "maternity leave")	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
3) Flexible working hours (flextime)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
4) Telecommuting work/home work	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
5) Special leave/unpaid leave (e.g., interruption of work to care for relatives or children)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
6) Other measures, namely:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>

26. **I will now read out several measures to integrate employees with different cultural or ethnic backgrounds.**

Please indicate which ones are taken by your establishment/operating unit.

Please indicate how often the measures that have been taken by your establishment/operating unit were used within the last year.

Measure	Taken	Frequency of use
1) Language courses	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
2) Promotion of employees with different cultural/ethnic backgrounds through targeted career planning, mentoring programs, networking groups	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
3) Courses on cultural competence/getting to know the German culture	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
4) Mixed teams used specifically to support equal opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>
5) Other measures, namely:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>

Part 3: Health Promotion

27. Which of the following measures for employees' health protection and health promotion are implemented or financially supported by your establishment/operating unit?

- a) Sickness rate analysis
- b) Employee survey on health protection in the workplace
- c) Discussion group on health problems at the establishment ("health circles").....
- d) Courses on health-promoting behavior.....
- e) Others, namely: _____

Part 4: Willingness to Participate in the Panel Survey

28. Before we conclude this interview, I have one final request. In order to complete this research project successfully, it is important for us to conduct a follow-up interview with all respondents after 2 years to understand the reasons for any changes that have been made within the company over that period. Your participation in this second interview is very valuable for us.

To conduct a follow-up interview in the context of this survey, we must your contact information.

In accordance with the Data Protection Act, we ensure that details regarding your contact information (name and address of the company) will be saved separately. Your information will remain completely anonymous throughout the study. It will not be shared with evaluating researchers and cannot be connected to the responses you have provided. Once the research project has been completed, your address will be permanently deleted.

We would be very grateful if you would agree to contribute to our research project.

Do you agree to participate in the panel survey?

Yes

No

INT: Please make sure that you have the contact details of the interviewee and, if applicable, his or her corresponding department to ensure further contact.

29. As stated in our previous correspondence, we will gladly send you a brief overview of our research results. Would you be interested in receiving this information?

Yes

No

Thank you very much for your participation.

Additional Information on Data

DOI: [10.4119/unibi/sfb882.2014.12](https://doi.org/10.4119/unibi/sfb882.2014.12)

Creators:

Diewald, Martin
Schunck, Reinhard
Abendroth, Anja-Kristin
Melzer, Silvia Maja
Reimann, Mareike
Pausch, Stephanie

Title:

LEEP-B3

Publisher:

SFB 882

Year of publication:

2014

Subjects:

Sociology
DOAJ: Social Sciences
DDC: 301

Contributors:

ContactPerson: Abendroth, Anja-Kristin
ContactPerson: Melzer, Silvia Maja
ProjectLeader: Diewald, Martin
ProjectLeader: Schunck, Reinhard
ProjectMember: Abendroth, Anja-Kristin
ProjectMember: Melzer, Silvia Maja
ProjectMember: Reimann, Mareike
ProjectMember: Pausch, Stephanie
HostingInstitution: Universität Bielefeld
RegistrationAgency: Universitätsbibliothek Bielefeld
Producer: Teilprojekt B3
Funder: DFG

Dates:

Accepted: 2014-02-13

Primary language of this resource (ISO 639):

de

Resource type:

Dataset (Stata dataset)

Size:

10000 kb

Formats:

application/x-stata-dta

Version:

1.0

Rights (license):

Confidential data.

Abstract:

Der LEEP-B3 Datensatz wurde im Rahmen des Teilprojektes "Wechselwirkungen zwischen Verwirklichungschancen im Berufs- und Privatleben" erstellt. Mit Hilfe des Datensatzes kann die Rolle betrieblicher Kontexte bei der Genese sozialer Ungleichheiten unter Berücksichtigung wechselseitiger Beeinflussung von Berufs- und Privatleben untersucht werden. Neben der Befragung von Beschäftigten und deren Einschätzungen zu Verwirklichungschancen in beiden Lebensbereichen werden Arbeitgeber nach Maßnahmen befragt, die Arbeitnehmern eine Verwirklichung nicht nur im Berufs-, sondern auch im Privatleben ermöglichen. Dabei wird die Rolle von Betrieben als Verhandlungspartner und Gelegenheitsstrukturen gleichermaßen untersucht. Durch die Verknüpfung der Befragung von Arbeitgebern wie auch Arbeitnehmern entsteht ein Datensatz im Linked-Employer-Employee-Design.

Previously published SFB 882 Technical Reports:

Meinert, Julia & Sünkel, Zara (2013): *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung devianten und delinquenten Verhaltens im Lebensverlauf und ihre Bedeutung für soziale Ungleichheitsprozesse: Methodendokumentation der Schülerbefragungen in Dortmund und Nürnberg. Erste Erhebung 2012*, SFB 882 Technical Report Series, No. 01, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.

Pausch, Stephanie; Harald, Julia; Schunk Reinhard & Jacobebbinghaus, Peter (2013): *Methodenbericht Betriebsbefragung Projekt B3: Wechselwirkungen zwischen Verwirklichungschancen im Berufs- und Privatleben*, SFB 882 Technical Report Series, No. 02, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.

Golsch, Katrin, Bröckel, Miriam, & Pruisken, Henrik (2013): *Measuring social support within partnerships: proposal for a short survey instrument*, SFB 882 Technical Report Series, No. 03, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.